

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.

Towards collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori.

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

Doctor of Education, at Massey University, Manawatū,  
New Zealand.

Mākao Teresa Bowkett

2015

## Abstract

This thesis investigates Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that could assist secondary school principals and teachers to foster an environment to facilitate more appropriately, in Māori terms, the learning and teaching of Māori students who are attending mainstream secondary schools and kaupapa Māori schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The study included two types of secondary schools: one mainstream secondary school; and one kaupapa Māori school. In each school, interviews were undertaken with the two principals, groups of teachers and groups of parents. The aim was firstly to identify leadership approaches in the two schools that staff and parents there saw as successfully encouraging teaching and learning practices that are meeting the needs of Māori students. In addition two significant Māori leaders in Māori education were interviewed for their insights about the current state of Māori education and the potential future of Māori education. By capturing the perspectives of all the participants through a series of face to face interviews/kanohi ki te kanohi conversations the research investigated a framework for Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that is adaptable for mainstream and kaupapa Māori schools.

The thesis concludes that there were multiple approaches to kaupapa Māori in terms of unique experiences and understanding, rather than one exclusive form of a Kaupapa Māori approach. The diversity of many Māori worldviews across iwi explained why there was no singular, universal concept found. Respondents identified tikanga Māori values and practices that were iwi specific, inclusive of cultural identity and whanaungatanga family relationships, as significant in kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership, but had reservations about the capabilities of schools' leadership to adapt. Hence they highlighted the importance of collaborative pathways of leadership that encompass change in order to make a difference for Māori students. An implication of the findings is that principals need to be held accountable for the results of Māori students in their schools. Furthermore, secondary schools need to change the leadership, structure and pedagogy of schooling for the majority of Māori students attending mainstream schools, and for some in kaupapa Māori schools. Strategies for how to implement change implicated in the findings are explored.

## He mihi mō Te Mātauranga

Ko te whiu o te kōrero I whiua ki Tarimano

Ko Te Aongahoro Ko Te Ruahine

A Tawakeheimoa

Kia rere, Ki mua

Ko Rangiwewehi e

Kei te tangi, kei te hotu ki a rātou ngā pukenga, ngā wānanga

kua riro atu ki Te Pūtahitanga nui o Rehua

kua whetūrangihia koutou, hei tiahotanga mā mātou ngā pia, ngā tauira e kawē nei i ngā

hua o ngā Kete wānanga, e mana ai te kupu kōrero o ngā Tūpuna e mea nei.

“Ko te Manu e kai ana i te miro, nōna te ngāhere

Ko te Manu e kai ana i te mātauranga, nōna te āo.”

Ka huri aku mihi ki a koutou i awhi mai, kia tūtuki tēnei kaupapa.

Kāti rā, ko te mihi o taku manawa e rere atu ana

ki te tau o taku ate ki taku mokopuna Kahurangi

a Ella Mae Bowkett

Nāu ahau i whakaongaonga

kia ea ai aku mahi, ā, kua ea.





Ella Mae Bowkett

## Acknowledgements

Heartfelt thanks to Professor Claire McLachlan, my supervisor, whose absolute confidence and trust cleared the obstacles in my path.

My sincere thanks to my former supervisor Dr Marian Court and Professor Wally Penetito, my former second supervisor; both were an integral part of my doctoral adventure. Special thanks to Dr James Graham for so much support and expertise on the Kaupapa Māori sections and the final draft. Ngā mihi maioha. Thanks also to Associate Professor Tracy Riley for completing the team effort. He mihi hoki.

My grateful thanks to Dame Iritana Tāwhiwhirangi, inspirational stalwart of the National Kōhanga Reo Movement, Mereana Selby, Tumuaki, Te Wānanga o Raukawa, Nori Parata, Tumuaki, Tolaga Bay Area School and Kuranui, Arihia Stirling, Tumuaki, Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae. Kei aku Rangatira, ko tēnei taku mihi aroha. Thank you to the respective staff, teachers, parents, and communities who also supported this research so that others may benefit. E kore ngā mihi e mutu!

I wish to acknowledge my mother Rangimārie Hahunga (nee Pukeroa) who died on 20 January 2014 before I completed this work. Moe mai rā.

The value of education resonates deep within the heart of my whānau. My late husband Jim Bowkett and I had always believed it was important for me to document some of my educational experiences and knowledge, and to continue to pursue the best possible outcomes for Māori.

In Jim's memory, this thesis is dedicated to our first mokopuna, Ella Mae Bowkett, who was born in Te Ūpoko o te ika a Māui Wellington, Aotearoa New Zealand on Monday 16 March 2015.

*He tohu maioha tēnei.*

*He pōhiri tēnei ko koe ki taku ao tō ātaabuatanga te mōkai o tātou whānau.*

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	i
He mihi mō Te Mātauranga .....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Table of Contents .....	v
List of Figures and Tables .....	xi
Māori Glossary .....	xii
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 ‘Problem’ and purpose of the study .....	1
1.2 Background and rationale .....	2
Chapter 2 Literature .....	11
2.1 Introduction .....	11
2.2 New Zealand Education Policy and Research.....	12
2.2.1 BES .....	12
2.2.2 Ka Hikitia .....	14
2.2.3 The Education Review Office (ERO) .....	15
2.2.4 Te Kotahitanga.....	17
2.2.5 He Kākano.....	20
2.3 Māori Leadership.....	22
2.4 International School Leadership Literature.....	25
2.4.1 Summary of Māori Educational Strategy and Leadership in Schools .....	31
2.5 Social Justice – Pathways towards being successful as Māori.....	32

2.6	Kaupapa Māori: Theoretical Context of a Māori Worldview .....	38
2.6.1	Summary.....	41
2.6.2	Research questions.....	42
Chapter 3	Materials and Methods .....	44
3.1	Introduction.....	44
3.2	Epistemology and Theoretical Framework.....	45
3.3	Methodology.....	50
3.3.1	Kaupapa Māori Approaches to Gathering Data.....	50
3.3.2	Case Studies .....	51
3.4	Methods.....	53
3.4.1	Semi-structured Interviews.....	53
3.4.2	Focus Groups.....	55
3.5	The Study Participants.....	60
3.6	Research Process .....	64
3.7	Analysis of the Data.....	66
3.8	Thematic and Content Analysis .....	67
3.9	Ethical Considerations.....	68
3.10	Summary.....	71
Chapter 4	Findings .....	73
4.1	Case Study 1.....	73
4.2	Nori - Approaches to Leadership.....	73

4.3	Nori – Influencing the Learning Environment .....	80
4.4	Nori’s – Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori Approaches .....	84
4.5	Nori – Summary .....	87
4.6	Teachers’ Views of Nori’s Approaches to Leadership .....	90
4.6.1	Identity.....	90
4.6.2	Connective Relationships .....	91
4.7	Teachers’ Views of Nori Influencing the Learning Environment .....	94
4.7.1	Summary.....	100
4.8	Teachers’ Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori .....	101
4.9	Teachers – Summary .....	105
4.10	Parents’ views of Nori’s Approaches to Leadership.....	106
4.11	Parents’ Views of Nori influencing the Learning Environment .....	109
4.12	Parents’ Views and practices of Kaupapa Māori.....	112
4.13	Parents – Summary .....	114
4.14	Overall summary .....	115
Chapter 5	Findings .....	117
5.1	Case Study 2.....	117
5.2	Arihia – Approaches to Leadership.....	118
5.3	Arihia – Influencing the Learning Environment.....	120
5.4	Arihia’s – Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori.....	124
5.5	Arihia – Summary .....	126

5.6	Teachers' / Parents' Views of Arihia's Approaches to Leadership .....	128
5.7	Teachers' / Parents' Views of Arihia Influencing the Learning Environment.... .....	131
5.8	Teachers' and Parents' Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori .....	134
5.9	Teachers and Parents – Summary.....	137
5.10	Overall summary .....	139
Chapter 6	Key Informant Interviews .....	140
6.1	Introduction .....	140
6.2	Māori Leader 1.....	140
6.3	The Effectiveness of Mainstream Leadership .....	141
6.3.1	Summary.....	148
6.4	Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori.....	149
6.5	Kaupapa Māori Approaches in Mainstream Secondary Schools .....	150
6.5.1	Summary.....	151
6.6	Māori Leader 2.....	152
6.7	The Effectiveness of Mainstream Leadership .....	152
6.7.1	Summary.....	155
6.8	Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori.....	155
6.8.1	Summary.....	156
6.9	Kaupapa Māori Approaches in Mainstream Secondary Schools .....	157
6.9.1	Summary.....	158
6.10	Overall summary .....	158

Chapter 7	Discussion.....	160
7.1	Introduction.....	160
7.2	How Effective is Educational Leadership in meeting the needs of Māori Students in Mainstream Secondary Schools? .....	161
7.3	How does Educational Leadership in Kaupapa Māori Secondary Schools work towards meeting the needs of Māori Students? .....	164
7.4	What Kaupapa Māori Approaches to Educational Leadership could be used in Mainstream Secondary Schools / Kaupapa Māori Schools? .....	165
7.5	Implications for Educational Leadership .....	169
7.6	Strengths and Weaknesses of Methodology.....	171
7.7	Further Research .....	172
Chapter 8	Summary and Conclusions .....	174
8.1	Summary.....	174
8.2	Conclusions.....	179
References.....		182
Appendices.....		205
Appendix 1 .....		206
Appendix 2.....		208
Appendix 2.....		211
Appendix 2.....		214
Appendix 2.....		217
Appendix 3.....		220

Appendix 4.....	221
Appendix 5.....	222
Appendix 6.....	223
Appendix 7.....	224
Appendix 8.....	225

## List of Figures and Tables

Figure 1.	Photograph of Ella Mae Bowkett	iii
Table 3.1	Case Studies	60
Table 3.2	Mainstream school interviews	62
Table 3.3	Kaupapa Māori school interviews	63
Table 8.4	Leadership approaches identified as meeting the needs of Māori students (CS1)	176
Table 8.5	Leadership approaches identified as meeting the needs of Māori students (CS2)	177
Table 8.6	A Kaupapa Māori Framework	178

## Māori Glossary

Ahipara	A town, locality in Northland, Aotearoa
Aotearoa	Māori name for New Zealand
Āpiha Māori	Māori officer or policy advisor
awa	river
hapū	subtribe
hau kāinga	home; true home
hauora	health
hui	meeting or gathering
iwi	tribal nation
Kahukuranui	Māori Immersion section of Tolaga Bay Area School
kaikaranga	female who carry out the karanga
kaimoana	seafood
kanohi ki te kanohi	face to face
kapa haka	Māori performing arts
karakia	Māori incantations and prayers for guidance, protection
karanga	an exchange of calls to welcome visitors
kaupapa	social or political cause or issue; rationale, philosophy
Kaupapa Māori	critical pro-Māori policy, philosophy, research
ki-o-rahi	Māori game played with a small round ball or ki
kōhanga	nest
kōhanga reo	language learning nest

kōrero Māori i ngā wā katoa	speak Māori language all the time
kura	school
Kuranui	Māori Immersion section of Tolaga Bay Area School
mana whenua	customary authority exercised by iwi or hapū in an area
Māori	indigenous person of Aotearoa New Zealand
marae	communal, sacred place for social and religious purposes
mātauranga	education or knowledge
matua	parent
maunga	mountain
me	and
moana	sea
Moe mai ra	Rest in peace
ngā	the (plural)
Ngāti Haua	A tribal nation from eastern Waikato, Aotearoa
Ngāti Huia	A hapū of Ngāti Raukawa, Aotearoa
Ngāti Kahungunu	A tribal nation from Paritū north of Wairoa to Tūrakirae in the south Wairarapa and from the coastal borders in the East to the western mountain ranges of Huiarau, Maungaharuru, Kaweka, Ruahine and Tararua
Ngāti Kauwhata	A tribal nation from the Aorangi settlement, Feilding, Aotearoa
Ngāti Porou	A tribal nation from the East Cape and Gisborne, Aotearoa

Ngāti Rangiwewehi	A tribal nation from the confederated tribes of Te Arawa, Aotearoa
Ngāti Raukawa	A tribal nation from Waikato, Taupo, Manawatū and Horowhenua, Aotearoa
Ngā taiohi	students
Ngāti Tamaterā	A tribal nation from the Hauraki region, Aotearoa
Ngāti Toa Rangatira	A tribal nation from Kapiti, Wellington and Te Tau Ihu (northern South Island) regions, Aotearoa
Pākehā	non-Māori New Zealander
Pārekereke	Junior kapa haka group at Tolaga Bay Area School
Rangatira	Māori chief or leader; authority or distinction
Rangitāne	A tribal nation from Manawatū, Horowhenua and Marlborough areas, Aotearoa
reo	language
Tainui	Tribal waka confederation of New Zealand Māori iwi, central North Island, Aotearoa
Tai Rāwhiti	Māori name for East Coast, Aotearoa
Tai Tokerau	Māori name for Northland, Aotearoa
tamariki	children
tangata Māori	Māori person(s), people
tangata whenua	indigenous people of the land; first people of the land
taumata	summit; high place; speakers' bench
te	the (singular)

Te Aitanga a Hauiti	Tribal nation of Tokomaru Bay to Gisborne, Aotearoa
Te Arawa	The Te Arawa people of the Bay of Plenty, Aotearoa
Te Āti Awa	A tribal nation from Taranaki and Wellington regions, Aotearoa
Te Rarawa	A tribal nation of Northland, Aotearoa
te reo Rangatira	Māori language
Te Tiriti o Waitangi	The Treaty of Waitangi
Te Ūpoko o te ika a Māui	Māori name for Wellington, Aotearoa
tikanga	customs or culture
tinana	person; physical
tīpuna	ancestors
tuawhā	fourth
tūrangawaewae	standing place
Uawa	Māori name for Tolaga Bay, Aotearoa
Ūkaipō	identity, homelands, mothers
wairua	spirituality
waka	canoe
wānanga	tertiary or adult learning institution; learning situation
whakapapa	genealogy
whakawhanaungatanga	process of establishing relationships; relating to others
whānau	family
whanaungatanga	family processes based on kinship obligations

whare tū taua

school for ancient Māori weaponry

## Chapter 1 Introduction

Ka kōrihi ngā manu

Ka tākiri mai te ata

Ka ao ka ao

Ka awatea

Tihei Mauri Ora!

When the birds begin to sing

The morning breaks

It is dawn, it is dawn

It is daylight

We welcome the sweet breath of life!

### 1.1 'Problem' and purpose of the study

This study documents an investigation of Kaupapa Māori approaches to thinking about and practising leadership for improving the education of Māori students in one mainstream secondary school and one kaupapa Māori school.

As the researcher, I have an extensive background in education which includes 20 years at the PPTA (New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association). My previous roles included being a teacher and policy analyst in education and this helped to shape my passion for Māori education and politics. Combined with my whakapapa affiliations to Ngāti Rangiwewehi, Te Arawa and my maternal Tai Tokerau links to Ngāti Parewhero, Te Rarawa ki Ahipara, I felt prepared for the work ahead.

This study investigated Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that could assist secondary school principals and teachers to foster an environment to facilitate more appropriately, the learning and teaching of Māori students who are attending mainstream secondary schools and kaupapa Māori schools in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The majority of Māori students, over 85%, are taught by non-Māori teachers in mainstream secondary schools (Ministry of Education, 2014; Tuuta, Bradnam, Hynds, Higgins & Broughton, 2004) and against a backdrop of negative educational outcomes for Māori. This study aimed to identify the features of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership in one mainstream secondary school and one kaupapa Māori school that were working successfully for Māori students, with a view towards creating Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that were adaptable for mainstream secondary schools and kaupapa Māori schools.

## **1.2 Background and rationale**

Numerous reports indicate there is significant and alarming disparity in educational achievement in Aotearoa New Zealand between Māori and non-Māori (Hynds, Meyer, Penetito, Averill, Hindle, Taiwhati, Hodis & Faircloth, 2014; Meyer, Penetito, Hynds, Hindle & Sleeter, 2010; Ministry of Education, 2008, 2009, 2013). Lower Māori participation rates in early childhood and lower levels of achievement at senior secondary level comparative with other New Zealanders are discouraging (Ministry of Social Development, 2007) while rising levels of Māori truancy and suspension rates are also noted (Ministry of Education, 2007, 2008). In terms of socio-economic circumstance there are still significant socio-economic gaps between Māori and non-Māori in education, health, income and labour market status (Chapple, 2000; Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998, 2000). These measurements of Māori educational performance are cause for concern, nonetheless there is research evidence that highlights the links between positive educational achievement and improved income levels, living standards and psychosocial outcomes (Alton-Lee, 2003; Duncan, Yeung, Brooks-Gunn & Smith, 1998; Fergusson, Lloyd & Horwood, 1991; Fergusson & Woodward, 2000; Hynds et al., 2014, McGrath, 2014; Meyer et al., 2010; Ministry of Education, 2005).

The causes of the discrepancy in educational performance between Māori and non-Māori are argued from two differing perspectives; the impacts of colonisation and the impacts of socio-economic disparities. The first perspective maintains that colonisation has caused negative impacts on Māori and this disadvantage is prevalent in the education system and curriculum that is taught (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Pihama, Cram & Walker, 2002; Smith, 1999a). Furthermore the system has been negligent in its

recognition of cultural difference between Māori and Non-Māori where the literature has reported differing world-views (Smith, 1999a, 1999b), pedagogical practices (Bishop, Berryman & Richardson, 2002), and contrasting styles of cognition (Durie, 1994). There are challenges for teachers, Māori and Non-Māori, in accepting these differences and having the ‘tools’ to respond appropriately. Learning environments that do not reflect Māori cultural values and beliefs may impact negatively on the willingness and ease of students to identify as Māori and on their cultural esteem (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh & Teddy, 2007; Durie, 2005). This problem may be exacerbated in mainstream education where Māori students may not be connected to their culture, but at the same time are struggling to fit into the dominant culture of the school. The Kaupapa Māori approaches that incorporate decolonising frameworks, such as those advanced by Smith (1999a, 1999b), can be used to explore and critique the degree to which colonisation has caused negative impacts and educational disadvantage for Māori.

The writings of the revered Ngāti Porou leader Sir Āpirana Ngata (refer to King, 1988; Ngata, 2005, 2006, 2007) clearly show the importance of traditional patterns of social organisation that were based on genealogical authority and, that are still retained and practiced within the contemporary fabric of tribal affiliations today. For example, Iwi (tribal) and affiliated organisations are an enduring part of the traditional groupings of social, political and economic organisation for Māori. In the area of education, there are Iwi who have established Kura-a-Iwi or (Tribal Immersion Schools) that focus on tribal knowledge, narratives, values and aspirations to provide an education that will support and empower the young people in their care. In a communication to Sir Peter Buck, Sir Āpirana Ngata conceded that “our hearts are not with this policy of imposing pākehā culture-forms on our people. Our recent activities would indicate a contrary determination to preserve the old culture-forms as the foundations on which to reconstruct Māori life and hopes” (as cited in Sorrenson, 1986, p. 123).

Most commentaries on Māori social organisation indicated that the earliest social units were formed around the crew of the founding waka or canoe (Buck, 1977; Makereti, 1986). These groups expanded into larger family groupings and were named according to established links with leaders of respective waka. Whānau or family worked as a collective and operated as an autonomous unit that expanded over several generations

often named as hapū. The whānau and the hapū are an expression of important values in Māori social organisation; the people are born from a common ancestor, they have close kinship ties and their lives are organised within a unified collective for mutual benefits. This scenario can be traced to early Māori social settings and has survived in a modern form in contemporary Aotearoa society.

Given the significant impact of the urban Māori experience on Māori, it is worth noting some historical commentary on the journey undertaken by Māori urban migrants. The process of urbanisation of the post-World War Two period would have been associated with the prospects of better housing, better jobs and better health services than were available in rural areas (Chapple, 2000) and continued to occur over many generations. However, the long term impact of urbanisation also resulted in the loss of ties to their homelands and traditional culture (Meredith, 2000). This was apparent in the experience of the offspring from Māori urban migrants who were separated and disenfranchised from the tribal origins of their parents and grandparents. Walker (1979) described the high costs suffered by city born children of Māori migrants who were deprived of the traditional teachings of their elders and the comforts and care of the extended whānau. Within the urban context they were relegated to a minority status as Māori and when coupled with the lack of knowledge about Māori values and pride in their cultural heritage this merely compounded matters and adjustment to living in the towns and cities (p. 38).

Meredith (2000) also recognised with the passing years how generations of Māori had evolved into a new collective of urban Māori membership and had created a more responsive urban Māori environment of cultural affirmation and a greater sense of community (p. 6). Further analyses note that urban Māori advocate, John Tamihere, offered an optimistic presentation to the New Zealand Waitangi Tribunal (1998) stating:

Māori of my generation born in cities find comfort, solace, support and coverage as a Māori under the umbrella of our Matua marae Waititi and Te Whānau o Waipareira. There are now third generation babies that know no other marae than this pan-tribal marae. It is a symbol to the progression of our

people into the urban areas and a statement that we can continue to practice tikanga Māori in a new environment. (p. 40)

Anderson (1983) referred to these as the shared space derived from social and political commitments. Consequently, urban Māori were now in a position to assert their right to be recognised within the broader spectrum of Māori politics and as urban Māori to live as Māori with their own tikanga and bodies that had a uniquely urban Māori infusion.

Traditionally and equally relevant today is the notion of hapū identity as the means and the cause to ensure political and economic status and viability. The whānau and hapū at a broader level melded into a larger and more effective political grouping as an iwi or tribe. Eligibility for iwi membership came through descendancy from a common ancestor through whakapapa; biological and blood ties. Whakapapa ties are very relevant for Māori today as the basis and foundation for both iwi and hapū identity and cultural sustenance in an everchanging dynamic world. For example, in some educational contexts today, where Māori cultural identity is valued and Māori students are provided with the opportunity to be themselves and to develop a sense of belonging and understanding of their place in the world as espoused through *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013).

Battiste (2005), in her narrative on the First Nations experience in Canada, wrote of the systematic bias of the modern education system with its “cognitive imperialism and its Eurocentric, patriarchal, exclusionary and hegemonic foundation” (p. 151). She described how all educators and including Aboriginal educators had been influenced and “marinated in the same Eurocentric, gendered and racialized educational institutions” (p. 152). Accordingly, she opined that the tragedy for Canadian educators was in the generally non-existent training in Aboriginal pedagogy. Included in this is the impact of colonialism, embedded in power, voice and legitimacy, resulting in the marginalisation of Aboriginal peoples’ identity, their knowledge and languages (p. 154). She acknowledged the phenomenal challenges of unpacking the powerful Eurocentric assumptions and narratives of race, gender and difference in curriculum and pedagogy in a post-colonial education system. Despite these barriers she affirmed the value and significance of the journey and process towards a decolonised Indigenous education of

self-determination, and deconstructing decisions about knowledge and reenergising education (p. 155). These perspectives both resonate with Māori experiences and make similar arguments to the Aotearoa New Zealand studies of colonisation. This predicament is endorsed by the British academic, Helen Gunter (2005), who wrote that “educational leadership is not just the must of delivering efficient and effective organization but it is also about challenging the power structures and cultures that we inherit and that can act as barriers to democratic development” (p. 6). Thus advocating the place and value of indigenous approaches to educational leadership and enacting leadership within an Indigenous context.

McGrath (2014) provided a substantive summary and overview of leadership theories in the field of education that tended to reflect the western experience based on “the management and administration of organisational systems” (p. 30). Thus, highlighting the problem of viewing uncritically the concept and construct of leadership as a ‘solution’ to issues in Māori education. Therefore in this study the term leadership is explained and located within a Māori educational context of leadership in Aotearoa New Zealand that is Māori centred and that works towards the advancement and educational success of Māori students. This perspective is central within the ‘local context’ of leadership throughout this study.

According to Mead, Stevens, Third, Jackson and Pfeifer (2006, p. 4), the principle of service as encapsulated in traditional Māori leadership was comparable to a rata whakaruruhau or sheltering rata tree. Mead indicated how the contribution of such leaders was metaphorically described as providing protection and sustenance for their people. It is worth noting that in his review of Māori leadership in a contemporary context he had identified that a necessary prerequisite for a person to lead was the ability to gain a mandate from the people (Mead et al., 2006). So whilst a leader may have been born with certain whakapapa credentials and developed leadership talents, over time the critical point was whether he or she was accepted and confirmed by the people. Such a mandate if given came with a huge responsibility, usually for life and could be taken back by the mandating group or community.

Waitere (2008) located cultural leadership in a framework of complexities that are “value laden, context dependent and politically focussed” (p. 43). Thus, she argues that leadership is about a “relationship with people, process and principles embedded within the socio-political contexts” (p. 45). She noted that leadership can establish potential opportunity and therefore act as a site of transformational change. Hence, she argues the need to gain deeper understanding of the context in which leadership occurs within Māori education particularly in reference to the “politics of knowledge (what is worth teaching and who gets to decide)” and “the politics of place (the geographical context in which education is enacted)” (p. 43). Waitere posed two critical questions: “what are the implications for educational leadership when framed within the needs of a cultural group to retain a cultural identity?” (p. 37); and “what purpose underpins cultural leadership in contemporary educational contexts?” (p. 45). Waitere’s response was to challenge leaders and power brokers at the centre of power to not only take heed of the messages coming from Māori in the ‘margins’ of education but to also take action and accommodate in the interests of Māori students! Her challenge is an incentive for Māori to challenge the insidious forms of colonisation that continue to control the powerbase.

Although the adverse effects of colonisation, often resulting in institutional racism (Freeman-Moir, 1997; Poata-Smith, 1997), are recognised, the second and alternative perspective focuses on the role of socio-economic disparities between Māori and other New Zealanders (Chapple, Jefferies & Walker, 1997). Here, the root cause of Māori educational underachievement is attributed to access and participation in New Zealand’s capitalist economic system (Chapple et al., 1997; Chapple, 2000; Rata, 2003). Accordingly, Māori outcomes are linked to economic status, resource capacity and educational performance (Marie, Fergusson & Boden, 2008). It is argued that the lower socio-economic status of Māori negates their access to resources that support educational participation and attainment. However, according to Sidorkin (2002) the quality of relationships is pivotal as “relations ontologically precede all else in education” (cited in Bishop et al., 2009, p. 6). The point is illustrated in Hattie’s (2003) findings that achievement differences in reading test results between Māori and Pākehā were constant regardless of the school’s decile rating. Hattie (2003) asserted that “the evidence is pointing more to the relationships between teachers and Māori students as the major

issue – it is a matter of cultural relationships not socio-economic resources – as these differences occur at ALL levels of socio-economic status” (p. 7). The proposition therefore is that teachers have the potential and ability to change the educational outcomes of Māori students (Alton-Lee, 2003; Hattie, 2003).

The issues as argued on the state of Māori in education and across New Zealand society are complex and neither the colonisation nor socio-economic perspective is adequate on its own. Both views are relevant and cannot be separated if solutions are to be found. The problem becomes clouded when Māori as a grouping are mostly located in the lower socio economic band. It would be easy to conclude that the influences of colonisation are so entrenched that Māori are destined to remain in a lower socio economic state. However it can be equally argued that the state is failing dismally in its responsibility to provide an education framework that purposely lifts Māori educational achievement levels in a culturally inclusive and empowering form. As this chapter has shown that Māori are lagging behind non-Māori, the majority of Māori attend mainstream schools and are taught by mainly Non-Māori teachers it is reasonable to expect that the national school system be equipped and required to meet the education needs of all its students (Ministry of Education, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2013). Hence the aim of this series of case studies is to identify leadership approaches in one mainstream school and one Kaupapa Māori school that staff and parents there see as successfully encouraging teaching and learning practices that are meeting the needs of all Māori students. To this end, the key questions investigate what Kaupapa Māori approaches to educational leadership are currently tenable to use in schools and how successful these approaches are for Māori students. Kaupapa Māori theory and practices are used as part of the methodology in order to answer the research questions. By capturing the perspectives of all the participants the research investigates a potential framework for Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that is adaptable for mainstream and kaupapa Māori schools.

The thesis is divided into eight chapters. Chapter One has provided an introduction and statement of purpose to investigate Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that could assist secondary school principals and teachers to foster an environment to facilitate, in Māori terms, the learning and teaching of Māori students. This chapter has

also included an overview on the status of Māori students, their lower levels of achievement and rising levels of truancy and suspension comparative with other New Zealand students in mainstream education. The discrepancies in educational performance were presented in brief from two different perspectives. One view is based on the negative impacts of colonisation, while the other locates the root cause of Māori educational underachievement on limited access and participation in New Zealand's capitalist economic system.

Chapter two provides a review of the literature on educational leadership in secondary schools from both Aotearoa New Zealand and the broader international context with a view to identifying good practice and approaches to leadership. There is also a brief section on Māori leadership on aspects of traditional and contemporary Māori leadership. There is a range of statistical national data on education policy and strategy reviewed which was gathered from the relevant government agencies including the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Social Development and the Education Review Office. There is a section on the Ministry of Education's main policy documents *Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy 2008-2012* and *Ka Hikitia – Accelerating Success 2013-2017*. Research drawn from the Best Evidence Synthesis is included within the strategy. The Ministry's *He Kākano* professional development programme to improve Māori student achievement through culturally responsive leadership in secondary schools is examined, along with the 2010 Education Review Report on strategies to promote Māori students' success in schools. The international literature reviewed focuses on the importance of professional leadership, providing support for learning and teaching, engaging and relating to the local communities and having an awareness of the wider political and global influences on education.

Chapter three discusses the methodology used in the study and locates the research within Kaupapa Māori research approaches. Issues of epistemology and theoretical framework in relation to chosen methodology are examined and the research methods are explained and justified. Data collection and approaches to analysis were discussed, along with some of the ethical issues pertinent to the data collection and analysis of data.

Chapters four and five present the findings of the case studies in each school, while chapter six provides additional commentary from interviews with the two significant Māori leaders. These findings focus on the participants' insights and perspectives of leadership approaches that are successfully encouraging the teaching and learning practices of Māori students. Chapter seven synthesises the answers to the research questions in relation to extant literature, reviews limitations of the methodology and proposes avenues of further research. Chapter eight presents an overall summary and conclusions.

## Chapter 2 Literature

### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a review of the literature on educational leadership in secondary schools in Aotearoa New Zealand with a particular focus on the role of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership. This follows with a section on Māori leadership incorporating traditional and contemporary aspects. The review begins with literature from within Aotearoa New Zealand, and then draws on the range of literature from an international context to help identify attributes and practices of good leadership. The overall literature review will be used as the basis to support and inform the critical analysis of the thesis findings.

The following two paragraphs provide an overview of the process undertaken for the literature review. The statistical data provided on the Ministry of Education's website identified the location of Māori students attending secondary schools and their levels of educational outcomes. The website also provided the link to the Ministry's Strategy approach for Māori students, *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2009, 2013) and further access to key documents including:

- Ngā Haeata Mātauranga: the Annual Report on Māori Education.
- A wealth of literature on *Te Kotahitanga*, effective learning and teaching strategies for students in Māori medium education, culture and power relations and key authors in these fields in particular the work led by Russell Bishop and his colleagues.
- Kiwi Leadership Principals as Educational Leaders and *He Kākano*.

The Education Review Office (ERO), Ministry of Social Development and Te Puni Kōkiri websites offered valuable official reporting and statistical data on Māori students. The key words ERO on Māori education and national reporting located the ERO National Reports "Promoting Success for Māori Students: School Progress June 2010". The literature search also located Best Evidence Syntheses on leadership (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009). By using the Massey University library database and Google

Scholar other useful documents were retrieved on Māori education hui and Māori leadership forums. The key words Kaupapa Māori and methodology, Kaupapa Māori theory, Māori education leadership and Māori education leaders were used in the searches.

In terms of the international literature on leadership the searches were undertaken by author and subject using the Massey University library database Discover and initially the ERIC database, and Google Scholar and from there various articles provided insights into additional relevant research. These databases were selected after discussion with the librarians and based on the relevant content, reliability, organisation and regular updating of the information that could be accessed. General key words used included education and educational leaders, leadership and leadership in education, principals, secondary schools or high schools, attributes and qualities.

## **2.2 New Zealand Education Policy and Research**

### **2.2.1 BES**

The *School Leadership and Student Outcomes: Identifying What Works and Why* Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration (BES) programme is a collaborative venture developed by the New Zealand Ministry of Education and a range of experts to identify and explain leadership characteristics linked to improving students' learning outcomes. It drew together bodies of research evidence to explain what works and why to improve education outcomes for students in our schools (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009). The BES on leadership took a practical approach to include all research of reasonable quality, with particular focus on New Zealand studies. Both the work produced and the inquiry processes used to build collaborative knowledge has provided educators and researchers an opportunity to contribute to future research that can inform educational practice.

The BES (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009) report on the impact of school leadership identified two types of leadership: transformational and pedagogical. These types were most prevalent in the empirical research identified and provided sufficient evidence for analysis. Whilst transformational leadership emphasised relationships, the pedagogical leadership highlighted purposes that were more specifically educational. The summary

suggested that pedagogical leadership practices were better predictors of student outcomes than the transformational leadership, because the theory was grounded in evidence relating to learning and teaching and assessment tools were more focused on educational practices and purposes. As well, the data collected were less subjective than the results of surveys on transformational leadership that were influenced by teachers' personal likes and dislikes.

In the BES summary, which involved only 27 published studies on the impact of particular leadership dimensions on a range of student outcomes, the leadership practices in high performing schools indicated that leaders were actively involved in professional learning and sufficiently informed to address the day to day needs of their teachers, including in areas of resourcing and assessment (Robinson et al., 2009). As most of the studies were mainly based in primary schools and focused on the leadership of the principal the recommendation was to conduct further studies on the leadership in more secondary schools. Although the analysis concluded with a strong indication that pedagogically focused leadership impacted on student outcomes when the leadership focus was on learning and teaching and on the well-being and achievement of students.

In terms of Māori student outcomes the BES report stated that achievement improves when teachers have positive teaching and learning relationships with Māori students and when “principals demonstrate professional leadership in relation to teaching and learning” (Robinson et al., 2009, p. 23). Furthermore, the BES supported the view that “principals who focus on teaching and learning as part of their leadership role and participate in the professional development of their staff, tend to improve outcomes for students” (Robinson et al., 2009, p. 27).

Waitere (2008) commented on the complexities of cultural leadership in terms of relationships with people, process and principles embedded in the realm of socio-political contexts. Waitere referred to the politics associated with knowledge in terms of what is of value and who decides, and the politics of place, the context in which education is enacted. Penetito (2010) asserted his view that Māori education was rooted firmly within the Pākehā system of mainstream education and remained subjected to the power base within the institutional and pedagogic structures of mainstream.

## 2.2.2 Ka Hikitia

The Ministry of Education's current policy and strategy documents, *Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy 2008-2012* and *Ka Hikitia – Accelerating Success 2013-2017: The Māori Education Strategy* (Ministry of Education, 2009, 2013) are underpinned by the BES report and have a range of expected outcomes and areas of priority for raising the performance of the education system to improve Māori achievement. The overall aim of the *Ka Hikitia* strategy is to transform the education system and ensure that Māori experiencing education success as Māori is the norm. Such transformation is dependent on students and teachers understanding the relevance of what is learnt, and its application in the wider sense.

*Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2009, 2013) drew on the findings of the BES, including the following concepts of leadership:

- It includes both positional and distributed leadership.
- It views leadership as highly fluid.
- It sees leadership as embedded in specific tasks and situations.

Leadership can be exercised by those without positional authority or formal leadership responsibilities such as those held by senior and middle managers. By including distributed leadership there is recognition of “how leadership may be exercised by anyone whose ideas or actions are influential on the context of specific tasks and activities” (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, p. 67). Leadership that is highly fluid allows for participants to engage in seamless acts of influencing colleagues and their behaviour. Furthermore, the concept of leadership is linked to task-relevant expertise where the influencing ideas or actions are viewed in context and determined by others as either useful or not for achieving a satisfactory outcome.

The distinction is made between management, which is about “maintaining operations and routines”, and leadership, which involves “influencing people to think and act differently” (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, p. 68). Educational leadership is seen as leadership that brings about change and improved educational outcomes for students. It also suggests the notion of leadership by influence which resonates within Māori

pedagogy and Māori approaches to leadership that is dependent on providing vision, motivation, encouragement, support and the building of strong followership (Mead et al., 2006; Penetito, 2010). Furthermore it acknowledged that Māori educational leaders have additional expectations placed on them to ensure Māori students have both universal knowledge and skills, along with the cultural, social and wider aspirations of their respective Māori communities.

Following on from *Ka Hikitia*, the Ministry's *Kivi Leadership for Principals* (KLP) document provided an "approach" to school leadership "that takes account of the particular conditions in which New Zealand's self-managing schools operate" (Ministry of Education, 2008, p. 7). The document emphasised the importance of principals developing their relationships with teachers, and communicating goals and expectations more clearly. Thus, it proposes, that when principals get the relationships right then educational matters can be addressed more effectively. As noted in the introduction by the Secretary for Education, "A critical leadership challenge is reflected in the disproportionately large number of Māori and Pasifika students who are not achieving their potential within the current education system" (p. 4). McGrath's (2014) critique of the KLP goes one step further and locates this model of leadership within a western framework that "serves to perpetuate power relationships over indigenous peoples through the continued political control of what knowledge counts" (p. 66).

As a government strategy *Ka Hikitia*, has recognised the inequitable education outcomes for Māori, and is focused on shifting thinking and changing attitudes. Its purpose is to transform the education system so that Māori are able to enjoy success as learners and as Māori. This is in alignment with the contribution and focus of the Education Review Office (ERO) on implementing initiatives that aim to make a positive difference to raise Māori student achievement.

### **2.2.3 The Education Review Office (ERO)**

In its monitoring and evaluation of New Zealand schools the Education Review Office (2010) found that only a third of secondary schools maintained high levels of Māori student achievement. Within these schools there was a culture of inclusion that was reflected in "school leaders' and teachers' understanding of the centrality of *te reo me ngā*

*tikanga* in the curriculum, responsive teaching, positive student-teacher relationships, and the inclusion of parents' views and aspirations in working with Māori learners” (ERO, 2010, p. 2). Furthermore, schools that had “developed initiatives in response to what they knew about Māori students and whānau tended to be more effective in building better relationships and enhancing achievement” (ERO, 2010, p. 3). In these secondary schools, ERO found that Māori student achievement had either remained at high levels or substantially improved. These schools demonstrated consistently good presence and engagement of Māori students. There were several common characteristics in these schools, but most of all they were inclusive of students and their parents and whānau.

The report highlighted however the need for all educators to recognise their professional responsibility to provide a learning environment that promotes success for Māori students. A substantial proportion of schools do not review their own performance in relation to Māori student achievement (ERO, 2010). These schools do not make effective use of data to improve classroom programmes and school-wide systems to promote success for Māori. Nor do they use research about Māori students' learning to guide their curriculum review and pedagogical development. Indeed ERO found that the majority of secondary schools lacked robust data in relation to Māori student achievement and therefore noted that schools needed to establish a baseline of information specifically for Māori students in order to compare current achievement levels with previous data (ERO, 2010). In the absence of such data schools did not know the extent to which Māori students were succeeding, or if there was a need for targeted interventions and changes to teaching practice. Where improvement programmes were put in place these were often for all students, and separate data for Māori was not collected or analysed. As a result there was no way of demonstrating the impact of these programmes on Māori students, or that disparities in achievement had been addressed. In order to address the persistent disparities in the education system ERO have undertaken to monitor schools closely to support the acceleration of Māori student achievement (ERO, 2015).

This ERO report made a number of recommendations (2010, p. 32) for school leaders to action in support of promoting Māori students' success in schools. ERO recommended that school leaders:

- Evaluate the impact of their initiatives to improve Māori students' presence, engagement and achievement, and use this information in their self review;
- Provide leadership, support, encouragement and professional development for trustees, senior managers and teachers to build their capability in implementing policies and practices that promote success for Māori students;
- Familiarise themselves with *Ka Hikitia – Management for Success* and use it in their thinking, planning and action for Māori learners;
- Support teachers to implement effective pedagogical practices for Māori;
- Continue to review their school curricula to ensure that these reflect the aspirations and needs of Māori students and are inclusive of principles of *The New Zealand Curriculum*;
- Improve school practices for assessment for learning, including rigorous analysis of student achievement data for school planning and reporting purposes; and
- Use a variety of ways to engage parents and whānau regularly and involve them in students' learning.

The theme of promoting Māori students' success in schools is further supported by the Te Kotahitanga research and professional development programme that highlights the need for culturally responsive learning and teaching contexts for Māori.

#### **2.2.4 Te Kotahitanga**

One of the interventions to bring about change at the level of schools and classroom, *Te Kotahitanga*, was pioneered by Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson (2003). Much has been made of the Ministry of Education funded *Te Kotahitanga* projects over its five phases of development from 2001 through to 2010. The project, which started in 2001, involved a sequence of in-depth semi-structured interviews with 70 Māori students from

five mainstream secondary schools in Aotearoa New Zealand. The students were engaged in conversations about their classroom experiences and how they were affected by these experiences. This process of collaborative storytelling was complemented with additional data provided by their families (50), their principals (5) and their teachers (80, 23% of the staff in the 5 schools) (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh & Teddy, 2009, p. 1) and from these a series of narratives were developed. The methodology used identified and incorporated a Kaupapa Māori (philosophy and research) approach that acknowledged mātauranga Māori (Smith, 1997) as an approach to address Māori educational achievement and disparities. The solutions were located within Māori cultural ways of knowing that operated firmly outside of the majority culture system that had effectively marginalised Māori in school institutions (Bishop; 2005; Smith, 1992, 2003).

From 2004 – 2007 *Te Kotahitanga* was introduced into an additional 33 New Zealand secondary schools. The overall aim of the *Te Kotahitanga* model has been to develop culturally responsive pedagogies designed to enhance Māori student achievement based on the “Effective Teaching Profile” concept, which was focused on teacher professional development to enhance teacher practice (Meyer et al., 2010). Bishop (2003) wrote that Māori students and their whānau are not passive bystanders in education and are intelligent enough to recognise that they have a significant responsibility in their educational achieving in education, but within the classroom and school context teachers were the significant agents. Bishop reported that in the *Te Kotahitanga* narratives Māori students rated their relationships with teachers as being influential to their learning. Students identified and understood what behaviour was appropriate in a classroom setting and the consequences of their actions whether positive or negative. Their teachers in return identified some basic requirements expected of Māori students, such things as attending class, bringing the right equipment and coming with the intention of learning.

In his critique of Phase 1 of *Te Kotahitanga*, Nash (2005) asserted that the evidence did not back up the research claims that the *Te Kotahitanga* teacher professional development programme improved Māori students’ educational achievement. Yet, he acknowledged that there might be processes operating in ways that reduce the achievement of Māori

students. Openshaw (2007) further argued, that proponents of *Te Kotahitanga* had threatened collaborative professionalism by imposing notions of ‘best practice’ and adhering uncritically to culturalist ideology (Openshaw, 2007; Rata & Openshaw, 2006). Teachers however, reported a number of positive outcomes from the *Te Kotahitanga* project that involved classroom observations, in-class support, feedback, collaborative cross-curricular conversations with colleagues, implementing the “Effective Teaching Profile” concept, goal setting and reflecting individually and collaboratively (Bishop et al., 2007, p. 131). Teachers also recognised the significance of the “Effective Teaching Profile” of *Te Kotahitanga*, as it came directly from student narratives on their experiences of schooling.

In their “*Summary Report Evaluation of Te Kotahitanga: 2004-2008*”, Meyer, Penetito, Hynds, Savage, Hindle and Sleeter (2010) found that teachers valued the relationship-based pedagogies of the professional development and their positive impact on classroom instruction and enhanced outcomes for Māori and non-Māori students as well. Students also reported a greater sense of pride in “their identity as Māori learners and increases in culturally responsive practices” (p. 3). They commented on the ways in which teachers showed they valued them as learners and as Māori, and indicated that positive relationships were essential in their learning process. Whānau also noted major changes for the better in their children, especially in terms of enthusiasm to attend school and motivation to achieve. However, some whānau still expressed concern at the lack of support for Māori culture and te reo, and that their children “still struggled to be both Māori and high achievers” (p. 4). The 2010 report findings suggested that relationships between schools and the Māori community were generally not happening, and were most evident by the lack of information sharing and strategies for effective engagement with Māori whānau.

Meyer et al. (2010) commented on the lack of distributed leadership responsibilities for *Te Kotahitanga*, with only “philosophical rather than structural” (p. 4) support from deans, head of departments and deputy principals. Principals indicated that *Te Kotahitanga* had no significant impact on other school practices and/or school policy (p. 4). In response, the evaluation team suggested that successful implementation was very much dependent on leaders’ willingness to change systems and structures. They noted

that this would be a challenge given that “most principals [were] continuing to set the overall agenda and not necessarily involving others in establishing targets for staff and students” (p. 23). Of particular significance is the recommendation that overall school change associated with *Te Kotahitanga* needed to be driven by school principals and other relevant leaders; a finding of direct relevance to the present study.

### 2.2.5 He Kākano

The Ministry’s *He Kākano Te Awe o Ngā Toroa* professional development programme from 2010-2012 was a strategic school-based initiative for secondary and area school leaders and focused on improving culturally responsive leadership and teacher practices for raising the achievement of Māori students. According to the *He Kākano* programme documentation the intent was to improve emotional, social, cultural and academic outcomes for Māori students in mainstream secondary schools (The University of Waikato & Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi, 2010, p. 4).

Hence, the aim of *He Kākano* was to support and enhance the social and cultural conditions required to bring about improved changes for Māori students. Through working with school leaders the project team sought to find ways to effect change that was culturally and contextually responsive. This practical approach aimed to support principals to create school-based solutions that focused on the educational needs of Māori students in mainstream secondary school classrooms. The key elements included goal setting; developing pedagogy of relations that created culturally appropriate classroom learning contexts; school reforms that were responsive to classroom changes; distributed leadership that was inclusive of whānau, hapū and iwi aspirations; evidence-based decision making and collective ownership of the goals of improving Māori student success. How the schools responded was considered to be unique to each school and therefore each set of school leaders determined their approaches to the challenges of reducing educational disparities in their own way (The University of Waikato et al., 2010, p. 9). The strategy for *He Kākano* stemmed from *Ka Hikitia* and drew on the key understandings of the *Te Kotahitanga* research (Ministry of Education, 2008).

The *He Kākano* strategy also provides a practical checklist for school leaders to refer back to (Ministry of Education, 2008, pp. 1-2), which is worthy of note in relation to this study:

- School leaders need to create culturally appropriate and responsive contexts for teaching and learning – cultural considerations are important in leadership.
- School leaders need to be agentic – that is, they themselves must be agents of change - so that all aspects support Māori student achievement and success as Māori.
- School leaders play a critical role in enabling and supporting teachers to develop a ‘culturally responsive pedagogy of relations’ in classrooms.
- School leaders need ongoing support in order to make the kinds of decisions and changes needed to be successful.

An evaluation of *He Kākano* (Hynds, Meyer, Penetito, Averill, Hindle, Taiwhati, Hodis & Faircloth, 2014) concluded that New Zealand secondary schools needed further support to assist Māori students to achieve educational success as Māori, in particular the intervention efforts to build schools’ cultural capabilities. It was reported that whānau Māori complained that the “social disconnect between them and the leadership remained a stumbling block in future developments” (p. 157). Another feature highlighted was that schools continued to require support to build capability around the use of evidence data to evaluate school initiatives and learning programmes for students and professional development for teachers. Furthermore, the systematic monitoring of student outcomes and goal setting including high expectations also warranted further attention. The report warned of the risk of deficit theorising, thus highlighting the need for schools to focus on enhancing capability to provide culturally responsive schooling for Māori. Cultural competence as a social skill for all nevertheless remained a work in progress. As with all forms of change the report gave a reminder to schools that the change process must be managed and implemented with due attention to the impact of such changes. Finally where there were multiple initiatives operating in a school at any given time the assessments would require specific attention to ascertain which programmes were associated with particular outcomes for teachers and students. The successor to *He Kākano and Te Kotahitanga* is *Kia Eke Panuku – Building on Success* (Ministry of Education, 2015), a strategic leadership programme for principals, leaders and

teachers in mainstream secondary schools to engage more successfully with Māori students, whānau, hapū and iwi. It is underpinned by the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and recognises the value of Māori language and culture and identity in meeting the needs of Māori in education. *Kia Eke Panuku* seeks to develop more culturally responsive relations across the school and within Māori communities. Schools and communities are encouraged to work collaboratively to develop a programme of action along with the support of appropriate facilitators. An important component of schools building closer relationships is in the collaborative connections that are developed with whānau, hapū and iwi and local Māori organisations. The next section will introduce Māori notions of leadership covering traditional and contemporary approaches.

### 2.3 Māori Leadership

Traditional leadership in Māori society was determined by a leadership system that fulfilled cultural criteria based on kinship ties, wider kinship alliances, whakapapa or genealogy (Mead, Stevens, Third, Jackson & Pfeifer, 2006). In addition, Royal (2012) indicated the importance of the spiritual qualities of mana (status) and tapu (sacred and restricted customs). The concept of leadership was framed in terms of a rangatira or chief, and one who could be male or female but was usually male. The role of the rangatira was both hereditary and political. Durie (as cited in Katene, 2010) also identified the traditional leadership role of the tohunga who had expertise in the spiritual realm. Traditional Māori held to the belief that all power and authority originated from the atua (gods) and that authority resided within the descendants of the ariki/rangatira lines (Mead, 2003).

The principles of traditional Māori leadership that reflected the type of qualities most admired by people were recorded in the various cultural art forms of song and/or ornately carved waka (canoe). A leader whose leadership provided protection, shelter and stability might be described as a rata whakaruruhau (*he rata whakaruruhau*), in reference to the sheltering rata tree (Mead et al., 2006). The significance was in the leadership value of giving service to the community and inspiring pride and confidence in the people to live life to the full. The image of the beautiful totara tree was used to portray the awesome beauty and strength in leadership, which was significant in the following proverb when a leader passed - *kua hinga te tōtara i te waonui a Tāne*. While the

image of the rock struck by the waves in the ocean suggested leadership, that emphasised values of steadfastness and commitment (*he toka tū moana*). The image of the waka was also extremely powerful in portraying the chiefly qualities of leadership (*mā te tika o te toki o te tangere, me te tohu o te panaho, ka pai te tere o te waka i ngā momo moana katoa*) and could be used as a memorial and beached upon the graveside when a tribe lost a valuable leader.

Mead (Mead et al., 2006) provides a critique of traditional information as a means to inform Māori leadership in a contemporary context that also acknowledges the contributions of traditional ancestors whose guiding principles are still held to be important and valid today. The qualities are numerous and include the ability to mediate matters that impact on the overall unity of people and communities; to provide for the basic living needs of all whānau members, to be brave and act with courage on behalf of the collective; to tend to the cultural arts and the economic wellbeing of the people; to reflect manaakitanga or hospitality and to be sufficiently equipped in the traditional practices of culture, language and mātauranga Māori.

In a contemporary context Mead (Mead et al., 2006) also introduces the importance of leadership that is mandated by the people. Along with the mandate to lead Katene (2010) also attaches a requirement of leadership as the will and desire to serve the people. Within this relationship there are huge responsibilities that come with the mandate and there are consequences in the advent of failure to perform. Therefore matters of accountability back to the community of mandating supporters can result in quite robust and challenging exchanges. Henry and Pene (2001) emphasise the importance of power sharing in the political and decision making forums. Glover (2013) however provides a more solemn and serious wake-up call to look after leaders to ensure their wellbeing and accountability and for this we ourselves need to understand power and the exercise of power. Hence leadership is continually changing to meet the varying demands of members of the community and the everpresent voices of the critics and hopefully the unspoken voices of the passive followers. Leadership is not a domain for the fainthearted! But it does require leadership based on “doing the right thing at the right time for the right reason and for the benefit of the people served” (Katene, 2010, p. 13).

Williams (2010) develops the notion of leadership in terms of a problem solving process that is responsive to meeting the needs and/or goals of the individual and the wider group membership and which will hopefully lead to transformations. Katene (2010) reinforces the significance of transformational leadership as one that focuses on vision rather than the leader. There is a recognition in which leadership has to be reflective and astute in processing important information that can either enhance or impede the achievement of key decisions, goals and opportunities. These actions would suggest that leadership must embrace responsibility, tolerance and, learning as a continuous process for leadership and all levels of the community involving whānau, hapū and iwi who are tasked with certain jobs and responsibilities.

Katene (2010) describes the dispersed leadership approach that is needed in contemporary Māori society to meet the modern world to become part of the global web of technology and communications. He acknowledges the need for many kinds of leaders across the spectrum, from men and women of all ages and affiliations who are open, transparent and accountable. Mead (Mead et al., 2006) maintains that the success of Māori leadership lies in the capability of the people to affirm traditional principles while interacting with leadership principles of mainstream contemporary society. The centrality of a Māori worldview and its related cultural concepts provides the unique qualities that differentiate Māori leadership from other approaches to leadership (Mathews, 2013). In addition, there is an increasing need for leadership that can also project critical and strategic thinking and analysis of data and information overload (Gifford & Boulton, 2013). Given the complexity of leadership today there is a need to share the tasks and responsibilities of managing tribal interests. Tribal members can be encouraged to contribute to the wellbeing of the tribe through offering to help in their individual area of expertise. With this form of succession planning the tribe is able to utilise the dispersed leadership and also identify and prepare the next generation of leaders. Failure to recognise these opportunities may result in a weakening of tribal structures, unity and stability. Following on from an Aotearoa New Zealand context the discussion in the next section will consider the literature on leadership from an international context.

## 2.4 International School Leadership Literature

The international literature indicates that there are broader influences and challenges for leadership with possible consequences for Māori education. Recent research has provided critical analyses of common challenges facing school principals in western societies (Bottery, 2006; Gronn & Rawlings-Sanaei, 2003; Pont, Nusche & Moorman, 2008; MacBeath, O'Brien & Gronn, 2012). The challenges identified include the importance of professional leadership, providing support for learning and teaching, engaging and relating within the community, and being aware of the wider political and global influences on education. While these factors also affect indigenous communities there were more specific concerns for them that centred on the predominance of an ethnocentrically western culture and leadership approaches in schools, overwhelming levels of student academic disparity when compared alongside non-indigenous peers, and high levels of suspension and dropout rates (Buckmiller, 2015; Frawley & Fasoli, 2012; James & Lunday, 2014; Jorgensen & Niesche, 2011; Shockley, 2008). Such issues resonate strongly with the Aotearoa New Zealand context where school leaders have been challenged to create culturally appropriate and responsive contexts for teaching and learning to assist Māori students to achieve educational success (Ministry of Education, 2008) and to address the social disconnect reported between Māori whānau and school leadership in order to progress future developments for Māori students in education (Hynds et al., 2014).

Traditionally, studies of educational leadership have predominantly focused on individual leaders and individualistic views of leadership (Harris, 2003, p. 314), but there is now an awareness that leadership can be considered as an interactive process that is inclusive of the collective views of all members working in educational organisations (Harris, 2003; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004). Furthermore, the trend is moving towards a more holistic approach to leadership so that the leader not only can identify the characteristics of a situation but can also apply the appropriate behaviour for that situation (Hooijberg, Hunt & Dodge, 1997). However, within various indigenous communities analyses indicate a shared expectation of the importance of having indigenous educational leadership with an understanding and commitment to community values and culture (Buckmiller, 2015) that supports efforts to empower communities with agency and self-determination over themselves (Shockley, 2008) and

challenges the status quo to be responsive to their educational aspirations and increase the academic achievements of indigenous communities (Frawley & Fasoli, 2012; Jorgensen & Niesche, 2011) and to correct versions of history that have been subjected to colonialism (White, 2010).

Leadership can be viewed as more of a distributed practice (Silins & Mulford, 2002) rather than one focused exclusively on the individual and also associated with improved student outcomes (Mulford, Kendall, Edmunds, Kendall, Ewington & Silins, 2007). The research identified schools with shared visions and practices around learning and teaching and collaboration and collective responsibility for student success, created supportive environments that provided opportunities for teachers to improve their practice (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; White & Wehlage, 1995). Distributed leadership is inclusive of all leadership acts, which include the task-specific leadership of teachers, as well as the formally designated leadership roles of those in middle and senior management positions. According to Gronn (2000), research that focuses on the principal is a more traditional and limiting view of leadership with an individual at the head of an organisation. Yukl (1999) commented on leadership as a collective process that did not require an individual “who can perform all of the essential leadership functions, only a set of people who can collectively perform them” (pp. 292-3). In addition, indigenous literature identified significant pressure created by the multiple levels of roles and responsibilities on indigenous educational leadership in aspects of educational management and administration, curriculum leadership, advocacy for students and community in education, and numerous cultural roles and responsibilities within the wider community (Frawley & Fasoli, 2012; Jorgensen & Niesche, 2011; Shockley, 2008).

Research undertaken during the 1970s identified the key role that principals played in supporting efforts towards school improvement (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976; Fullan, 1982). The research on school effectiveness in the same period showed the link between strong administrative leadership in a school and making a difference in student learning (Edmonds, 1979; Rutter, Maugham, Mortimore, Ouston & Smith, 1979). Further, the literature on indigenous experiences indicated strong positive outcomes on indigenous students when they were located within a learning environment that was

more culturally responsive and respectful, and where the education received is relevant and meaningful (Beaulieu, 2008; Buckmiller, 2015; James & Lunday, 2014; McCarty & Nicholas, 2014; Shockley, 2008). However, despite an acknowledgement of the principal's impact on teachers' and students' lives, the debate on the nature and degree of that influence is still ongoing (Leithwood, Begley & Cousins, 1990; van de Grift, 1990). Hallinger and Heck (1996) viewed the principal's role as part and inclusive of "a web of environmental, personal, and in-school relationships that combine to influence organizational outcomes" (p. 6), a perspective shared by others (Hallinger, Bickman & Davis, 1990; Heck, Larsen & Marcoulides, 1990). By the 1980s researchers had witnessed a period of government policy interventions throughout the United States and countries outside including England, Canada, Singapore and Hong Kong that resulted in a more restrictive climate as teachers and principals were thrust into an environment of school-based management, privatisation, and greater levels of parental choice (Hallinger, 1992; Murphy, 1990).

Through their review of empirical research on the relationship between the principal's role and school effectiveness during the period from 1980-1995, Hallinger and Heck (1996) provided further insights on the nature of the principal's role. The 40 studies selected of mainly quantitative research investigated the relationship between principal leadership behaviour and school effectiveness. Most of the studies found that the impacts of principal leadership had most effect on in-school processes rather than outcomes (Goldring & Pasternak, 1994; Hallinger et al., 1990; Heck et al., 1990; Leithwood, 1994; Leithwood & Hallinger, 1993; Leitner, 1994).

The critique of the negative effects of new managerialism and globalisation highlighted the dismantling and privatisation of public education (Gunter, 2015; Gunter & Fitzgerald, 2015). Lingard, Hayes and Christie (2003) noted that although school principals were positioned as managers during the 1990s, it was time for principals to be repositioned as educational leaders. They argued this shift would require new policy frameworks and principal practices, individually and collectively. They proposed that school leadership and learning practices ought to mirror good classroom practices which are focused on providing supportive learning environments and the achievement of high quality outcomes for all students (p. 49). Such practices are imperative and require the

collaborative effort of both formal and teacher leadership to foster. Implicit in this proposition is the suggestion that the purpose of leadership is to provide teachers with the support and tools necessary to develop their practices in the classroom and within the wider community.

The trend over the last two decades towards managerial reform and a renewed focus on school restructuring has been evident in the USA, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand (Codd, 2004; Gordon, 1992a; 1992b; Gronn, 2003; Olssen & Peters, 2005; Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999a; Thrupp, 2006; Wylie, 2009). Educational leadership has become part of the ideology of public management, the adoption of standards as a model of leadership along with the implementation of standards for classroom teachers. Schools have been turned into semi-autonomous self-managing institutions, yet subjected to quality assurance, performance targeting and conforming to officially sanctioned codes of conduct (Ball, 1998). The imposed standards have been used to regulate the role of school leaders along with those that they are responsible for, taking attention away from the role of the professional to exercise professional judgement and to engage in collective collegiality, and moving towards acts and practices of individuality.

While there is increased recognition of the value of dispersed and collegial forms of leadership in schools such as distributed leadership, Bottery (2007) has also argued against the imposition on education of economic policies that supported decentralisation, a climate of mistrust of educational institutions, an acceptance of the market as the most efficient determiner of resources and public sector professionals being treated as mere human resource to be directed by management. Bottery's semi-structured interviews with 12 headteachers from a variety of contexts suggested that while the level of flexibility in their approach to work had diminished, contrary to current literature, they were still prepared to critique educational policy to ensure better outcomes for their students (2007, p. 108). However, there was ongoing concern as the research had shown that leadership in education is now subjected to global forces and imposed changes that extended beyond local and national spheres of power and influence. The impact of such challenges for public education and society in general, has imposed new contexts on the work of educational leaders (Bottery, 2004, p. 3).

Along with others (Fullan, 2004; Gronn, 2003) although in different ways and in different contexts Bottery warned that leaders in education must recognise the prevalence of these forces and the ways in which they can impede both the vision and the purposes of education. He maintained that education ought to be wider than the delivery of government goals that are focused on narrow curricula and assessment. It should be rich and diverse, affirming the significance of interpersonal relationships, values and practices, to enable citizens to interact harmoniously and equitably. Current global trends in education however, indicate the dominance of economic productivity and its threat to the role of education as a public good for the betterment of human existence. Thus, when other powerful agendas are operating to undermine public education the risk to the advancement of Māori educational priorities and aspirations is significant and implicated in these findings.

Gronn (2003) further warned of the “pervasive ‘greed is good’ ideologies” of consumerism (p. 148). He argued that in the current competitive market ideologies education institutions are “greedy” of personal time and driving educational leaders in self-managing schools to work relentlessly at treadmill pace to meet the constant demands of the job. The need to be seen to be handling the pressures of a greedy work environment has deterred many from seeking help, for fear of risking their annual performance appraisals, and the public perceptions of their professional image. Gronn concluded that the new educational leadership work ethic had embraced the power and pervasive phenomena, of greedy work, to the point where one lives to work, rather than works to live. The impact has resulted in less time for personal professional reflections on the state and quality of education.

However, Blackmore (2005), in noting that current education leadership theory is drawn predominantly from management more than social theory, maintained that organisational life is now viewed as apolitical, and leadership as a set of generic attributes that can be detached from the broader social relations and conditions of educational work. The effect of this has led to the failure of leadership research to address issues of changing relationships between the individual, education and society, the changing nature of knowledge and educational work, and the wider impacts on the professional educator in current times (Lingard et al., 2003).

Like other critics (Bottery, 2004; Olssen & Peters, 2005; Peters, 2013), Blackmore also noted how globalisation, the rise of the information knowledge society, and the radical educational restructuring of the last two decades has resulted in new anxieties and new risks (Blackmore, 2005). Blackmore posits that education has been repositioned as central to national productivity and treated as a commodity. Education professionals are now seen as knowledge workers central to national growth, and government and educational managers are focused on managing the knowledge production. According to Blackmore (2005), the direction of professional expertise has been shifted towards particular national or organisational ends. This move to meeting external demands has taken out the sense of people connecting on a personal level and valuing one another, which has significant effects for education and particularly for Māori who place great emphasis on relationships and knowing people's identity and relationship ties (Mead et al., 2006; Williams, 2010).

New Zealand based studies on managerialism identified the negative effects of educational 'reforms' aimed at turning schools into private profit-making business; driven by competition, subject to high levels of accountability and reduced pay and work conditions (Gordon, 1992a). The neoliberal revolution had largely commodified and commercialised education as leading political advocates grasped at the opportunity to embrace economic globalisation and a knowledge-based economy (Codd, 2004). The new administrative roles that were imposed on principals resulted in increased work hours that meant less time to focus on educational leadership (Wylie, 2009). The significance of providing a quality public education for all learners had been seriously undermined by the rise in neoliberalism and the discourses of new public management (Olssen & Peters, 2005).

The challenges identified in the international literature are relevant within the Aotearoa New Zealand context in terms of identifying the leadership needed in schools to improve the educational outcomes for Māori students. The notion of collective leadership rather than the sole individual leader and the importance of distributed task-specific leadership resonate with the strategies in *Ka Hikitia* and its focus on shared and

collaborative leadership practices and the inclusion of parents and communities in the education of Māori students.

#### **2.4.1 Summary of Māori Educational Strategy and Leadership in Schools**

The overall aim of the New Zealand Māori education strategy *Ka Hikitia – Accelerating Success 2013 – 2017* is for Māori students to experience educational success as Māori. The literature indicated that in high performing schools Māori achievement levels improved when teachers had positive teaching and learning relationships with Māori students. Furthermore when principals focused on teaching and learning as part of their leadership and participated in the professional development of their staff student achievement outcomes improved. However, as the literature was drawn from mainly primary schools the findings still needed to be tested in secondary schools and research questions are needed to challenge the disproportionately large number of Māori students who are not achieving to their potential in the current education system. There were issues where not all educators recognised their professional responsibility to provide a learning environment to promote Māori student success. The key gaps identified the need to create culturally appropriate relations and classroom learning contexts that were informed by data gathered specifically on Māori students. Additionally more focus needed to be on the role and practice of distributive leadership in schools. Moreover the question of how the leadership could be more inclusive of whānau and the wider community of hapū and iwi needed to be addressed. This issue was evident in the reported Māori disconnect with schools and the leadership in schools which had continued to pose a barrier to supporting Māori students.

The international literature identified the importance of professional leadership in schools which included providing support for learning and teaching, engaging with the community and forming a greater awareness of the effects of political and global influences on education and educational leadership. The literature identified the trend towards leadership practice that was inclusive of the collective views of all members working in schools. Leadership was viewed more as a distributive practice that was no longer focused on leadership as an individual process. However, there was debate over the nature and degree of the principal's leadership influence on in-school processes rather than on student outcomes. As well the literature raised the issue of the role of

school leadership in providing supportive learning environments to facilitate the achievement of high quality outcomes for students. The literature indicated that more attention was needed on the collaborative efforts of both formal and teacher leadership. This raised the need for leadership to provide support and tools for teachers to develop their practices in the classroom and in the wider community. The literature also highlighted the significance of culturally responsive approaches in leadership to meet the expectations of indigenous communities. The literature foreshadowed some of the gaps in our knowledge that this study will hopefully help to resolve.

## **2.5 Social Justice – Pathways towards being successful as Māori**

Both Sir Mason Durie and Professor Wally Penetito have identified important principles about what is needed for a successful education for Māori. Professor Durie is of Ngāti Kauwhata, Ngāti Raukawa and Rangitāne affiliation. He was head of Māori Research and Development and Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Māori and Pasifika) at Massey University, Palmerston North before his retirement. His expertise and research is acknowledged throughout the academy in Māori Development, Health and Social Policy and Higher Education for Māori. Professor Penetito is a descendant from Ngāti Hauā, Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Tamaterā. He was the head of Te Kura Māori and Co-Director He Pārekereke, Faculty of Education, Victoria University of Wellington before his retirement. His expertise and research interests are in Māori education, sociology of education, indigenous education, educational change management, contexts for learning, pedagogy, teacher education, and philosophy of education. He also provided guidance as one of the second supervisors to this thesis.

At the first Hui Taumata Mātauranga in 2001 Mason Durie presented a framework for Māori educational advancement, incorporating three important goals to be pursued concurrently, and which provide a simple but significant way for thinking about the future of education for Māori. These goals included (Durie, 2001, p. 9):

- To live as Māori;
- To actively participate as citizens of the world; and
- To enjoy good health and a high standard of living.

Durie (2001, p. 3) explained that the goal of enabling Māori to live as Māori is about providing ready access to te ao Māori, the Māori world of Māori language, culture, marae, resources such as land, tikanga, whānau and kaimoana. As one of the key objectives of education is to prepare people for participation in society, educators need to be mindful that preparation of Māori students for participation in Māori as well as mainstream society is required. At the conclusion of formal education Māori students must be able to interact within te ao Māori; if this is not the case then no matter what else had been learned, their education would have been incomplete. While the education sector is not solely responsible for Māori students accessing the Māori world, it does carry some obligation to prepare them for active lives within Māori society and being able to live as Māori. This is a view that is acknowledged in Ministry of Education policy documents (*Ka Hikitia*, 2007; *Ka Hikitia*, 2013; *New Zealand Curriculum*, 2007; *Ngā Haeata*, 2005) as part of meeting Treaty of Waitangi obligations for partnership, participation and protection.

Durie's discussion on the goal of Māori to actively participate as citizens of the world recognises that Māori students will live in a variety of contexts and should be able to move freely from one to the other. There is a wide Māori expectation that education should provide pathways into technology, the economy, the arts and sciences, understanding others, and to making a contribution to a greater good. As the world becomes more accessible Māori students are exposed to cultures and peoples from other lands and communities. If their schooling experiences do not result in Māori students having some readiness to participate actively in the global environment, then opportunities for their advancement will suffer. "Access to music, sport, travel, and the international disciplines of commerce, law and science will be increasingly important for all Māori over the next 25 years. Even if there is no travel overseas, the global impact will be felt just as much at home" (Durie, 2001, p. 4).

The third goal to enjoy good health and a high standard of living is linked to well-being. Education should enhance positive outcomes for Māori students' health and well-being and lead to a decent standard of living. According to Durie (ibid), educational achievement correlates directly with employment, income levels, standards of health, and quality of life. A successful education is one that establishes the foundation for a

healthy lifestyle and a career with an income adequate enough to provide a high standard of living.

To achieve these goals Durie (2001, pp. 5-8) proposed three important guiding principles and three pathways:

- The principle of best outcomes
- The principle of integrated action
- The principle of indigeneity
- A Māori-centred pathway
- A Māori-added pathway
- A collaborative pathway

Durie suggested that a guiding principle of best outcomes is essential for Māori education. Māori students should expect to make significant and measurable progress towards reaching the three broad goals. He added that the system will have failed them if such movement has not occurred. Achieving best outcomes requires that the measures of progress actually quantify an outcome. These outcomes lead inevitably to the question of benchmarks. Educators need to consider what is the benchmark against which Māori should gauge progress? Most tend towards comparison of data with non-Māori without considering other options. Benchmarking, for example, with other indigenous communities or other iwi groups may be more relevant. Aligned with the principle of best outcome is one of zero tolerance of failure. Whatever the reasons for failure and poor performance the onus is on key stakeholders to reject failure as an option. Durie concluded that the home, the whānau, the school, and the wider system must resolve that failure will not be tolerated.

For Durie, the principle of integrated action recognises that education is dependent on numerous and significant influences. The school and community, teachers and parents, students and their peers, Māori and the State all have a part to play in the success or failure of Māori students. Hence, there should be a shared platform of integrated action to ensure the balance and flow of development. Currently, there is also a need for greater co-operation between institutions such as homes and the school, and better co-ordination across sectors. Durie warned of the risk in taking a piecemeal approach to

Māori development; “if the Hui Taumata Mātauranga had not been able to recognise the impacts of socio-economic, political and attitudinal factors on education, then it would have glossed over a key principle for future progress – integrated action” (2001, p. 6).

The principle of Indigeneity encompasses a set of rights that Indigenous peoples can expect to exercise in modern times. In this country it recognises the rights of Māori by virtue of being tangata whenua in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Durie (2001, p. 7) wrote that within the context of Indigeneity Māori hold Indigenous rights that will have implications for the education that Māori students can expect to take advantage of. In exercising their Indigeneity, Māori are free to establish closer relationships with other groups, apart from the Crown, including other Indigenous peoples. The Treaty of Waitangi is an important relationship – with the Crown – but Māori should be encouraged to explore other relationships towards honouring the principles of citizenship and Indigeneity.

Durie emphasised the need for all educational pathways to incorporate the three principles of best outcomes, integrated action, and Indigeneity (2001, pp. 7-8). A Māori centred pathway is mainly under Māori direction and has the goal of increasing access to te ao Māori. Kōhanga Reo and Wānanga are excellent examples of this focus enacted, though there have been critics of such initiatives based on the premise that power ultimately remains with the State because of its compliance issues (Johnston, 1997). Whilst they conform to national standards the direction and management of the institutions is Māori led. Māori centred pathways have tended to prioritise Māori language revitalisation and work closely with Māori communities, Māori aspirations and Māori development (Durie, 2001, 2009).

Māori added pathways include schools, polytechnics and universities. These are the most common educational environments for the majority of Māori students. Currently over 85% of Māori students are in the mainstream or general school system (Tuuta, Bradnam, Hynds, Higgins & Broughton, 2004). Māori dimensions are either added onto the existing framework or integrated into the overall operations. Durie (2001) highlighted the need for unreserved commitment from learning institutions to ensure the survival of the Māori dimension through the provision of resourcing, curriculum

and community support. However, he noted (Durie, 2009) progress across most tertiary institutions that indicated that Indigeneity had become part of higher education in elements of Māori methodologies, pedagogies and learning networks.

Durie concluded that the collaborative pathway is a move away from working solo to finding co-operative joint ventures that may enhance the growth of the institution and enrich the education experience and outcomes (2011). Collaboration can be a local, national or international initiative. There is the example of the partnering initiative of the University of Waikato with the Bay of Plenty Polytechnic, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi and the Waiariki Institute of Technology formed to increase tertiary opportunities and provide a unique collaborative approach to tertiary education in the Bay of Plenty. Another example is in the collaboration of the University of Waikato, Auckland University and Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi combining their collective experience and expertise to support the *Kia Eke Panuku: Building on Success* professional learning and development programme. The success of this pathway is dependent on the mutual respect for the autonomy and integrity of the respective institutions. Forging strong relationships across institutions and leadership will be beneficial to all parties. Hence, this study aimed to draw on these ideas through an investigation of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that could be applied in mainstream secondary schools and Kaupapa Māori schools for improving education for Māori students.

Pathways for Māori education, which are based on autonomy and integrity, are consistent also with Wally Penetito's (2010) argument in his book, *What's Māori about Māori Education*. He noted that Māori people tend to relate positively to education if it reflects their unique qualities and identities and "if it helps them to project themselves into the immediate world around them as well as into the world at large" (2010, p. 35). He also stated that an authentic Māori education must emanate from te ao Māori and all those essential qualities of wairua, te reo and whakapapa; all of which are integral features of Kaupapa Māori approaches, that one would expect to be present in Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership.

As Penetito pointed out, however, this authenticity must also recognise that Māori education is rooted firmly within the Pākehā system of mainstream education. He

argued that for too long mainstream education has been the only real option available to Māori with minimal expectation placed on mainstream education to engage in Māori kaupapa (p. 53). This has perpetuated the mainstream socio-cultural ideology of shaping Māori to fit into the current structures. He asserted further that Māori education is subjected to “power inherent in the institutional and pedagogic structures of the mainstream” (p. 90).

Penetito (2010, pp. 16-17) identified a number of key issues to reflect and act on to enable Māori a degree of success and satisfaction in current education pathways:

- Māori cease to flourish when located in an historical context of lagging behind the rest of their student peers; being labelled as the problem negates their pathway towards success;
- Māori rights to be treated equally and to be treated with equality have important distinctions that the education system and New Zealand/Aotearoa society have yet to pay heed to;
- Māori must be recognised as tangata whenua and tangata Māori, and with these multiple and complementary identities, treated accordingly;
- Māori must have access and options to choose an education that is appropriate, in either mainstream or kaupapa Māori education;
- Māori autonomy and independence inevitably will need to embrace a system that is Māori in substance, in philosophy and practice.

Mason Durie and Wally Penetito have drawn on many years of Māori research and scholarship to highlight their ideas for ways forward. Māori experience over the past decades has underlined the importance of an authentic array of Indigenous approaches to education that is consistent with Māori world views and inclusive of holistic perspectives in terms of the social, cultural, intellectual, emotional and spiritual state of wellness of Māori students in mainstream secondary schools and kaupapa Māori schools. This leads into the discussion in the next section on Kaupapa Māori theory as a means of resistance to colonialism and a struggle for tino rangatiratanga and transforming solutions.

## 2.6 Kaupapa Māori: Theoretical Context of a Māori Worldview

Kaupapa Māori theory encompasses a Māori worldview of thinking and understanding with te reo Māori and tikanga Māori at its core. The key components of Kaupapa Māori as outlined by Smith (1999) are:

- The validity and legitimacy of Māori.
- The survival and revival of Māori language and culture.
- The struggle for autonomy over our own cultural wellbeing and over our own lives is vital to the cause.

As an educational intervention Kaupapa Māori was set up to deal with the Māori educational crisis and to ensure the survival of Kaupapa Māori knowledge and Māori language. Smith (1997) co-opted the term *theory* to link it to Kaupapa Māori in a deliberate attempt to:

- Develop a counter-hegemonic practice;
- Understand the cultural constraints when faced with questions of “what counts as theory?” ; and
- Challenge the narrow, Eurocentric interpretation of theory in New Zealand education.

Smith (1997) reinforced Kaupapa Māori interventions that extend beyond pedagogy, curriculum and evaluation. Interventions are also operating at an institutional level in matters of economics, power, ideology and democracy. The critical role of Kaupapa Māori interventions is to challenge the political context of unequal power relations and structural impediments. Smith stated:

Kaupapa Māori strategies question the right of Pākehā to dominate and exclude Māori preferred interests in education, and assert the validity of Māori knowledge, language, custom and practice, and its right to continue to flourish in the land of its origin, as the tangata whenua (Indigenous) culture. (p. 273)

Walker (1996) positioned Kaupapa Māori theories as being distinctly Māori in initiation, definition and control. Consequently, it has provided theoretical space for Māori academic writing and scholarship. It has also become the subject of critical interrogation, analysis and application. Bishop and Glynn (1999, p. 61), in a similar

vein, have noted the “flourishing of proactive Māori political discourse” in Kaupapa Māori. It has set the grounding for Māori conscientisation, resistance and transformative praxis, to advance Māori cultural and educational outcomes.

Integral to Kaupapa Māori theorising is the counter-hegemonic role of critiquing dominant ideologies and policies imposed on Māori. The imposition of Pākehā structures, language and knowledge has forced Kaupapa Māori theories and approaches into the political domain. Smith (1997) believes that Kaupapa Māori must be both culturalist and structuralist, to include culture, human agency and an analysis of current structures and power relations. Pihama (1993) concurred, arguing that:

Kaupapa Māori theory is a politicising agent that acts as a counter-hegemonic force to promote the conscientisation of Māori people, through a process of critiquing Pākehā definitions and constructions of Māori people, and asserting explicitly the validation and legitimation of te reo Māori and tikanga (p. 57).

Rata (2005) argued that while culture does count, the overriding forces that determine our everyday lives are socio-economic, not ethnic, and according to her personal view “the world of real political and economic forces is the ultimate determinant of how societies operate” (p. 6). Rata pointed further to the pervasiveness of culturalism in education, citing Ministry of Education (2003) policy statements acknowledging a “Māori world, with different Māori realities and Māori intellectual traditions” (p. 33). She suggested that policy is influenced by neotraditionalist intellectuals, and she places in this category Mason Durie, who writes of a Māori world view and Māori knowledge system, which is both distinct from western philosophies and unique to Māori. Rata stated that “the powerful ideological alliance of neotraditionalism and culturalism is used to justify ethnic-based policies in education, health, justice, and throughout the public sector” (2005, p. 6).

Kaupapa Māori theory proponents including Smith (1997, 2003); Smith (2000) have produced research that locates Kaupapa Māori theories as being born out of a Māori worldview extrapolated by Māori for Māori. Accordingly, Kaupapa Māori theories and approaches are indeed bound by collective commitment and vision that connects Māori aspirations to political, social, economic and cultural wellbeing. Kaupapa Māori theories

critique dominant power structures in Aotearoa, which position Māori as ‘Other’ and marginalises them in the areas of education, health, justice, and the socio-economic sphere of society. Through alignment with critical theory, Kaupapa Māori aims to expose power relations that perpetuate continued oppression of Māori (Pihama, 1993). Decolonisation will assist this process, as well as Māori understanding the colonising forces that have created power dynamics that marginalise Māori. Smith (1997) added:

The act of “struggle” itself is seen to be an important factor in the cycle of conscientisation, resistance and praxis in not only making sense of one’s life; but in also transforming it in more meaningful ways, and ultimately re-claiming it. (p. 25)

Durie (2012) reflected on the broader expansion of Kaupapa Māori as an inspirational movement that was part of the transformation of thinking about Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand society. He acknowledged how its influence helped bolster Māori rejuvenation across a range of endeavours and provided impetus for the acceptance of a Māori world view. However, he believed that more focus was needed on developing mātauranga Māori as an evolving form of knowledge to guide practice and ultimately strengthen Kaupapa Māori theories and approaches. Smith (2012) has continued to challenge Māori to take full ownership of both the cultural and political-cultural elements of Kaupapa Māori that both require, analysis and action.

In summary, Kaupapa Māori is located within a Māori worldview that holds fast to the validity and legitimacy of Māori, the survival of the Māori language and culture and the struggle for Māori autonomy. This will challenge Māori to affirm the value of being Māori and of living as Māori. Kaupapa Māori theories and approaches have been developed to counter hegemonic practice and to challenge the narrow Eurocentric interpretation of theory in New Zealand education. Kaupapa Māori advocates have persevered in their critiques of the dominant power structures that have marginalised Māori in education, health, justice and the public sector. According to Smith (2012) the neglect of the political component can only hinder Kaupapa Māori as a means, in idea and practice, to transform our disproportionate levels of social and economic disadvantage.

### 2.6.1 Summary

Whether the cause of Māori educational disparity is rooted in colonisation or in lower socio-economic banding, the debate needs to focus on solutions that have the potential to transform the lives and experiences of young Māori. Hence it is important for principals to gauge the critical role and impact teachers can have on Māori student attitudes and levels of achievement in secondary schools and thus, the effects of their leadership as principal in supporting and advocating affirmative action that facilitates and fosters Māori student success.

The literature reviewed has indicated there is a significant role for school principals and leaders to fulfil in this area:

- In affirming a decolonised indigenous education system (Battiste, 2005; Beaulieu, 2008; Buckmiller, 2015; James & Lunday, 2014; Shockley, 2008; Waitere, 2008; White, 2010)
- In engaging with and establishing effective relationships with Māori communities (Meyer et al., 2010)
- In providing support for learning and teaching (Harris, 2006)
- In supporting practices of reforming schools in curricular, pedagogical innovations (Lingard, 2007; Thomson, 2001; Wrigley, Lingard & Thomson, 2012)
- In building capacity for change (Gronn, 2008; Sergiovanni, 2001)
- In understanding community-based and cultural knowledge (Thomson, 2002)
- In converting symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 2004) as a “counter to standard educational processes whereby working-class and Indigenous cultures are misrecognized and excluded (Wrigley et al., 2012, p. 99).

Although some gains have been made, there are still too few Māori students who are successful in either world, Te ao Pākehā (mainstream academic outcomes) or Te ao Māori (competence and confidence to participate in te reo me ona tikanga Māori on their own tūrangawaewae). Research (Bishop, 1998a, 2003, 2005; Meyer et al., 2010; Smith, 1997, 2003; Smith, 1999) has shown that the secondary school system is struggling to meet the educational and cultural needs of Māori students. The failure of the system potentially affects the longer-term outcomes for these students in areas of

employment, social and health indicators and quality of life (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh & Teddy, 2007; Bishop, Berryman & Richardson, 2002; Durie, 2001, 2005; Hattie, 2003).

The purpose of Kaupapa Māori theories and approaches is to give body and substance to the values, principles and practices of a Māori system of thinking and understanding. This study aims to identify leadership approaches in one mainstream school and one kaupapa Māori school that the respective staff and parents see as successfully encouraging teaching and learning practices that are meeting the needs of their Māori students. The study also aims to investigate and develop a framework for Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that is adaptable for mainstream and kaupapa Māori schools.

Thus the objectives of this study are to:

1. Consider current educational leadership practices in one mainstream secondary school and in one kaupapa Māori school;
2. Consider their areas of strength and weakness in meeting the needs of Māori students;
3. Identify Kaupapa Māori approaches in leadership that the teachers and parents in each school perceive as having the capacity and capabilities to transform the lives and outcomes of Māori students;
4. Explore the range of perceptions of two significant Māori leaders on the effectiveness of mainstream educational leadership in the education of Māori.

### **2.6.2 Research questions**

1. How effective is the educational leadership in meeting the needs of Māori students in mainstream secondary schools?
2. How does the educational leadership in Kaupapa Māori secondary schools work towards meeting the needs of Māori students?

3. What Kaupapa Māori approaches to educational leadership could be used in mainstream secondary schools and kaupapa Māori schools?

Chapter Three will introduce and examine the methodology employed in this study, including an explanation of the epistemology and theoretical framework underpinning the methodology and a description and justification of the methods of data collection and analysis.

## Chapter 3 Materials and Methods

### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter is focused on the key elements of the research that are framed by Kaupapa Māori theories and that advocate Māori knowledge (philosophy), Māori ways of knowing (epistemology), Māori ways of being (ontology), and Māori ways of doing (methodology). Consequently, the methodology is informed by these Kaupapa Māori philosophical, epistemological and ontological positioning's or assumptions of the world. The principles of Kaupapa Māori methodology are further complemented through the inclusion of case study methodology that can generate understanding and explanation of complex issues that occur within a natural real-life context. The methods used to collect and analyse data were informed by Kaupapa Māori methodology and approaches, and involved individual interviews and focus group interviews.

In terms of Kaupapa Māori, as a Māori researcher I am guided by the principle of Rangatiratanga (autonomy) that gives Māori the opportunity to shape their own research processes. I also acknowledge my identity and whakapapa that provide the foundations to guide me through this research journey “*i ngā wā o mua*” in the knowledge that “*my past is always in front of me*”.

*Ko Tibeia te maunga*

*Ko Awahou te awa*

*Ko Tarimano te papa kōhatu*

*Ko Tawakeheimoa te tūpuna*

*Ko Pubirua, Ko Orangikabui ngā whakatakotoranga te iwi*

*Nā Tawakeheimoa rāua ko Te Aongahoro ka puta ko Rangiwewehi*

*Koia nei te reo o Ngāti Rangiwewehi*

*Ngā uri o rātou mā*

*Ko Te Mākaio Bowkett tōku ingoa*

*My mountain is Tibeia*

*My river is Awahou*

*I was born and raised in the tribal nation of Ngāti Rangiwewehi, and  
I am a proud descendant of my esteemed ancestors  
My name is Te Mākaao Bowkett.*

Linda Smith (2006, p. 173) has identified the following critical questions that may facilitate Māori autonomy in the research process:

- What research do we want to carry out?
- Who is the research for?
- What difference will it make?
- Who will carry out the research?
- How do we want the research to be done?
- How will we know it is a worthwhile piece of research?
- Who will benefit?

These critical questions shaped the study in a number of ways and so the research questions, the research design and specific methods used in the study were located within a research framework that is based on Kaupapa Māori theories, that is qualitative and that locates Māori at the core and periphery of the research.

### **3.2 Epistemology and Theoretical Framework**

Historically, Māori viewed Western researchers with distrust and were skeptical of the work carried out in Māori communities. From their perspective Western research has resulted “in the production of Western knowledge, in the nature of academic work, in the production of theories which have dehumanized Māori and in practices which have continued to privilege Western ways of knowing” (Smith, 2006, p. 183). Māori and Māori communities have been objectified in research since early colonisation in the 19<sup>th</sup> century where they were viewed “through a calculated culturally constructed lens that gave no credence to Māori ambition” (Graham, 2009). In addition Bishop makes reference to the inequality and disadvantage suffered by Māori within both the wider educational and social contexts of the time (2003).

In contrast, Kaupapa Māori research is based on the premise of the validity of Māori ways of knowing, Māori knowledge, language and culture. Epistemology involves the nature and scope of knowledge and awareness and understanding of what is knowledge. It poses questions of how knowledge is acquired and of what do people know and what makes their beliefs valid (Crotty, 1998). Kaupapa Māori theories assert the validity and affirmation of Māori knowledge and Māori epistemological traditions, Māori philosophical traditions and customs, Māori language and a Māori worldview drawn from te ao Māori (the 'Māori' world). For the purposes of this research and its methodology, Kaupapa Māori epistemology is contextualised within a Māori framework or worldview that allows Māori to view the world from a position of authority that positively reinforces our identity as Māori and our ability to adapt and utilise traditional Māori knowledge systems for our benefit and to fit into the world we live in today (Mead, 2012). In essence, it is about whakamana or empowerment of Māori towards having or taking more control over our lives in the form of self-determination with the overriding motivation to undo the "colonial patriarchal ideologies and hegemonies" (Hutchings, 2002, p. 56).

Kaupapa Māori approaches to research are aimed at creating space for Māori knowledge, ensuring that Māori are convinced of the value of research for Māori and ultimately seeks commitment from the mainstream research communities for greater Māori involvement in research (Smith, 2006). In sum, the reasons for using Kaupapa Māori research approaches aim to ensure the integrity of the work undertaken with the [Māori] research participants (the researched) by communities of Māori researchers. While these research approaches are informed by the historical legacies they are also setting new directions through engagement in dialogue for, by and with Māori.

In describing the traditional narrative of how knowledge was gained for Māori, Smith (2006) referred to the search undertaken by the Māori ancestral figure Tāne-nui-a-rangi who travelled to the twelfth universe to gain knowledge. The knowledge gained was for the collective wellbeing of the people and much of it was applied in daily life. However some areas of knowledge was more specialised and held by a select group of individuals on behalf of the collective. Māori mythology also captures the traditions of Tāwhaki who had ascended into the heavens by the aka matua or parent vine in pursuit of

atonement (Mead, 2003; Walker, 1990). The heroic feats of Tāwhaki are acknowledged and passed on by the different tribes according to their own unique interpretations. Thus, reinforcing the tikanga that there is no one correct way to share the multiple experiences of Tāwhaki and different tribal groups will claim and relate to their particular version of events. Smith (2006) regarded these ‘searchs for knowledge’ as one of the first research projects by Māori, about Māori, for Māori since the early oral traditions began, and which are still held in high regard by Māori with both its practical application and selective elements that were the preserve of the chosen few.

Of significance for Māori is the way in which research has formed part of the colonising process, “because it is concerned with defining legitimate knowledge” (Smith, p. 173). Without doubt the colonisation of Māori culture has created challenges for Māori forms of knowledge and learning to be accepted as legitimate in the non-Indigenous Pākehā world. However there remains a “strong belief held by many Māori that there is a uniquely ‘Māori’ way of looking at the world and learning” (p. 174). Within this, inquiry is always grounded in Kaupapa Māori principles that include but are not limited to rangatiratanga (autonomy), taonga tuku iho (cultural aspiration), ako Māori (culturally preferred pedagogy), kia piki ake i ngā raruraru o te kainga (the principle of socio-economic mediation), whānau (the principle of the extended family structure), kaupapa (the principle of collective philosophy), Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the principle of the Treaty of Waitangi) and ata (the principle of growing respectful relationships, kinship and whakapapa ties).

These same Kaupapa Maori principles provide the theoretical framework underpinning the methodology of this study. Kaupapa Māori theories (Smith, 1999, p.120) for instance, are guided by the provision of a code of behaviour and responsibilities that Māori researchers have to Māori people:

- 1 Aroha ki te tangata (a respect for people).
- 2 Kanohi kitea (the seen face, that is present yourself to people face to face).
- 3 Titiro, whakarongo ... kōrero (look, listen ... speak).
- 4 Manaaki ki te tangata (share and host people, be generous).
- 5 Kia tūpato (be cautious).
- 6 Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata (do not trample over the mana of people).

7 Kāua e māhaki (don't flaunt your knowledge).

Aroha ki te tangata requires a respect for people's knowledge; their contribution to the study, their location, land and home. As a researcher one must be aware of the sacred space that is entered into throughout the research process and to respect that privilege.

Kānohi kitea or the process of conducting business face to face is a fundamental requirement of working with Māori. To be present in person is a form of accountability; it indicates you are prepared to stand by your work and be identified to those from whom you seek knowledge. Your credibility is determined by your actions. It is important to keep returning and presenting your face throughout the course of the research and beyond its completion.

Titiro, whakarongo, kōrero encourages the researcher to listen and observe rather than to assume the role of an "expert" and risk coming across as "whakahīhi" or arrogant. Māori researchers must be mindful of tikanga, language and culture when working with Māori people in the wider community.

Manaaki ki te tangata refers to the sharing of time and resources and the sharing of knowledge between the researcher and the participants. The process is two-way and potentially satisfies both parties. It also reminds the researcher of the importance of providing a form of koha to acknowledge a participant's contribution to the research.

Kia tūpato is about being culturally safe and acting with integrity when undertaking research with Māori; a Māori researcher is privy to the many aspects of Māori life and experience. The Māori researcher is researching from an "insider" perspective and must be able to acknowledge this position as an insider, as part of the community participating in the study. A Māori researcher must ensure that the research participants are not placed in a position of being researched upon as the "other" (Cram, 2001, p. 47).

Kāua e takahi te mana o te tangata is linked to aroha ki te tangata and reminds researchers to treasure the knowledge that is passed to them. Māori researchers do not own this knowledge but for the time they have it, treat it with respect. The importance

of this guideline is to remind the researcher to consider the merits of the research from the perspective of the Māori community it must be worthwhile for Māori.

Kaua e māhaki requires the researcher to remain humble and to recognise that academic knowledge is just one form of knowledge. Often it is the researcher's relationship with Māori communities that allows access to people rather than university qualifications. The expectation is that the knowledge generated from the interaction with the community must be given back to the community. This notion of utu or reciprocity can be expressed in many ways as in the traditional form of giving koha or gifts in appreciation of the time and knowledge shared in the research process (Jones, Ingham, Davies & Cram, 2010). It may even involve the researchers agreeing to an advocacy role at the request of the research participants. The reporting may have a close off date but the relationships are life-long, which holds true to each of these principles.

This code of behaviour and responsibilities reflects the value system that is integral to Māori society and when practiced in research contexts, is seen as an indicator to Māori that a person (the researcher) has good qualities and intentions. The concept of respect is generic across cultures however, within an Indigenous context, respect is viewed as a mark of the significance of relationships and humanity (Smith, 2006). Respect is expressed as a shared form of reciprocity between one another and the wider environment. Underpinning all of the elements is the sense of humility and protection of the rights and interests and sensitivities of the research subjects. The process, the methodology and method, is significant to Māori in that the outcome may be sullied if this 'process' is compromised in any way.

Kaupapa Māori theories are focused on the strategic goal of self-determination of Māori peoples; rangatiratanga. Hence, within the research agenda self-determination extends beyond a political goal and encapsulates social justice across a range of psychological, social, cultural and economic boundaries. Kaupapa Māori theories integrate the processes of transformation, of decolonisation, of healing and of mobilisation of peoples, thus making it epistemologically and theoretically an appropriate framework for this study. Transformation creates a mind shift that can motivate Māori away from reactive modes to being more proactive. The notion of decolonisation is reframed in

ways that enable Māori to engage in conscientisation or consciousness-raising. This reawakening can uplift Māori out of the stifling and diminishing impacts of colonisation processes. The assertion is that Māori are empowered to take on more responsibility for transforming their lives and resisting the forces of the dominant society that impede Māori advancement (Graham, 2009; Smith, 1997, 2003). In Kaupapa Māori theories the solutions advocated are located in the politicising acts of promoting the conscientisation of Māori people, through critiquing Pākehā definitions and constructions of Māori people through an analysis of current structures and power relations (Pihama, 1993; Smith, 1997).

This section has provided insights into historical contexts through which historical Western research had rendered Māori into an inferior state of objectivity and disempowerment. In contrast, Kaupapa Māori research has given impetus towards empowerment and reinstatement of Māori ways of knowing, Māori knowledge, language and culture, which leads into the next section that will address the study's methodological approach.

### **3.3 Methodology**

#### **3.3.1 Kaupapa Māori Approaches to Gathering Data**

For Māori researchers, Kaupapa Māori approaches to research have provided a focus for Māori to determine priorities and practices of research that are Māori initiated and thus led by Māori, inclusive of Māori and ultimately for the benefit of Māori (Smith, 2006). As a methodology, the principles and codes of behavior and responsibilities of Kaupapa Māori theories have underpinned the design of this qualitative study and have been combined with the use of case study methodology to give shape and context to the flow and substance of the respective in-depth data gained from both the individual and group cases, and were used to provide potential answers to the research questions.

Kaupapa Māori approaches to research are best described as mechanisms, that operate across a range of positions such as “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, Western economics and global

politics” (Smith, 2006, p. 191). As is widely commented by Smith (1990) and Pihama (1993) where Kaupapa Māori approaches to research prevail today, they operate within the historically viewed contexts of struggle and competition for autonomy over Māori cultural well being. For instance, Kaupapa Māori approaches to gathering data were guided by an expectation that research by Māori, involving Māori and for Māori people will contribute towards making a positive difference for the researched. Utu or reciprocity is an important protocol in the research process and requires an element of manaaki or generosity on the part of the researcher who is receiving the taonga or gifts of knowledge from the research participants (Jones et al., 2010). It requires that something is returned back to the people who have shared their knowledge and experiences (Smith, 2006). In addition, Smith (2003) asserted both the proactive and positive qualities of Kaupapa Māori approaches in terms of an evolving theory of transformation and conscientisation of Māori in education, by moving from a state of victimisation to one of choice for empowerment. Smith (2012) is however, adamant that at the heart of Kaupapa Māori there must be action and analysis that interweaves both the cultural and political dimensions needed for transformation. Hoskins (2012) offered further insights towards the enhancement of Kaupapa Māori through the process of robust political analysis and critical engagement in Kaupapa Māori theories and approaches. Kaupapa Māori approaches further enhance the research process through the conduct of the researcher in that throughout the duration of the research there is genuine respectful behaviour, sharing of processes and knowledge, networking and consultation and sharing control of the research (Smith, 2006).

### **3.3.2 Case Studies**

The case study approach to research is particularly helpful for generating an in-depth and multi-faceted understanding and explanation of the complex issues that occur within a natural real-life context (Crowe, Cresswell, Roberston, Huby, Avery & Sheikh, 2011; Starman, 1997; Yin, 2009). The central tenet of a case study approach is “the need to explore an event or phenomena in depth and in its natural context” (Crowe et al., p. 1). Simons (2009) proposed that a case study approach “is an in-depth exploration from multiple perspectives of the complexity and uniqueness of a particular project, policy, institution, program or system in a real life” (p. 21). The case study approach offers the advantage of connectedness to everyday life and the individual

elements and details from within the respective case studies. There is also the added value for developing different views of reality and the deepening awareness of the complexity and innate qualities of human behaviour. The inclusion of case study methodology within and alongside Kaupapa Māori approaches to this study recognises a complementary approach when working across multiple cases. This approach also offers a broader appreciation of issues, in this particular study, of the issues of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership in secondary schools (Bishop, 1998, 2005; Bishop et al., 2009; Smith, 1997; Walker, 1996).

Accordingly, the methods of collecting data for this study were guided by Kaupapa Māori cultural practices and underpinned by the key principles of advancing Māori development and ensuring that the research outcomes were judged by Māori to be positive and worthwhile for Māori (Smith, 2006). The study used qualitative methods to gather the information for the study. Qualitative methods are useful for studying people in their natural social settings and for collecting naturally occurring data (Bowling, 1997). Through qualitative methods there is an ability to capture the reality of experience as seen through the eyes of the research participants themselves (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1993).

This choice of research method allows for examination of real-life situations and the investigation of contemporary phenomena in a real-life context involving multiple sources of evidence including documentary analysis (Yin, 1994). Case studies can be viewed as narrow in scope but they are nevertheless useful in terms of their realistic and flexible nature that is open to the notion that there is no right or wrong answer. Case studies are widely used in organisational studies across the social sciences and have gained more momentum as a form of qualitative inquiry (Hartley, 2004; Stake, 2000).

The information and data collected from the various categories of interviews were combined, compared and contrasted as part of the research method known as triangulation. The triangulation process is used as a means to ensure that the qualitative data is robust and credible and to gauge the validity of the information gathered. The purpose of triangulation is to provide a basis for determining what is “true information” from “error information” (Polit & Hungler, 1995, p. 362). The use of methodological

triangulation or multiple methods to study a problem is one way in which researchers can strengthen a study design, or ensure the validity of results (Patton, 1990). This study utilised data triangulation where data was collected at different times from different individuals or groups to assist the data collection and analysis phases (Berg, 2001; Bowling, 1997).

### **3.4 Methods**

The methods used in this qualitative study included individual interviews and focus group interviews in the context of *kanohi ki te kanohi* conversations that flowed in the openness and flexibility of a framework that encapsulates Kaupapa Māori approaches to research.

#### **3.4.1 Semi-structured Interviews**

As noted earlier, the purpose of this study was to determine what critical perspectives and experiences the research participants had of the current educational leadership approaches for improving Māori students' learning in mainstream secondary schools and Kaupapa Māori schools. By capturing their perspectives, the study sought to develop a framework for Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that is adaptable for mainstream secondary schools and Kaupapa Māori schools. Face to face, in-depth, semi-structured interviews were a means to capture this knowledge. According to Rice and Ezzy (2002) in good interviews, the interviewer works hard at listening, as careful listening allows the interviewer to ask pertinent questions that challenge the participant to think and in turn, expose what they do and how they do it. Stokes (1992) wrote that the researcher working in Māori domains who has learned to listen quietly will "learn more and so be more effective" (p. 11). The use of face to face interviewing resonated naturally with the Māori cultural imperative of *kanohi ki te kanohi* engagement as well as the 'kanohi kitea' code of behaviour and responsibility discussed earlier (Smith, 1999). The personal nature of this approach was important as a way to hold the researcher accountable to the research participants (Milroy, 1996). This form of collecting data is considered respectful and empowering and so aligns with the cultural values and principles of Kaupapa Māori.

The use of semi-structured interviews as a method also had benefits in terms of its resilience so that while there was an interview schedule the flexibility allowed participants opportunity to develop and work through their ideas on a range of issues (Denscombe, 2003). As Bowling (1997) points out, in semi-structured interviews the researcher is able to probe fully for responses, and ensure that a greater depth of information is obtained. The benefit of using the semi-structured interview meant a set of topics and themes arising from these could be explored, yet still remain open for spontaneous views to be expressed (Polit & Hungler, 1995).

In this study the data were collected by conducting a series of face to face, semi-structured interviews with individuals. Interviewing was chosen as a data gathering device for this study in order to encourage participants to talk about a range of phenomena. The participants were information rich and had a wealth of experience that provided valuable insights, perspectives and deeper understandings of the issues to be explored in this study. Interviewing requires skill and sensitivity (Smith, 2006) and effort was made to gain a rapport and establish a relationship with the participants, which was necessary in order to delve deeper into the issues of discussion. The other benefit was in terms of being able to explain the purpose of the study and the nature of the information that was required. I was also available to clarify questions as the need arose. Furthermore when the responses from the participants were unclear the researcher had an opportunity to rephrase the question in order to obtain a clearer response.

Participants were asked about their experiences and expectations for the improvement of Māori students' education achievement outcomes in secondary schools. The semi-structured interviews were appropriate for gaining detailed information about the participants' thoughts and actions relative to this because it allowed the freedom to express their views in their own terms and encouraged open two way communications between the interviewer and the participants.

Semi-structured interviews are more like conversations that allow the researcher to explore perspectives at a general level to begin the process of uncovering the participant's views (Galletta, 2013). The level of engagement between the researcher

and the participant is established on equal terms. In this way the researcher can help to provide a framework that allows the participants to share their views and to ensure that they are accurately represented. The researcher is seeking to facilitate the process for dialogue but not to dominate or limit the participant's responses in any way. There is a sense of give and take between the two parties with the flexibility necessary for eliciting rich, detailed information (Galletta, 2013, pp. 48-49).

The use of semi-structured interviews was also useful as I met with teachers and parents for one time only. Participants were encouraged to freely express ideas and provide information that they considered important. The flexibility of semi-structured interviews provided opportunity for unexpected information, as well as answers for prepared interview questions. The other advantage of this method is that the open-ended questions in semi-structured interviews require descriptive answers; encouraging more detailed responses from the research participants. However, there are potential challenges to using semi-structured interviews: time is needed to plan the overall format and details and a skilled interviewer is essential. The interviewer must relate to participants whilst at the same time avoiding any form of bias. In readiness for the potential challenges I prepared a plan of the overall interview process and a range of starter questions to encourage the participants to contribute with ease. In my interviewer role when asking questions I undertook to probe participants without being either leading or directive. During the data analysis I took every care to capture the contributions and their meanings provided from the participants. Although the analysis was time consuming it revealed a depth and richness that was shared by the participants.

### **3.4.2 Focus Groups**

A focus group can be viewed as a “carefully planned series of discussions to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment” (Krueger & Casey, 2009, p. 2). The significance of providing a culturally safe context for participants to engage in discussion is highly compatible with Kaupapa Māori theories and research approaches (Smith, 2006). As Russell Bishop (1994) commented, Kaupapa Māori is a means to address the prevailing ideologies of cultural superiority currently pervading our institutions. Focus groups thus provide people with valuable opportunities to give direct responses on particular phenomena. In a Kaupapa Māori

context, engagement necessitates a culturally relevant and appropriate forum for Māori to express a uniquely Māori worldview that invokes an open and non-judgmental response. Focus group participants can engage in rich discussion and build on each other's comments and test the veracity of what is said based on their own experience (Linville, Lambert-Shute, Fruhauf & Piercy, 2003) and thus are compatible with Kaupapa Maori research approaches. Furthermore the reciprocal nature and synergy of robust dialogue and active listening suggests the potential for an educative outcome. This research method was used to “gather substantial information in a short period and hear directly from those with the perspective they need” (Krueger, 1988; Linville et al., 2003).

Nonetheless, as the researcher I had to be mindful of the makeup of the focus group participants to ensure discussions were free flowing and not inhibited by already established ways of relating to each other (Krueger, 1988). Barbour (2007) also encourages flexibility with regard to where the focus groups will be conducted and that researchers not limit options to possible research settings. This is entirely in accord with the flexibility of Kaupapa Māori approaches to research that consistently operate in ways to empower participants to determine the research setting in terms of personal comfort levels and cultural appropriateness for instance, at home, at the marae and or at a venue of their choice.

Depending on the research questions and research design focus, groups are usually conducted for one to two hours (Morgan, 1997; Vaughn, Schumm & Sinagub, 1996). For the purposes of this study the time allocation met the practical aspect of the parent and teacher participants and fit within the recommended timeframes. However, in Kaupapa Māori the element of time restraint is not the usual practice as some hui and wānanga can be conducted according to the significance of the kaupapa (matter of importance) rather than the time taken to discuss it.

The size of effective focus groups can range from four to 12 participants, with the ideal size being seven to ten individuals (Krueger, 1988; Krueger & Casey, 2009; Linville et al., 2003; Smithson, 2008). The groups need to be small enough to allow people to feel comfortable sharing their thoughts and large enough to provide for diversity of

perspectives (Krueger, 1994; Krueger & Casey, 2000; Morgan, 1997). Conducting multiple focus groups on the same topic has the potential to balance out idiosyncrasies of individuals and groups and to include the breadth of people with relevant information and insight.

The value of the focus group discussions are related to the skills and background of the facilitator (Allen, Grudens-Schuck, & Larson, 2004). Best practices for focus group facilitation include respect for participants, empathy, knowledge of the topic, clear written and oral communication skills, good listening skills, ability to refrain from asserting personal views, a sense of humour and the ability to be flexible (Krueger & Casey, 2009). When Kaupapa Māori approaches to research are followed the goal is to foster and inspire a sense of empowerment and means for Māori to regain control of the research investigations into their lives. In line with Kaupapa Māori, the best practices for focus group facilitation meet that threshold required for Māori research participants to be considered culturally safe. Furthermore, the facilitator needs to use a variety of strategies to ensure that all participants are fully involved. Krueger (1988) suggests this occurs by asking good questions, using skilful probing, pauses, comments and body language and knowing when to move on to a new topic. Furthermore, according to Culver (2007 as cited in Franz, 2011) successful facilitators keep the conversation moving, balance opinions in the group, paraphrase responses to ensure accuracy and track and review strands of the discussions.

A distinctive feature of focus groups is that they create research data by generating social interaction. According to Boddy (2005), this is done by bringing a group of participants together to discuss a topic and then observing how the ensuing discussion evolves. The underlying assumption follows that meaning is created in social interaction (Wilkinson, 2001). Focus group discussions provide a context for participants to articulate the meaning of their experiences and delve deeper within a collective sensemaking process. Focus groups also seek individual viewpoints and move towards exploring the different viewpoints that emerge. Participants are encouraged to deal with complex issues and in doing so utilise their collective knowledge and experience.

According to Linville et al. (2003) focus group participation is enhanced through the skill of the facilitator to be inclusive and involve everyone in the discussion. Hence rich data were produced by limiting the topics to be discussed, focussing on issues not people, encouraging both positive and negative feedback, dealing effectively with negative feedback and being directive when necessary. They suggest that an inclusive approach should “honor the knowledge and experience of people who typically do not have a voice” (p. 219). This notion of inclusivity is also located within Kaupapa Māori approaches that argue for recognition of Māori struggles for self-determination and Kaupapa Māori theories in its analysis of power structures and societal inequalities (Smith, 2006).

The ability of the facilitator to ask questions requires a degree of preparation that will ensure that focus group questions can be narrowed down to four or five because of limited time duration (Rio-Roberts, 2011; Sharkey-Simon, 1999). Furthermore, the initial questions should be more open-ended and progressively get more specific. The facilitator should refrain from asking “why” questions that the participants may be unable to answer (Krueger, 1988) too early in the interview. Successful facilitators explore the context driving the questions, and typically have pilot tested the questions with a group similar to those being studied. However while there was no pilot for this research I had previous experience in this particular technique and because I had observed and participated in a number of focus group interviews I felt confident to facilitate this process.

According to Calderon (2011) there is room for researcher participation in the focus group discussions including answering questions from the participants, asking questions, probing for answers and commenting on them. Participants have the opportunity to learn and respond with “new found understanding” (p. 309). In Kaupapa Māori approaches to research, part of any educational understanding would give recognition to issues of identity thus allowing Māori participants to openly identify as Māori and to be confident in the acceptance of their diverse Māori world views as being both essential and desirable.

Onwuegbuzie, Dickinson, Leech, and Zoarn (2009) have noted a range of benefits from using focus groups in qualitative research as a means to collecting qualitative data involving discussions around a specific topic or set of issues. However, they recognised that focus groups can be prone to the same weaknesses of any group interview. They introduce a framework for analysis of focus group data that involves both verbal and non verbal communication in order to increase the rigor of focus group analyses. Focus groups are economical (Krueger & Casey, 2000) by allowing participants to be interviewed in group settings, where the collection of data is faster and usually at a lower economic cost to the researcher. It is feasible that more participants are likely to be involved in focus groups (Krueger & Casey, 2000). Focus groups can create an atmosphere that encourages more responses to take place (Butler, 1996). Vaughn, Schumm, and Sinagub (1996) suggest that for some participants the focus group can provide a sense of security in numbers in contrast to individual interview situations. Focus groups can also provide a forum for participants to share personal issues and engage in some form of problem solving. Kruegar (1988) advocates for the use a variety of strategies to enable participants to connect deeper with their emotions and unconscious behaviours. Hence, the focus group experience can potentially create an opportunity for emotional release and personal revelation. On these matters they are consistent with Kaupapa Māori approaches to research which are inclusive of a wider social justice agenda and Kaupapa Māori research that is focused on making a positive difference for Māori people, as individuals and as communities. The tikanga or conduct of Kaupapa Māori research approaches are culturally respectful and based on shared processes and knowledge. The attention to problem solving through focus groups is very much a part of the value systems and cultural practice of Kaupapa Māori approaches.

The main purpose of the focus group interviews was to gauge the attitudes and experiences that these participants had towards their respective school's leadership practices and approaches and the reasons for their views. The information gleaned from the focus group interviews was written in the form of case studies, and the next section provides an overview of the criteria used in the recruitment of the study participants.

### 3.5 The Study Participants

For the purposes of this study, the schools were recruited on the basis of particular criteria, which required positive ERO Reports that confirmed the presence of good practice and confidence in the school leadership and that also prioritised further improvements in the education of their Māori students. The schools were located in the North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand and fulfilled the additional criteria that they catered for a large majority of Māori secondary students. The two schools are co-educational and are designated to have students in attendance from Years 1 to 13. The mainstream secondary school is selected from a small rural location and the Kaupapa Māori school is from an urban setting. Neither school is designated as a Kura Kaupapa Māori under Te Aho Matua (refer to Appendix 1: Types of schools for an explanatory note).

Table 3.1 Case Studies

#### Case Study 1 Tolaga Bay Area School/Kuranui, Gisborne

This school is a composite area school catering for students ranging from years 1-13. It has a decile rating of 2. The school roll is 261. The gender composition is 52% boys and 48% girls. The ethnic composition is 94% Māori, 4% NZ European/Pākehā, 2% Pacific. The special features of Tolaga Bay Area School include an Immersion Te Reo Years 1 to 6 and Kuranui Immersion Te Reo Years 7 to 13.

#### Case Study 2 Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae, Auckland

This school is a special character kura catering for students ranging from years 1 to 13. It has a decile rating of 1. The kura roll is 288. The gender composition is 44% boys and 56% girls. The ethnic composition is 100% Māori. The special feature of Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae is a Māori Immersion Kura Years 1 to 13.

For Kaupapa Māori research, it is a necessary requirement of the researcher, whether Māori or non-Māori, to have well established credentials in the Māori communities you intend to work within before even contemplating an approach to engage in research.

Hence the rationale in this study for drawing on my own background in education as a former teacher of primary and secondary students, and Māori students in secondary Māori language immersion units, my role as a former policy analyst Māori in the Ministry of Education and my current position of 20 years as the Āpiha Māori (policy advisor Māori) in the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association (PPTA), to establish my credibility as a researcher.

Consequently, I had established selection criteria for principals on the basis of their strong leadership focus on providing positive learning environments that were improving Māori student educational outcomes. Through my years of working in education I had knowledge of principals who had reputations for providing effective leadership. Therefore in accordance with Kaupapa Māori research protocols I approached the principals to initiate discussions on an informal basis to talk about the study and to gauge their interest and support for the study. The end result of this initial process was a formal agreement from each principal to consent to be part of the research and to also facilitate the participation of teachers and parents. Given my familiarity with the education community the potential for researcher bias will be discussed later in Section 3.9 as part of the ethical considerations of the study.

Further participants from each school were identified on the basis of their interest and willingness to share their perspectives on leadership approaches that they considered were successfully encouraging teaching and learning practices that were meeting the needs of Māori students. The participants were selected by purposive sampling (a deliberately non-random method of sampling). Purposive sampling involves the researcher making decisions about who will be selected and thus has a high risk of researcher bias as a sampling method. However, there are benefits that help advance the purpose of the research as the researcher has specific knowledge about the research population and the sample of groups and individuals with the required knowledge for the study (Minichiello et al., 1999).

The teacher participants consisted of teachers from each school, from basic scale to middle and senior management positions. The intention was to provide a genuine

opportunity for people to participate in the research because they had an expressed interest in the research topic as well as in its framing, within Kaupapa Māori theories.

The parent participants consisted of parents who were contacted by the principal and who then indicated their interest to participate in the study. The intention was to cast the net wide to ensure that parents had an opportunity to register an interest and contribute to the research. However, in the Kaupapa Māori school the parents were also teachers and were therefore interviewed as one group. This was a pragmatic choice made by the participants, based on their availability and the time constraints of living in a densely populated urban area.

At the mainstream school the principal was interviewed and three focus group interviews of teachers and one focus group interview of parents also took place.

Table 3.2 Mainstream school

Interview	Role and Context	N
N (Nori)	Principal	1
Focus group interview	Role and Context	
K1	Kaiako (teachers) in immersion /mainstream	3
K2	Kaiako (teachers) in mainstream	4
K3	Kaiako (teachers) in mainstream/senior management	4
P	Parents/Board of Trustees/iwi	4
Total		16

In the Kaupapa Māori kura (school) the principal was interviewed and one focus group of sixteen teachers, of whom eight identified as current parents, were interviewed.

Table 3.3 Kaupapa Māori school

Interview	Role and Context	N
A (Arihia)	Principal	1
Focus group interview	Role and Context	
	Teacher/parent/senior management	2
	Teacher/parent	5
	Teacher	5
	Teacher/kaitautoko (support role)	2
	Teacher/administrator/parent	1
	Teacher/advisory role	1
Total		17

The two principals and their respective school focus groups of teachers and of parents were interested in sharing their experiences and perspectives. It was important to negotiate with the two principals appropriate protocols for working with teachers on staff. In terms of Kaupapa Māori research any participatory involvement of teachers and parents emphasised respect for the mana of each individual. Therefore in order to protect the integrity of the research process, the principals were advised against any form of coercion or subtle pressure on teachers or parents to participate in the research. It was made very clear that the research process and practices were entirely voluntary and the resulting outcomes should be affirming for all involved.

In addition, there were two significant Māori women leaders interviewed who were selected on the basis of meeting a range of criteria, that included them having extensive experience and knowledge of working with Māori in education. They were also highly regarded by Māori community organisations and government and public sector organisations responsible for Māori education, Māori language and cultural development, and whānau, hapū and iwi development. The two significant Māori leaders were interviewed for their overview and perspectives on the current state and

the potential future of Māori education, Māori in secondary education and Māori education in general. The process for conducting these personal interviews involved *kanohi ki to kanohi* or face to face conversations in accordance with Kaupapa Māori forms of engagement in order to capture both the spirit and detail of the information shared by the participants. Their contributions added further to the insights already provided through the writings of Emeritus Professor Sir Mason Durie and Professor Wally Penetito in the literature review section of this study.

Prior to undertaking any form of field-work, the prospective participants were contacted to introduce the study and rationale, and to ask for a meeting. As they agreed to give serious consideration to participating further information on the details of the research phases was then provided. No major barriers to this process were anticipated as I was confident in my ability to argue the merits of the purpose of the research to develop Kaupapa Māori approaches of leadership that could be adapted for mainstream and kaupapa Māori secondary schools. However, I was mindful of possible challenges to the study through my prior experience of working with Māori teachers who had felt compelled to unshackle from mainstream secondary schools in order to establish Kaupapa Māori education in a more Māori inclusive environment. As well, I was not absolutely sure of the response from non-Māori professionals working in mainstream and kaupapa Māori secondary schools to the research. However, the study helped to bring out the plethora of possibilities, and having completed the process of interviewing the teacher participants from both schools it was obvious that they were keen to offer constructive and robust input. Although an ambitious undertaking, I was always confident in my [Māori] cultural grounding to undertake this study and to move easily within the Māori community and the wider education community.

### **3.6 Research Process**

The research process began with interviews with the school principals. In accordance with *tikanga* Māori the interviews were opened with *mihimihi* and *karakia* to ensure the participants were culturally safe and to acknowledge the importance of the research being conducted. The role of the Māori researcher is varied and can include acting in a leadership or advisory capacity to ensure that the people being researched are supported and well informed (Stokes, 1985). The researcher must also “ensure high standards of

accuracy, presentation and communication to retain credibility in the Māori world, and translate with credibility for the Pākehā world as appropriate (Stokes, 1985, p. 41). The time and place and duration of the interviews were pre-arranged for the convenience of the participants. Whilst the individual interview questions were available in advance of the interviews none of the participants wanted these. The participants were also welcome to include whānau support at their interviews although no whānau actually attended any of the interviews in a supporting capacity. Brief notes were taken during the interviews and all interviews were tape recorded. To ensure that the information was accurate and approved for final publication I transcribed the data, before being given back to participants for checking and providing feedback and final approval.

Focus group interviews were then arranged with teachers and parents from each school. In the mainstream secondary school the teachers were organised into three groups, immersion/mainstream, mainstream, and mainstream/senior management, which helped to keep the discussions manageable (refer to Table 3.1, p. 60). Four parents participated in the focus group interview; some were involved in community activities and had either served as members of the Board of Trustees or were current Board members. The Kaupapa Māori school focus group interviews were different and consisted of one large combined whānau group of sixteen, where all were teachers and eight of the participants identified as current parents as well (refer to Table 3.2, p. 62). In terms of the focus group literature in reference to the ideal number of seven to ten participants there was still an easy flow of interaction with most participants speaking or nodding to indicate their agreement. When and if necessary participants indicated their different views without hesitation.

The interviews took place during the day at the two schools. These interactive discussions were tape recorded. The focus group interviews were conducted in the two schools, which was the decision of the participants. The interviews were semi-structured and in keeping with the purpose of a focus group, the questions started wide and became more specifically focused on a research question. As there is substantial literature on focus groups as a method, the researcher explored some of that literature prior to the interviews to refine interviewing techniques. A focus group protocol (refer to Appendix 4) along with the Information sheet for focus group participants (refer to

Appendix 2) provided useful guidelines for preparing and then conducting the focus group interviews. As with the process followed for the principal interviews, to ensure that the information was accurate and approved for final publication the data that I had transcribed was given back to focus group participants for checking and providing feedback and final approval.

### **3.7 Analysis of the Data**

In accordance with Kaupapa Māori theories, the analysis of data focused on the concept of interpretation. The interpretation of data and understanding of the phenomena under investigation were reliant on personal knowledge, understanding and world view. The role of the researcher as an active participant is critical to this analysis. As the data needs to be read and interpreted by the researcher, it is important to acknowledge the biases that the research has and to be aware of how the biases can affect the analysis and the findings (Smith, 1999b).

Kaupapa Māori theories require the researcher to have an informed awareness of Māori systems, knowledge, people and processes (Smith, 1990, cited in Smith, 1999b). Yet at the same time, the researcher's level of knowledge may be labelled as a form of bias, which can affect how the researcher executes the data analysis. Kaupapa Māori acknowledges that such biases may exist and requires the researcher to use their cultural knowledge in the analysis phase. Thus Kaupapa Māori theories affirm and advocate for the researcher to acknowledge the validity of Māori knowledge and to utilise this knowledge and a Māori worldview in the interpretation and analysis of the data. Pivotal to the analysis is the researcher's ability to appropriately interpret and understand information that is interwoven with tikanga Māori, Māori knowledge and understandings. The researcher must have the ability to view the data collected for analysis within the wider cultural and societal context that is shaping the research material.

In Kaupapa Māori analysis it is critical to take care to desist from any form of deficit theorising that results in victim blaming, when interpreting the information in the data analysis phase of the research (Smith, 1999b). However, it has the flexibility to allow more than one approach to the data analysis. Kaupapa Māori analysis is dependent on

what the research is attempting to find out. In this research, the transcripts from the semi-structured interviews lent themselves to content and thematic analysis. Key words or phrases within the text that were often stated, that evoked strong emotions, images or significant concepts revealed links and relationships that started the process of sorting the data into various categories (Mutch, 2013)). Themes that occurred consistently were grouped across the transcripts and then underlying factors were analysed.

### **3.8 Thematic and Content Analysis**

The analysis involved a number of stages: identifying possible themes and patterns in the information data collected in the principal interviews, the teacher focus group interviews and the parent focus group interviews, to making links between categories and then identifying the key qualitative themes most represented across the case study interviews. Coded data from the significant Māori leader interviews was then compared with case study data to gauge the commonalities and the contradictions. Coding by thematic analysis allowed the process of identifying emerging themes or concepts in the data while content analysis brought similar data and themes together to be interpreted for better understanding. The necessary inclusion of cultural and political dimensions is entirely consistent and advocated for within Kaupapa Māori approaches (Smith, 2012) and inclusive of robust political processes and critical engagement (Hoskins, 2012). The synthesising of data and their different aspects helped determine the similarities and the differences in the results. It proved a useful way of confirming or testing the validity, reliability and relevance of the findings obtained from the study (Bevan-Brown, 2001; Ezzy, 2002).

The interviews were initially analysed by defining broad categories and further reflections on the literature. Field notes assisted this process as the material was coded according to these categories and as new themes emerged. The arising themes were interpreted from the evidence provided within the interview data collected and the notes from each interview reviewed in light of the interpretations, to check for any omissions. The coding and analysis of data was done manually, as previously noted by categorising the information that was organised according to the key themes to emerge out of the data. Due to the modest sample selected for the research the amount of data generated

were deemed manageable hence the decision not to utilise the additional aid of NVivo, a specialist software package for qualitative data analysis. NVivo is useful for managing and storing large quantities of qualitative material.

Once the initial analysis in the form of their transcripts was completed the findings were given back to the participants for comment. This allowed the participants to keep involved with the research and retain a sense of ownership of the research process. The participants had an opportunity to provide comment, clarification or provide additional information to assist the study. The research process followed was consistent with the requirement of Kaupapa Māori research to ensure that the research contributed towards making a positive difference for Māori (Smith, 2003; Smith, 2006) and adhered to the important tikanga or principle of utu (reciprocity) of giving back to the research participants who had shared their gifts of knowledge and experiences identified by Jones, Ingham, Davies and Cram (2010).

The Kaupapa Māori analysis of the data took cognisance of a Māori philosophical framework that validated Māori knowledge (Smith, 1999). I was guided in the analysis phase by acknowledging and validating Māori knowledge (philosophy), Māori ways of knowing (epistemology), Māori ways of being (ontology), and Māori ways of doing (methodology). Kaupapa Māori epistemology is contextualised within a Māori framework that allows a Māori world view from a position of authority (Mead, 2012) and self-determination (Hutchings, 2002). Māori analysis validates Māori knowledge and the perception that there is a uniquely Māori way of viewing the world and interpreting theoretically within te ao Māori rather than specific guides for analysing interviews (Smith, 1999). However, the key Kaupapa Māori guide in interpretations and analysis is based on the premise that Māori research involving Māori people, as individuals or communities, should make a positive difference for the researched and have the ultimate goal towards the improvement and development of Māori.

### **3.9 Ethical Considerations**

The definition of ethics is one of distinguishing right from wrong in terms of conduct and behaviour that is acceptable or unacceptable (Resnik, 2011). With regard to ethical norms in research this is inclusive of guidelines for ensuring the aims of research, for

example, the promotion of knowledge that is based on accurate and truthful data. Guidelines can also cover aspects of authorship, confidentiality, public accountability and the protection of human subjects and animal care and use. Professional organisations and including universities have adopted ethics guidelines and codes of conduct that are framed around rules, duties or responsibilities (Resnik, 2012). There have been significant historical factors that led to the establishment of human ethics committees. For example, the Nuremberg Military Tribunal established the Nuremberg Code (1948) for research on human experimentation on concentration camp prisoners. Concern over coercion in research today remains legitimate especially when the research places the people involved at high risk (Parsell, Ambler & Jacenyik-Trawoger, 2014).

I have endeavoured to give effect to the ethics in my research approach by:

- Seeking participants' permission to participate in this research study and to use information gathered from interviews;
- Fully informing participants of the aim of the research, the method proposed for collecting the research, their rights as research participants and the ethical requirements of the researcher and the research process;
- Consulting with participants to determine the time and location of the interviews;
- Working according to the protocols of tikanga Māori including manaaki tangata;
- Returning their interview transcripts for corrections and accuracy on the part of the researcher/recorder;
- Protecting their confidentiality rights; and,
- Storing transcripts and taped interviews in a secure location.

Within the wider education community my responsibility is also to uphold the ethical conduct for research involving human participants as prescribed by Massey University. The Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluations involving Human Participants has been developed to ensure that research undertaken by students of Massey University comply with the legal requirements of Section 6 of the Education Act 1989. Prior to commencing any form of research data gathering I sought and received code of ethics approval from the Massey University Human Ethics Committee at Palmerston North. In gaining ethics approval I was bound to conduct my study with

genuine regard to the Treaty of Waitangi obligations of protection, participation and partnership where Māori were involved as participants and according to the following major ethical principles:

- Respect for persons;
- Minimisation of harm to participants, researchers, institutions and groups;
- Informed and voluntary consent;
- Respect for privacy and confidentiality;
- The avoidance of unnecessary deception;
- Avoidance of conflict of interest;
- Social and cultural sensitivity to the age, gender, culture, religion, social class of the participants; and,
- Justice (Massey University, 2015, p. 4).

In conducting the research following Kaupapa Māori theories and research methodology I acknowledge the insider/outsider status I carry as the researcher given the links that I have to both of the research communities. Ethical considerations that have guided me in my role as a Māori researcher engaging in Kaupapa Māori research, locate my position as being primarily responsible to the people involved in the research and ensuring that the findings and the process are beneficial to them (Cram, 2001; Smith, 2003; Jones et al., 2010; Smith, 2006). Aspects of transformation, positive impact and dissemination of the research findings are all part of this process. I need to acknowledge the multiple situations of some members of the Kaupapa Māori school focus group analysed as parents, teachers and education leaders. The rights of the members to be interviewed as one whānau group was entirely consistent with Kaupapa Māori approaches of rangatiratanga and aroha ki te tangata; self-determination and respect for people. I understood the tikanga of their decision and accepted the situation with the added proviso that members indicated the capacity in which they were contributing to the interviews, either as a parent, teacher or education leader. The openness and ease of members to share their views and aspirations reflected tikanga and processes that were respectful and mana enhancing for all the focus group members. Hence, by adopting Māori ethical conventions that derive from Kaupapa Māori approaches to research, this protected the cultural integrity and relevance of the study.

Furthermore, as I kept within the research guidelines and worked with my experienced team of supervisors I managed any arising issues in the study.

### **3.10 Summary**

This chapter provided insights into the effects of Western research on the state of Māori education and the response from Māori through the transformative impacts of Kaupapa Māori theorising and Kaupapa Māori research. These analyses were then followed by an examination of the research's dual methodological approaches, Kaupapa Māori methodology and Case-study methodology to generate an indepth understanding of the Māori educational leadership issues in question.

The methods used in the study involved individual interviews and focus group interviews that were guided by Kaupapa Māori cultural practices and principles to ensure positive and worthwhile outcomes for Māori. The use of semi-structured interviews were useful as a data gathering device to encourage participants to talk about a range of phenomena which provided detailed information and valuable insights into their perspectives on the issues explored in this study. The use of focus group interviews provided a safe forum for participants to discuss issues and share their experiences in a group context. The interactive nature of the group dynamics helped stimulate a range of viewpoints and generated social interaction throughout the discussions.

The criteria for selection of the study's participants were broadly based on credible educational leadership and practice in schools and the wider community, along with a strong commitment to serve the needs of Māori in education. The research process covered aspects of recruitment including related challenges and the important considerations that enabled the research to proceed. The data analysis in accordance with Kaupapa Māori interpretations and approaches rests within the goal of a Māori philosophical framework for the improvement and development of Māori. The ethical considerations were guided by Kaupapa Māori ethical principles that keep participants safe and the process respectful at all times, whilst upholding the Massey University Code of Ethical Conduct for Research, Teaching and Evaluation involving Human Participants, and obligations to Māori under the Treaty of Waitangi.

The ensuing chapter presents the first of the two case studies, beginning with the data gathered from the principal of the mainstream school, followed by the findings from participant teachers and parents.

## Chapter 4 Findings

### 4.1 Case Study 1

This chapter provides the results of the findings from Case Study 1 conducted in a mainstream secondary school. The chapter starts with analyses of data collected from the principal, Nori Parata on her leadership approaches, her influences on the learning environment and her views of Kaupapa Māori. Nori opted to use her own name rather than a pseudonym because her school is the only secondary school located in the area and she felt entirely comfortable to be identified through her narratives and with her school, Tolaga Bay Area School. These analyses are followed by examination of the teachers' perspectives and concludes with analyses of the views of the parents. Some of the analyses are discussed in relation to policies and literature. The participants can be identified via the audit trail used after the participant's italicised quotes, which indicates the interviewee's code name, followed by the page number/s and the line numbers of the interview transcripts for ease of researcher review and reference purposes.

### 4.2 Nori - Approaches to Leadership

Te Tai Rāwhiti is translated as 'the tides where the sun rises' and the tribes of this origin are located along the East Coast of the North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand. The imagery of energy and natural light is an apt description of this impressive expanse, and of Nori, as a principal and descendant of Ngāti Porou, the major tribe of Te Tai Rāwhiti.

Nori acknowledged that her cultural origins had played a major part in shaping her philosophical approach to leadership. She spoke openly about how she had been influenced by traditional whānau and tribal values of kinship, loyalty and obligations to upholding the prestige of Ngāti Porou: *My style of leadership is partly culturally based...I grew up with strong cultural leadership models and I've tended to try to use those same sort of models in a contemporary way, the example I would use is that I grew up with a very one-eyed Ngāti Porou mother and we seem to have inherited that sort of iwi-centric view of Ngāti Porou [N:1:6-16].* She mentioned how she and her siblings had very strong cultural identities and of course for them that was a Ngāti Porou cultural identity.

Nori is located within a context of tribal constructs based on identity, descendancy and relationships that have endured throughout many generations. Nori's ownership of her Ngāti Porou culture is consistent with the well-documented culturalist position of kaupapa Māori theories as advocated by Smith (1997), to act as an agent of change to counter the hegemonic forces of a dominant Pākehā culture. Opponents have argued that culturalism had been merely a pretense for progressing ethnic-based policies in education and in the wider public sector (Rata, 2005). However, while Nori's cultural perspective was more consistent with Smith's than Rata's her position and sense of connection may not be shared or recognised by her principal colleagues in other mainstream secondary schools. Therefore it is possible that minimal shifts will occur in the thinking and leadership practice for Māori in some secondary schools (Bishop, 2003).

It is worth exploring some of the historical and cultural contexts of what it is to be of Ngāti Porou ancestry. Nori identified this as the source and inspiration for so much of what she believed in and stood for and which she credited as having moulded and shaped her values and her motivation to be a worthy Māori educational leader and role model in serving and meeting the needs of her community (Katene, 2010; Mead, 2006). Nori's strong sense of cultural identity and an overwhelming sense of pride, loyalty, mana and prestige for her Ngāti Porou iwi (tribe) were clearly evident within who she was, a descendant of Ngāti Porou iwi. Her exuberance overflowed when she recalled early childhood memories of being raised as Ngāti Porou and having an extremely one-eyed Ngāti Porou mother who instilled in her an iwi-centric view of the world. Nori's school is located within the beautiful Tolaga Bay also known by its original name of Uawa. The founding rangatira or chief of the Uawa people settled in the area around the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Hauti was a descendant of Māui and Paikea and from his time to the present day the major tribal group is referred to as Te Aitanga-a-Hauti (the descendants of Hauti).

Nori referred to her mother in her description of an example of a strong cultural leadership model: *When I'm talking about that the example I would use is that I grew up with a very one-eyed Ngāti Porou mother, who married a Ngāi Tahu man but certainly we were brought up*

here in Ngāti Porou [N:1:13-15]. Nori further attributed her sense of leadership to the significant qualities and influences passed down from her mother: *I say it's cultural and intuitive because my mother's passion was always about Ngāti Porou succeeding and particularly saw education as underpinning that success and that you would always have greater choices if you had that education* [N:1:19-22]. She added that her mother blended the best of what education provided in the Pākehā mainstream system. As an example both mother and children were heavily involved in Playcentre, along with the strong cultural identities of the Māori domain and for them that was a Ngāti Porou cultural identity. Nori recalled her mother's energy and commitment towards providing her with a strong education base.

The consistent thread throughout Nori's narrative was the prevalence of Kaupapa Māori as demonstrated in her mother's acts of conscientisation (Pihama, 1993) to advance Ngāti Porou cultural and educational outcomes, and to assert the validity of their knowledge, language, custom and practices. Her mother was clearly visioning well beyond the playground and building strategies for longer term outcomes that included Māori preferred interests in education and the right to succeed. These were the invaluable legacies that informed Nori in her philosophical approach to culturally-based leadership.

Nori commented on cultural identity as an indicator of success and how this was an essential trait underpinning her leadership: *I guess now in contemporary terms, the research is telling us that children who have strong identities are most likely to be more successful at school and my leadership style...is that these kids have a very strong sense of identity* [N:2:31-35]. She added that the challenge was not only in strengthening students' cultural identity, but also convincing them of the relevance of their cultural identity.

Māori and non-Māori educationists have consistently identified the negative impact on Māori student achievement outcomes when mainstream secondary school learning environments do not reflect Māori cultural values and beliefs (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh & Teddy, 2007; Durie, 2005). Given that Nori is a well established and highly regarded principal within her own Ngāti Porou boundaries she has been successful in her leadership, but the expectations on mainstream secondary principals both taura here (Māori living amongst other iwi) and Pākehā (non-Māori) to meet the same challenges in

nurturing positive ownership of culture and identity is potentially intimidating. However, there could also be positive implications if principals accepted the challenges to meet these expectations. Smith (1999) has argued that these manifestations of cultural disconnect are rooted in colonisation and need to be explored and deconstructed by Kaupapa Māori approaches that incorporate a decolonising framework. The Ministry of Education's current policy and strategy document, *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2009, 2013) has also moved towards a more responsive approach by prioritising Māori achievement in education through transforming the education system so that Māori students are supported to experience education success. However, it must be reiterated that *Ka Hikitia* on its own is not the silver bullet that will instantly solve the long-standing and complicated issues of improving Māori achievement and transforming the education system overnight. Furthermore, the level of engagement with the strategy can vary across the range of schools throughout the country.

Her commitment to defend the offspring of Ngāti Porou was further testimony to her sense of whakawhanaungatanga that bound and strengthened kinship ties. As she said, *your degree of Ngāti Porouness is enriched by being able to speak the language te reo but it is not the key ingredient, it is your DNA, so that the children who go to mainstream schools are just as much Ngāti Porou as those that go to wharekura and they deserve the opportunity to explore that identity and to have it reinforced* [N:2:50-54]. Nori was aware of the range of perspectives in Māori communities over the issue of whether the Māori students who were speakers of te reo Māori were held in higher esteem over non-speakers. However she has focused attention on the more substantial challenge for mainstream secondary school principals: to respond in practical and meaningful ways to provide an environment to ensure Māori students can enjoy success as learners and as Māori.

Nori referred back to her belief in the importance of nurturing in young people the value of a strong identity: *We shouldn't deny those kids and those families that haven't the opportunity for their children to have that strong identity. That is one of my underpinning philosophies if you like for leadership, is identity and people understanding the worth of that identity* [N:2:58-60]. She admitted that it was a difficult task trying to convince 10 or 12 year olds of the merits of the cultural capital invested in them as young people. Even so there were

some tangible affirmations through participating in things of interest and often leading to a sense of identity that felt worthwhile. As she put it: *Identity is a huge driver for me in my leadership style* [N:2:66].

There was directness in Nori's philosophical approach to leadership that was apparent in her eagerness to transform outcomes for students and the wider community, as the following quote suggests: *that's been a labour of love, drives me mad half the time not just worrying about what's happening in your school, it's what's happening for all of us and how can we all contribute and support each other to raise those outcomes. I always tell the kids there's nowhere else on earth you will find this. That's why we're special. Aue!* [N:8:263-266] This approach was in alignment with the Ministry of Education *He Kākano* professional development programme (2010-2012) for secondary school principals which had identified the important role of leaders as agents of change. Nori had previously referred to the significance of being raised with a strong Ngāti Porou cultural identity and this was further exemplified in her approach to leadership as she wore her identity as a badge of pride. Inclusive in Nori's approach was the vital component of cultural leadership that students related to as learners and as Māori.

Nori aspired to provide nothing but the best to ensure that community outcomes were paramount. As she stated:

*Leadership is not just about contributing to the educational outcomes for these children but it's about contributing to the whānau outcomes in the community as well...if they have a good education they will have greater choices, greater choices influence the jobs or career paths you are able to have and it influences the health and wellbeing of your family. The leadership is about a community participating in a community leadership* [N:3:68-75].

Nori's arguments are echoed in the literature on collaborative leadership practices that indicated improved educational outcomes when communities were included in the learning process (Hallinger & Heck, 1996a, 1996b). Underpinning her beliefs about the community involvement and engagement in the education of their children was a strong sense of citizenship that bound people to whānau, to community, to country and to universe. Nori had however expressed concern about a growing generation of children

who tended to take more than they gave. Therefore reclaiming the cultural value of reciprocity was an important component of her philosophical approach to leadership as well, as she explained: *the communities are only as good as how much giving and taking goes on and the quality of the environment that you provide for children is only as good as the community they are in* [N:3:88-89]. Nori affirmed once again that the act of reciprocity was a two-way contribution from the individual to the community and from the community back to the individual.

Nori thus viewed the community as the focal point and the school as a part of that community, so being highly connected with her community was another important aspect of her philosophical approach to leadership: *this school will reflect this community in both its positive and its negative and as a leader of this school I cannot do it without working with the leadership in this community* [N:3:94-96]. In the early years of her appointment Nori felt the need to earn the respect of the community, even though she had whakapapa (genealogical) links to the local community and iwi (tribe). She was also supported in many ways by virtue of her husband being a descendant of the local iwi Te Aitanga a Hauiti. She experienced their support and vote of confidence when her appointment was challenged by the Ministry of Education on the grounds that she was not a teacher: *This community rallied behind and put their faith in me by saying we're gonna have her. I guess I have spent the last 14 years, 15 years of my life repaying that faith and trust in me...it hasn't always been easy but by and large it's been rewarding* [N:5:156-159].

She also said though, that it was only within the last three-five years as a leader that she had understood the importance of working with and being highly connected to the leadership in the community. As she said, *It is our collective and collaborative leadership that will make the difference...the school is only a formal building, the kids' education is far wider than coming to school here. It's what happens in the community, in the marae and all those sorts of things* [N:3-4:101]. While she referred here to an array of leadership that involved local business, health providers and the marae, she credited marae and tribal leadership as absolutely crucial to the success of the school. The school had used marae mainly as culturally appropriate venues for wānanga (teaching and learning sessions) which were an important part of the different styles of pedagogy designed to facilitate students' learning experiences. Over time however the school and marae had come to build their

relationships in terms of close collaboration and connectedness. As she explained, *Now we're at a point where the marae leadership is telling and talking to me about the types of things they want to see reflected in the education of the children, in terms of cultural identity...and where we have the gaps in our leadership and in our content knowledge in certain areas* [N:4:115-122].

She described how the journey of collaboration had evolved beyond the immediate community to embrace national and international organisations and their resource contributions, to improve the learning and teaching in the school and the community. For example, to facilitate the development of science they had established networks with Otago University, the Allan Wilson Centre for Molecular Ecology and Evolution, Kew Gardens and The Royal Society of London. The key to the success of these collaborations had lain in Nori's cultivating and nurturing working relationships between them. These relationships were another form of whakawhanaungatanga that helped to weave people together in closer and more collaborative ties. Working in collaborative relationships had the effect of improving the learning and teaching opportunities for the students. The positive effect of a collaborative approach was consistent with research that shows the effectiveness of a similar collaborative approach to leadership focused on principles of inclusivity to meet the needs of students and local communities (Blackmore, 2005).

In terms of Nori's philosophical approach to leadership there was the issue of what is meant by the term culturally-based. For Nori this was akin to Ngāti Porou iwi identity and descendance from ancestral waka and whakapapa and whānau. She spoke about her strong cultural identity that was Ngāti Porou cultural identity. This assumption of an iwi-centric view of Ngāti Porou and of having a one-eyed Ngāti Porou mother evokes a sense of pride. The central focus of this study was to probe and to identify Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that may be adapted for use in mainstream secondary schools and Kaupapa Māori schools. How her principal colleagues might view and respond to both her culturally-based approach to leadership and forms of cultural pride is a question for further research.

### 4.3 Nori – Influencing the Learning Environment

Nori knew before her appointment that the school was in a state of downward spiral, the morale amongst students and teachers was low, the academic results were poor and the parents and community did not have a strong presence or sense of inclusion in the life of the school. Therefore it came as no surprise that educational leadership at the school was a key issue at the beginning of her tenure. As she said, *I think when things are in a bad way that people have and do invest their trust and faith in you and hope, they're taking a gamble really that things will turn around* [N:5:164-165]. Nori felt the community's desperation and also recognised how familial links had influenced the locals to provide openings for her to enter; *I've got whakapapa here...but I think my job was aided and abetted by my husband being Te Aitanga a Hauiti so that helped* [N:5:150-151]. As Nori had mentioned previously even though she was born in the Ngāti Porou boundaries, having married a man from the local iwi Te Aitanga a Hauiti certainly had its benefits. The community wanted strong leadership from Nori and in response she prioritised the needs of the community. In doing so she had begun the process of influencing the learning environment and invoking relationships that were both familial and reciprocal. As indicated in the literature on utu and reciprocity (Jones et al., 2010, Smith, 2006) Nori was acting in accordance with these principles by sharing her gifts of educational leadership and knowledge she was giving back to the community. This also reinforced another important Māori tikanga concerning whanaungatanga or kinship obligations which Nori expressed through her willingness to take responsibility for the education of the students and for meeting the needs of the people in her community and for her readiness to be held accountable in her leadership role back to her community (Mead et al., 2006; Williams, 2010).

Nori believed that the community was the main focus and that the school was a part of the community. She did not hold the view that the school was the centre or focal point of the community. She also held to the belief that as a school leader she could not be effective in her role unless she worked with the leadership in her community. This was a realisation that evolved over time and as she said, *I didn't understand myself fully the importance of being highly connected to the leadership in this community* [N:3:100-101]. Her outlook was compatible with the ERO (2010) findings that indicated improved relationships and enhanced achievement for Māori students when whānau were

included in developing initiatives in schools. This is also captured in the policy response from the Ministry of Education's (2013) *Ka Hikitia*, which refers to the need for strong engagement and contribution from parents and whānau to support Māori students to reach their full potential.

Initially Nori adopted a very strong overt form of leadership that required a huge investment of time and energy in communicating with the community and restoring their faith in an education system and in their school. However, she said her leadership had changed from those early years of directive leadership to a more intuitive and cultural approach where there was more community initiated conversations about education and community expectations. The notion of Nori needing to build confidence and trust was paramount and in alignment with the growing awareness documented in research literature of educational leadership as an interactive and inclusive process operating within educational communities and gatherings (Harris, 2003; Spillane et al., 2000). Through her networking Nori established direct lines of communication that were about building confidence and trust and ultimately channels of influence within the community at large.

Nori resolved to provide parents and whānau with visible signs of success for their children, *so that they could feel that it [the learning environment/school] was being successful* [N:6:171-172]. Working at trying to build this confidence in them was an ongoing involvement and as her confidence grew Nori used her powers of persuasion; *once you've got that confidence you're able to buy them in to taking some risks with us* [N:6:173]. She wanted parents and whānau to take some risks to achieve better learning and educational outcomes by trying something new; *and then you move but it's all hard grunt because while you have whistles and bells success you can't be shiny on top and shit underneath* [N:6:174-175].

This form of engagement and involvement resonated with national directives on responsive practices for improving Māori students' learning (ERO, 2010; Ministry of Education, 2007). Her goal was always to provide a relevant education for her students and to recognise their unique qualities. Nori remarked on how the teachers tried their best to keep students on track and engaged in ways that were relevant and Nori was herself engaging in shaping their education. She worked hard to provide parents' and

the community some visible signs of success for their children in the school environment. This was consistent with *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013) which focused on “quality education for and with Māori students and their whānau” (p. 8).

Nori set out to provide a new learning environment that was a more culturally appropriate context for students. The introduction of tikanga Māori offered a change in the way the curriculum was delivered by taking more cognisance of wānanga style (mass group) learning. She had observed how Māori students involved in kapa haka loved being together; *They love staying at the marae, they love learning their bracket ad nauseum so I thought why aren't we doing this for other subjects?* [N:8:235-236]. This kapa haka model of ongoing intense work followed by regular breaks was introduced into the learning and teaching of science. In addition scientists from both the academy and the local iwi were invited to work with the students. The combined body of knowledge helped students understand the connections between the science of today and the mātauranga (knowledge/education) of their tūpuna (ancestors). Nori believed that she was shaping their learning and education through making use of culturally appropriate contexts that embraced wānanga, a kapa haka model and mātauranga expertise from the region. These approaches were consistent with literature on the development of culturally responsive pedagogies to enhance Māori student achievement (Bishop, 2003).

While Nori spoke about an array of different successes that included sporting and cultural achievements in ki-o-rahi and kapa haka, she was also concerned about academic knowledge and skills; *you have to ensure that these kids are literate, that they have the numeracy skills and that they have a solid foundation* [N:6:177-179]. Through endeavouring to shape their education by providing sound foundations and prioritising numeracy and literacy, she was also working on influencing people to think and act differently to bring about improved educational outcomes for students; *That's the hard work as you will know in any school it's all that work* [N:6:181]. Her aims were in making a difference and change for students; *like I said that solid foundation underpinning it and then providing new learning context for them, changing the way that we deliver the curriculum to them, taking more cognisance of wānanga style learning* [N:7:231-234]. These aims were in strong alignment with the framework goals for Māori educational advancement to prepare Māori students to participate in Māori society and to participate actively in the global environment of

technology, the economy, the arts and sciences (Durie, 2001) and in supporting Māori students through the Māori Education Strategy *Ka Hikitia* advocating “local solutions for local change, by local communities” (Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 8).

While Nori believed that robust and rigorous educational leadership of this kind was important in her school, she was also committed to the wider network of East Coast schools. Driven by a strong obligation to uphold the wellbeing of Ngāti Porou descendants, she explained her mission: *so it's a case of ebara taku toa i te toa takitahi, he toa o takitini and so it is not just about the children in Hauiti succeeding it's about the children in Ruataupare succeeding and Iritekura and all those areas because that is our collective strength that we will bring to bear* [N:7:207-210]. Her view was that all of the learners in this area all shared the same whakapapa and by investing in their educational success they were enhancing the wider community strength and contributing to the tribal strength. The validity of Nori's perspective was tested by the response from the teacher focus groups regarding whether others also agreed that building the community strength contributed to the tribal strength (see Sections 4.6.1 and 4.6.2).

Thus Nori aimed to work collaboratively with other Ngāti Porou principals to develop their management and leadership roles in mainstream schools and to maintain the Ngāti Porou side of their professional leadership. Nori's collaborative approach was consistent with the literature on Māori leadership which maintained strong cultural and kinship ties and obligations to maintain the wider tribal alliances (Mead et al., 2006). She sought and found opportunities through this network to engage in professional conversations, as she explained:

*...and so our leadership has been concentrated on how do we support each other and how do we network and how do we bring about change? Schools are often reluctant to talk about issues but I think that now and certainly we are talking about the real deeper issues that are at the crux of changing Māori education* [N:7:210-214].

A topical issue raised was that of National Standards and Nori expressed her position that schools and principals should not be fearful of showing what's really happening. Through her networks of professional colleagues and schools supporting other schools

Nori impressed upon others her stand for shaping the education of Ngāti Porou students was in understanding change in order to make a difference, as she outlined:

*It's about truly being honest with those whānau but not brutal, and straight up with them about where their children's learning is at...It's about this is where we're at and this is where we need to be going. This is what we can do, what can you do to help and truly get that learning triangle going and getting them engaged [N:9:285-290].*

Her influence in the community for improved outcomes was both personalised and collectivised; *You can only spread the example of good practice. The people that are receiving it have to decide what have I learnt out of that? What can I change to make a difference? But I think also that we have to have courage and be brave and be willing to try and take risks and be innovative [N:10:314-319].*

Given that Nori's initial entry into her position as principal had caused controversy as she was not a trained teacher, her credibility and influence amongst principal colleagues may have been challenged. However, the New Zealand Teachers Council insisted that she undertake and complete a Graduate Diploma in Teaching, which she did in 2006, eight years after her appointment as principal. Furthermore in her Bachelor of Arts degree she had majored in Education and Māori. These feats indicated the level of her commitment to the wider community and the education of students in their schools. Such feats have also demonstrated Nori's commitment to education leadership and her tenacity to walk the talk and exhibit strong educational leadership amongst her peers.

#### **4.4 Nori's – Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori Approaches**

For Nori, Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership involved having the very highest expectations for students and their learning outcomes. She explained that although the whakataukī (proverb) by Sir Āpirana Ngata was overused, Kaupapa Māori approaches to educational leadership embodied the sentiment behind his words:

*Grow up tender child in the days of your world. In your hands the tools of the Pākehā as a means to support and sustain you. In your heart the treasures of your ancestors, as a plume for your head. Your spirit given to God, the source of all things*  
*Sir Āpirana Ngata, 1949 (as cited in Bennett, 2002, p. 57).*

Nori considered the words were still very relevant and timeless with the only difference being today was that students were extending their hand to the *learning of modern and contemporary technology [as the new tools of the Pākehā]* [N:13:407]. She felt that it was a good mantra and philosophy because Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership were about being pro-Māori and was opening, not closing doors to the modern world. Her thinking was a very strong indicator consistent with Kaupapa Māori's concern for "the struggle for autonomy over our own cultural well being" (Smith, 1990 as cited in Smith, 1999).

However, as illustrated in her commitment to Ngāti Porou heritage and traditions, for Nori, broad Kaupapa Māori approaches were expressed as behaviours and practices that were specific to Hauiti and Ngāti Porou; *Kaupapa Māori to me means kaupapa Hauiti, kaupapa Ngāti Porou* [N:12:397]. The focus of her interpretation also suggested that Kaupapa Māori approaches were centred on Hauiti and Ngāti Porou peoples, including their historical and cultural influences, so that the students' learning context, concepts and content were *grounded in Uawa and they were getting mātauranga (knowledge) Hauiti and mātauranga Ngāti Porou* [N:8241-242]. However she acknowledged and respected the right of other iwi to assert their influence in their own rohe (regions).

The diversity of Māori worldviews across iwi is clearly reason why a Māori worldview "cannot be seen as a singular, universal concept. Individual iwi have their own existential explanations of the world. These serve to promote and reinforce iwi identity and knowledge" (Tamati, 2007, p. 102). An example of this diversity is in the Tāwhaki and Tāne traditions, where both are accepted by certain iwi in view of acquiring the baskets of knowledge for mankind. The narratives surrounding their feats highlight the similar yet distinct iwi traditions (Mead et al., 2006; Smith, 2006) that have been retained by Māori society throughout the generations. This notion of iwi authority was also in alignment with a key component of Kaupapa Māori involving the validity and legitimacy of Māori as outlined by Smith (1999). Thus in Kaupapa Māori educational settings Māori language, knowledge, culture and values is validated and legitimated by Māori without the need for justification to outsiders. Within Nori's perception there was a sense of the legitimacy of iwi authority operating inside iwi boundaries, which in her case were Hauiti and Ngāti Porou, but not beyond. How this approach could be

operationalised in schools that comprise mixed iwi student populations and in schools located in areas where multiple iwi groupings reside is unknown, but worthy of further research. Nori's expectations for Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership being reflected more widely in the community, iwi and marae, raises the important implication of capability of some Māori and arguably all non-Māori principals to apply specific iwi protocols and authority. This is consistent with Bishop's (2003) research commentary on mainstream educators who ignore the power imbalances of colonisation and its consequences:

Therefore, the potential for addressing development and educational achievement for Māori and other minority groups from within current mainstream educational models leaves much to be desired. An alternative source of experience is necessary to inform mainstream educational practices in Aotearoa/New Zealand. (p. 223).

Nori provided some insights into her understanding of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership by posing a number of self-reflected questions: *What is in the best interests of Hauiti and Ngāti Porou? How do we as teachers and learners incorporate that into our learning programmes? How do we ensure that it's not just reflected in the school?* [N:12:399-400]. The responses to these questions would suggest that Kaupapa Māori consisted of different ideas and issues that necessitated a degree of flexibility and adaptability. Her view of iwi-placed based leadership for learning resonates with the research on place based education that prioritised Indigenous peoples' aspirations in education (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005; Graham & Jahnke, 2013; Penetito, 2009). Place-based education develops in learners "a love of their environment, of the place where they are living, of its social history, and of the bio-diversity that exists there" (Penetito, 2009, p. 16). The linking of education to the physical and cultural environment of the student learner is significant as it enriches the educational experiences for students and provides insights into how traditional Indigenous ways of learning and knowing can support educational processes for students (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005). The emphasis is placed upon learning and teaching through culture that is deeply rooted in what is local and unique to a place (Penetito, 2009). Of particular significance is the focus on relationships between place and space and place and identity. The notion of nurturing in learners a sense of spiritual, cultural and historical attachment to land, place and environment is compatible

with Nori's interpretation of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership. Hence the synergy in terms of learning through a living culture that in Nori's community is rooted and grounded in kaupapa Hauiti and kaupapa Ngāti Porou.

Nori talked about the integrity of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership and the importance of observing the same tikanga (cultural practices) in the school as those that occurred on the marae and in the community. She had spoken in support of the community leaders and the benefits of establishing cultural and collaborative links with them. She cited an incident concerning the exhumation of a gravesite on the school grounds; *That was one of the times of the greatest examples of where cultural leadership mattered* [N:13: 433]. Through the community leaders and their guidance the school continued to operate during the exhumation period and provided a culturally safe environment for all. Nori's discourse comprises a Kaupapa Māori cultural position that is distinctly Māori in initiation, definition and execution (Walker, 1996). Her actions involved thinking and engaging in a uniquely Māori way that required her to operate according to tikanga Māori (Māori cultural protocols) and mātauranga Māori that were iwi based and sourced in her own Ngāti Porou iwi and through to the local iwi of Te Aitanga-a-Hauiti.

#### **4.5 Nori – Summary**

Nori located her leadership within an iwi specific paradigm and as such she identified herself wholly in terms of her Ngāti Porou cultural identity. For her the notion of an iwi-centric view of Ngāti Porou was as natural and spontaneous as it was desirable. The issue of the personal and the sense of connection that Nori alluded to in her Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership suggested key implications of how other secondary school principals view the relevance of culture in their leadership approaches and then attribute value to the cultural identity of the students in their schools. The impact of these scenarios are worthy of further comment in the case of Māori principals there are implications in terms of the relevance of iwi knowledge and traditions when living in 'another' iwi area. They will at least have some advantage in understanding the significance to Māori of both cultural identity and cultural values. In contrast, the potential impact facing non-Māori principals with limited understanding or experience of cultural matters could lead to disadvantage across multiple layers but more

specifically in terms of relationships and responsiveness to the needs of their Māori students.

There were elements of Kaupapa Māori theories (Pihama, 1993) in the acts of conscientisation as retold through Nori's narratives in reference to the vital leadership role assumed by her mother and one that consequently influenced Nori's perspectives on her own leadership. However, the crux of Nori's Kaupapa Māori acts of conscientisation were centred on advancing and advocating her Ngāti Porou iwi cultural and educational outcomes and asserting the validity of Ngāti Porou iwi specific knowledge, language, custom and practices (Smith, 1992). She revealed her definition of Kaupapa Māori approaches in terms of multi-dimensional characteristics and traits according to individual iwi, which in her case and for her students was a combination of Ngāti Porou and Te Aitanga a Hauiti.

Nori held the view that cultural identity was an indicator of success for her students and she had ensured that cultural identity underpinned her particular approach to leadership. The challenge remained for Nori and her teachers to impress upon the young adolescent minds the significance of their cultural identity. The degree to which they have been successful in convincing students towards cultural enlightenment may best be sourced from the final commentaries from other focus group interviews later in this chapter. However, another issue that emerged from Nori's positioning was in relation to the capability of other mainstream secondary school principals to nurture their student's cultural identity when they or their students were not personally affiliated to iwi within the school boundaries.

Community featured prominently for Nori in terms of community involvement, engagement and direction in the education of their children. Coupled with this community focus was Nori's drive towards a strong sense of citizenship and public service that required the school and community, parents, teachers and students to contribute and to receive through their mutual acts of reciprocity (Bishop, 1998a). The intended outcome was to nurture the calibre of the person and ultimately enhance the local community of Te Aitanga a Hauiti iwi. This was apparent throughout Nori's notion of relationships through whakapapa (genealogy) and whakawhanaungatanga

(inter-relationships) and in her belief that their students' educational successes contributed to the strength of the community and just as importantly the strength of the tribe. In Nori's reckoning the community was the tribe and the tribe was the community. The focus group data reported in Sections 4.6.1, 4.6.2 and 4.7 provide evidence of the effectiveness of Nori's chosen leadership style.

Nori claimed the genesis of her distinct and definite Kaupapa Māori approaches to life and that which frames her Ngāti Poroutanga were mirrored by the sentiments of Sir Āpirana Ngata coined whakataukī *E Tīpu E Rea*. According to Nori this mantra and philosophy included the intention for Māori to be open to the offerings of a modern and technological Pākehā world, as termed in the words of her tīpuna; *Turn your hand to the tools of the Pākehā for the wellbeing of your body*. As Nori intimated the Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that worked for her students were Kaupapa Hauiti and Kaupapa Ngāti Porou and their iwi specific historical and cultural influences. She believed that other iwi were by right and by duty, bound to assert their tribal influence and kaupapa-ā-iwi in their tribal boundaries. Only then would they be in a position of authority to promote and reinforce their iwi identity and knowledge, and explanations of their world views (Giroux, 2005). The Ngāti Kahungunu iwi provide an example of this authority when they investigated the status of Māori secondary schooling in their tribal area. Their findings indicated a clear crisis in Māori education and they responded swiftly with an intervention strategy that strengthened school and community relationships through the implementation of their cultural standards project, Te Pae Huarewa (Graham & Jahnke, 2013). The priority here was to ensure that mainstream teaching was more responsive to Māori learners through the adoption of more culturally and pedagogically aligned practices that included the history and cultural knowledge of local hapū; a work in progress.

The issues that Nori raises of managing situations of multiple iwi groupings of students in a given school and the capability of some Māori and arguably all non-Māori principals to apply specific iwi protocols and authority may well rely upon a set of negotiated collaborative pathways (Durie, 2001, pp. 5-8) if Māori students are to be successful in education as learners and as Māori. Such pathways are open to a place-based education approach where the teachers have knowledge of locality, community, ecology and

history, including social knowledge, not just the knowledge of curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure Māori students see themselves affirmed and reflected in their school experiences (Penetito, 2009, p. 16). This approach is also relevant within the international place-based education context as Indigenous peoples develop forms of self-determination that directly benefit their learning outcomes and at the same time inform the wider educational practices for others to learn from local cultural contexts (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005).

## **4.6 Teachers' Views of Nori's Approaches to Leadership**

This section explores the key themes of culture in terms of cultural identity and their connective relationships, which were identified by teacher focus groups as significant influences in Nori's leadership. According to their responses, Nori had embraced the notion of cultural identity and firmly established connective relationships that were iwi based and community based.

### **4.6.1 Identity**

There was a strong emphasis on students' learning about their cultural identity as part of a complementary strategy to foster positive levels of self-esteem, reinforcing the findings of other studies (Pihama, Cram & Walker, 2002). Teachers celebrated the fact that students were confident to express their identity as descendants of Te Aitanga a Hauiti: *the kaupapa of this kura is very kaupapa Māori and it's very kaupapa Te Aitanga a Hauiti which I think forms strong foundations for our kids to know and believe in who they are* [K1:el:18:604-605]. Furthermore, the teachers considered that the students were provided with opportunities to engage in relevant real life learning experiences from within their own community, a notion that is consistent with Kaupapa Māori approaches premised on the validity of Māori cultural practices (Lee, 2002). As one teacher commented: *how we plan our units, also role modelling, so what we do in the community and within school, we have people that do kapa haka we have ta moko artists and just people that they can see, touch, feel and associate with reflecting themselves* [K2:an:30:1000-1002]. This sense of belonging was complemented by the practice of localising the school curriculum to reflect community and content that was specific to Te Aitanga a Hauiti people.

#### 4.6.2 Connective Relationships

Nori had stated in her philosophical approach to leadership the importance of establishing community partnerships. To this aspiration, her teachers responded supportively: *in a small community like ours the school is such a big part of the community and she has the respect of the community; and the community's moving equally with the school* [K4&K2:52:1728:1731]. Nori's prioritisation of community in her leadership approach had encouraged parents to take an active interest in the education of their children (Hallinger & Heck, 1996a) and the teachers endorsed this approach. The teachers credited Nori's leadership approach for the successful engagement of the community by the school, as the following quote suggests: *we have a great community who work together with our kura in every aspect of our community whether it be on the river, on the water or on the marae* [K1:el:17:549-550]. They considered a further successful outcome of Nori's approach was in her decision to seek marae input into setting school policy directions through areas such as the school charter. As one teacher stated: *and that's her driving those things, making suggestions to the board, I think we should do these good ideas and you know that triggers other people to think, oh yes that's a good place to start* [K3:4:52:1722-1724].

It was also the view of the teachers that Nori worked very strategically to win over the support of her community; *you've got to know your community and I think she definitely knows that, she's got people that she can confide in and get an idea as to what's happening* [K1:al:24:799-800]. The teachers stated that Nori had gained the confidence of the various community groups and had successfully helped to build strong collaborative relationships that reaped mutual benefits for the school, the students and community; *relationships that she makes with the other stakeholders, the Hauora, the Fire Brigade, the Polytech, the providers that are out there she's an amazing leader* [K2:ih:34:1140-1142]. Nori's leadership approach described by her teachers was consistent with the literature on Māori leadership that suggested qualities that unified people as a strong collective and one that had gained the mandate from the people to lead their community (Mead et al., 2006).

There was expressed agreement from the teachers that the strength of the school was built on outstanding leadership from Nori and this was sustained through the contributions of the entire senior management team combined with the community working together. One focus group stated that Nori's leadership had a certain structure

and clarity so they knew and understood exactly what their roles and functions were in the school. This approach to leadership enabled people to work with a sense of confidence and security, as this comment suggests: *We know that kōkā Nori is our leader and then below that is the management and then the teachers then feed in so I think having a good structure to the management and us knowing our roles is really good* [K1:al:17:561-563]. In a similar vein one teacher from another focus group acknowledged that their ability to make things happen for the benefit of students was due to the leadership within the school:

*mind you we've been enabled to do that as well, it really does come from the top where our leadership structures as such because there's Nori and there's the senior management team and you know you don't feel afraid to go and ask her for something like I just did this morning* [K2:ih:33:1081-1083].

Two of the teacher focus groups mentioned how Nori's philosophical approach in leadership embraced the goal of creating young successful citizens who would contribute to the community and achieve well throughout Uawa and the world. They also spoke of shared aspirations where students could experience different forms and models of citizenship from within their own whānau and the wider community. These groups proposed that Nori's proactive approach, which had provided students with international travel and learning opportunities beyond the school and local community, was testament to her philosophical approach to inspire the depth of citizenship that was experienced the world over. Nori's approach was consistent with Sir Āpirana Ngata's mantra to inspire young Māori to be open to the teachings and experiences of the modern world with the confidence and strength of their cultural foundations to carry them throughout their journeys.

Two of the teacher focus groups spoke of Nori's philosophical approach to leadership as one that included a collaborative team approach. The comment was made that leadership was a known system and this helped keep the team in sync with one another. The literature identified a collaborative approach to leadership in schools as significant in creating environments that encouraged teachers to improve their practice in support of student success (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; White & Wehlage, 1995). Working

collaboratively as a team was not only encouraged it had become the norm, according to the teachers, as these quotes suggest:

*we all pool our thoughts and ideas together and respond from each other very well and from there you're building capacity and teacher knowledge and there's lots of exciting stuff happening [K3:1:49:1623-1635]*

*people don't feel threatened you know look I'm having a problem here, you ask for help you know what can I do to try and lift this child, have you got any ideas and we all just work really well together as a team. I think that's really powerful [K3:1:49:1634-1636].*

Nori was seen to be a leader who was decisive and very clear, but also very fair and willing to listen. These qualities were considered as some of the integral components to her collaborative approach as a leader. While Nori was decisive in her final decisions, the teachers felt she was also prepared to be openminded as the following comments suggest:

*She's also very fair about it and she will listen and she's very approachable and you can go in and give your ideas and she'll give some thought to it [K3:1:51:1701-1708].*

*She'll even go back and say look I've thought about this and I've realised yeah, we will do it that way but she's seeking us as a collaborative team constantly to gauge our ideas and our thoughts on things which is really great [K3:2:51:1712-1714].*

According to the teachers, integral to Nori's collaborative approach was her ability to gain the trust and backing from her teachers. Trust in school leadership is an essential component in gaining the confidence of teachers. So when teachers are empowered and given opportunities to share control and decision making this in turn increases their levels of trust in the principal (Seashore Louis, 2007). Within Kaupapa Māori, trust was critical in order for a person to gain the mandate of the people to be accepted as the leader (Mead et al., 2006). The accountability back to the people also carried a huge responsibility and that trust could be diminished at any time. It was evident that Nori experienced high levels of teacher trust in her leadership approach. She extracted the best from people by always working to their strengths as well as tapping into their chain

of networks: *she utilises our strengths and our contacts or our skills and she's quite happy to cater for us to be able to maximise those skills...we are actually quite a tight knit staff and yeah she's really approachable and honest, straight up but fair, she respects you!* [K2:an:34:1130-1133]. Consequently, teachers were often prepared to take on extra work responsibilities because of the greater good that they perceived in the longer term by supporting Nori as their leader and principal; *we can see the big picture and rather stress ourselves for the bigger picture for kōkā Nori, we're like that though we can see the big picture and back each other up* [K2:ut:35:1162-1164].

The teachers also commented on the seamless cohesion between the teachers in the two forms of educational streams of general education and Māori immersion education that operated within the school. As these teachers stated,

*if any of the mainstream kaiako feel that they need guidance or assistance with their te reo Māori then they feel happy to come into our akomanga and realise that this is a te reo Māori speaking environment and to be happy and safe with that* [K1:al:20:654-656].  
*There are no fences. If we needed a bit more science input for whatever mahi we want to be doing we've just got no qualms to go talk to the science teacher or the maths HOD in the secondary school* [K1:al:20:667-668].

Another feature identified by the teachers was the seamless nature of the primary and secondary sectors of the school working cohesively and collaboratively without being restricted according to the particular sectors they were teaching in.

#### **4.7 Teachers' Views of Nori Influencing the Learning Environment**

The teacher focus groups identified a range of ways in which they believed Nori had influenced the learning environment and their approaches to teaching. There was consensus that Nori placed high expectations on teachers to be accountable for the learning and teaching of students and to raise student achievement. Teachers spoke about Nori's ability to establish positive relationships with the students and within the wider community. These factors were consistent with the critical factors identified in *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013) for improving Māori students' educational success, high quality teaching and strong engagement from students, parents, families and whānau, hapū, iwi and communities. They also agreed that Nori supported them to

carry out their professional duties and was available to them when they needed personal support. They felt that Nori's knowledge of them as teachers had influenced the learning environment through her careful placement and utilisation of their individual areas of strength. Another aspect that the teachers saw as influencing the learning environment was in the leadership structures that Nori had established. She encouraged a strong team ethic and put in place senior teachers to work alongside her and also throughout the school. The research (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; White & Wehlage, 1995) identified this type of collaborative leadership as beneficial in terms of building supportive environments for teachers to share practices and collaborative responsibility for student success.

The teachers said they felt the immense weight of the expectations Nori placed on them, yet at the same time they recognised how she had those same levels of high expectations on herself: *She expects nothing but the best. She works us hard. That's modelled too you know. She's at the grindstone within the office too and around the community* [K1:el&al:21:696-699]. Analyses revealed that while Nori's demands were tough they were not seen as unattainable for the teachers, as these comments highlight:

*It's like she sets this high expectation that's reachable you know what I mean cause it always happens, all the time, oh God I can't get there I can't do it and then you end up doing it* [K1:el:23:747-749].

*She expects us to do our best it may not be the best best but it's the best that you can do and she expects us to raise achievement in our tamariki everything is about them* [K2:an:35:1172-1174].

They stressed that her goal was for teachers and students to be grounded in Te Aitanga a Hauiti and for the teachers to prioritise the learning success of the students; *with what's gonna be the best for the tamariki*, [K1:al:21:686] and *students at the forefront of everything that we do* [K1:el:21:687]. Nori's leadership goals in these examples were consistent with Kaupapa Māori principles of validating and legitimising Māori language and culture and authority over the education of Māori in schools (Smith, 1999).

Nori was also prepared to ensure that teachers received the best professional development in curriculum areas in order to meet the learning needs of their students. The point was made concerning the limited availability of professional support for Māori language teachers and how Nori never gave up searching for help: *for example te reo Rangatira NCEA where we're still expected to deliver everything however we don't have the same support as other NCEA teachers especially with the Team Solutions so she tried everything in her power to support* [K1:el:21:706-708].

Despite her own strong personality and opinions, Nori had definitely encouraged teachers to debates issues, to challenge and to look for ways forward. Teachers stated that they were encouraged to think about issues, as the following quote suggests: *try and make it happen you know this is where we're heading you know it's about not so much getting buy in from us but it becomes a collective vision* [K1:el:22:712-713]. Teachers considered that Nori knew their strengths and therefore channelled them into well-suited roles and responsibilities. The teachers were aware of their own professional responsibilities too:

*everything falls back to her if a teacher does something and if it's not done very well it will fall back to the leader so we do the best we can, be aware we're professional, I suppose be careful out in the bigger community because we can't do things like other people because we're held in such esteem* [K2:ut:36:1177-1180].

The teacher focus groups were able to recognise that there were many ways in which the community worked collaboratively together with the school. Student involvement in learning through sporting and cultural initiatives in surf life saving, whare tū taua, and Ngā Taiohi a Hauiti had helped develop in students a sense of purpose and self discipline. They had reaped the benefits of participation that involved both the school and its leadership from Nori and the community working in partnership. Many of these experiences had prepared students for life post school and for tertiary education away from home. The Kaupapa Māori ethic of reciprocity (Jones et al., 2010) was emphasised so that the notion of returning home to give back in some form had been instilled into them at a young age:

*we really want to create those citizens who are actually gonna be contributing to our community so trying to model that trying to find examples of that in our community and*

*for the tamariki within their own whānau so that then reinforces that's what we want them to emulate later [K1:al:19:613-615].*

One teacher who had come from outside of the tribal base was impressed by the teamwork in the whole school and the feeling of inclusion. This process of connectedness is akin to the Kaupapa Māori concept of whakawhangaungatanga which is establishing whānau relationships (Bishop, 1998a). She also experienced the same welcoming response from the students; *it was yeah pretty much instant really and just being able to read the kids for who they are and them trusting you, just the whole different atmosphere from like where I came from [K1:yt:19-20:643-645].* Another teacher mentioned that one of her students spoke about how her time spent at school was like a home away from home; *that's how natural I think it felt and the whole idea about learning takes place anywhere as long as you've got a strong steady base [K1:el:20:649-650].* Analyses suggested that the school culture of support and manaaki that permeated throughout had seeded from Nori's leadership.

Within the school there were established te reo Māori teaching zones for the immersion classes, but teachers from the general teaching stream were still able to move freely in these teaching spaces. When outside of the classroom and for example while on duty, Māori immersion teachers were able to continue to kōrero (speak) Māori and really encouraged students from the immersion learning classes to converse in Māori unaffected and with ease. As one teacher stated, *a high percentage of our tamariki in the mainstream who come through kōhanga but for whatever reason their parents opt to sustain their tamariki in mainstream in English medium but it's still a natural thing to kōrero [K1:al:20:660-662].* Teachers considered that a positive spin-off from the shared approach to areas like curriculum planning had strengthened their teamwork and resulted in better use of teacher time and resources. This also provided opportunities for students to be taught in a more holistic and grounded context, confirming the findings of other studies (Bishop, 1998a; Heshusius, 1994) with the benefits of cooperative learning and teaching. As one teacher said:

*how can we work together, in the past it's naturally happened for a large majority of us but now we're making sure that it is happening everywhere with everybody because if we're*

*all talking the same talk then our students and everybody's sort of on the same path*  
[K1:el:20:673-675].

Nori's high visibility around the school and community was matched by her level of approachability to students, staff and community which teachers stated had helped to nurture a culture of trust and openness (Donaldson, 2007; Spillane, 2006), which this quote illustrates:

*if you have got a take (issue) you can still go and approach her about it so she's not up in that little glass house unapproachable, she's visible and accessible even to the kids and coming around the classes knowing every child and knowing their link here, even the staff and what their passions and interests are and trying to accommodate* [K1:al&el:21:689-692].

According to the teachers, Nori's effectiveness in influencing the learning environment was in part due to her personal qualities to gain people's confidence: *just her belief in everybody and the support that she gives everyone...yeah just her belief in all her teachers that would be one big word for me* [K1:yt:22:733-737]. This was combined with her practice of fair and firm approach to people and decision making; *there's no pulling the wool over or anything like that at our meetings it's like I need the data you know we get a slap on the hand and just swallow it but we also get a principal's award every now and then* [K1:al:23:740-744]. Nori's practice of no surprises and honest conversations about the problems and the positives kept the ebb and flow of the school cycle in balance, which was reinforced by teachers in the following comment: *are you having problems, is there anybody in your department that we need to find support for, give some release time...and I mean she's just very aware of what's happening in our lives too that's another strength* [K1:al:23:753-756]. Others spoke of Nori as *visionary, strongminded, passionate, openminded, forgiving when you screw up and she's confident, like you can feel it when she's in the room, whatever she says or thinks or an idea she's just so confident that you, trust me!* [K2:ih:ut:an:on:36:1193-1202]. Nori's commitment to ensure the continuation of both Hauititanga and Ngāti Poroutanga resonated throughout the shared narratives and were clearly insync with Kaupapa Māori principles of rangatiratanga/autonomy, taonga tuku iho/cultural aspiration, whānau/the principle of the extended family structure and ata/the principle of growing respectful relationships, kinship and whakapapa ties (Smith, 1997, 2003; Smith, 2006)

Teachers were candid about the challenges they perceived that Nori had to deal with as their principal and her investment of energy to pick up staff morale:

*oh yeah when we drag our feet that's hard! [K1:el:23:763] and at the end of term 2 and term 4 are usually times when there's a bit of a decline in energy because of the things happening as well as the exams and kids students coming in and booking their time for tutes and probably it takes a lot of energy from her to pick us all up [K1:el:23:770-772].*

There was also reference to Nori's uniquenesses as a forthright Ngāti Porou woman, but one who also possessed a softer side that showed her sensitivity towards others. She was aware when teachers were in need of quiet support: *if she sees something not right with you she'll come and sit with you in the staff room or ask to have a little chat. You know she picks up those things quite fast too [K3:3:53:1786-1787].*

Her influence with the students was regarded by teachers as phenomenal as she knew the names and whānau connections of every student in the school. She had the ability to make the students feel at ease when she met with them in both formal and informal situations. As well the students were encouraged to express their interests and concerns openly and she was available to meet them on a one on one basis to discuss their options.

The general consensus from teachers indicated that Nori had a strong desire to help nurture and create the future generations in such ways that they had the capability to walk anywhere in the world with confidence: *she wants them to be young citizens achieving throughout Uawa and the world. Being contributors. Yes, responsible contributors. [K3:3&4:52:1742-1744].* Nori's vision for the students was seen to include a realisation that there was a big wide world out there and readily accessible to each and every one of them if they chose it. This principle is captured in the realms of traditional Māori leadership that inspires pride and confidence in the people to live life to the full and experience the awesome beauty of what may lie beyond the shores of home (Mead et al., 2006). In contrast she also celebrated the small though significant milestones, such as retention of students: *she was proud this year we had the number of year 13 students that started at*

*the beginning of this year still there at the end of the year, you know we had none that left throughout the year and she really wants to make sure [K3:1:52:1749-1751].*

Analyses of teachers' responses revealed that Nori had worked hard to encourage a school culture of strong connective relationships and a team of professional teacher expertise. Such an approach is compassionate both in approach and educational philosophy with a power to seriously influence and improve educational achievement for Māori students (Gronn, 2008). This finding is typified in the following quote:

*We've been on this kaupapa of trying to find accurate levels of where children are working at and working with teachers quite closely. We have interviews with teachers they have to present themselves and their data and to prove why they think where their kids are at [K3:2:55:1831-1833].*

In the community Nori had purposely adopted a low key approach in amongst the locals and was considered by teachers to be very strategic and someone who definitely knew her community. As the role of leader can generate its own unique sets of challenges one teacher commented on Nori in this way:

*as a leader there's always people wanting to throw stones so she's got people she can confide in and get an idea to what's happening and to keep herself safe too because you don't want the school to be encroaching on the community and telling parents how they should be parenting [K1:al:24:801-803].*

In her position as principal Nori's obvious ability to communicate across different audiences in te reo Māori and English enabled her to participate fully in educational and iwi forums; *so there's no problem there she can sit amongst any in any situation and speak [K2:ih:37:1235].* She was also as capable to easily slip into the role as one of the whānau; *the other thing that's really cool, at school you can see here she's the principal and then on Saturday or Sunday she just does what the locals would do because she's not in the principal role [K2:ut:37:1238-1239].*

#### **4.7.1 Summary**

The teacher focus groups reported that Nori held high expectations of them to prioritise student learning and to be accountable for their part as teachers in this process. Whilst

they felt the pressure from Nori to perform they also acknowledged the support Nori provided in terms of professional development and personal needs. They felt that Nori had recognised their individual strengths as teachers and utilised them fully. They spoke about Nori's ability to build strong team support within the school and consequently they themselves experienced positive relationships, collaboration and sharing of expertise from one another. They observed how Nori had continued the same effective relationships with students and community through her efforts in terms of her own levels of high visibility and accessibility to others.

#### **4.8 Teachers' Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori**

The three main themes of Kaupapa Māori approaches identified by the teacher focus groups were in broad terms *manaaki tangata* or respect and kindness, a holistic framework for learning that incorporated the *whānau* and the child at the centre and an education pathway that reflected locally based *iwi* centred curriculum and context.

The teachers talked about Kaupapa Māori in the school as part of their ordinary everyday practices; *it's just a natural part of who we are just how we behave it's just one of the things that works* [K1:el:25:822]. Another commented; *I see it as normal, if there was ever a line to draw where would that be to be kaupapa Māori initiatives in the school and just what we do everyday.* [K2:re:37:1246-1246]. However, what they considered to be an ordinary everyday occurrence in their school was something uniquely Māori in kaupapa and in practice. This was also an integral part of living according to the cultural values, knowledge, history and fundamentals of their Ngāti Poroutanga and Te Aitanga a Hauititanga each uniquely bound to their *iwi* identity and *whakapapa*.

Two of the teacher focus groups identified the concept of *manaaki tangata* (supporting and caring for people) as a key factor of Kaupapa Māori approaches in the school. They relayed the way in which students were placed at the top of their professional priorities in the expectation that they as teachers would provide a balanced curriculum and culturally appropriate learning contexts for young Māori to achieve and to flourish. When their students did so, the teachers were bound to celebrate their academic, sporting and cultural achievements. As teachers they had set the standards required for these successes to happen.

Manaaki tangata would also take the form of zero tolerance of violence and bad behaviour from the students. Teachers communicated with parents through every known means including Facebook and cellphone texting. The school was opened to the community and the community was involved in the school, in the classrooms, on the sports fields and in the board room. From the teacher focus group responses it was clear that Nori had been a model of transparent and open leadership that was very much team oriented whether she was dealing with students, teachers, parents or the wider community. This aspect of Nori's leadership approach is identified by *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013) as a key focus area necessary for increasing the achievement levels of Māori students through building positive relations with parents, whānau, hapū, iwi and communities.

An important link can be made here to Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership in the school and to education through the references teachers made to Nori's role and contributions to ensure the presence of manaaki tangata. Her strong support of teachers, her personal character traits and her unrelenting commitment to ensure that the whole community played their part in raising the child underpinned the essence of manaaki tangata, the holistic view of the child and the whānau at the centre and the iwi dynamic throughout the school.

There was so much more to Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that teachers suggested permeated throughout the cultural dynamics of the school in the way teachers and students related to one another and in the synergies between the school and community. The responsive nature of the students in the expression of their identity as Te Aitanga a Hauiti descendants was apparent, as one teacher suggested:

*you don't need to dumb it down or anything like that because that's who you are and that's your maunga and they go there to those places to reconnect and to celebrate and to be. To understand the reality of it. Within Kabukuranni trying to sustain our kaikaranga role and the responsibility of being on the paepae and us knowing our students we can try to nurture that and bring that through in our tamariki [K1:al:18:586-591].*

Even in the way students learnt kapa haka from the very early years in a culturally seamless context saw them start as Pārekereke (in a ‘seedbed’ in which seedlings are nurtured until young plants are ready to be planted in the main garden) and then progress through the different year groups while at the same time watching the senior adult kapa haka also based at the school. As a teacher stated; *they realise that once they’ve gone to Taiohi then they’ll go up to the tuakana up to the Pakeke Roopu and so it’s all that showing those progressions showing that huarahi for our tamariki* [K1:al:19:627-630].

One teacher spoke about the concept of localising the curriculum to reflect the area so that the detail was quite specific to Te Aitanga a Hauiti and this incorporated Kaupapa Māori approaches that helped to make learning meaningful and relevant to their surrounds:

*In citizenship or social sciences one way we would do it is to research and investigate our own marae, the six marae here in Te Aitanga a Hauiti* [K2:ih:30:988-989].

*But in the sciences we also have the sustainability project called Uawanui which is just at the bottom there and that’s a restoration a repatriation of the native fauna of our area* [K2:ih:30:994-995].

The notion of localised curriculum is identified in the research on place-based education for Māori in New Zealand (Graham & Jahnke, 2013; Penetito, 2009) and Indigenous peoples internationally (Barnhart & Kawagley, 2005) as a means to supporting and affirming identity and self determination. Place-based education can also help inform wider practices to learn from local cultural contexts (ibid.).

Certain aspects of tikanga Māori pertaining to social behaviours were practiced in order to highlight and reinforce for students their awareness of Kaupapa Māori then followed by their actions;

*We had this ki-o-rabi day and before all our visitors showed up I said one thing I want us to do is manaakitanga. What does it mean? So you explain it to them. The first thing they did they hogged all the shade. I said to them that aint manaakitanga get out in the sun and bring all our visitors in here, but they don’t know unless you tell them and*

*show them you practice it and preach it so they can actually see it physically and do it*  
[K2:ut:38:1264-1268].

On the other hand the ki-o-rahi competition provided the opportunity for senior students or tuākana to take on the role as coaches and referees for the juniors or tēina. As another teacher articulated:

*at the end of the day to me it's all about giving back to whether it's the school or to the community whether it's picking up rubbish or things like that so it's trying to teach our kids independence and life skills. They have to realise it took blood sweat and tears to get where they are so when they succeed we are all very proud because we realise you know you worked or we helped you work to get where you're at* [K2:ut:32:1041-1048].

The concept of tuakana/teina originates in two important Kaupapa Māori principles: whanaungatanga (kinship obligations within whānau, hapū and iwi) and ako (learn, teach) (Tangaere, 1997). The vital component in whanaungatanga is the act of aroha or love and this helps to bind people in acts of loyalty, commitment and obligation to one another. The tuakana/teina relationships are carried out within the dual nature of the ako process of learning and teaching. Within a Māori context tuakana/teina roles are interchanged where the learner will shift and become the teacher and the teacher to become the learner. These reciprocal roles nurture responsibility and care for one another as well as strengthening the whanaungatanga and relationships.

A strong theme of whakawhanaungatanga and whakapapa emerged in the way that connected people and in the sense of responsibility they felt for one another; *one thing the school does well is the support we give the students and that they give us but that the school gives, it's just everyone supporting everyone* [K2:re:32:1055-1056]. This particular teacher went on further to explain the commitment teachers felt towards the students succeeding so they provided additional tutoring and mentoring as part of their support systems. Another spoke of the relationship between the school and the local Hauora (community Health Centre) who worked with students and their whānau when students were involved in taking drugs; *They embark with their whānau and the point of it is not just about a quick fix at the*

*school, this is about your family has to sign up and take part in whānau counselling to take a different track from being suspended [K3:4:57:1913-1915].*

The practice of Kaupapa Māori in the school had been embedded within a holistic approach about learning that embraced the whānau and the child. Pākehā teachers in the school also felt culturally safe to ask the questions they wanted answered. Part of their ease came from the security of guidance they considered they received from Nori. Teachers posited that Nori had effectively imbued a collective openness and confidence in a kaupapa Māori context; *For our wānanga we go to a different marae and that's a reflection on Nori too, she will never let one of us look silly or do the wrong thing when we're at something. You know any of the staff. You know different places have different tikanga [K3:2&4:57:1919-1924].*

#### **4.9 Teachers – Summary**

According to the teacher focus groups the strong theme of cultural identity resonated from Nori's leadership approach and this was linked to whānau and whakapapa and iwi connections. The interposition of cultural identity and iwi identity was a dominant theme as teachers identified the significance of these to the student's increased levels of self-esteem. As was noted in previous data from Nori the teachers also recognised that the school culture was immersed in Kaupapa Māori approaches that were specific to the local iwi. For them the key integral influences in the school were Kaupapa Māori approaches that were Te Aitanga a Hauiti based. The teachers were also confident that students who were imbued with cultural knowledge and cultural identity from their own iwi were likely to exhibit more positive attitudes and behaviours to self and to learning at school, including those who struggled academically. The sentiments of learning in and through local cultural contexts resonated strongly with the Aotearoa New Zealand (Penetito, 2009) and international (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005) practices of place-based education that links the physical and cultural environment of the student learner to enrich their educational experiences.

Nori's leadership centred on the empowerment of people and shared vision that had community ownership and intent to make change where it was required. She engendered in her teachers strong ethics centred on trust, loyalty and collective spirit. These qualities are all grounded in the Kaupapa Māori principle of whanaungatanga and

the importance of people: whānau, hapū and iwi as a support system to ensure the stability and survival of the collective (Tangaere, 1997). The community presence in the school was equally matched by the participation and leadership of teachers and students actively engaged in community initiatives. The teachers were convinced that Nori had indeed strengthened the relationship between the school and the community in ways that enhanced successful outcomes for students in terms of the quality and relevance of their learning experiences.

Nori's collaborative leadership approaches of open dialogue and open doors at all levels of the school's operations featured prominently in the teacher focus group responses. Shared visioning often marked the way in which teachers were prepared to go the extra mile for students, colleagues, community and principal. The trust and backing of her teachers reflected Nori's leadership and influence. In terms of student learning, Nori constantly encouraged teachers to work with the expertise from within the community to involve students in relevant life experiences that provided them with opportunities to learn new skills and knowledge and more importantly self-discipline and decision making.

There was a view that Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership were of ordinary everyday experiences and teachers found it impossible to differentiate between Kaupapa Māori approaches to what they did ordinarily without labelling these things as Kaupapa Māori. However, there was a definite sense of local iwi-based Te Aitanga a Hauiti approaches that permeated the cultural essence of the students and wider school. The impressive aspect of this was the absolute synergy of school and community in nurturing the descendants of Te Aitanga a Hauiti. A Kaupapa Hauiti approach was recognisably instilled in many of the students' everyday experiences from an early childhood age, which was then further developed as they progressed through their schooling years.

#### **4.10 Parents' views of Nori's Approaches to Leadership**

Nori's views on leadership philosophy reported in Section 4.2 indicated that for her, significant themes were cultural origins, cultural identity, whānau and tribal values of kinship, loyalty, and obligations that included upholding the status of Ngāti Porou,

providing a strong cultural leadership model, building on best outcomes for whānau and community, building citizenship and being highly connected to the community.

When parents were interviewed about their perceptions of Nori's approach to leadership the major theme of building partnerships was threaded throughout their comments. There was strong appreciation of Nori's intention to honour the will of the community through her educational leadership of embracing the mantra of strength in unity. Within traditional Māori society strength in leadership was likened to the beautiful totara tree to portray the awesome strength and beauty in leadership (Mead et al., 2006). They felt Nori's philosophy was symbolic of the community's desire to bring about deliberate change in the education of its children and young people. Expressed another way in an old time whakataukī: "*Mā tini mā mano ka rāpa te whai*"; "*By many, by thousands the work will be accomplished*". There was a sense of the collective grouping of a community and its people under the guidance and stewardship of Nori's overarching leadership. As one parent commented; *she came with some particular skills that were about being clear that there was an intent [about] what happens in education in this place and she had to work out a way of delivering that* [Pw:1:19-21].

According to parents and whānau, Nori's philosophy was definitely iwi focused and centred on Te Aitanga a Hauiti as the community's main tribal base, which also included an element of Ngāti Porou at a wider level. They said her approach was constantly community minded and inclusive of the people in all the smaller isolated pockets within the tribal boundaries. Incorporated in managing the dynamics of each group, Nori's philosophy centred on building relationships and seeking to define the bigger picture in terms of education for their community. The focus on harnessing people was the gel that kept the approach at ground level and ensured there was shared ownership of their collective educational vision. The notion of collective commitment and vision was integral in Kaupapa Māori principles as a means to connecting Māori aspirations and autonomy (Pihama, 1993; Smith, 1997) and strengthening whanaungatanga kinship ties for mutual benefits (Pere, 1994; Tangaere, 1997).

From the parents' perspective, Nori's strong whānau upbringing, values and beliefs in self-identity and strongly aligned iwi identity had undoubtedly helped to shape her

leadership philosophy. She instilled in her community that same sense of self-identity and iwi identity she received from her mother and her whānau. Nori's leadership was constantly focused on building citizenship and people's willingness to contribute to the greater good of the community; *there's a focus to build their experiences, their skills and their qualifications to be good people to be good citizens of Te Aitanga a Hauiti* [Pw:4:123-124]. The consensus of the parent group indicated that Nori had been pivotal in the succession of nurturing strong young people with a clear sense of identity and purpose (Ladson-Billings, 1995). This was the result of years of input and not something that transpired overnight.

Parents commented on the confident approach in Nori's leadership; *It's direct and clear and full of intent you can feel that as she leads, it's very much focused on the education portfolio per se but within the community dynamics, so it's a leadership style that spreads across* [Ph:1:10-12]. Aligned with this was her sense of dedication and commitment; *she's really passionate about things that encourage prosperity, you being able to create something, as part of her succession planning for the community* [Pkl:4:115-118]. She had strived to advance and transform outcomes for students and community through her leadership skills that were grounded in Kaupapa Māori, as an agent of change for the community.

Nori's dogged approach was considered by parents to simply be a necessary part of her role; *she can be a dictator and there are times when you need that and there are times when she steps right back and let's things happen* [Pw:1:30-31]. More importantly she had the ability to retain a sense of fairness when dealing with people or situations, a quality that people valued and appreciated in her. From the parents' perspective, Nori's strong sense of distributed leadership that encouraged Kaupapa Māori values and practices of shared responsibility and co-creation nurtured the community in ways that allowed for open dialogue, healthy exchange of ideas and community buy in (Fitzsimons & Smith, 2000; Smith, 1990). This form of distributed leadership worked successfully as leadership functions were distributed through the network of helpers, parents and community leaders who were part of the wider community outside of the school

The parent group spoke of Nori's partnership with the community which allowed them to experiment with a range of strategies concerning education and learning in the

school, and provided opportunities to try different approaches to see what worked for students, as the following quote suggests; *So at the end of the day she allows us and helps us through the school to do these things that we think might work, take a risk, have a go* [Pw:3:76-77].

Nori's approach was seen to imbue the common touch; *As a leader she has a really neat ability to work right across the levels* [Pkl:4:106]. When she worked with the community Nori was aware of the balance in allowing others to lead initiatives; *It makes it easier for you to do the mahi that you need to do, so she allows you to get out and be part of forming things too, growing things, creating things* [Pkl:4:113-115]. From what parents said it appeared that Nori was collaborative in her leadership in ways that sought to value and utilise the uniquenesses and strengths of the people in her school and wider community to enhance collective outcomes. This is a form of dispersed leadership that can help to meet the demands of contemporary Māori society (Katene, 2010) because it is inclusive of all individuals who together can influence school life to improve students learning (Donaldson, 2007). Within this approach parents and teachers are in a unique position to contribute to school leadership.

#### **4.11 Parents' Views of Nori influencing the Learning Environment**

In Section 4.3 Nori's reflections on influencing the learning environment were reported. This section provides insights from the parents' perspectives and their level of observation on what has been taking place in the school learning environment. The data collected from the parents on the community's views of the education on offer at the school and the quality of the relationships between the school and the community will be used to triangulate the research findings.

According to parents, Nori had influenced the learning environment by setting up culturally relevant programmes such as the establishment of the Māori immersion unit Kuranui and by prioritising te reo Māori in the school curriculum. She was credited for her emphasis on building successful pathways for students and pathways that lead to tertiary qualifications. Aligned with these initiatives she had nurtured a culture that had the effect of building role models within the student body and building on the tikanga based practice of tuākana (senior) tēina (junior). The tēina students had the opportunity to learn from the examples of the more experienced tuākana. These interactions were

important components of the reciprocal exchanges and mutual benefits where the tuakana is learning from the teina and vice versa (Tangaere, 1997). There were also opportunities for students to assume leadership roles and responsibilities. Parents had indicated that they had a responsibility to think about future goal setting and developing an infrastructure that would prepare students to assume lead roles as adults in the tribe and in the community.

The Māori immersion unit Kuranui was regarded as a good example of Māori students being educated through the medium of te reo Māori and who were also high academic achievers. It had been established as Kuranui a decade previously when the school introduced the immersion unit as part of the programme development for te reo Māori. Thus Kuranui became the wharekura element of the school. There were a range of objectives that inspired Kuranui's foundation but the sustaining and most significant one was that of developing good citizens of the school and the iwi; *Kuranui was about building, essentially good Te Aitanga a Hauiti citizens in and through te reo Māori* [Pw:6:197-198]. Parents considered they were given genuine choices in educating their children; they had the option to educate them in a mainstream English speaking environment or a Māori language speaking environment. Within *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013) the ako concept of a two way teaching and learning process is grounded within the principle of reciprocity which recognised the necessity to involve students and their whānau in education. Parents stated that without Kuranui they would have been forced to send their children away from home to other schools in the region to learn Māori.

Nori's leadership as principal had seen the overall climate of the school improve which helped students to see the positives; *nowadays the pride in presenting themselves as students of this school is definitely a huge improvement from when [we] were at this school* [Pk:10:316-317]. Students being acknowledged at school prizegiving events and then photographed had become a major part of the establishment. Their successes were a source of pride and cause for community celebrations.

Nori had set out to make deliberate and consistent moves towards providing culturally appropriate forms of learning and teaching (Bishop, 1998a; Sexton, 2011) for her students and one of the main change shifters was through the establishment of Kuranui.

The parents reinforced this perception and were adamant that Nori's leadership initiatives had laid a platform of optimism and success that gradually spread throughout the community.

The parents observed how students had assumed roles organising important events in the community like birthday celebrations. These were opportunities for them to exhibit leadership skills and to experience responsibilities in decision making, as the following comment suggests; *we get made redundant, you get pushed aside which is the whole idea and they run whatever needs to be run* [Pw:7:211-212]. Parents considered that the actions of these young people were reflecting back to the wider community the influences of those who had helped to shape them. Parents spoke of Nori's involvement in leading technology initiatives with other principals throughout the east coast. They commended Nori on her willingness to help other schools in the region: *this is her real gift, that she leads a school but she's leading a community to lead that further, once that message gets through to other areas of innovation on the coast then those will grow* [Ph:8:247-249]. Nori's approach had always been inclusive of the wider east coast network of principals and communities because of their strong cultural iwi affiliations and collaborative ties as educators and the goal towards collective empowerment (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Another feature reported by parents was Nori's ability to encourage the community to get involved in shaping the future prospects for themselves and their children: *The school working in the community, the community working in the school and just trying to show them if we all work together, without directly telling them, you will get great results* [Pke:8:253-255]. Nori's leadership to encourage and engage her community is identified in the literature on Māori leadership as a problem solving approach that is responsive to meeting the needs and aspirational goals of the wider group (Williams, 2010).

The parents spoke about the hard task of attracting good quality staff to their school due to the geographical isolation and limited funding: *it's not all rosy and you know she's gone through times where she thinks she's got the right one and it hasn't been or she's got someone and they've left which we could have held on to* [Pw:9:281-283]. The staffing issues were seen by parents as critical to the longer term goal of maintaining successful outcomes for the school and community. Parents stated that as the person in charge, Nori was at the helm and she just had to deal with it; *Any other person might have gone by now, she's tough! She can shoulder it,*

*you can see her grit* [Ph:9:290]. Without exception parents said she sought to increase the sources and voices of influence in all facets of school life and culture. This position is consistent with Gronn's (2008) view of distributed leadership where influence and leadership can prevail in a school context. In this scenario the parents (influence/leadership) contributions are supported by the principal (authority/power) (Gronn, 2008). Nori's approach was indicative of the principles of traditional Māori leadership that required the ability to mediate and to foster stability and unity amongst the people (Mead et al., 2006).

#### **4.12 Parents' Views and practices of Kaupapa Māori**

The parents' views on Kaupapa Māori approaches to education and leadership identified a range of factors like being able to speak Māori at any time and in any given situation in the school context. *Intellectually, kia kōrero Māori i ngā wā katoa!* [Ph:10:337]. They regarded Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership for instance, as quite deliberate actions and more specifically embodied in initiatives that were relevant to Hauiti, Ngāti Porou and the wider community. They said that aspects of Kaupapa Māori were also intuitive at the subconscious levels of their thinking. Often over time these became part of their cultural practices and behaviours; *that's what you want, to get to a point where it is intuitive, where it's subconscious where it becomes a culture* [Pw:11:349-350]. Furthermore they believed that Kaupapa Māori was a phenomenon that connected people. Parents agreed that as a core of people they belonged, they experienced pride and they were part of a community in which they could openly source their identity and express it freely.

Parents commented on the significance of what Nori achieved through her Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership, which allowed Māori identity, language and culture to flourish in its most natural form and context without the risk of external manipulation or alienation; *So what is kaupapa Māori approach, it's allowing our identity to be out there and to be a normal part of how we operate, in its many ways whatever those are* [Pw:11:365-366]. Through Kaupapa Māori Nori regarded identity as the foundation from which to build a successful and meaningful education for Māori students. This was a view shared by her parents who felt Nori had achieved this level of engagement and connection in her school; *that's what's happened here, the focus is on the Hauiti identity within the relationship with Ngāti Porou, so that's very strong at both levels* [Ph:12:379-380]. In accordance with *Ka Hikitia*

(Ministry of Education, 2013) these forms of collaboration and achievement highlight ways in which the system can take action to improve Māori students performance by supporting the key stakeholders to contribute and to fulfil their individual and collective roles.

The parents understood the sentiments expressed by Nori about the risks involved in losing the things they valued most regarding their cultural foundations. As one parent commented: *so certainly in the last 20 years the whole kaupapa Māori approach has become highly articulated so that people understand it, quite deliberate, I know how we do things in Hauiti I certainly know how Ngāti Porou do things and so I know how we do things here* [Pw:11:341-345]. Consequently, parents said they supported Nori's strongheld views about holding fast to cultural practices and beliefs, and autonomy over key decisions affecting Māori. More specifically for them the important decisions needed to be made at the local level and steeped and grounded in their own Hauiti iwi and Hautitanga.

The parents also recognised that Nori regarded Kaupapa Māori approaches as those that involved holding high expectations of the students and community alike. As parents, they also fully accepted their part in supporting these expectations. Accordingly, there was an air of confidence amongst parents about the education that was taking shape with some working directly with students which included additional tuition towards gaining NCEA credits.

There was a strong identifiable theme in the focus group data concerning community and support which the parents attributed to Nori's ability to meld both school and community leadership initiatives to create relevant experiences and successful outcomes for her students. As one parent stated: *a youth advisory group that started at our Hauora we started bringing into the school and it was growing young leaders and part of forming the Gisborne Youth Council, she supported me and we had youth in parliament* [Pke:13:414-416]. The parents spoke further of Nori's support for the Uawa Tiakitai surf lifeguards training scheme that involved parents, teachers and students training as a community: *she supports the community and that's what I like about Nori, she supports us, we will reciprocate back but twice. So yeah I like leaders like that because they trust you they back you they don't tell you how to do your mahi* [Pke:13:424-426].

Parents stated that the success of the Kaupapa Māori approaches in their school was founded upon a collective leadership and unity of strength that resonated with Kaupapa Māori principles that included rangatiratanga (autonomy), Taonga tuku iho (cultural aspiration), ako Māori (culturally preferred pedagogy) and whānau (the principle of the extended family structure). As one suggested; *The key is that upper leadership working together without crowding each other out and there's that quiet respect for that shared purpose and shared intent so she's a pivotal part of that in leading the school and through that leading the community* [Ph:16:523-525]. Nori was clearly regarded by her parents as an integral cause and connection to the health and wellbeing of the community. They observed that Nori had assumed a respectful deference in her approach to the local iwi; *she knows that being in the centre of Te Aitanga a Hauiti that she must step back at times and she'll do that appropriately* [Ph:2:56-57]; and *she does it deliberately* [Pw:2:60]. Through her actions they acknowledged how Nori genuinely attempted to provide space and opportunity for iwi to take ownership of education forums concerning their children, confirming the findings of other studies (Bishop, 1998a). From the parents' perspective, Nori's longer term goal that was Kaupapa Māori based in terms of philosophy and education was to enhance iwi and community ownership of the education of their young people. Within the policy realm there were also strong indicators that promoting Māori students' success in schools relied heavily on the ability of the system to recognise and engage parents and whānau regularly and to actively involve them in the students' learning (Education Review Office, 2010; Ministry of Education, 2013).

#### **4.13 Parents – Summary**

According to the parents, Nori's leadership was strongly community minded and transformative in its approach and in ways that sought to transform outcomes for students and the community. This type of transformational leadership placed emphasis on relationships, vision and inspiration. There was a sense in which Nori was on a joint mission with community leaders to bring about change. Nori inspired a level of confidence in parents and that helped put the community at ease and provided her the scope for shaping the educational landscape. One of the significant features of Nori's leadership approach was her strategy to facilitate genuine community ownership and authority over the education of their young people and in time that of the principal's

role. In this context her leadership was increasingly pedagogical in terms of an emphasis on educational purposes and establishing clear educational goals. As well, she was determining the future potential of the community to recognise the need for leadership that not only affirmed traditional practices of culture, language and mātauranga Māori (Mead et al., 2006) but one that could prepare students to continue to meet facets of the modern and global world (Katene, 2010) beyond Tolaga Bay.

Nori had adopted an open door policy to the community and that same openness was reciprocated in the frank interchange between Nori and her parents. They had spoken of and experienced her forthright approach and had also accepted that at times this was a necessary tack to achieve their goals.

The parents reported that Nori's leadership approach and influence was always about the educational outcomes and learning achievements of the students. Her influence saw many of the students constructively engaged in numerous roles as citizens and some as leaders, in the school, on the marae, as volunteers in the Firebrigade or in the budding role of local body youth politics. Parents considered there were numerous evidential indicators of Nori's influence and succession planning as students developed into strong young people who were aware of their identity and future options.

The theme of cultural roots embedded in every day life situations, which were seen as normal best described the parents' approach to notions of Kaupapa Māori. They made reference to Kaupapa Ngāti Porou and Kaupapa Hauiti. There were related expressions of identity and the significance of that identity with a strong message for other principals to give substance and genuine respect to Māori students' sense of worth and identity and the origins of that identity.

#### **4.14 Overall summary**

The first part of this study involved interviews with the principal and focus groups with teachers and parents at Tolaga Bay Area School/Kuranui on their views of the successful leadership approaches to support the learning and teaching of their Māori students. What emerged from their narratives were distinctly Tolaga Bay/Kuranui school community and iwi based Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that were

consistent across the respondents. The key themes that emerged and warrant further consideration are that Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership (about Māori), led by Māori and for Māori in the learning and teaching of Māori students have been iwi specific in terms of iwi and cultural identity, cultural knowledge and cultural narratives, and strongly community based, educational and transformative. The next chapter examines approaches to leadership in a Kura Kaupapa Māori school.

## Chapter 5 Findings

### 5.1 Case Study 2

This chapter provides the findings from case study 2 which was conducted in a Kaupapa Māori school with data collected from the principal, Arihia Stirling on her leadership approaches, her influences on the learning environment and her views of Kaupapa Māori. Arihia opted to use her own name rather than a pseudonym as she has always been prepared to stand by her statements and is proud to be identified with her people and Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae. This is followed by the combined views of the teachers and parents on the same topics collected in a focus group. As previously mentioned in Section 3.5 and 3.6, the Kaupapa Māori school focus group interviews involved one focus group of 16 teachers, some of whom were also parents. The focus group participants chose to be interviewed as a whānau grouping in one large focus group in accordance with their practices of tikanga Māori. The audit trail after the participant's italicised quotes indicates the interviewee's code name, the letter/s T indicating a teacher or TP for a teacher who is also a parent, followed by the page number/s and the line numbers of the interview transcripts for ease of researcher review and reference purposes.

In her narratives Arihia focused on the tribal circumstance of her students, of whom the majority lived locally, but were not of Tainui descent. Her narrative traced back to the establishment of Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae, as it was first founded in 1996 when three schools, Ngā Tapuwae College, Mangere Intermediate and Southern Cross Primary were amalgamated onto the original Ngā Tapuwae and Mangere Intermediate school sites. In January 2011 Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae was granted independence as a school in its own right. It has since become a Kura-ā-Iwi in its bid to be more responsive to the rights and responsibilities of Mana Whenua (customary authority exercised by iwi or hapū in an area) and to uphold the intricate but connected relationships they have with the Māori students in her school.

Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae is located within the bounds of the historic Pukaki Crater and Lagoons in Mangere alongside the Manukau Harbour and in the tribal

boundaries of the tangata whenua of Te Akitai Waiohū and Tainui. Pukaki Crater is one of Auckland's oldest volcanic craters formed during a single burst of explosive activity. The original name 'Te Pukaki tapu o Poutukeka' the sacred well spring of Poutukeka, acknowledges one of the crew of the Tainui waka and the original ancestor of all mana whenua in Mangere.

The Pukaki Crater is of great significance to the local iwi as one of 'Ngā Tapuwae o Mataoho' the footprints of Mataoho the god of volcanic forces. A Tapuwae is also a karakia to ensure fleetness of foot either in intellectual pursuit or athletic prowess. Hence, the ancient name Ngā Tapuwae was chosen for the school and within this an acknowledgement of the tūpuna who passed through these lands including Pōtatau Te Wherowhero, the first Māori King, who lived in the area. Within Ngā Tapuwae there is a beautiful tōtara tree which marks the significance of this very special whenua on which the school stands.

## **5.2 Arihia – Approaches to Leadership**

Leadership came early in Arihia's career, having completed only five years of teaching in mainstream schooling before becoming a leader. In a very short space of time she had advanced from a beginning teacher position to middle management as an acting associate principal and she was then appointed into the role of principal. Arihia's leadership was triggered by a series of crises and upheaval amongst her Māori community struggling for recognition within a mainstream education system. As she explained, *To appease the mamae that was caused upon the Māori community permission was given for the Māori department to turn itself into a school* [A:1:10-12]. With the formation of the Southern Cross Campus Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae began in 1996 with the appointment of its own director. Arihia Stirling applied successfully for the position of Director and from there on she took up the leadership reins.

In her initial years as a principal, Arihia was influenced by the leadership approaches that were prevalent in the mainstream environments she had worked in: *The only type of leadership I knew was leadership where people were very adversarial, very unionised, very fragmented, very disrespectful treaty partner to us as Māori and the Pacific people were set against us, so I didn't feel that was a good role model of leadership* [A:1:26-28]. She adopted an authoritarian approach

with her leadership and commented on the lack of any real support for her as a new principal: *I didn't have any really good experience of seeing good role modelling, as I know now, and people were really so offended that a Māori could get the position where it was a mainstream school, I never got any help so I had to reach out and find my own feet* [A:1:18-21]. In contrast, the principles of traditional Māori leadership centred on providing for the people and the needs of the collective (Mead et al., 2006). Strength in leadership was always in support of and on behalf of the collective. However, while she grappled with her leadership approach, Arihia was always aware of the trust and support from her community and especially at a time when they were all coming out of a very painful experience.

After a couple of years Arihia realised that she was not in a good space in terms of the leadership model she had adopted. She started to explore the leadership practices coming from within te ao Māori that were based on consensus and a lot of democracy: *where there was just an agreement that you had your say, you didn't necessarily agree but you knew the bigger picture so you supported and the trust remained* [A:2:40-42]. Her approach moved from an authoritarian style towards a more inclusive model of leadership based on Māori working with Māori; *I realised if we're really gonna be truly Māori effective we have to abide by the tikanga and principles of being Māori* [A:4:103-104]. The changes in Arihia's philosophical approaches to leadership stemmed from her desire to serve and her understanding that an essential aspect of leadership was in supporting the collective aspirations of the whānau and the wider community; *I actually morphed into these things because I was responding to the way I wanted to lead my staff and my community. I've come to this collective and distributed leadership, and servitude to know that you are a servant of the community* [A:2:47-50]. The changes in Arihia's leadership approaches were more compatible with traditional Māori leadership literature that emphasised values of commitment and giving service to the community (Mead et al., 2006).

Arihia found that a distributive and collective approach in her educational leadership was much more engaging as there were times when she needed to be actively leading and there were times when she adopted a shared leadership approach to recognise the contributions of other members of staff. In accordance with the literature on Māori leadership she was astute in processing situations in order to enhance opportunities (Williams, 2010). Her value of collective practices helped to shape her philosophy as a

leader and the important principles of collegial and reciprocal relationships. Furthermore the overarching goal of her educational leadership was to sustain learning and teaching practices that resulted in enhanced outcomes for all their students. The research literature (Yukl, 1999) on leadership identified that it was more important to develop a team of people who could collectively perform all of the essential leadership functions for instance, at Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae, rather than focusing solely on the leadership of one individual.

Arihia's passion to serve others is comparable to the traditional pūmanawa (qualities/talents) of providing stability in the community and actively ensuring that people felt a strong sense of security. Accordingly, by gaining the mandate from people in her community to lead them she had satisfied an important aspect of contemporary Māori leadership (Mead et al., 2006). Furthermore, through her actions Arihia's leadership had embraced the necessary values of responsibility and accountability back to the community involving whānau, hapū and iwi (Williams, 2010).

### **5.3 Arihia – Influencing the Learning Environment**

Arihia spoke of the learning and teaching environment that her kura provided for their students who were born and raised in an urban setting and for the majority who were located outside their own boundaries of tribal origin. They were part of the generations of the Māori urbanisation process that occurred during the post-World War Two period as Māori moved from the rural areas in search of employment, housing and opportunities to expand (Meredith, 2000; New Zealand Waitangi Tribunal, 1998). Arihia's philosophical approach to leadership integrated her sense of belonging to the collective and in return she experienced strong whānau and community backing; *I was lucky that I had a lot of people that trusted me as we were coming out of the space where we had experienced a lot of mamae as a Māori community* [A:2:34-35]. Consequently, she worked to ensure that her students also felt supported through her leadership as a principal as well as her staff where she prioritised their learning and wellbeing above all else. In terms of Māori student outcomes, the BES report stated that achievement improved when teachers built positive teaching and learning relationships with Māori students (Robinson et al., 2009). Arihia's approach as principal was consistent with research that

indicated how principals who focused on teaching and learning as part of their leadership role tended to improve outcomes for students (Robinson et al., 2009).

Arihia believed that her leadership approach also involved a curriculum role where she took full responsibility for leading the learning in her school; *I know that if I do not lead the teaching and learning the school doesn't go forward and I think that's a real measure of my community that learning and teaching is the most important focus* [A:5:145-146]. She described the extent to which she and her staff were prepared to work to enrich the learning and teaching in the school in terms of their ongoing professional conversations in relation to ensuring that student's reached their full potential as Māori learners.

Arihia felt that the role of the school was to serve the needs of the students and consequently she and her staff were the servants for their children and community; *for us as a school, our citizenship as Māori is really holding on the experiences that our kids have in schools. We have the privilege to be a Māori school and live and learn as Māori but we also have the responsibility of providing good learning* [A:6:177-179]. Arihia's perspective was consistent with the literature reported in the BES stating the key role of Māori educational leadership was to ensure that Māori students gained both universal knowledge and skills and were supported to achieve their aspirations in te ao Māori (society) (Robinson et al., 2009). She spoke of her respect for students and the practice of reciprocity in terms of love for students and the love reciprocated back from the students; *The more energy it's just a positive vibe and these kids I believe the kids here know my door is very open* [A:6:184-185].

Arihia was critical of traditional models of learning and teaching where the teacher held all the knowledge to be imparted to the student/learner (Goubeaud & Yan, 2004; Prensky, 2008). As the principal, Arihia's responsibility for leading the learning has focused on the flipped classroom pedagogy (Vaughan, 2014) that reverses traditional approaches in favour of a learner-centered model to include online learning and learning outside of the classroom. This has been significant within Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae where she supported working towards a more responsive approach to fully personalise the learning; *we've totally flipped that and we're in to flip instruction methods to absolutely being in an education system within our community that services the needs of the learner* [A:3:66-67]. Arihia spoke of an education where the students chose their learning and

career pathways based on personal preferences; *the students choose the career pathways they wish to pursue and now the learning must fit around those things so it must have a strong academic base and be aspirational for the kids* [A:3:71-72].

She took pride in the quality of education offered to her students that had a balance of academic curriculum choices and an internship; *which is about what makes their heart sing and an opportunity to explore what makes their heart sing* [A:3:75]. These work experience placements included working with the police, going to different ports or freighting spaces or gaining media experience at a local radio station. Equally important for the students was the compulsory element of their community service as part of the kura's responsibility to develop citizenship:

*every child in the school has to do that in community support, they pick up the old people from the pensioner flats at Te Puia for two hours to help with their shopping, take them for an outing and it's just an opportunity for the old people and the young people to make a connection* [A:3:85-87].

The BES report (Robinson et al., 2009) noted the additional duties expected of the likes of Arihia and other Māori in educational leadership positions who were responsible for overseeing the Māori cultural affairs within the community as well as meeting their school commitments. As a result they had to endure increased workloads and more work related pressures.

The parents, students and staff of Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae have formalised their relationships through a Tripartite Agreement. The main purpose is to ensure that students always have a voice within the school. Hence, the role of advocacy for the parties involved and a greater understanding of the importance of such relationships; *The school's got to advocate with the child or it could be a time when the school needs to consider the elements for the parents so it's never against each other it's always with each other* [A:4:120-122]. Arihia spoke of the Tripartite Agreement in her school as an integral body of parents, students and staff; *and it's up to us to advocate for each other at any point in time* [A:4:116].

Arihia proposed that part of supporting student learning and teaching involved a shared leadership approach for everybody to experience leadership; *so kaitiaki, kaimhakarite, you*

*are a manager, you manage certain parts of different wholes, you're also a visionary person, you've got to have vision, you need to know where you're going and everybody in, and a leadership model for everybody to experience not just the principal leader [A:4:128-130].* She felt that there were times when she as principal could step back and let someone else step forward, as she said:

*You can't just lead from the top, you actually have to be really good role models and good followers and you better be generous with your leadership, everyone can lead. That's really important to my leadership that we can all generously lead right through to the students, and where we all back that student as well [A:5:133-136].*

Arihia's strong sense of service to others and the wider cultural value of contribution towards the greater good of the community was an intrinsic influence on the kind of appropriate learning environment she aspired to create for Māori students. In doing so she continually credited any success in the school to the contributions of the teachers, parents and whānau and this included the governing Board of Trustees and local iwi. Arihia's shared leadership approach is comparable to a concept of leadership that is highly fluid and both positional and distributional (Robinson et al., 2009). The key outcome is focused on educational leadership that brings about change and improved outcomes for students. As well, throughout Arihia's narratives there is no doubt that cultural leadership had played an important role in her approach.

Arihia spoke about the way teachers at Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae had recognised that the majority of their students have grown up outside of their ūkaipō or their haukāinga (homeland). She referred to the students as urban Māori growing up in an urban setting in contrast to those Māori who were born, raised and likely to still be residing inside their tribal boundaries. Faced with the reality of living in their urban communities the students at Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae had been given the opportunity to be immersed within a Kaupapa Māori learning environment. This was deliberately created to provide a Māori foundation shelter to meet their unique circumstances so that they could learn as Māori and practice tikanga Māori.

Part of shaping the learning environment involved Arihia working in collaboration with Mana Whenua to provide authentic Māori experiences for the students to start their engagement in their own personal journeying about themselves from which they may discover and create their own living narratives. Her approach was reflected in the policy

direction from *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013) which focused on education professionals collaborating with Māori communities to influence better educational outcomes for Māori students. This approach was consistent with one of the key goals within the framework for Māori educational advancement of enabling Māori to live as Māori through access to te ao Māori and the Māori world of Māori language, culture, marae and resources (Durie, 2001). As well, the BES report (Robinson et al., 2009) highlighted the collective influence of Kaupapa Māori communities on ‘their’ principal to be leaders in the regeneration of te reo Māori and tikanga Māori (language and culture).

Arihia’s intuitive response to adopt both a collective and distributive leadership approach when she deemed necessary indicated her willingness and capability to influence and establish relationship dynamics with the community and within the school learning environment. She had also indicated that in order to gain credibility as a curriculum leader in the school she had to demonstrate leadership in the learning and teaching within the school which highlighted Arihia’s intent to provide positive influence on the learning environment. This is identified in the literature as a form of pedagogical leadership that is strongly focused on leader involvement in teaching and learning (Robinson et al., 2009). Having a deliberate school policy that aimed to reconnect the students with their original tribal origins and ūkaipō was yet another strong indication of Arihia setting out to influence the learning environment for students.

#### **5.4 Arihia’s – Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori**

Arihia felt very strongly that Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership were essentially relationships based and these involved values of respect and the key practice of service to the community; *Relationships are important because everything positive rolls out of that. You get good support from your parents who support their children and I know the most successful students are those with parents who are so supportive of them* [A:7:210-212]. She said that the strong relationships with students, parents and teachers was based on family processes, collective interests over individual concerns and kinship obligations; *we enjoy a strong relationship and it’s actually a real whanaungatanga that we truly believe that your child is our child* [A:7:213]. Hence, the acknowledgement that they all had a role and responsibility to

ensure students enjoyed success through their learning experiences during and beyond their schooling years. The kinship obligations that Arihia acknowledged were consistent with the literature on traditional Māori leadership that linked the cultural values of kinship ties within whānau and hapū and the wider kinship alliances within the iwi as significant cultural criteria in the fulfilment of a leadership system (Mead et al., 2006).

Arihia felt that Kaupapa Māori was particularly important for them as Māori living in the city and for their ability to establish relationships with Mana Whenua; *it's important because that allows us to show the kids that aren't in their homeland what it means to have a responsibility to Mana Whenua* [A:7:223]. She hoped that students would then be better placed to understand how to conduct themselves in a Māori context when they returned to their homelands; *a lot of our children are one or two generations removed from their homelands so they don't have the same relationship with their own tūrangawaewae because they have existed in the cities, and for some families three generations* [A:7:228-229]. Arihia added that they had to teach the students about the different relationships they were a part of through their birthright and whakapapa:

*we need to teach our kids to be good about knowing innately, who you are as a Māori, how to operate from a Māori perspective from a Māori worldview to be the best you can be within a global framework, something that's a little different from kids that reside in other schools that aren't able to have that experience* [A:7:232-234].

Within Māori society whakapapa (genealogy) and kinship obligations are fundamental in the social organisation of the whānau groupings and in the ability of its members to build a unified collective for mutual benefits and long term survival (Mead et al., 2006; Ngata as cited in Sorrenson, 1986).

Arihia stated that the key role of schools is education and principal leaders needed to know what good practice looks like and then maintain good practice and be prepared to challenge the status quo. Her position was consistent with the BES report (Robinson et al., 2009) that identified a key purpose of education was to improve social and educational outcomes for students and in particular to raise the achievement levels of Māori. In terms of Kaupapa Māori she stated that tikanga Māori was not transferrable. She suggested that the right response for Māori education lay in creating and

establishing more Kaupapa Māori schools that provided Māori in mainstream with alternative choices for education. In her experience to have a Māori context required a Māori heart; *it doesn't matter how much you try and replicate it if you're not Māori you don't know the mamae (pain), you don't know what we've gone without, and you don't have the historical sense of improving your own citizenship* [A:9:287-289]. Arihia was not convinced of any successful transfer from kaupapa Māori to mainstream or that mainstream schools had done a good job for Māori. In her view Māori needed to move out of mainstream to get better; *the more we set up little niches of greatness for Māori where they can feel safe, the more of these little schools that are more intimately involved and we can support each other, the better* [A:11:345-347].

## 5.5 Arihia – Summary

Arihia's leadership emerged out of crises during a period of emotional and political turmoil as her Māori community fought for the right to be recognised as Māori and to be treated as such. However, having won the right to exist and immerse in a Kaupapa Māori school Arihia struggled with much of the backlash from mainstream advocates and mainstream practices in education. Accordingly, she found herself isolated from any form of support from mainstream school leaders and consequently she started to implement the only form of leadership she had experienced which was straight from mainstream schools. The basis of her approach in the first years of leadership was authoritarian and controlling. The leadership literature identified this style of leadership as transactional and occurs when the leader specifies the goals and rewards or even corrective discipline when the standard of performance is considered below an acceptable level (Avolio & Bass, 1998). With an authoritarian approach this can tend to stifle teachers ability to work effectively rather than supporting a collaborative school culture needed to promote student achievement.

However, over time Arihia could not reconcile her rigid approach to leadership with her own awareness that to be effective as Māori, required her and the people around her to abide by the tikanga and principles of being Māori. This led Arihia to explore leadership approaches from within te ao Māori in her search for an inclusive model of Māori leadership working for Māori with Māori. Arihia's sentiments resonated strongly with the literature on traditional Māori leadership that described leadership attributes in reference to leaders providing for the needs of whānau and by acting on behalf of the

collective or providing shelter, protection and stability (Mead et al., 2006). The constant theme emerging from Arihia's interview was the ultimate trust and faith of her community to back her as principal. Their unequivocal loyalty provided her with a strong sense of security and motivation to fulfill their needs. Arihia's actions were driven by her desire to serve the people and to uphold their collective aspirations. This resulted in Arihia moving into another realm whereby she actively engaged in both a distributive and shared leadership approach. This approach is documented in literature as a form of collective teacher leadership that included sharing knowledge with colleagues, reflecting on learning and teaching, mentoring others and focusing on curriculum improvements (Derrington & Angelle, 2013).

Arihia's narratives were sensitive to the way in which several generations of Māori were now residing in an urban context and aware of how this had shaped their lives. Part of Arihia's responsibilities lay in her ability to lead the learning in her school at a curriculum level and a cultural level in terms of filling the gaps for the students born outside of their homelands. She aspired to create learning environments that were academically stimulating and relationships rich in history, language and culture. She had formalised relationships within her school that were based on whanaungatanga with parents, staff and students and with the local Mana Whenua in the area. This was consistent with Durie's (2001) education goals for Māori to live as Māori and to be sufficiently prepared by the conclusion of their formal education for active lives within Māori society. Similarly within *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013) the strategy is focused on ensuring that Māori students achieve their potential to succeed as Māori and to be proud in knowing they are Māori. Furthermore, their educational experiences are enriched when they are aware of their place in the world and the relationship to the land they are connected to (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005).

The key outcome from Arihia's experience and knowledge is important for other principals currently leading education provision for Māori. Arihia spoke strongly against any transfer of tikanga Māori into mainstream schools, however, she advocated for more Kaupapa Māori schools, small enough for students to feel safe and secure and that were intimately involved with other Kaupapa Māori schools in support of one another. Furthermore, given the prevalence of a mainstream education system this poses the

question of: what cultural leadership mainstream principals are capable of demonstrating in support of the Māori students in their schools? (Penetito, 2010; Waitere, 2008).

The next section provides insights into the way in which Arihia's approaches to leadership have been perceived and experienced by teachers and parents. The data gathered in the combined focus group provides evidence of the effects of Arihia's leadership approaches on the people she works with on a daily basis within the school environment.

## **5.6 Teachers' / Parents' Views of Arihia's Approaches to Leadership**

The combined teachers' and parents' focus group identified Arihia's approaches to leadership as strongly rooted in Māori cultural values of service towards other people and the practice of personal humility. They also spoke of a shared and distributive approach to her leadership when she engaged with teachers, students and the wider community. There was only one point of difference expressed in reference to Arihia's leadership. This point of difference concerned her perceived prioritisation of secondary education over the primary sector in the school, which related to her being seen to spend most of her time on the senior secondary area. This prioritisation resulted in the deputy principal taking the lead in the school's primary sector. However, with the deputy principal taking the lead in the school's primary sector it was a clear example of distributive leadership in action. It provided another staff member with an opportunity to take on a school leadership role and to share her breadth and depth of expertise for the benefit of others.

According to the focus group Arihia's leadership philosophy was grounded in terms of serving the community and was one in which her teachers and parents were prepared to follow her; *we all follow in Arihia's philosophy of serving the community that we are in and serving not just our own people but all people of Mangere* [Ao:TP:2:53-54]. The impact of her leadership approach was viewed as extending well beyond the school and working within the wider community. The BES report (Robinson et al., 2009) indicated the need for cultural considerations to be reflected in leadership and noted the "philosophical and moral imperative" felt by Māori medium leadership to embrace the vision and expectations of the wider community.

The group viewed Arihia in terms of her many outstanding qualities and these were also attributed in part to her parents, who were both very strong leaders in Māori education; *Nan, Arihia's mum was a beautiful linguist a beautiful person and I think that Arihia benefits greatly from having great genes, and in saying that she also holds her own mana and has really grown into being a leader already revered by many people* [Ey:TP:9:273-275]. The role of whakapapa in Arihia's leadership is consistent with the way in which Māori society value the passing down through generations of traits and feats from ancestral tūpuna (esteemed elders/leaders). This is consistent with Mead's (Mead et al., 2006) commentary on the value of traditional leadership qualities that have been passed on to the next generations through custom and role modelling. As well, the onus often placed on the younger generation to learn from careful observation and practice.

There was agreement that Arihia embraced an inclusive approach in her leadership that was both sensitive and perceptive to the people she worked with. Her understanding and respect of an individual's personal mana and uniquenesses had instilled strong feelings of gratitude and loyalty from them, as the following quote suggests:

*tino kaha a Arihia, tino kaha i te whakarongo, tino kaha i te whakawhiti kōrero, kei tēnā kei tēnā kei tēnā o mātou ake mana, kāore anō kua kite ai ia te whakawhiti te mana o tētahi o mātou/ Arihia is an awesome principal, she treats us as unique people, she listens and talks to us respectfully and she never puts anyone down* [Th:TP:1:35-37].

Arihia's leadership that embraced responsibility and tolerance was identified in the literature on Māori leadership (Williams, 2010) as a key factor in enhancing the wellbeing of the people. Arihia's teachers and parents responded in kind by their reciprocal acts of appreciation and had affirmed their support of her leadership. The notion of reciprocity is an important value in maintaining the balance and accountability in relationships (Jones et al., 2010).

Arihia's approach to leadership was described in terms of the effect she had on people and the level of support she provided and the feeling of being valued by her as the principal: *I feel valued and from some of the things we are presented with at hui that's what makes me*

*feel valued, I've worked in other environments where you don't know what's going on and you do your thing and that's it [As:TP:1:12-14].* There was also a sense in which being valued equated to being kept informed on matters of importance that affected everyone in the school. The focus group commented that Arihia was very open and transparent in her leadership. The literature on Māori leadership noted that when leadership is responsive and reflective in meeting the needs of the group membership it can enhance the achievement of key decisions and goals (Mead et al., 2006; Williams, 2010). This was a quality that they experienced through her ability and willingness to communicate clearly with staff in a two-way process that allowed people to both receive information and provide feedback; *Being part of the senior management she takes into account our responsibilities and always gets advice from us, as well as giving us directions in areas that we need support [Gi:TP:1:20-21].* Another related comment was about Arihia's clarity and vision; *Arihia's leadership is really clear that's the thing she's a real visionary and she has a really clear idea of what she wants, of the direction that we should be heading in and she's really open to other people's whakaaro/thoughts/views. We like to refer to it as the Ngā Tapuwae way [Ey:TP:10:303-305].*

Arihia's adoption of distributive leadership approaches was supported by the focus group especially in light of the move towards utilising the different strengths and passions of her teachers. Arihia's position was consistent with the BES report (Robinson et al., 2009) that indicated that leadership today was strongly focused on improving teacher effectiveness in order to support student achievement levels. Arihia was described as a highly motivated charismatic leader who constantly challenged herself and the people around her to move outside of their comfort zones and to work for greater improvement and to attain greater achievements; *what I love about her the most is that she takes risks, she's not somebody that will just rest on laurels and over the last 15 years I've been here we've had lots of changes in the way we teach and what we teach and how we teach [Ge:TP:5:166-168].* One of the group felt that Arihia's expertise was in secondary education and this resulted in her giving stronger focus to that sector of the school. However another interpretation of the difference was that within a distributive leadership approach Arihia had identified the expertise and skills of her deputy principal in the primary sector, as this quote illustrates: *Arihia is very trusting and supportive and this is another skill that Arihia possesses, that is identifying areas of expertise that each of us have and trusting that we are able to undertake the mahi that she sets out [Ey:TP:11:368-370].*

The group spoke of how Arihia constantly managed the changes in the school and worked to ensure that the school was always a living and vibrant place to be; *she worked together with all the different stakeholders to create the school Charter and what it is to be now a kura-ā-ini, and that in itself shows how much of a risktaker she's been. We've come through a mainstream system, the bilingual system, the kura Māori and now we're a kura-ā-ini* [Ge:TP:6183-185]. Aligned to this was Arihia's vision of success for Māori as Māori and through this clarity of vision they felt she had managed to instill in them the same desire to help carry and fulfill their obligations to serve the students' needs as learners and as Māori. Her vision was consistent with the ongoing strategy of *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013) to improve the education system and performance to ensure that Māori students enjoyed and achieved education success as Māori.

## **5.7 Teachers' / Parents' Views of Arihia Influencing the Learning Environment**

The combined focus group of teachers and parents identified a range of ways in which they believed Arihia had influenced the learning environment and their approach to teaching. They recognised her hands on approach to encourage them to create an environment that nurtured a healthy balance and wellness in people. They spoke of her ability to keep everyone informed of their roles and responsibilities and to understand how they were all essential parts in the school's function of providing good learning and teaching for the students. Of particular significance was their support of Arihia's actions in prioritising the place and authority of Mana Whenua to help the school prepare young Māori students to find their place in a global context. The significance of place-based education as presented in this context is by its objective to develop in students a love of their environment, of the place where they are living, the social history and the way the people have existed there and continue to relate to their surrounds (Penetito, 2009).

The focus group spoke of Arihia's active encouragement in motivating them to create positive and safe learning environments for both students and teachers to co-exist within; *Tino kaha i te whakanui ngā tauira, whakanui boki i ngā mātua, whakanui ki ngā*

*kaimahi/She has great respect for the students, the parents and us the workers/the teachers [Ki:TP:2:38]. In creating the harmony and balance in the learning environment they also recognised Arihia's focus on the essential aspects of their spiritual health; which is bringing in respect, kindness and responsibility as corner stones that we have to teach and in terms of the learning environment-a-wairua/in the spiritual domain [As:TP:4:109-110].*

There was a strong consensus around Arihia's ability to provide clear messages in terms of setting the tone and setting the expectations that she had for teachers and for students as well as their whānau in terms of the school community. Her pragmatic approach was accepted as a helpful approach in motivating people to act on their intentions:

*I think she's very good at setting the tone and setting expectations so everyone is able to just clearly pick up and follow that. In terms of the learning environment a-tinana (physical) I feel really trusted in being able to try new things and she's straight up, in terms of your classroom she'll tell you how it looks and what needs improving [As:TP:4:118-121].*

Arihia inspired staff to capture the heart and the spirit of their learners by making the students want to learn. Furthermore, in relation to Arihia's expectations of them, the focus group were just as keen to report on the high level of support she provided back in terms of professional development, which included learning and teaching resources for support at the classroom level and some valuable whole school initiatives. The effect of Arihia's leadership is identified in the literature that showed how teachers were more innovative when the school leadership encouraged collaboration and sharing amongst colleagues (Harris, 2003; Spillane et al., 2004). The group recognised the value of sharing information and experiences from the different levels of teaching within the school.

The group spoke about Arihia's attendance at a number of national and international forums and they commented on how Arihia used her experience as a researcher in these forums for the full benefit of her staff and students; *she's a researcher she'll research and only bring back to us the things that she feels will benefit the tamariki in our whānau and the teachers. What I love about her too is she shares what she learns with everybody, all the stakeholders in the school are working in unison [Ge:TP:171-175].* They were very proud of Arihia's achievements

and her principled stance when advocating on behalf of the collective interests of Māori. They felt privileged to have such an outstanding principal in Arihia working beside them and on their behalf; *she doesn't only speak for herself or her own kura or tribe or mokopuna, she speaks for everyone's mokopuna, it's just amazing!* [Ge:TP:8:237-238]. Arihia's leadership had also been used to good effect through her role as co-chair of Ngā Kura ā Iwi o Aotearoa; *she's really leading into a whole new direction and targeting the successes of working together with all the tumuaki to target successes within each kura and helping bring everyone up in those different areas* [Ey:TP:10:331-332]. Arihia's educational purpose focused on improving the educational outcomes for Māori, and aligned with the BES report that the wider purpose of educational leadership was to improve teaching and learning across the education system (Robinson et al., 2009).

Arihia prioritised her time with the students and met with them on a regular basis to keep herself in close contact with their needs and expectations; *She's strict but fair and the kids love her. I truly think they do love her. Her relationship with the students, they're really clear. She is the boss you do not muck with her but if you need her support she's there in an instant* [Ey:TP:11:351-352]. The focus group felt that Arihia had the foresight to change the status of Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae into a Kura-ā-iwi in order to meet the cultural and identity needs of the students, as mokopuna of their respective iwi. As one teacher parent commented: *we are a kura of the iwi and the iwi have to be involved in order for things to be successful* [Ge:TP:7:201].

Arihia always prioritised the needs of the students and made time for them and met with them on a regular basis. Arihia oversaw the development of the school's enrolment policies to enable students from the tribal area special rights to attend the school without the complications of being added to the growing waiting list of students wanting to enroll at the school. The reciprocating benefit back to the school was in terms of bringing the kaumātua and kuia from the wider community and Mana Whenua into the school learning environment. This also allowed the students from the school to go out into the community to work with these tribal elders. Arihia was credited for both the thinking behind these initiatives and the related successes that have resulted; *That's the thing with Arihia, she allows those things to happen, whereas in other places, not sure if the tumuaki are as responsive to those sorts of needs* [Ge:TP:7:207-208]. The literature identified a

model of leadership that saw Arihia and other Māori educational leaders in the role of change agents responsible for organising cultural and community initiatives and leading the revitalisation of the Māori language and culture for their Māori community (Robinson et al., 2009). Durie (as cited in Robinson et al., p. 70) had also indicated that effective Māori leadership involved expertise in the Māori domain and leadership that extended seamlessly into the wider mainstream society. Furthermore the group commented on the importance of the consultation with the community and the Mana Whenua as it enabled whānau hui to be hosted and supported by the community, whether there were issues that needed to be discussed or just the opportunity for information sharing. The Tripartite Agreement of the whānau, the students and the school was perceived to show the value of people working together and resonated strongly with Kaupapa Māori principles of whānau (extended family structure) and kaupapa (collective philosophy); *if one of those areas is not working efficiently then the agreement is not going to work for the student at the centre of it, so the community and the school community is a big part of the support mechanism* [Gi:TP:7:222-223]. This form of community networking was endorsed by the Education Review Office report that recommended for school leaders to use a variety of ways to engage parents and whānau regularly and involve them in students' learning (2010).

## **5.8 Teachers' and Parents' Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori**

The focus group of teachers and parents spoke about their views and practices of Kaupapa Māori in terms of their history as a kura and some of the related struggles, their very close whakawhanaungatanga relationships and the way that Kaupapa Māori permeates throughout the school and the strong appreciation of whakapapa and ancestral ties that bind them in a uniquely urban Māori context.

Some in the group related back to their own days of when they were students at the school and others recalled the experiences of their whānau members who were also students at one time. Their recollections are of Arihia as a teacher who lived according to Kaupapa Māori principles and values of te tika me te pono (virtuousness and honesty) and how she forged strong bonds with the young people many years ago and the relationships have remained intact; As one person commented:

*I kuraina a tōku hunaonga ki tēnei kura, mihi kau atu ia ki a Arihia, ko ia tētahi o ana kaiako kuraina ki konei. Ko tāku te mea mutunga he kaihoe tino hoe kaha ia i te waka, abakoa ngā piki ngā auheke o te waka, he tino kaha a Arihia i a tātou kia mahi tika kia mahi roto i te pono hoki/ My hunaonga (brother or sister-in-law) went to school here and Arihia was her teacher. She is an excellent person who has steered the ship through the highs and lows in a manner that is just and right, and true to the cause [Th:TP:2:41-43].*

The group spoke of Arihia's emphasis on developing in student's their sense of identity and pride as young Māori from Mangere presenting to the very best of their ability in any and all surrounds; *when I was here she always said to us you have to go out there and represent your school, your whānau and ultimately yourself, you always aim to be your best, you know things we learnt in that time they're all about life skills* [Ao:TP:2:60-63]. The focus on supporting Māori students to grow into confident and successful young people with the knowledge and values of their identity, language and culture is also a central focus of *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013) and a fundamental goal of place-based education that revolves around community, specific relationships between place and space, and place and identity (Penetito, 2009). They were aware of their role in fulfilling a dream set by those who had since passed on as a legacy for future generations to have and to hold on to; *I'm also a mama my son's in year 8 so having him continue in my footsteps it's an honour for me to have my boss, my ex-teacher, my English teacher be his tumuaki now* [Ao:TP:3:71-72]. This holistic interconnection is centrally located in Durie's educational objectives for educators to be mindful that Māori students must be prepared for participation and interaction in both Māori and mainstream society (2001).

The bonds of friendship and love within the group have been established over many years in some cases many decades and it is these sorts of relationships that help to make the school the hub and heart of the people; *we are part of the DNA of this kura and what's more important is knowing that we help create this kura, we fulfil it, we help keep it going, it's the intrinsic rewards that keep us here and it's the camaraderie and whanaungatanga amongst everyone* [Ao:TP:3:87-89]. The sentiments here embrace the qualities of Kaupapa Māori that give cognisance to the significance of whakapapa (genealogy), whanaungatanga kinship ties and obligations and the essence of being tangata whenua people of this land (Mead et al., 2006). Having the knowledge of identity and of belonging are fundamental

requirements for young Māori in order to begin their journey into the education system and further (Penetito, 2009). The group understood their obligations of reciprocity in kaupapa Māori terms and they spoke about their willingness to practice these values of giving and contributing and of also receiving back; *those are resonating and are the kind of touchstones that we were given as students when we were here and now we've come back to support that and for our future generations to be part of this awesome journey* [Ge:TP:5:162-163].

There was reference by some of the group to their early years at the school and the struggles in forming Te Kura Māori o Nga Tapuwae. They spoke of tumultuous times at Ngā Tapuwae College and how Arihia and her parents fought for the Māori students to be educated as Māori:

*...it took a lot of courage to stay here and teach us and I'm very grateful and I think that's what's made lots of us ex-students here half the people that we are today. It's because of Nan and Paps, Arihia and the people that stood up for us back then* [Ey:TP:9:297-299].

The group recognised they had a responsibility to ensure that their Māori students, who have been first, second and or third generation living away from the hau kāinga (true home/original homelands) of their grandparents and great grandparents, had opportunities to know about their cultural and iwi identity. They were aware that some students did not return home and some who were unsure of their original homelands. Consequently, Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae had become their Kaupapa Māori environment and one established by the Stirling whānau, in particular Arihia's parents; *we've become our own little hapū in the melting pot of Auckland unfortunately our kids don't have the benefit and don't have the luxury of going home, as often, or even knowing where home is and having parents that know where home is. So yes, we're very lucky, this school is our second home* [Ey:TP:12:393-395]. They were optimistic that now they were a Kura-ā-iwi with links across Aotearoa, their students would have more chance of linking back to their hau kāinga (homeland / home winds); *so in terms of that we can support the students in terms of them making those links back to their own iwi* [Gi:TP:12:400-401].

Kaupapa Māori approaches in the school occur at many levels. On one hand they are seen to permeate to the degree that all kaupapa are seen and experienced through a

Māori frame; *Thinking of the context within our school and Arihia's leadership then kaupapa Māori just intertwines, it permeates everything we do, we are totally kaupapa Māori* [Ey:TP:15:473-475]. Another perspective shared was intuitively based but just as strongly felt; *If it feels right that's the one way that I know in terms of any decision or discussion or issue, in terms of that feeling, the wairua of it will feel right and so that's one way I know kaupapa Māori is permeating* [Gi:TP:15:479-480]. The whole school embraced Kaupapa Māori in a way that was more about the recognition of many esteemed leaders and tūpuna who had worked to build the school as a permanent and lasting legacy; *ki au nei kaore e tū atu ki te whakaaro e whakatinanahia e mātou i ngā ohākei o ngā tūpuna o ērā i whakapou wera ki te whakatū i te kaupapa o te kura nei. Kei konei hoki i tēnei wā i ngā wā katoa, ka kore nei a rātou e warewaretia* [Ka:TP:15:494-496].

## 5.9 Teachers and Parents – Summary

According to the focus group a strong theme of service resonated in Arihia's approach to leadership and the impact of this was felt well beyond the school into the broader Mangere community and local iwi. Arihia's desire to serve the people of her community was seen as part of the early influences of her upbringing in a Kaupapa Māori environment. Her parents were highly regarded and the focus group recognised many of their teachings were now appearing in Arihia's values and practices. She genuinely valued people and in turn had an ability to make them feel valued. Arihia's leadership exemplified the importance of both cultural and curriculum leadership that effectively bonded generations of students and families in her school and wider community. They had melded to form their own unique tribal identity and base that continued to sustain their personal and their collective wellbeing.

Arihia was regarded by the focus group as someone who approached her leadership with very open and transparent qualities where she was a superb communicator and an active engaged listener. Communications were always a two-way process and this helped keep everyone informed and aware of key expectations, information and specific roles and responsibilities. Aligned with these factors Arihia was seen as a leader who was a clear thinker and a real visionary whose vision was one of success for Māori as Māori. According to the group Arihia had the confidence to take risks and explore new pathways. She utilised to maximum effect her distributive approach to leadership that

enabled others to shine in their areas of expertise and experience leadership across the many different levels and forums. As identified in the literature (Harris, 2003; Spillane et al., 2004) her leadership was interactive and inclusive of the collective views and contributions of all of the teachers in her school.

The group felt that Arihia was quite deliberate in her intentions to motivate her teachers to create vibrant and mana enhancing opportunities and environments for students to learn in. They recognised that she set the tone in the school that encouraged affirming interactions amongst the staff, students and wider community members. This included Arihia providing the support and necessary resources for teachers to use in their classroom programmes. The group spoke positively about their sense of belonging to the collective and consequently they worked within a strong team ethic. This was indicative of Arihia's curriculum leadership that emphasised the importance of setting clear educational goals and attending to curriculum planning (Robinson et al., 2009). They appreciated Arihia's ability to engage in educational forums with the purpose of bringing back potential and new initiatives into the school for the wider benefits of the teachers and students.

Arihia's affirming relationships with the students was seen by the group as one of her many strengths. She sought to find ways to reconnect the students with their cultural and tribal identities through gaining kura-ā-iwi status and bringing Mana Whenua into the school learning environment. Arihia's commitment to the community and their relationships was formalised through a Tripartite Agreement.

Kaupapa Māori approaches were considered by the focus group to be an ever-present quality that permeated the values and practices of everyone in relationship to the school. The binding relationships formed amongst the teachers, parents, students and community were rooted in the historical struggles of Māori seeking recognition and mana in an urban context. Many families connected to the school were now third and fourth generation Māori born and raised in the cities and towns of Greater Auckland. The literature on place-based education reaffirms these intrinsic needs to have a sense of place, to form worthy relationships with the people and the environment within, and to embrace the unique ways knowing and being within a Māori context (Penetito, 2009).

The contemporary context of Māori today presents a scenario of organised pan-tribal groupings as Māori have located outside of their once geographically distinct Māori tribal communities (Graham 2009). The whānau groupings of Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae are pan-tribal and urban based yet their narratives are indicative of the ancestral ties that bind Māori through the generations by whakapapa, relationships, histories, environment, cultural values, beliefs and practices (ibid.). The school and the esteemed leaders past and present have successfully created an authentic Māori learning and living space that has become a second home for them, a second home away from their traditional homelands. A poignant and progressive narrative kept alive for each succeeding generation to remember to hold on to. Arihia's leadership in this goal of maintaining the cultural survival of the Māori students and families are reflected in the sentiments of her ancestor Sir Āpirana Ngata, who also determined to preserve the traditional cultural forms of the Māori people (1928 as cited in Sorrenson, 1986).

### **5.10 Overall summary**

The second case study took place in Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae located near the Manukau Harbour in Mangere, Manukau City, within the Auckland metropolitan area. Through interviewing the principal and combined focus group of teachers and parents a number of key themes emerged. This case study showed that Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership about Māori, by Māori and for Māori in the learning and teaching of Māori students have been grounded in tikanga Māori values and practices. It has also shown that the approach is grounded in terms of whanaungatanga and family relationships, cultural and iwi identity, service to the community, strong community engagement and transparency, and is inclusive of shared, distributive and transformative practices that are located in the specific historical and urban contexts of the Ngā Tapuwae School and community.

## Chapter 6 Key Informant Interviews

### 6.1 Introduction

This chapter provides analyses of individual interviews involving kanohi ki te kanohi conversations with two significant Māori women leaders. Both leaders have extensive experience and knowledge of working with Māori in education and are held in high regard by Māori community organisations, government and public sector organisations. Furthermore, they were both comfortable to be identified within their narratives and in the knowledge that they may contribute to the best possible outcomes for Māori students in secondary schools throughout the country. The chapter is organised into four sections that examine personal background details, commentary on the effectiveness of mainstream leadership, views and practices of Kaupapa Māori and Kaupapa Māori approaches in mainstream secondary schools.

### 6.2 Māori Leader 1

*E kore au e ngaro, he kākano i ruia mai i Rangiatea:* Mereana Selby is affiliated to Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Hūia and Ngāti Porou. She is a former secondary school teacher of 14 years, specialising in Physical Education and te Reo Māori. In 1990 she accepted the role to lead the Bilingual Unit at Ōtaki College. She also participated in the language and cultural revival taking place within Ngāti Raukawa, through the Whakatupuranga Rua Mano iwi development plan. Mereana then moved into the tertiary sector in initial teacher education for Kaupapa Māori schools at Wellington College of Education before eventually joining Te Wānanga o Raukawa. In 2007 she was appointed to the role of Tumuaki of Te Wānanga o Raukawa, the first female to become a Wānanga CEO.

Although a second language speaker of Māori herself, she ensured that all of her five children were first language speakers of Māori and educated in Kōhanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori and Wharekura. Mereana has been a long standing advocate in the Māori language revival movement over the last 30 years. She is particularly committed to her iwi of Ngāti Raukawa and is passionate about Māori language revitalisation and intergenerational language transmission. As Mereana explained in her own words the

significance of the whakataukī above: *The seed has been sown and each succeeding generation will continue to cultivate that garden.*

### 6.3 The Effectiveness of Mainstream Leadership

Mereana proposed Kaupapa Māori approaches towards meeting the needs of Māori students in secondary schools that required principals to challenge and change their current deficit view of Māori and literally transform their way of thinking about Māori:

*I think that if professional leaders could see relationships with Māori and good outcomes for Māori students as an opportunity for all of New Zealand they may change their views rather than taking the view that dealing with Māori is difficult and problematic [M:1:16-19].*

Mereana's ideas were confirmed in the research literature (Hynds, Meyer, Penetito, Averill, Hindle, Taiwhati, Hodis & Faircloth, 2014) that identified the risk of deficit theorising in New Zealand secondary schools and the need to focus on enhancing capability to provide culturally responsive schooling for Māori. Penetito had previously reported on the barriers to Māori success in education that related to Māori being labelled as the 'problem' (2010). Mereana expressed a touch of regret at the lost opportunity that current leadership were missing by continuing to hold a deficit view; *as opposed to the idea that there's an opportunity to create something in New Zealand that nobody else, potentially in the world has because there is no other iwi Māori in the world [M:1:19-21].* The culturally responsive pedagogies in *Te Kotahitanga* though helped in some way to address deficit thinking as it focused on improving teacher practice through building positive relationships with Māori students in order to enhance their achievement levels (Bishop, 2003).

Mereana doubted the degree of understanding that many of our education leaders had with respect to the Treaty and the Treaty relationship that Māori have with Pākehā. She believed that implicit in these Treaty relationships were also obligations that potentially provided another opportunity to reject a deficit view of Māori; *there's an opportunity again for relationships that are meaningful to both Pākehā and Māori that can enhance both peoples if we were to see each other as partners as opposed to as enemies or competitors [M:1:26-28].* This concept of partnership is included in *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education 2007)

that acknowledges the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand. Consequently, all students must have the opportunity to learn te reo me ōna tikanga (Māori language and culture). However, in its evaluation of schools, while ERO (2012) reported improvements in acknowledging the bicultural foundations of Aotearoa New Zealand, it was noted that “some still had much to do in this area” (p. 18).

In addition to this partnership objective Mereana urged education leaders to acknowledge that Māori student achievement in secondary schools affected their current and potential future behaviour in our communities and as leaders they had the power to influence these outcomes; *it's in the palm of their hands they can make so much difference with our people if they were to regard this as a great opportunity that it is to strengthen our people* [M:1:31-33]. Mereana's analysis parallels the discourse of constitutional transformation advanced by Moana Jackson (2010) in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi and constitutional change, as a significant act towards achieving “something different – we are going to find something transformative, something new” (p. 237). Jackson also referred to the necessary consequence of transforming the constitutional process “that has done so much harm to the meaning of the Treaty and to the well-being of our people. We actually talk about dealing with all the legacy of colonisation” (ibid).

Looking back on her own school years as a Māori student she recognised that the poor performing students that were numerous in the school she attended were Māori as compared to Pākehā. She expressed a sense of disillusionment as she felt the state school system of which she was a part of for 14 years as a secondary school teacher had not improved Māori student performance; *it didn't seem to be able to make the slightest bit of difference at least I didn't feel that way after the 14 years I spent trying* [M:2:40-41]. The research literature (Ministry of Education, 2005, 2008) confirmed Mereana's concerns regarding the prevalence of low levels of Māori educational achievement and the ongoing disparities, in comparison to non-Māori students.

Furthermore since taking the role as a teacher educator in a state tertiary institution and now within her role in Te Wānanga o Raukawa, she was dismayed that the state system has not fared any better and how those in key power positions have continued to

abrogate their accountabilities and responsibilities; *I look at that and how we accept poor achievement and our education leaders do this, they accept poor achievement for Māori as the normality. I don't think that is right just for our education leaders to accept poor achievement as okay* [M:2:44-47]. These issues were inherent in the critiques of Kaupapa Māori theories of the dominant power structures that marginalised Māori in education (Smith, 1997; Pihama, 1993). Mereana was damning of this incriminating crisis because in her assessment if the situation was reversed and Pākehā student achievement mirrored that of Māori there would be an almighty outcry:

*we would close schools down and we would say they shouldn't be operating because they're doing too poor a job. It would be a scandal. But we accept this subgroup within our education system without owning it or without having any real passion about trying to change it* [M:2:50-52].

Mereana speculated on the state of Māori achievement over the decades and that in her assessment there had been no substantial change for the better. She posed the scenario that Māori are put into the same circumstances as Pākehā children but they failed to achieve the same therefore on that basis; *you could take one view that Māori people are dumb* [M:2:56] or *that Māori children are born dumb* [M:2:62]. However, she argued that if you did not believe that theory or myth of meritocracy “that you get out of the system what you put into it” (McNamee & Miller, Jr., 2004) then something else is the problem and principals needed to determine that they have to address it because something is wrong; *and it's got to be systematic and that's where I see education leaders need to accept that. I think at the moment they are accepting even subconsciously, the theory that Māori are dumb because they are not doing anything about it* [M:2:65-67]. The research literature confirmed Mereana's views on the negative impacts of the education system on Māori and identified failings in terms of the curriculum that was taught, the lack of recognition of cultural differences between Māori and non-Māori, and the differing world-views and pedagogical practices that were Māori based and more responsive to Māori learners (Bishop et al., 2007; Durie, 2005, Pihama et al., 2002).

In Mereana's view, the single most important indicator of Māori student success was the teacher and embedded within that teacher role; *that's the system and it's the inbuilt racism that occurs in schools. People hate to hear that kind of stuff but we've got to swallow that, own it and be*

*prepared to do something about it [M:3:72-74]. The research literature confirmed Mereana's issue that relationships between teachers and Māori students were significant factors in determining their levels of success, as teachers had the potential and ability to change the educational outcomes of Māori students (Alton-Lee, 2003; Hattie, 2003). She was defiant as she challenged educators across the country to substantiate what they were doing and why they were doing it. The response would hopefully confirm for her that they did not believe that; *Māori are born dumb or dumber than Pākehā. If they believe that the Māori mind is as good as the Pākehā mind then why is it that the Māori mind can't achieve as the Pākehā mind?* [M:3:76-77].*

Sadly, she felt that Māori whānau had carried much of the burden in terms of the mindset that Pākehā held of Māori. Even though she conceded that there were other indicators like poverty she was adamant that educators had to take some responsibility for the way in which education was offered and the way it was; *valued, packaged and delivered, the attitudes that are so evident for our kids when they're at school and that's the fundamental shift that's got to occur and it's a big one* [M:3:81-83]. The Māori potential approach in *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013) recognised that education sector professionals can hold lower expectations for Māori students that can act as barriers to their learning and achievement. Therefore through *Ka Hikitia* the determination was to place less focus on deficit and more focus on realising Māori potential, developing more personalised learning and valuing the cultural distinctiveness of Māori students. Furthermore, the impacts of societal racism established in the hegemonic behaviours, practices, policies and processes can also work to maintain and reproduce unfair inequalities for Māori (Barnes, Taiapa, Borell & McCreanor, 2013).

Mereana spoke about the different aspects of Māori education over time. In the 1970s she encountered the taha Māori process where teachers were encouraged to add Māori culture to their teaching. Then in the 1980s when bilingual, whānau and enrichment units were in vogue she was part of that development. In her experience these initiatives did not work but she remarked on the view of her Pākehā colleagues at the time; *what we found of course was the Pākehā teachers loved the fact that they could just devolve their responsibility for Māori kids off to Māori teachers and then they could get on with some real teaching* [M:3:92-93]. Mereana lamented that by the late 80s it became clear that the model of a

bilingual unit within a school was not working for Māori as she put it; *it wasn't working because still there was one Rangatira and it wasn't Māori. In the end te mutunga iho kei te Rangatira Pākehā te kupu, ka pēhea te toha haere o nga rauemi and that wasn't working for Māori and the quality of the education wasn't being delivered to Māori* [M:3:96-98]. Put simply, the power base remained with Pākehā leadership not Māori. To counter the dominant power structures of Pākehā in education that subordinate Māori, Kaupapa Māori intervention strategies have involved the deliberate political conscientisation of Māori to critically engage in what is happening to them in schools (Smith, 1992). The research literature (Penetito, 2010) also confirmed Mereana's claim that Māori education was rooted firmly within the powerbase of the Pākehā system of mainstream education and this had perpetuated the mainstream practice of directing Māori to fit into the current structures. Consequently, mainstream education had been the only real option for Māori and so had lagged in terms of engaging in Māori kaupapa. Also highlighted was the need for learning institutions to ensure the survival of Māori dimensions in aspects such as curriculum and resourcing (Durie, 2001).

Mereana was at the forefront of Māori education as it moved into the immersion phase and from this emerged the conception of kura kaupapa Māori, wharekura, wānanga and kōhanga reo. Mereana referred to this as the phase of education that was Māori owned, for Māori, by Māori and of Māori; *I think that we were really clear and I was too, that we had to provide a viable authentic Māori model and we had to say to all of our families, get on board this one. Go back us!* [M:4:102-104]. Mereana's approach was aligned with Kaupapa Māori theory advocating the acts of conscientisation, resistance to counter hegemonic practice and transformation through struggle for Māori autonomy (Smith, 1997; Pihama, 1993). Mereana argued that by attending a Pākehā school, Māori could almost be assured of poor results for their children so; *why would you back a loser?* [M:4:94].

In Mereana's assessment, the evidence of poor results for Māori students suggested that Māori were no worse off by attending a Kaupapa Māori school and might still get poor results but; *the other one's assured so why would you definitely go in? The risk is not in going to the new Māori model, the risk is in staying with the old one which is tried and true failure* [M:4:107-109]. However, for Mereana the issue that irked her most was the apparent inertia and resistance of most Māori; *who have not been able to make that shift* [M:4:111]. Whilst the

research literature had identified disadvantage and disparity for Māori in the current education system (Bishop et al., 2007; Durie, 2005; Ministry of Education, 2005; Penetito, 2010), Mereana had taken a more direct stand when she advocated for Māori to exit from mainstream in favour of a Māori system of education.

However, she stated that in her view, the next generation of Māori parents lacked a certain drive, passion and commitment: *a pretty wild generalisation but I don't see it like it used to be with us. We would have just about thrown ourselves in front of a bus to make our point* [M:4:115-117]. Mereana's expressed concern was for the cause and the struggle to keep te reo Māori a living language of consequence in Aotearoa and the risks to the intensity of it moving in an upward trajectory; *without the same energy, passion, determination and preparation to fight for what they want* [M:4:118].

Mereana thought seriously about the fundamental missed opportunity for Aotearoa to become a bilingual and bicultural nation: *I think that if we were able to nail that in New Zealand we would provide a model for the world but we have to take a shift by our people* [M:4:124]. She expressed her firm belief that all Māori and all Pākehā were obliged to embrace Māori language and biculturalism. Furthermore she laid down the challenge for everybody to delve deeper into their predetermined cultural positions in order to develop a more open mind and a better understanding of one another; *and for us to appreciate Pākehā culture because most of us are both, and without feeling threatened about it or like we are being disloyal to Māori if we show we appreciate and enjoy something about Pākehā culture like we're jumping the fence or something like that* [M:4:127-128]. Mereana was adamant that government's should be striving towards building a Treaty balanced bicultural nation that affirmed and advanced Māori alongside Pākehā; *and until the government and education leaders set that as a benchmark of success we're always going to be that group in the background that they have to flick some extra resources to, to keep them quiet and make some gesture about reo every now and again* [M:4:132-134]. She was convinced that without equal party status Māori would be in constant catch-up mode and were; *never ever gonna hold the status of real education which is around a Pākehā world view and around what matters in a Pākehā world. I feel I'm starting to move and shift my thinking that the whole Māori culture thing needs to rise and sit alongside, in people's thinking, that of Pākehā* [M:5:135-139].

The research literature (Penetito, 2010) confirmed Mereana's challenge for the rights of Māori to be treated equally and to be treated with equality in the education system and society at large. Mereana commented that some people would predictably reject a Māori model because of a lack of funding and teachers. Yet in her view at secondary school level not a lot of progress has happened: *I don't see us making great inroads, we're just still struggling, the status of the Māori education mātauranga mind all that sort of thing* [M:5:146-147]. In light of the issues she raises it is a timely reminder of the three Treaty principles recognised and outlined in the Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988): partnership, protection and participation. The principle of Partnership draws on the notion that the Treaty partners should engage in relationships that are based on values and practices that enhance mutual respect, honesty, tolerance and acting in good faith. It also places an obligation on the Crown to include Māori in the development of policies and strategies that will impact on their lives both individually and collectively. The principle of Participation is about securing equitable participation for Māori as tangata whenua within mainstream and Māori society. The principle of Protection reflects the Crown's duty to actively protect Māori interests including cultural practices and taonga, protocols, customs and language. Overall these principles were intended to sustain positive Māori development. They were in alignment with important goals that Durie (2001) advocated in a framework for Māori educational advancement which included living as Māori, actively participating as citizens of the world and enjoying good health and a high standard of living. However, in reality Mereana's distress is a far cry from the hailed Treaty principles of Partnership, Protection, and Participation identified by the Commission (1988) and further reflected in *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007).

Mereana recognised and endorsed how Kura Kaupapa Māori were striving to create and nurture the Māori mind; *We're not trying to translate what others do we want a person to go out of this place who thinks, acts and behaves as a Māori and it's not just about educating people* [M:5:150-151]. Furthermore she was critical of many mainstream schools that in her view did a very poor job of educating Māori to be successful and to be Māori; *This is a problem for us because our people are getting less Māori and so their point of reference in life are not against a Māori value system and Māori tikanga, they tend to measure success around Māori often these days of how well they do in a Pākehā institution. Now that's a problem for us* [M:5:155-158].

### 6.3.1 Summary

According to Mereana secondary principals in mainstream secondary schools had to change their widely held deficit views of Māori. She believed that as educational leaders principals were obligated to reject a deficit view of Māori in accordance with their Treaty of Waitangi principles and relationships between Māori and Pākehā. However, she doubted that most principals were aware or understood their Treaty obligations in the education of Māori students and the effect that Māori student achievement had on their current and future behaviours in our communities. Mereana was adamant that principals had the power and potential to influence Māori student outcomes that could potentially strengthen Māori as a people.

Mereana claimed that the state school system had not improved Māori student performance and furthermore she believed that if Pākehā student achievement mirrored Māori student outcomes a nationwide crisis would have been declared. Her response to this situation was two-part: one scenario being that Māori students are dumb; or the other is that there is a systematic problem that principals need to address. Hence, Mereana challenged educators throughout Aotearoa New Zealand to substantiate their learning and teaching approaches towards Māori students and their whānau. In relation to her challenge she stressed that educators identify and resolve the institutional racism in schools. Her position was further evidenced in the *Te Kotahitanga* research on teacher deficit theorising and narratives of Māori students experiencing negative impacts and disadvantage in the classroom (Bishop, 2003, 2005). In concluding, she stated that the power base was still with Pākehā leadership and the challenge was now for Māori to take the next step to embrace Kaupapa Māori schools and exit from mainstream. In her view, the risk for Māori remaining in mainstream was to endure more of tried and true failure along with Māori students simply being educated to be Pākehā; *We're not trying to translate what others do we want a person to go out who thinks, acts and behaves as a Māori and it's not just about educating people* [M:5:150-151].

## 6.4 Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori

Mereana remarked on the question of how she defined her understanding of Kaupapa Māori as an interesting question and one that had bothered her because it was a term that both Māori and Pākehā had bandied around; *and I hear people say, I'm using a kaupapa Māori approach and I haven't been able to understand what that is* [M:7:211-212]. She thought that for many, and perhaps in the past she was guilty of this too, that Kaupapa Māori approaches were achieved by following certain practices, for example, by taking off your shoes, conducting karakia throughout the day as part of the learning environment or using te reo; *But it has to be much more than that and I think that this is where the intervention has to be, at the Māori mind level where we're challenged to see things within a framework that is expressive of Māori values as opposed to using Māori tools* [M:7:217-221]. Mereana described the example set by her parent's generation, her aunties and uncles, who did not speak Māori but their behaviour was unmistakably Māori and supported by values that were grounded in Māori philosophical traditions and customs (Mead, 2006); *They were denied the language but their behaviours, no doubt about it. Their principles, their values, their tikanga, the kama they operate within their lives, my mum's an example of that* [M:7:222-225].

The research literature (Smith, 1997) confirmed Mereana's position that asserted the validity of the Māori knowledge and cultural practices and its right to flourish in the land of its origin. Mereana was clear that the current generations had to look to the model set by her parent's generation and those elders who were brought up in a very different value system, as she explained:

*and what was the difference, it wasn't the language although the language is important don't get me wrong. It was the value system that they were brought up in. Now, to that end and I think when I was teaching I was trying to discover exactly the answer to that question you're asking right now. I think we've taken a step at Te Wānanga o Raukawa that we're comfortable with and that is to develop a framework where we identify 10 kaupapa of Māori values and we decided to adopt those values as the framework for our organisation* [M:7:288-234].

## 6.5 Kaupapa Māori Approaches in Mainstream Secondary Schools

Mereana thought there were a lot of very sincere Pākehā leaders in schools who were struggling with how to generate Māori achievement and success. She felt that there needed to be a mindshift that recognised Māori capabilities. From her perspective these leaders failed to understand that Māori carried their share of burdens and until there was genuine redress Māori would suffer:

*Māori come in, like it or not with a whole lot of baggage and pretending that baggage is not there, that there hasn't been huge loss generationally for Māori, and that they should be able to behave like everybody else, it hasn't worked for us, it hasn't worked for most of us as teachers, it hasn't worked for educational leaders either [M:11:341-345].*

Mereana reiterated that for Māori education to succeed the status of Māori needed to be raised to sit alongside Pākehā. However, while she insisted that Kaupapa Māori and mātauranga Māori still needed to be valued by students and staff as important aspects of the traditional knowledge base (Mead, 2003; Walker, 1990) and contemporary critical understanding of the recent struggles for Māori autonomy (Hutchings, 2002; Smith, 2006) she felt a hint of optimism; *All students need to be able to understand and respect this body of knowledge as being as important as any other body of knowledge. I think it takes a fundamental mindshift and I think that there is an appetite of willingness with many of our educators [M:11:351-353].*

Mereana was realistic when she conceded that while there were as many school leaders who did not share her passion and drive for change it was important for Māori to help show others a way forward. She stated that one of the first tasks was to reinforce the importance of te reo. In her mind it was critical to continue to make inroads towards the direction of te reo. She commented that although recent reports had suggested that more Māori be spoken at home she felt the key strategy was in raising the status of the language; *I think we've got to raise the status of the language in our communities. It needs to be all around us, on all of our signs, schools need to raise the status of te reo in all of the symbols, so it's a language receptive environment [M:11:361-363].* Mereana urged for more action around te reo; *they need to be having reo Māori activities happening in schools. I'm not saying it's easy but it's initially a mind shift to the status of the importance of Māori language and what Māori culture can bring to our country to enhance not burden our current education outcomes [M:11:364-366].* The

research literature (Pihama, 1993; Smith, 1997) confirmed Mereana's pleas that in order for a positive mindshift to take place the status of te reo Māori and tikanga needed to be raised as a national priority.

Mereana challenged the current political leadership and the lack of genuine commitment to Kaupapa Māori. In her view the prime minister acknowledged positive Māori contributions only when there was political mileage to be gained. She continued to express her concern in the broader context; *This current prime minister shows absolutely no interest and in complete ignorance and his team is exactly the same and this is coming through education policy and implementation, we're on the backfoot all the time* [M:12:379-381]. Mereana felt that this lack of positive role modelling had ramifications for Māori in education and she commented that the leadership in schools needed to demonstrate recognition of Māori language and culture in meaningful ways for that message to pervade the school. Something that she believed was missing in our current government.

### **6.5.1 Summary**

Mereana acknowledged that many Pākehā leaders in schools were sincere but were struggling to generate Māori student success. In her view they failed to understand Māori burdens and the need for redress in the status of Māori to be located alongside Pākehā. She argued that the status of a Māori worldview and Māori thinking was entirely valid and not an optional consideration for educational leaders and educators in schools. Mereana's position on a Māori worldview is already validated in Kaupapa Māori theory and research that has been documented by Māori researchers (Smith, 1997; Walker, 1996). Mereana added that a key opportunity for schools and Māori communities to enhance relationships and outcomes was in raising the status of te reo Māori. She also challenged the government to show genuine commitment and positive role modelling for Māori in education, policy and implementation.

## 6.6 Māori Leader 2

*Ko Waiapu te awa, ko Hikurangi te maunga, ko Ngāti Porou te iwi,  
Taku Manawa ko Te Tai Rāwhiti, taku Manawa ko Te Tai Rāwhiti.*

Dame Dr Iritana Te Rangi Tāwhiwhirangi DNZM MBE is of Ngāti Porou, Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāpuhi, Canadian and English descent. As a passionate advocate of Māori language education Iritana has continued to work to bring te reo Māori back to generations of people through the National Kōhanga Reo movement. To date she has served as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Kōhanga Reo National Trust. She holds a life membership of the Māori Women's Welfare League and the Māori Education Trust. In 1991 she was made a Member of the Order of the British Empire and in 2001 was appointed Companion of The New Zealand Order of Merit for services to Māori education. In 2009 she was promoted to Dame Companion of The New Zealand Order of Merit. In 2014 she was a finalist for the 2014 New Zealander of the Year Awards. As a champion of biculturalism Dame Iritana is also deeply committed to the wellbeing of whānau:

*When I'm talking whānau I'm talking about the extended whānau around the parents and their children. The parents and their children are critically important, there is an expectation that they need to be strengthened but I think we need to know that can't happen without the support of the extended whānau [I:19:618-620].*

## 6.7 The Effectiveness of Mainstream Leadership

Iritana expressed a sense of great optimism about the future and status of Māori in education. She felt there were many examples of good leaders from the Ministry of Education who were sincere in their desire to support Māori in education and who wanted to find ways so that Māori might be better engaged in their children's learning. However, she had some regrets about the past and particularly the way in which Māori had been immersed in an education system that was not responsive to their needs and aspirations; *I think we've been working in a system that has embedded us in practices that they mean well but unfortunately our people haven't really felt comfortable in the mainstream education [I:1:6-8]* The research literature (Ministry of Education, 2007) confirmed Iritana's view of Māori 'discomfit' in mainstream and recognised the inequitable education outcomes for Māori

that were still prevalent in the education system (Bishop, Berryman & Richardson, 2002; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Durie, 2005).

Iritana recalled in 1949 how she struggled to cope with the demands of teaching a class of 30 children in her community. She sought the help and support of the parents to come into the school to assist her with teaching the children. The parents were initially reluctant and had to be convinced of their own potential. However, over time the parents arrived at the school and watched then gradually they were drawn in. Nine months later they were involved with their children's learning and they loved it. To this day Iritana has maintained the importance of parents and whānau being involved in the education of their children. In her experience when the professionals do not see Māori parents in schools they mistakenly think that Māori parents are not interested in the education of their children. In addition she believed that schools, teachers and principals had to recognise the value of the role that parents and whānau played in the education of their children. She suggested that it was time that those schools made a conscious effort to show interest and to involve the parents and whānau in their children's learning. Her position resonated with Kaupapa Māori theories that challenged the dominance of Pākehā structures in favour of a system that fulfilled Māori interests in education (Smith, 1997). As well, it exemplified the Kaupapa Māori values of whanaungatanga that ensured strong kinship and family relationships that were reinforced through whakapapa and belonging to the collective (Katene, 2010; Mead et al., 2006). The research literature (Hynds et al., 2014) also confirmed Iritana's views that Māori whānau still reported feelings of disconnect with schools and the current leadership in schools. This issue remained a barrier to further developments in supporting Māori students in secondary schools.

Iritana felt that schools had to change the way they operated. She stated that schools had failed to recognise that Māori children came from a huge extended whānau base and this base needed to be tapped. In terms of educational change she had observed how the people who were controlling education were prone to resist change. The ongoing issues of power and control over Māori in education continue to stifle Māori aspirations in education and act as barriers to Māori potential (Bishop, 2005; Smith, 1992, 1997, 2003); *they still don't get it because the system is so embedded, if you're going to change*

*something and the people who are holding the systems, batten down the hatches and that's where the unions are right at this moment...that traps us into operating in a certain way [I:4:106-109].*

Iritana also identified another problem when attempting to bring about change and that was about a view that throwing money at education would fix education; *everybody is of the opinion that more means more money to get a better result. It doesn't but we're trapped, in schools they get in truancy officers, kids abused they get in social workers, now kids are arriving without a feed. The whole business is actually dedignifying the people who own the children [I:4:125-128].* Iritana suggested that schools, parents and whānau needed to form support hubs in each school and community. The support while voluntary would come from people known within the communities who had special qualities and who knew how to touch people's lives positively. It would operate along the same basis as that of any extended whānau and it would take time to get the necessary results. However, she was adamant that small and humble beginnings would in time bring benefits to Māori children and ease the pressures on overloaded teachers; *I feel for schools, I feel for teachers, I feel for the parents and families that are locked out and it's not intentional it's just that the system is that way. Somebody said to me, there are some parents that don't want to come or don't want to be involved. I said, you show me the parent that doesn't want to be involved and I'll show you a parent that does! [I:6:199-201].*

According to Iritana, our schools were a micro scale of society in Aotearoa and the wellbeing of this nation could be measured according to the wellbeing of our schools. She felt that it was in and through our schools that changes for the better could happen providing that we made changes to the current system. She didn't advocate getting rid of the current education schooling system altogether but she did challenge the lack of will from some to bring about change. The research literature (ERO, 2010) confirmed Iritana's ideas for change and indicated that in schools where Māori students were experiencing high levels of achievement, the school leaders and teachers were responsive to the parents' views and student aspirations and the importance of te reo Māori and tikanga. Iritana suggested the resistance came from those who were secure in their current positions; *you'll never get a disempowerment of power to empower others [I:9:277].* Iritana believed in an education system for Māori that allowed for parent involvement in key decision making and where the type of schooling available was not subjected to the

rules of the current system; *I feel rather sad because this whole idea that one system fits all. This country has got to, whether it likes it or not, has got to understand the different cultural frameworks that can work* [I:9:284-286].

### 6.7.1 Summary

Iritana felt that leaders in education were sincere in their bid to support Māori student learning but unsupportive school learning environments for Māori had caused her angst over the years. She commented on the discomfort of Māori in mainstream schools where their needs were not recognised. She had concerns about the way teacher's misread Māori parent's non-attendance at school forums suggesting they lacked interest in their children's progress. She believed that schools, teachers and principals had to actively connect with Māori whānau and the extended whānau to help break down the barriers. ERO (2010) had also identified that when schools included Māori whānau and communities through building strong relationships Māori student achievement levels improved. Iritana was very keen to see more community input and parent involvement in key decision making areas within schools. Her views were also consistent with the *Ka Hikitia* strategies to accelerate Māori success, supporting learning at a local level and actively seeking contributions from students, whānau and communities (Ministry of Education, 2013).

## 6.8 Views and Practices of Kaupapa Māori

Iritana's experience and understanding of Kaupapa Māori in its absolute interpretation is that it's about cultural mores that included whakapapa, respect for each other and the involvement of whānau. She spoke about the importance of te reo and taha wairua as being integral elements to Kaupapa Māori but it was also about how Māori living in different contexts actually expressed their tikanga of behaviour, of respect, of karakia, of whanaungatanga, of tautoko. Iritana commented that Kaupapa Māori in a Māori cultural framework could not be taken into a Pākehā education system or school: *You know I explain it to non-Māori [Pākehā] and I'm actually saying kaupapa Māori are Māori ways of behaving, ways of living, and the values, the respect, the collective responsibility, you've got them but you've got them in a [Pākehā] system that meets your [Pākehā] needs* [I:10:327-330]. She explained that with Kaupapa Māori and the way in which Māori operated Kaupapa

Māori, it did not fit a Pākehā system. The research literature (Penetito, 2010) confirmed Iritana's views that Māori needed genuine Māori based pathways in education that embraced Māori philosophy and practice.

Iritana had a great deal of faith in the principals in schools and wanted them to acknowledge the potential of all their students. The focus on realising Māori student potential is a core principle of *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013) whereby Māori students are supported to succeed and to make valuable contributions in their chosen field. This included tailoring education to meet the student's needs and improving the teacher's ability to relate to the students. She also commented on the standard of education in Aotearoa as having much more to achieve given the number of students, not only Māori students, who were just not excited by their education. She also warned that Māori institutions and organisations had to ensure they were operating according to Kaupapa Māori:

*poor old iwi you know the Trustboards, the Rūnanga, the Kōhanga, you know all we've got is a shift of the tyranny of Pākehā systems into tyranny of Māori, we're being programmed to a system that operates in that way so just because we are Māori, we think things are different they're not and all we've done is taken on the trappings of what we don't like [I:12:388-392].*

### **6.8.1 Summary**

Iritana viewed Kaupapa Māori in terms of Māori cultural mores associated with whakapapa, respect, whānau, te reo (language) and taha wairua (spirituality). More importantly for her was the context of Māori living and giving expression to the tikanga of behaviours and values that were Māori authentic. Iritana did not believe that Kaupapa Māori in a Māori cultural framework could be transferred into a Pākehā education system or school because they were Māori ways of behaving and Māori values. However she acknowledged that Pākehā had their values and practices that were equally valid and meaningful for them as Pākehā.

## 6.9 Kaupapa Māori Approaches in Mainstream Secondary Schools

Iritana's view was that leaders in mainstream schools could learn from Kaupapa Māori approaches but could not replicate these things that were intrinsically Māori. She commented on the way the current system of education that included Māori education was being crippled by siloism: *a unit for this and a unit for that and they don't talk to each other, so it's a perpetuation of a system that believes that's the only way to do things* [I:12:402-404]. She added that there needed to be more focus on people's understandings of how to build relationships and through this accord value and respect to oneself and to others. Iritana also spoke about the need for Māori to work on relationships and to renew their connections with one another because people need to feel valued. The research literature (ERO, 2010) confirmed Iritana's position on the mutual benefits that were gained when schools worked at building relationships and a culture of inclusion of parents and students in school initiatives. Furthermore, she was actualising the Kaupapa Māori principle that affirms the value of collective strength in unity (*toa takitini*) in contrast to the pursuits of the individual (*toa takitahi*).

Iritana reflected on ways to support schools and communities to be more responsive to the children in their care and for communities to be more responsive to their schools. She felt there needed to be people who were able to deal with both sides of the issues and maintain the dignity of those involved and genuinely value people's point of view. Iritana felt that principals needed to work with their teachers to provide openings for parents and communities to get involved in schools. Iritana was adamant that schools were the key to developing communities. Iritana's vision for leadership was in strong alignment with the qualities of traditional Māori leadership that served the needs of the community and inspired hope and confidence in people to meet the challenges in life (Katene, 2010, Mead et al., 2006). In her optimism she held great expectations for education systems to be set in place based on the understanding that change is necessary: *we've got to look at how are we touching people's lives and what is it that works, what can work better, we know what the issues are, we need to understand why, what are the reasons that it's not as good as it can be?* [I:17:556-558]. She felt that the education system and the professionals needed to be supported by the wider communities to address ways of enabling people in their lives.

### **6.9.1 Summary**

Iritana felt that leaders in mainstream schools could learn from Kaupapa Māori approaches to educational leadership and what was needed was an understanding of how to build relationships and how to give value and respect to oneself and to others. She spoke of the need for people to see both sides of issues and to act in good faith and in good spirit. A key opportunity for schools lay in their willingness to be open and responsive to parent and community involvement after all an education system was about enabling people.

### **6.10 Overall summary**

The two leaders identified a range of issues that were hindering the effectiveness of leadership to be more responsive to the learning and teaching of Māori students in mainstream secondary schools. They acknowledged the sincerity of leaders and educators but believed they were struggling to progress the achievement and outcomes of Māori. They suggested that mainstream leadership needed to change their deficit view of Māori students and their parents and challenge the inbuilt racism of the system and the educators who continued to hold deficit views. One of the leaders felt strongly that the lack of action to change and improve the results for Māori students was an acceptance by the leadership that Māori students were dumb.

The two leaders believed that the monopoly of power with Pākehā leadership was merely reinforcing to Māori a strong sense of inequity. It also inferred a false sense of superiority that was either accepted through and in the continuation of hegemonic practices or challenged as enacted in the Kaupapa Māori position that asserted the validity and legitimacy of Māori and the autonomy of Māori to determine their goals and future outcomes (Penetito, 2010; Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999). More community and parent involvement in schools, including decision making was one way that the system and the learning environment could become more supportive and responsive of Māori needs. Inclusive in the broad range of issues identified, the two leaders did share some optimism that people cared enough to make the changes and consider the challenges as potential opportunity to create something better.

In terms of Kaupapa Māori, the two leaders strongly believed in the authenticity of Māori living and behaving in contexts based on Māori values and thinking. They spoke of Kaupapa Māori within a Māori cultural framework that was entirely for and from a Māori worldview, which therefore could not be placed in a Pākehā setting because it did not fit a Pākehā system. They considered that Pākehā leadership could learn from Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that emphasised building and enhancing relationships and raising the status of Māori as a people, a culture and a language. However they felt that Pākehā could not use Kaupapa Māori as it was from a context that was born of Māori for Māori and accessed from within te ao Māori. However, by developing Treaty relationships for how Māori and Pākehā interact in schools it could lead the way for Māori redress of their historical and political agendas in other forums. They believed there was potential for Pākehā leadership to intervene positively to ensure successful outcomes for Māori students that could literally change their lives and our future communities. In concluding, the two Māori leaders were adamant that a commitment in terms of Treaty obligations and responsibilities from government, policy and implementation was long overdue. The next chapter discusses the impacts and consequences of decisions and praxis that converge on Māori education.

## Chapter 7 Discussion

### 7.1 Introduction

The purpose of Kaupapa Māori theories is to give body and substance to the values, principles and practice of a Māori system of thinking, being and understanding (Smith, 1997, 2003; Smith, 1999, 2000). This study aimed to identify leadership approaches in one mainstream school and one Kaupapa Māori school that staff, parents and whānau there saw as successfully encouraging teaching and learning practices that were meeting the needs of their Māori students. It also investigated the potential for a framework for Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that were adaptable for mainstream and Kaupapa Māori schools. This chapter will summarise key findings and answer the research questions, which were as follows:

1. How effective is the educational leadership in meeting the needs of Māori students in mainstream secondary schools?
2. How does the educational leadership in Kaupapa Māori secondary schools work towards meeting the needs of Māori students?
3. What Kaupapa Māori approaches to educational leadership could be used in mainstream secondary schools and Kaupapa Māori schools?

The literature review identified effective educational leadership in broad terms as consisting of professional leadership, support for learning and teaching, engaging and relating to the community and an awareness of the broader political and global influences on education (Gronn, 2003; Lingard et al., 2003). Underlying these factors were the challenges of coping with greater decentralisation, combined with increased accountability for school and student results, excessive workload pressure and increased administrative demands and difficulties in achieving a work-life balance (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Bottery, 2006; Gronn & Rawlings-Sanei, 2003; MacBeath et al., 2012; Pihama et al., 2002; Pont et al., 2008; Smith, 1990, 2003; Smith, 1999, 2006)). The research literature also supported the need for triangulation by using multiple sources of

evidence, rather than relying solely on the principal's perceptions of success, to determine the elements of successful school leadership (Mulford et al., 2007). Consequently, the findings of the case studies have been triangulated using the data from the principals, teachers and parents, with additional insights offered from the two significant educational leaders.

The case studies identified that traditional approaches to leadership that once focused on individual leaders and leadership had been superseded by an interactive and inclusive process of all members working in schools. Leadership was no longer regarded as the sole function of the principal, or any individual or group of leaders, but rather a range of activities that leaders were engaged in and interacted with others in particular contexts around specific tasks (Durie, 2001; Katene, 2010; Mead, 2006; Robinson et al., 2009; Spillane et al., 2004). Consequently, leadership in its many forms was considered far more complex than any narrowly prescribed model of one-type, adjectival leaderships such as authentic, democratic or instructional (Mulford et al., 2007). Through these interactions it was clear that people learned from the debate and the focus groups were educational. A summary of the answers to the research questions across the data gathered is presented next.

## **7.2 How Effective is Educational Leadership in meeting the needs of Māori Students in Mainstream Secondary Schools?**

Case Study 1 was primarily used to answer this question, along with insights from Case Study 2 and the educational leaders. According to the respondents in Case Study 1, the strength of their school was dependent and built on the strong leadership demonstrated by their principal. In the early years of the principal's leadership her approaches were directive and focused on lifting morale and academic results. Over the years she realised and understood that to achieve better outcomes her leadership had to include the teachers. The study confirmed the findings of previous research that the team approach worked effectively in schools as it opened up space and opportunity for teachers to assume leadership responsibilities. This effectively decentred the sole principal leadership role in the school. Furthermore it was evident that when teachers were

included in leadership roles, this strengthened the team approach to leadership (Gronn, 2000; Katene, 2010; Mead, 2006; Williams, 2010).

The teachers in Case Study 1 agreed and benefited from their principal's leadership approach that clarified their roles and responsibilities. As a result their confidence levels increased. They were more willing to ask for help and to share with colleagues. They worked collaboratively in curriculum planning and in supporting student learning outcomes. The study was consistent with previous research findings that reported leadership as a team activity where people had specific roles and responsibilities (Harris, 2003; Spillane et al., 2004; Mead 2006). The study also confirmed previous research findings that when leadership was shared and collaborative it encouraged collective action within the wider membership (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Durie, 2001, 2009, 2011; Penetito, 2010; Silins & Mulford, 2002). Furthermore it exposed teachers to new ideas, new knowledge and new opportunities to participate in different forums. The study supported previous research findings that teacher leadership encouraged ownership of the school's successes and validated the potential of all teachers to participate in school leadership. It also supported the resultant state of achieved empowerment (Harris, 2003; Smith, 1990, 1997, 2003).

In Case Study 1, the principal recognised that for change to occur she had to gain the confidence and trust of her parents and community. She sought the support of her team of teachers. They in turn felt valued by their principal. The principal's leadership approach nurtured trust and transparency. Her confidence in the teachers had positive effects on their attitudes and the community responded as they saw education improvements in their students. The findings in this Case Study confirmed extant research evidence that when the principal's actions raised teacher empowerment and shared control and decision making, as in this situation, there are strong correlations with increased levels of trust in the school's leadership (Seashore Louis, 2007). The literature on Māori leadership confirmed that the principle of trust was necessary for leadership to gain the mandate and confidence of the people to act on their collective behalf (Makereti, 1986; Mead et al., 2006). The literature in the BES (Robinson et al., 2009), *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2009, 2013) and *Te Kotahitanga* (Ministry of Education, 2008) confirmed the correlation between the principle of empowerment in

leadership and the creation of conditions that enabled others to impact positively on student achievement.

The principal's leadership approach in Case Study 1 included utilising teachers' strengths that had the flow on effect of teachers responding by working harder and taking on additional duties. This created positive effects for the students and the community. The principal's leadership approach supported teaching conditions that enhanced student learning outcomes. The principal's leadership approach also included one-on-one sessions with students. The principal's leadership approach had become more inclusive of the community and the wider region. The findings confirmed research that showed when schools and leadership adopted collaborative approaches to learning and teaching including shared visions from teachers, parents and students there were improvements in teaching practice and student success (Bishop, 2003; Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Durie, 2001, 2009; White & Wehlage, 1995). Furthermore the Kaupapa Māori strategies in *Te Kotahitanga* and *He Kākano* confirmed research that indicated improvements for Māori student achievement and teacher practice when school leadership adopted culturally responsive pedagogies (Durie, 2001, 2009; Meyer et al., 2010; Ministry of Education, 2008).

The responses of the two significant Māori women leaders highlighted gaps in the general effectiveness of other mainstream secondary school principals to understand and to give effect to their Treaty of Waitangi obligations to address Māori education disparities and the deficit theorising of Māori in the education system (Smith, 1997; Jackson, 2010). The two leaders referenced the systematic failings in the continuation of poor Māori achievement, low levels of teacher expectations of Māori to succeed and the inbuilt racism that occurred in schools (Bishop et al., 2007; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Durie, 2005; Smith, 1999). They identified the critical first step for principals to act with urgency and to make conscious efforts to involve parents and whānau in their children's learning. The two leaders theorised on the transformation and successes of Māori in education and identified the potential responsive elements of Kaupapa Māori approaches in meeting the needs of Māori students in secondary schools.

### **7.3 How does Educational Leadership in Kaupapa Māori Secondary Schools work towards meeting the needs of Māori Students?**

The principal's leadership approaches in Case Study 2 had initially been influenced by her experiences of the practices in mainstream educational leadership for all including Māori that was fragmented and unsupportive. However, she turned her attention towards more democratic and consensus based leadership that resonated with tikanga Māori and Kaupapa Māori. The motivation for this change was inspired by her commitment to serve the whānau and community. The findings in this Case Study 2 confirmed the significant role of the principal in supporting the right conditions and processes necessary for teachers in schools to facilitate student learning (Bishop, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Robinson et al., 2009).

The principal's leadership approach in Case Study 2 was based on an open door policy for students, teachers and parents. She engaged the community at all levels of the school in support of the students learning. The research confirmed previous research findings that showed improvements occurred in teacher motivation levels to lift student learning outcomes when teachers, parents and students were encouraged to interact and share their collective views (Durie, 2001; Harris, 2003; Penetito, 2010).

The principal engaged in distributive leadership in order for teachers to undertake leadership roles in their specialised areas of expertise. The teachers felt supported by her professional confidence and trust and the students gained the benefits of the shared expertise of teachers. The findings of this Case Study 2 confirmed the view that the principal's influence on student outcomes was achieved through the school's capacity to support mutual trust, respect and levels of empowerment (Bishop, 2005; Mulford et al., 2007; Smith, 1992, 2003).

The principal's leadership approach had enhanced working relationships amongst all staff and this encouraged them to collaborate and to create supportive learning and teaching spaces for students. The findings of this Case Study 2 confirmed that when teachers were encouraged and given time to collaborate over ideas concerning learning and teaching there was an overall improvement in the culture and vibe of the school (Little, 1995; Ministry of Education, 2009, 2013; Robinson et al., 2009; Seashore Louis,

Marks, & Kruse, 1996). The research also confirmed previous research findings that showed innovation flourished when the leadership in the school was collaborative as this encouraged collaboration and sharing within the wider learning and teaching environment (Bishop et al., 2005; Harris, 2003; Robinson et al., 2009; Spillane et al., 2004).

The principal's leadership approach utilised the teachers' individual strengths and this had motivated them to make the learning environments more vibrant for their students. This had resulted in ongoing positive effects on their parents and community. The study confirmed the positive impacts of teacher leadership throughout the school and indicated that where teachers were empowered in areas of priority to them student outcomes were more likely to improve (ERO, 2010; Ministry of Education, 2013, 2015; Silins & Mulford, 2002a).

The teachers reported that their principal trusted them in their ability to teach and to fulfil their responsibilities. There was also strong community support and trust in the principal's leadership. They all agreed that trust was a significant factor in their relationships and these feelings of trust permeated throughout the school. The findings of this Case Study 2 confirm the importance of trusting relationships in schools and corresponding to these relationships is the need for schools to create supportive structures and a collaborative environment that lead to improved student learning outcomes (Durie, 2001; Eastwood & Louis, 1992; Penetito, 2010; Pihama, 1993; Smith, 1997).

#### **7.4 What Kaupapa Māori Approaches to Educational Leadership could be used in Mainstream Secondary Schools / Kaupapa Māori Schools?**

The key themes that emerged from the narratives from both Case Studies and the interviews with educational leaders indicated that Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership of the learning and teaching of Māori students was grounded in tikanga Māori values and practices of specific iwi, cultural identity, whanaungatanga and family

relationships. These findings are consistent with Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership:

- That advocate for Māori to have ready access to the Māori world of language, culture, tikanga, whānau and resources (Durie, 2001);
- That subscribe to an authentic Māori education system emanating from te ao Māori and all the essential qualities of wairua, te reo and whakapapa (Penetito, 2010);
- That allow Māori to view the world from a position of authority and reinforce positively identity as Māori (Mead, 2012);
- That affirm the empowerment of Māori to undo colonial ideologies and patriarchal hegemonies (Hutchings, 2002);
- That recognise Māori knowledge is valid, that being Māori is coupled with being educated in Māori cultural traditions, language and values;
- That a Māori worldview is part of everyday life and specific Māori contexts (Graham, 2009); and,
- That validate Māori cultural ways of knowing, Māori knowledge bases, Māori rights as tangata whenua and positive qualities of Kaupapa Māori approaches of transformation and conscientisation of Māori in education (Pihama, 1993; Smith, 1997, 2003; Smith, 1999, 2006).

Kaupapa Māori approaches to educational leadership described in the case studies were both Māori and iwi-centered and included Māori epistemology, iwi specific knowledge, history, behaviours and practices. There were significant cultural nuances that framed the pedagogies and that were also part of the learning content and passed on to students. These nuances not only influenced the environment but also prepared students to grow as citizens of their iwi, their hapū, their whānau and over time, as repositories of that heritage. To maintain integrity Kaupapa Māori approaches to educational leadership needed to be observed in all domains including the school and wider community. Case Study 2 was also centred according to modern contemporary constructs of pan-tribalism or urban Māori, both were essentially Māori-centred, one was more iwi-centred than the other and the other was essentially pan-tribally centred. The Case Studies confirmed the actions of Māori collectively asserting their authority and achievement of political, social, economic and cultural wellbeing (Smith, 1997;

Smith, 1999), and more specifically, of gaining iwi sovereignty, iwi identity and iwi knowledge (Tamati, 2007) in their idiosyncratic ways.

Kaupapa Māori approaches to educational leadership consisted of values and practices associated with manaaki tangata where people were treated with respect and kindness. This included holistic practices in learning and teaching and placing the wellbeing of the child and the whānau at the centre of learning. This translated into the school being open for the community to take part in raising and educating their children. The success of the children's education was regarded as significant and that ultimately provided longer term benefits for whānau health and wellbeing. These practices confirmed research which has identified the importance in school leadership of relationships between people, place and identity (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005) as part of school leadership.

Kaupapa Māori approaches to educational leadership were practices that enhanced collective group wellbeing over individual preferences. The success of the students was dependent on the support they received from the whānau and the collective group they were part of. Kaupapa Māori in this context relied on trust in one another and the acceptance of service to others and acts of reciprocity. The study confirmed the important principle of service in Kaupapa Māori approaches where the concept of giving and receiving and acts of service to others was accepted and confirmed by the wider collective (Jones et al., 2010; Mead et al., 2006; Smith, 1999; Williams, 2010).

Kaupapa Māori approaches also embraced the concept of cultural identity as critical in supporting the success of students at school. The students who had strong identities were more likely to be successful at school. As a result cultural identity was valued and reinforced through positive interactions, relationships and affirmations. The case studies and the interviews with educational leaders confirmed the need for learning environments that reflect Māori cultural values and practices to support the students' cultural self esteem and Māori identity. The converse was considered by most participants to exacerbate disconnection and that children struggled to fit in mainstream education (Bishop et al., 2007; Durie, 2005).

Kaupapa Māori was also based on family processes of whanaungatanga, kinship ties and obligations to one another. The acknowledgement of participatory connection is identified in the Kaupapa Māori interview method of collaborative storying where the participants work together with one another and with the researcher to construct meaning and interpretation of their collective experiences (Bishop, 1996). This form of storying assists in the process of drawing out the participants accounts of significant events. When the school had knowledge of the students' whānau the relationships between the school and the community were strengthened. These were so important for students who were born away from their ancestral and iwi homelands. In these situations there were obligations on the school to help reconnect students with their iwi as part of the goal for Māori succeeding in education in both mainstream and Māori pathways. The goal of reconnecting Māori with their cultural heritage is consistent with *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education, 2013) to ensure that Māori students gain the skills and knowledge they need to succeed and to take pride in their identity as Māori. The research confirmed the significance of these responsibilities in order to ensure the survival of cultural heritage and cultural affirmation (Meredith, 2000; Tamihere, 1998).

Kaupapa Māori approaches to educational leadership provided students with real life learning experiences from within their community through direct contact with their own kapa haka experts, ta moko artists, role models and leaders. The linking of education to the physical and cultural environment of the student learner is significant as it enriches the educational experiences for students and provides insights into how traditional indigenous ways of learning and knowing can support educational processes for students (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005). The research confirmed the value of localised learning in developing positive relationships within the community and iwi, and in affirming the students' sense of place and belonging (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005; Penetito, 2009, 2010).

Finally, Kaupapa Māori held fast to traditional Māori teachings while making full use of the tools available in the modern world and still retained a spiritual pathway in life. These approaches were regarded as timeless and continually relevant in people's lives today. Māori are using the past to understand the present and to prepare for the future. The traditional concepts of Māori society are working simultaneously alongside their

contemporary interpretations to develop and safeguard the future generations of Māori. The research confirmed the importance of these approaches in ensuring the survival and revitalisation of Māori as a people, as the tangata whenua and as a cultural and political entity indigenous to this land and accessing the global world beyond (Durie, 2001; Mead et al., 2006, 2012; Ngata as cited in Sorrenson, 1986; Walker, 1990).

## **7.5 Implications for Educational Leadership**

Historically, the formation of Kaupapa Māori theories and praxis had originated in responses and retaliation to an educational crisis in Māori education and from a drive in the movement of Māori to ensure the survival of Māori knowledge and Māori language (Smith, 1997, 2003; Smith, 1999). As an educational intervention Kaupapa Māori theories began with the strategy of challenging narrow Eurocentric views that dominated the face and fabric of New Zealand's education system for Māori in aspects of pedagogy, curriculum and evaluation (Smith, 1997, 2003; Smith, 1999). However, as a sustained process of intervention Kaupapa Māori moved beyond education per se to undermine at the institutional levels matters of economics, power, ideology and democracy (Pihama, 1993; Smith, 1997).

This study has highlighted the commitment by Māori to have increased control over their own lives and cultural well-being. Māori are clearly and capably organising the content and context for learning in their schools and exercising greater autonomy over key decision-making in administration, curriculum, pedagogy and Māori cultural aspirations. In 2015, secondary school education in Aotearoa New Zealand has the power and potential to transform the lives and experiences of young Māori students so that they are able to enjoy success as learners and as Māori (Ministry of Education, 2007, 2013, 2015). The study identified the important effects of principal leadership in supporting and advocating affirmative practices which were significant in assisting teachers to enhance the success of Māori students. For their part principals needed to gauge the critical role they play in leading the school and more significantly in understanding the impact teachers can have on Māori student attitudes and levels of achievement in secondary education. They needed to give genuine effect to their Treaty of Waitangi obligations to address Māori education disparities and the deficit theorising of Māori in the education system (*Te Kotahitanga*, Bishop, 2003; Hui Taumata, Durie,

2001; *Ka Hikitia*, Ministry of Education, 2013; McGrath, 2014). The findings in relation to the question or proposition of Kaupapa Māori being utilised, shared or taught in all schools is negated and based on the premise that Kaupapa Māori in a Māori cultural framework could not be taken into a Pākehā education system or school. The implication being that more Kaupapa Māori schools be established to provide for the education of Māori students and that all Māori students in mainstream have the option to transfer.

The findings of this study challenge mainstream principals to decentre leadership in schools and open up space and opportunity for collective leadership and groups of individuals to work in a team approach to leadership. Leadership has to be inclusive of teachers and teacher leadership that validates the potential of teachers to participate in leadership. This approach would enable all the team to take full ownership of the school and its possibilities to build students success (*Ka Hikitia*, Ministry of Education, 2013; Mulford et al., 2007; Robinson et al., 2009).

The study identifies that mainstream principals and teachers need to work hard to gain the parents and community's trust and support. When the community was part of the team and standing on the inside with the principal and teachers the trust was more forthcoming. Sharing the power of control and decision making has the potential to enhance confidence and performance that could lead to student improvements (ERO, 2010; Hattie, 2003; *Ka Hikitia*, Ministry of Education, 2013; McGrath, 2014; Waitere, 2008).

Finally, the study illuminated that mainstream principals can build supportive relationships with their teachers to encourage them to create supportive learning for students. This requires principals with vision to give teachers time and opportunity to think about education and learning and to let teachers share ideas with one another towards improving student learning and to developing innovation in schools (Bishop et al., 2009; Harris, 2003; Meyer et al., 2010; Spillane et al., 2004).

## 7.6 Strengths and Weaknesses of Methodology

The strengths of the methodology lie within the principles of Kaupapa Māori approaches to research that provide Māori researchers both the scope and flexibility to establish the priorities and practices of research that are initiated and led by Māori. More importantly, the research is inclusive of Māori and ultimately for the benefit of Māori (L. T. Smith, 2006); about Māori, by Māori, for Māori. Thus the Kaupapa Māori approaches that underpinned the design of this qualitative study and combined with case study methodology has enabled the capture of in depth data from both individuals and case studies to help answer the research questions. A further strength was in the shared understandings between the researcher and the research respondents in respect to Kaupapa Māori that was and remains inclusive of Māori paradigms, cultural beliefs and values, histories and experiences under colonialism and post colonialism, Western forms of education and economics and Māori aspirations in the global world today.

The protocols of Kaupapa Māori ensured that all the research participants involved in the research were guided by the tikanga practice of reciprocity, which required for instance, 'utu' with the respondents who had contributed their knowledge and experience to the research study (Jones et al., 2010; Smith, 1999, 2006). The conduct of the researcher was also informed by this methodology as it required engagement in genuine respectful behaviours and sharing of processes, knowledge and power over the control of the research. There was also a critical element of evolving theory of transformation and conscientisation of Māori in education, which was confirmed by participants in the interviews and focus groups.

The case study approaches helped to generate a sense of the connectedness and relevance of the lived experiences that the respondents brought to the research process and inquiry. This approach enabled the exploration of the case studies' different realities and complexities in a natural context and contributed to a deeper awareness of the events and phenomena that were taking place in the school and wider community environment. This helped to stimulate a better appreciation of the issues through the complementary approach of working and involving multiple case studies. The triangulation of the data collected certainly confirmed a degree of accord and consistency in the findings that helped counteract any threats to the validity of data

taken from individual respondents (Berg, 2001; Bowling, 1997; Patton, 1990; Polit & Hungler, 1995).

The weaknesses are predictable in that the use of smaller samples have limited the degree to which generalised conclusions can be drawn. A broader scope in the sample and research design could have allowed for more comprehensive data to be collected, with potentially more generalisability. Furthermore there may be quite different perceptions on the place of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership in secondary schools had the sample been taken from other schools or other regions which may have significantly changed the research findings. The importance of securing the agreement of participants in the study was a valuable lesson when after a long period of time neither the parents nor the teachers from one school had responded to my invitations to participate in the study. When this happened I also learned the upside of Kaupapa Māori research, and that is others will step in to support if the research and the researcher are genuine and committed to the overall Kaupapa Māori goal of improving and empowering Māori. This is one of the most significant strengths of this research approach.

## **7.7 Further Research**

The research has woven together some of the threads of Kaupapa Māori; Kaupapa Māori approaches to research, to education, in research methodology and kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership in secondary schools. Kaupapa Maori has revealed the depth of thinking and compassion that the research respondents have relied on to sustain generations of mokopuna navigating within an education system that has struggled to make important connections. The significant lesson to be taken from the research findings is that Kaupapa Māori is more than the outward showing of Māori cultural activities, for at a deeper level they are intrinsically rooted and woven within the principles, behaviours and practices of Māori values (Mead et al., 2006, 2012; Walker, 1990).

Future research should focus on specific studies on leadership in order to address research questions and concerns emerging from the findings of this study. The question of how the leadership in secondary schools could be more inclusive of whānau and the

wider community of hapū and iwi relates to the issue of Māori disconnect with schools and the leadership in schools, and the potential barrier this poses to supporting Māori students. Further concerns focus on the issue of creating culturally appropriate relations and classroom learning contexts, where little or no data has been gathered specifically on Māori students to help inform the development. In addition the concerns propose further research on the preparedness of all educators to recognise their professional responsibility to provide a learning environment to promote Māori student success.

Concern at the lack of support for Māori language and culture continues as Māori whānau report the struggle for Māori students to be both Māori and high achievers. Studies will need to focus on building relationships between schools and the Māori community and on ways for improving information sharing and strategies for more effective engagement with Māori whānau. Within the shared strategies the work will need to include Treaty of Waitangi obligations for partnership, participation and protection. The underlying issue emerging for future leadership studies poses the ultimate question of what cultural leadership mainstream principals are capable of demonstrating in support of the Māori students in their schools. The final chapter summarises and draws on the potential pathways forward for Māori in education through Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership in secondary schools.

## Chapter 8 Summary and Conclusions

### 8.1 Summary

This study began with an introduction and statement of purpose to investigate Kaupapa Māori approaches to thinking about and practising leadership for improving the education of Māori students in mainstream secondary schools and Kaupapa Māori schools in Aotearoa New Zealand. The aim was to assist secondary school principals and teachers to foster an environment to facilitate more appropriately and in Māori terms, the learning and teaching of Māori students and in doing so, address the prevailing negative educational outcomes that result for many Māori students.

The causes of the discrepancy in the educational performance between Māori and non-Māori have been argued from two different perspectives: one was from that of the adverse effects of colonisation often resulting in institutional racism; the second perspective was one that acknowledged the socio-economic disparities between Māori and other non-Māori. The literature from Māori researchers maintained that colonisation had caused negative impacts on Māori and this disadvantage was prevalent in the education system and curriculum that was taught. Furthermore, the education system had been negligent in its recognition of cultural differences between Māori and non-Māori that included differing world-views, pedagogical practices, contrasting styles of cognition and learning environments that did not reflect Māori cultural values and beliefs. Consequently, Māori students experienced low levels of self esteem, cultural esteem and identity as Māori. This problem was exacerbated in mainstream education where many Māori students are disconnected from both their Māori cultural roots, as in the case of multiple generations of urban Māori migrants, while also disenfranchised from their identities; instead, consumed by the dominant culture of the school.

The problem lay with Māori education being rooted firmly within the Pākehā system of mainstream education and subjected to the power inherent in the pedagogic structures of the mainstream. However, as the study evolved, what emerged from the respondents were quite unique experiences and understandings of multiple *approaches to Kaupapa Māori*

in a broader sense, rather than one exclusive form of a Kaupapa Māori approach, which in itself was an act of transformation from the theory to the living. The diversity of multiple Māori worldviews across different iwi was clearly reason why a Māori worldview could not be seen as a singular, universal concept. Uniquenesses across iwi helped to explain their own existential explanations of the world and as such served to promote and reinforce iwi identity and knowledge. The important point here is that the different understandings and interpretations are in alignment as Māori become more empowered in their explorations into their own existence and dimensions of their ao Māori.

The Aotearoa New Zealand literature reported that achievement improved when teachers had positive relationships with Māori students and when principals demonstrated professional leadership in relation to learning and teaching and participated in the professional development alongside their staff. As well, leadership was seen to be positional and distributive, highly fluid and embedded in specific tasks and situations. It included leadership that influenced people to think and act differently where sound and effective educational leadership resulted in change and improved outcomes for all students. The notion of leadership by influence was compatible with Māori pedagogy and Kaupapa Māori approaches to educational leadership. Furthermore, the literature recognised that Māori educational leaders had additional expectations placed on them to improve achievement outcomes and the cultural, social and wider aspirations of their Māori communities.

In order to promote Māori student achievement and success, educational leadership in schools had to recognise their professional responsibility to provide a supportive and responsive learning environment. The importance of principals, school leaders and teachers developing their relationships with Māori students, parents and whānau resonated throughout the literature. There was still whānau Māori disconnect with schools and the leadership in some schools remained a barrier to further developments in supporting Māori students in secondary schools. The risk of deficit theorising was a clear warning signal for schools to focus on enhancing capability to provide culturally responsive schooling for Māori. The current situation indicated that secondary schools needed further support to assist Māori students to achieve educational success as

students, learners and as Māori. The international literature identified effective educational leadership as consistent with professional leadership, support for learning and teaching, engaging and relating to the community and an awareness of the broader political and global influences on education.

The present study identified professional leadership in both Case Study 1 (CS1) and Case Study 2 (CS2) schools in terms of a shared team approach that included the principal and other members of staff taking on lead roles and key decision making functions across the school. Furthermore, in both CS1 and CS2 the presence of collegial trust and working within a collaborative environment gave teachers the time and place for teaching and meeting the needs of their students. The principal leaders worked to the strengths of the teachers and created a school climate that affirmed the value of teachers, students and parents in the wider community. Teachers were encouraged to create vibrant learning opportunities for students that embraced the community as a whole. Community engagement played a significant role in transforming outcomes for students and parents and whānau were actively encouraged to play their part alongside the teachers and the school. The principal and teacher respondents accepted the huge expectations placed on them because they rated service to community and students of key importance in order to achieve the best possible outcomes. The results of this study were consistent with the research on what constitutes effective leadership.

Table 8.4. Leadership approaches identified as meeting the needs of Māori students:

CS1	
Inclusive of teachers/team approach	Share information/new knowledge
Involve culturally responsive pedagogies	Prioritise student learning/achievement
Share visions/teachers/parents/students	Interact with parents and community
Collaborative/professional conversations	Share ownership of student learning
Develop empowering relationships	Clarify roles and responsibilities
Utilise teacher strengths	Prioritise curriculum and resourcing
Nurture trust and transparency	

Table 8.5. Leadership approaches identified as meeting the needs of Māori students:

CS2	
Democratic consensus based	Engage the community at all levels
Consistent with tikanga Māori	Prioritise student learning
Commitment to serve community	Prioritise communication at all levels
Work collaboratively	Build positive relationships
Nurture trusting relationships	Utilise teacher leadership and expertise
Build supportive environments	

The purpose of this study was twofold; one, to contribute to the transformation of Māori in education by contributing to the ongoing discourse on Māori pedagogies, with the aim of informing and adding to the research that has already been established. Secondly, the purpose was to inform practice in mainstream and Kaupapa Māori secondary schools nurturing Māori educational success for all Māori students. The study identifies that the features of leadership that are likely to work in mainstream schools are those that firstly act upon and give effect to the aspirations and conscientisation of Māori as whānau, hapū and iwi to flourish in the education system of their choice. Furthermore, while the study investigated and developed a Framework for Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership the assumption that they could be adapted for mainstream schools was challenged. *Kua takoto te mānuka (The challenge has been laid down).*

The study identified that a Kaupapa Māori Framework comprised of principles that were both Māori-centred and iwi-centred and were grounded in tikanga Māori values and practices. These principles affirmed the significance of iwi specific identity, knowledge, history, behaviours and practices. They also affirmed the way in which cultural nuances shaped the pedagogies, learning content and learning environments. Thus developing students as citizens of their iwi, hapū, whānau and in time to be the repositories of their heritage. Prioritised in accordance within the values and practices were whanaungatanga relationships, kanohe kitea, manaakitanga, trust, reciprocity and service to others. Located at the core were the students and whānau who were embraced and strengthened in cultural self-esteem, cultural identity and learning success. These helped to achieve acts of transformation that affirmed students' sense of place

and identity, enhanced positive relationships with community and iwi, shared responsibilities for educating students, asserting iwi sovereignty, authority and idiosyncrasies. Ultimately ensuring the survival of Māori traditions and language in a contemporary global world.

Table 8.6. A Kaupapa Māori Framework

Principles	Māori-centered/including urban Māori Iwi-centred/including pan-tribal/urban Māori Grounded in tikanga Māori values/practices
Affirm	Iwi specific identity/knowledge/history/behaviours/practices Pedagogies/learning content/learning environments shaped by cultural nuances Developing students as citizens of their iwi/hapū/whānau and in time repositories of their heritage
Prioritise Values Practices	Whanaungatanga/relationships prioritised <i>Kanohi kītea</i> - the face seen regularly around the school and wider community Manaakitanga/acts of kindness/respectful in behaviour Acts of trust / reciprocity / service
Locating at the core Students Whānau	Embrace cultural self-esteem/cultural identity/student success Strengthen cultural self-esteem/cultural identity/student success
Achieve Transformation	Affirming students' sense of place and belonging Enhanced positive relationships with community/iwi Shared responsibilities in educating the students Iwi sovereignty/iwi authority/iwi idiosyncrasies Survival of Māori traditions/language in a contemporary context

Implicit in this transformation for all Māori is the ability of leadership to make that critical mindshift towards understanding the value of nurturing relationships with Māori whānau, hapū, iwi, communities in order to talk honestly about the things that have happened to Māori in the name of education and what really matters now and for the future. Furthermore, when leadership is respectful and open to the different realities that Māori bring to the relationship, Māori are validated and more comfortable to participate in the school environment. Closely aligned to this level of engagement is trust leadership that can help the school to establish rapport with Māori and engage at all levels of the community. The overarching leadership framework for Māori students necessitates a sharing leadership that is inclusive of shared decision making, shared visions and shared control involving all the members of the school and the community. When coupled with team leadership there is opportunity for teacher leadership, collaborative actions and supporting learning and teaching conditions that link back to improving outcomes for Māori. The leadership of empowerment should be embraced and interwoven into the educational and cultural dynamics of the school in order to nurture the collective wellbeing of all its members.

## **8.2 Conclusions**

Māori students are the mokopuna of Māori, tipuna Māori whose cultural traditions and beliefs have been passed on from generation to generation and that have ultimately shaped what this thesis has framed as Kaupapa Māori. They literally wear the imprints of esteemed ancestors in the skin on their faces. They carry the traits of both the living and the dead. Māori are the tangata whenua of Aotearoa New Zealand and as such belong to a history and whakapapa that enables them to claim descendancy to tribal leaders, mythical demi-gods and Atua Māori (Māori gods) that exist to cover all forms of life and beyond, into the underworld. They are taonga tuku iho (treasures of our heritage) the precious heirlooms handed on from a proud heritage. Yet too many of these students have a record of poor academic results and are in schools and communities that can do better. Instead, they should be being immersed in learning and teaching environments that receive them with the full understanding of who they are and who they carry alongside them, whether it be in their facial features, their physical

attributes, their intellectual gifts, cultural practices, values and beliefs or in the baggage they also carry that comes of life's struggles and inequities.

The role of Māori educational leadership in secondary schools has become increasingly significant for creating the changes and the rongoa, which is a form of traditional healing, needed to carry Māori students forward in education. Many have learnt from the experience of working in mainstream and are now comfortably placed in Kaupapa Māori schools where the leadership approaches are grounded explicitly in Kaupapa Māori, framed by tikanga Māori. In comparison to others, Māori students in these Kaupapa Māori schools are better placed and perhaps privileged to be embraced in a Māori environment that supports the teachers and the students in a reciprocal learning and teaching dynamic, and is open for the community to be involved. The practice of sharing in educational leadership in the context of Kaupapa Māori schools has to be couched within values and practices of service, consensus and relationships so that people fully understand how to use power responsibly on behalf of others and themselves. In order for educational leadership in mainstream to take Māori students forward there has to be a shift in the powerbase where Pākehā principals make legitimate space for Māori principal leadership and Māori teacher leadership and start sharing control of the education of Māori students. As well, Māori as a collective have to step in and reclaim some of this space if they are to assert their rightful place and offer their contributions as whānau, hapū and iwi towards the education of the growing generations.

The majority of principals, teachers and education leaders in mainstream secondary schools are not Māori and neither do they share the cultural traditions or historical foundations of their Māori students. However, the responsibility of leadership places the onus on them to develop their knowledge and understanding of Māori society and the effects of colonisation on Māori students and on the perceptions of mainstream New Zealanders on Māori as a group. The politics of disempowerment and social and economic alienation still sit firmly on top of too many Māori. Restoration has to start across and through the leadership band in schools to bring back a strong sense of belonging and place and status to Māori students and their whānau. Educational leaders in schools need to acknowledge that they are not capable nor are they expected to create

these changes alone and for this reason they must accept and ask that the leadership in Māori communities and in Māori education step up and give support.

Through the voices and narratives of the participants the thesis captures the authentic experiences and insights of how educational leadership is contextualised and understood through Māori views of the world and our place within it. The thesis makes a significant contribution to our understanding and our knowledge as researchers about the critical factors involved in creating successful educational leadership and educational outcomes for Māori students in secondary schools in Aotearoa New Zealand. It will hopefully inspire researchers to undertake further research to address the myriad of challenges that have been revealed by the participants and seek to find better outcomes for Māori communities across the nation.

*E kore au e ngaro, he kākano i ruia mai i Rangiatea:*

*The seed has been sown and each succeeding generation will continue to cultivate that garden.*

*Tihei mauriora!*

## References

- Allen, B. L., Grudens-Schuck, N., & Larson, K. (2004). Good intentions, muddled methods: Focus on focus groups. *Journal of Extension, 42*(4), 1-3. Retrieved from <http://www.joe.org/joe/2004august/tt1.php>
- Alton-Lee, A. (2003). *Quality teaching for diverse students in schooling: Best evidence synthesis*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1998). You can drag a horse to water but you can't make it drink unless it is thirsty. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*(1), 4-17.
- Ball, S. J. (1998). Educational studies, policy entrepreneurship and social theory. In R. Slee, G. Weiner & S. Tomlinson (Eds.), *School Effectiveness for Whom?* (pp. 1524-1539). London: Falmer.
- Barbour, R (2007). *Doing focus groups*. London: Sage.
- Barnes, A. M., Taiapa, K., Borell, B., & McCreanor, T. (2013). Māori Experiences And Responses To Racism In Aotearoa New Zealand. *MAI Journal, 2*. Retrieved from <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz>
- Barnhardt, R., & Kawagley, A. O. (2005). Indigenous Knowledge Systems/Alaska Native ways of knowing. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 36*(1), 8-23.
- Battiste, M. (2005). Leadership and Aboriginal education in contemporary education: Narratives of cognitive imperialism reconciling with decolonization. In J. Collard & C. Reynolds (Eds.), *Leadership, gender & culture in education* (pp. 150-156). Maidenhead, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Beaulieu, D. (2008). Native American education research and policy development in an era of No Child Left Behind: Native language and culture during the administrations of Presidents Clinton and Bush. *Journal of American Indian Education, 47*(1), 10-45.

- Bennett, S. (2002, December). *Cultural identity and academic achievement among Māori undergraduate university students*. Paper presented at the National Māori Graduates of Psychology Symposium, 29-30 November 2002, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for Social Sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1976). Implementation of educational innovations. *The Educational Forum*, 40(3), 345-370.
- Bevan-Brown, J. (2001). Evaluating special education services for learners from ethnically diverse groups: getting it right. *The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 26(3), 138-147.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R. (1998a). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A Māori approach to creating knowledge. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(2), 28-44.
- Bishop, R. (1998b). Examples of culturally specific research practices: A response to Tillman and Lopez. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(3), 419-434.
- 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. (2005). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: a Kaupapa Māori approach to creating knowledge. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 109-138). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2007). *Te kotahitanga phase 3 whanaungatanga: Establishing a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations in mainstream secondary school classrooms*. (Report to the Ministry of Education). Wellington: Ministry of Education.

- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2009). Te Kotahitanga: Addressing Educational Disparities Facing Maori Students in New Zealand. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 25(5), 734-742.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., & Richardson, C. (2002). Te Toi Huarewa: Effective teaching and learning in total immersion Māori language educational settings. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26(1), 44-61.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S., & Richardson, C. (2003). *Te Kotahitanga: The Experiences of Year 9 and 10 Māori Students in Mainstream Classrooms. Report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1994). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Blackmore, J. (2005). The emperor has no clothes: Professionalism, performativity and educational leadership in high-risk postmodern times. In J. Collard & C. Reynolds (Eds.), *Leadership, gender & culture* (pp. 173-194). Maidenhead, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Boddy, C. (2005). A rose by any other name may smell as sweet but “group discussion” is not another name for a “focus group” nor should it be. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 8(3), 248-255.
- Bottery, M. (2004). *The challenges of educational leadership*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Bottery, M. (2006). Education and globalization: redefining the role of the educational professional. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 95-113.
- Bottery, M. (2007). Reports from the front line: English headteachers’ work in an era of practice centralization. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(1), 89-110.

- Bourdieu, P. (2004). The forms of capital. In S. Ball (Ed.), *The Routledge Falmer reader in sociology of education* (15-29). London: Routledge.
- Bowling, A. (1997). *Research methods in health, investigating health and health services*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership*, 60(6), 41-44.
- Buck, P. (1977 [1949]). *The Coming of the Māori*. Wellington: Whitcoulls, Māori Purposes Fund Board.
- Buckmiller, T. (2015). Seagulls and Eagles. *Journal of School Leadership*, 25(5), 876-898.
- Butler, S. (1996). Child protection or professional self-preservation by the baby nurses? Public health nurses and child protection in Ireland. *Social Science and Medicine*, 43(3), 303-314.
- Calderón, J. L. (2011). How-to data collection series: The evolution of the focused discussion group: From non-participant to one of the crew. *The Qualitative Report*, 16(1), 308-311. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR16-1/calderon.pdf>
- Chapple, S., Jefferies, R., & Walker, R. (1997). *Māori participation and performance in education. A literature review and research programme*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Chapple, S. (2000). Māori socio-economic disparity. *Political Science*, 52(2), 101-115.
- Clarks, J., & Newman, J. (1997). *The managerial state: Power, politics and ideology in the remaking of social welfare*. London: Sage.
- Codd, J. (2004). Export education and the commercialisation of public education in New Zealand. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 13, 21-41

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Cosner, S. (2010). Drawing on a knowledge-based trust perspective to examine and conceptualize within-school trust development by principals. *Journal of School Leadership, 20*(2), 117-44.
- Crabtree, B. F., & Miller, W. L. (1992). *Doing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cram, F. (2001). Rangahau Māori: Tona tika, tona pono – The validity and integrity of Māori research. In M. Tolich, *Research ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 35-52). Auckland: Pearson Education.
- Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspectives in the research process*. Sydney, NSW: Allen and Unwin.
- Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Huby, G., Avery, A., & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 11*(100), 1-9.
- Del Rio-Roberts, M. (2011). How I learned to conduct focus groups. *The Qualitative Report, 16*(1), 312-315. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR16-1/rioroberts.pdf>
- Denscombe, M. (2003). *The good research guide: For small-scale social research projects* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., & Smith, L. T. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of critical Indigenous methodologies*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Derrington, M. L., & Angelle, P. S. (2013). Teacher leadership and collective efficacy: Connections and links. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership, 4*(1), 1-13.
- Donaldson, G. A., Jr. (2007). What do teachers bring to leadership? *Educational Leadership, 65*(1), 26-29.
- Duncan, G. J., Yeung, W. J., Brooks-Gunn, J., & Smith, J. R. (1998). How much does childhood poverty affect the life chances of children? *American Sociological Review, 63*(3), 406-423.

- Durie, M. H. (1994). *Whaiora*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. H. (2001, February). *Hui Taumata Mātauranga*, Paper presented at the first Hui Taumata Mātauranga for Māori education (pp. 1-12). Turangi and Taupo, New Zealand, 23-25 February 2001.
- Durie, M. (2005). *Ngā Tai Matatū: Tides of Māori endurance*. Melbourne, Vic.: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2009, June). *Towards Social Cohesion: The Indigenisation of Higher Education In New Zealand*. Paper presented at the Vice-Chancellors' Forum (VCF2009) How Far Are Universities Changing and Shaping Our World, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 15-19 June 2009.
- Durie, M. (2011). *Ngā tini whetū: navigating Māori futures*. Wellington: Huia.
- Durie, M. (2012). Kaupapa Māori : Shifting the social. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 21-29.
- Eastwood, K., & Louis, K. (1992). Restructuring that lasts: managing the performance dip. *Journal of School Leadership*, 2(2), 213-224.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-24.
- Education Review Office (2010). *Promoting Success for Māori Students: Schools' Progress*. Wellington: Education Review Office.
- Education Review Office (2010). *Tolaga Bay Area School Education Review*. Wellington: Education Review Office.
- Education Review Office (2012). *Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae Education Review*. Wellington: Education Review Office.
- Education Review Office (2012). *The New Zealand Curriculum Principles: Foundations for Curriculum Decision-Making*. Wellington: Education Review Office.
- Education Review Office (2013). *Tolaga Bay Area School Education Review*. Wellington: Education Review Office.

- Education Review Office (2015). *2014/15 Annual Report*. Wellington: Education Review Office.
- Ezzy, D. (2002). *Qualitative analysis: Practice and innovation*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Fergusson, D. M., Lloyd, M., & Horwood, L. J. (1991). Family ethnicity, social background and scholastic achievement-An eleven year longitudinal study of a sample of Christchurch born children. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 26(1), 49-63.
- Fergusson, D. M., & Woodward, L. J. (2000). Family socio-economic status at birth and rates of university participation. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 35(1), 25-36.
- Fitzsimons, P., & Smith, G. (2000). Philosophy and Indigenous cultural transformation. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 32(1), 25-34.
- Franz, N. K. (2011). The unfocused focus group: Benefit or bane? *The Qualitative Report*, 16(5), 1380-1388. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR16-5/franz.pdf>
- Frawley, J., & Fasoli, L. (2012). Working together: intercultural leadership capabilities for both-ways education. *School Leadership & Management*, 32(4), 309-320.
- Freeman-Moir, J. (1997). State and education across half a century. In C. Rudd & B. Roper (Eds), *The political economy of New Zealand* (pp. 202-219). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Fullan, M. (1982). *The meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. (2004). *The moral imperatives of school leadership*. London: SAGE.
- Galletta, A. (2013). *Mastering the semi-structured interview and beyond: From research design to analysis and publication*. New York: New York University Press.
- Gifford, H. & Boulton, A. (2013). 'Capacity and the Cusp': Māori academic leadership in an iwi development setting. In P. Whitinui, M. Glover & D. Hikuroa (Eds.), *Arai Mai he Tētēkura-Visioning our futures: New and emerging pathways of Māori academic leadership* (pp: 53-65). Dunedin: Otago University Press.

- Giroux, H. A. (2005). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Glover, M. (2013). Te Manaaki i ngā Kaiārahi Māori: Looking after Māori leaders. In P. Whitinui, M. Glover & D. Hikuroa (Eds.), *Arai Mai he Tētēkura-Visioning our futures: New and emerging pathways of Māori academic leadership* (pp: 66-76). Dunedin: Otago University Press.
- Gordon, L. (1992a). The bulk funding of teachers' salaries: A case study in education policy. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 1, 28-58.
- Gordon, L. (1992b). Educational reform in New Zealand: contesting the role of teacher. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 2(1), 23-42.
- Goubeaud, K., & Yan, W. (2004). Teacher educators' teaching methods, assessments, and grading: A comparison of higher education faculty's instructional practice. *The Teacher Educator*, 40(1), 1-16.
- Graham, J. P. H. (2009). *Whakatangata kia kaha: toitū te whakapapa, toitū te tuakiri, toitū te mana: an examination of the contribution of Te Aute College to Māori advancement* (Doctoral dissertation, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10179/1254>
- Graham, J., & Jahnke, H. (2013). *Te Pae Huarewa: Tribal perspectives on Māori education*. In A. St. George, S. Brown, & J. O'Neil (Eds.), *Facing the big questions in education* (pp. 44-53). South Melbourne, Australia: Cengage Learning.
- Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: a new architecture for leadership. *Educational Management and Administration*, 28(3), 317-338.
- Gronn, P. (2003). *The New Work of Educational Leaders*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Gronn, P. (2008). The future of distributed leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(2), 141-158.
- Gronn, P., & Rawlings-Sanaei, F. (2003). Principal recruitment in a climate of leadership disengagement. *Australian Journal of Education*, 47(2), 172-184.

- Gunter, H. (2001). *Leaders and leadership in education*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Gunter, H. (2005). *Leading teachers*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Gunter, H. M. (2015). The politics of education policy in England. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 19(11), 1206-1212. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2015.1044206>
- Gunter, H. M., & Fitzgerald, T. (2015). Educational administration and neoliberalism: historical and contemporary perspectives. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 47(2), 101-104. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2015.1002388>
- Hallinger, P. (1992). Changing norms of principal leadership in the United States. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(3), 35-48.
- Hallinger, P., Bickman, L., & Davis, K. (1990). What makes a difference? School context, principal leadership, and student achievement. *Occasional Paper No. 3* (pp. 1-35). National Center for Educational Leadership.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996a). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: a review of empirical research 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5-44.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996b). The principal's role in school effectiveness: an assessment of methodological progress 1980-1995. In K.A. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger & A. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 723-783). New York, NY: Kluwer.
- Harris, A. (2003). Teacher leadership as distributed leadership: Heresy, fantasy or possibility. *School Leadership and Management*, 23(3), 313-324.
- Harris, A. (2006). Opening up the 'black box' of leadership practice: Taking a distributed leadership perspective. *Leadership and Management*, 34(2), 37-45.
- Hartley, J. (2004). Case study research. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 323-33). London: Sage.

- Hattie, J. (2003, February). *New Zealand education snapshot*. Paper presented at the Knowledge Wave 2003: The leadership forum, Auckland, 19-21 February 2003.
- Heck, R., Larson, T., & Marcoulides, G. (1990). Principal assessment: Conceptual problem, methodological problem, or both? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 68(1), 124-144.
- Heiskanen, E., Järvelä, K., Pulliainen, A., Saastamoinen, M., & Timonen, P. (2008). Qualitative research and consumer policy: Focus group discussions as a form of consumer participation. *The Qualitative Report*, 13(2), 152-172. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR13-2/heiskanen.pdf>
- 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
- Henwood, K. L., & Pidgeon, N. F. (1993). Qualitative research and psychological theorising. In M. Haammersley (Ed.), *Social research philosophy, politics and practice* (pp. 97-111). London: Sage.
- Heshusius, L. (1994). Freeing ourselves from objectivity: managing subjectivity or turning toward a participatory mode of consciousness? *Educational Researcher*, 23(3), 15-22.
- Hooijberg, R., Hunt, J. G., & Dodge, G. E. (1997). Leadership complexity and development of the leadership model. *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 375-408.
- Horkheimer, M. (1986). *Critical theory: Selected essays*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Hoskins, T. K. (2012). A fine risk: Ethics in Kaupapa Māori politics. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 85-99.
- Hutchings, J. (2002). *Te whakaruruhau, te ukaipō: Mana wahine and genetic modification* (Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand). Retrieved from <http://www.kaupapamaori.com/action/18/>

- Hynds, A., Meyer, L. H., Penetito, W., Averill, R., Hindle, R., Taiwhati, M., Hodis, F., & Faircloth, S. (2014). *Evaluation of He Kākano Professional Development for Leaders in Secondary Schools 2011-2012 Final Report*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Jackson, M. (2010). Constitutional Transformation. In M. Mulholland & V. Tawhai (Eds.), *Weeping waters: The Treaty of Waitangi and constitutional change* (pp. 325-336). Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- James, A. B., & Lunday, T. (2014). Native birthrights and Indigenous science. *Reclaiming children and youth*, 22(4), 57-58.
- Johnston, P. M. G. (1997). Tiptoeing through the Puha: Policy reforms for Māori Education. In M. Olssen & K. Morris Mathews (Eds.), *Education policy in New Zealand: The 1990s and beyond* (pp. 83-106). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Jones, B., Ingham, T., Davies, C., & Cram, F. (2010). Whānau Tuatahi: Māori community partnership research using a Kaupapa Māori methodology. *Mai Review*. 3. Retrieved from <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz>
- Jorgensen, R., & Niesche, R. (2011). Curriculum leadership in remote Indigenous communities. *Leading & Managing*, 17(1), 45-58.
- Katene, S. (2010). Modelling Māori leadership: What makes for good leadership? *Mai Review*. 2. Retrieved from <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz>
- King, M. (1988). *Āpirana Ngata E Tipu e Rea*. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Education, School Publications Branch.
- Krueger, R. (1988). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Krueger, R. A. (1994). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2000). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied researchers* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Krueger, R., & Casey, M. (2009). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Labour Market Bulletin. (1999). *Explaining patterns of disparity between Māori and non-Māori employment chances*. Wellington, New Zealand: S. Chapple.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, 34(3), 159-165.
- Lee, J. B. J. (2002). Akonga Māori: A framework of study of Māori secondary school teachers and teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 24(2), 64-74.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 498-518.
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P., & Cousins, B. (1990). The nature, causes and consequences of principals' practices: An agenda for future research. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 28(4), 5-31.
- Leithwood, K., & Hallinger, P. (1993). Cognitive perspectives on educational administration: An introduction. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 24(3), 296-301.
- Leitner, D. (1994). Do principals affect student outcomes? An organizational perspective. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5(3), 219-239.
- Lingard, B. (2007). Pedagogies of indifference. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 11(3), 245-266.
- Lingard, B., Hayes, D., & Christie, P. (2003). *Leading Learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Linville, D., Lambert-Shute, J., Fruhauf, C. A., & Piercy, F. P. (2003). Using participatory focus groups of graduate students to improve academic departments: A case example. *The Qualitative Report*, 8(2), 210-223.
- Little, J. W. (1995). Contested ground: the basis of teachers leadership in two restructuring high schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 96(1), 47-63.
- MacBeath, J., O'Brien, J., & Gronn, P. (2012). Drowning or waving? Coping strategies among Scottish head teachers. *School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organisation*, 32(5), 421-437. Doi: 10.1080/13632434.2012.739870

- Makereti. (1986 [1938]). *Makereti: The Old-Time Māori*. Auckland: New Women's Press.
- 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.
- Marsden, M. (1975). God, man and universe: A Māori view. In M. King (Ed.), *Te Ao Hurihuri-The world moves on* (pp. 118-138). Auckland: Hicks Smith.
- Massey University. (2015). *Code of ethical conduct for research, teaching and evaluations involving human participants*. Palmerston North: Massey University
- Mathews, N. (2013). He Toka Tūmoana: Māori leadership within the academy. In P. Whitinui, M. Glover & D. Hikuroa (Eds.), *Arai Mai he Tetekura-Visioning our futures: New and emerging pathways of Māori academic leadership* (pp. 20-30). Dunedin: Otago University Press.
- McCarty, T. L., & Nicholas, S. E. (2014). Reclaiming Indigenous languages: A reconsideration of the roles and responsibilities of schools. *Review of Research in Education*, 38(1), 106-136.
- McGrath, F. (2014) *Indigenous educational leaders: A legacy of praxis* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- McNamee, S. J., & Miller, Jr., R. K. (2004). The meritocracy myth. *Sociation Today*, 2(1), 1-11.
- McNaughton, S. & Glynn, T. (1998, October). *Effective collaboration: what teachers need to know about communities*. Invited keynote address, New Zealand Council for Teacher Education Annual Conference, Hamilton, 15-17 October.
- Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Mead, H. M. (2012). *Understanding Mātauranga Māori*. Wellington: New Zealand Qualifications Authority.
- Mead, H. M., Stevens, S., Third, J., Jackson, B., & Pfeifer, D. (2006). *Hui Taumata Action Scoping Paper: Māori leadership in governance*. Wellington: Victoria University.

- Meredith, P. (2000, February). *Urban Māori as 'new citizens': The quest for recognition and resources*. Draft Working Paper, Based on Paper Presented to the Revisioning Citizenship in New Zealand Conference, University of Waikato, 22-24 February 2000, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Meyer, L. H., Penetito, W., Hynds, A., Savage, C., Hindle, R., & Sleeter, C. (2010). *Summary Report Evaluation of Te Kotahitanga: 2004-2008*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Milroy, S. (1996). Māori women and domestic violence: The methodology of research and the Māori perspective. *Waikato Law Review*, 4(1), 58-76.
- Minichiello, V. & Sullivan, G, et al. (Eds.). (1999). *Handbook for research methods in health sciences*. Sydney, NSW: Addison-Wesley.
- Ministry of Education (2003). *Te kotahitanga*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (2005). *Ngā Haeata Mātauranga: Annual report on Māori education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education (2007). *Ka Hikitia-Managing for success*. The draft Māori education strategy 2008-2012. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education (2007). *The New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from <http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum>
- Ministry of Education (2008). *PIRLS 2005/2006 in New Zealand: A summary of national findings from the second cycle of the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS)*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education (2008). *He Kākano The developing history of He Kākano*. Wellington: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from <http://hekakano.tki.org.nz/About/The-developing-history-of-He-Kākano>
- Ministry of Education (2008). *Kimi Leadership Principals as Educational Leaders*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

- Ministry of Education (2009). *Ka Hikitia-Managing for Success/Māori Education Strategy 2008-2012*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education (2013). *Ka Hikitia-Accelerating Success 2013-2017*. The Māori Education Strategy. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education (2014). *Ngā Haeata Mātauranga 2014-2015*. Assessing Māori Education. Retrieved from <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/.../nga-haeata-matauranga-annual-report-on-ma>
- Ministry of Education (2015). *Kia Eke Panuku building on success*. Retrieved from <http://nzcurriculum-tki-org-nz.System-of-support-incl.-PLD/School-Initiated-Supports/Professional-learning-and-development/K>
- Ministry of Social Development (2007). *The social report*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.
- Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mulford, B., Kendall, D., Edmunds, B., Kendall, L., Ewington, J., & Silins, H. (2007). Successful school leadership: what is it and who decides? *Australian Journal of Education*, 51(3), 228-246.
- Mutch, C. (2013). *Doing educational research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Wellington: NZCER Press
- Nash, R. (2005). Professional development and student achievement gains: A look at the Te Kotahitanga Report. *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work*, 2(1), 20-27.
- New Zealand. Waitangi Tribunal. (1998). *Te Whānau o Waiāpapa report (Wai 414)*. Wellington, NZ: GP Publications.
- Ngata, Ā. T. (2005). *Ngā Mōteatea the songs* (Part Two). Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Ngata, Ā. T. (2006). *Ngā Mōteatea the songs* (Part Three). Auckland: Auckland University Press.

- Ngata, A. T. (2007). *Ngā Mōteatea the songs* (Part Four). Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Olsen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313-345.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Dickinson, W. B., Leech, N. L., & Zoran, A. G. (2009). Toward more rigor in focus group research: A new framework for collecting and analyzing focus group data. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 8(3), 1-21.
- Onwuegbuzie, A., Leech, N. L., & Collins, K. M. T. (2010). Innovative data collection strategies in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(3), 696-726. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssw/QR/QR15-3/onwuegbuzie.pdf>
- Openshaw, R. (2007). A sense of déjà vu across the Tasman? What Australians might learn from the New Zealand experience with the Te Kotahitanga professional development programme. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 34(2), 24-50.
- Opie, A. (1994). Transforming unruly experiences. In J. Davey, P. Laing, J. Neale, A. Opie, D. Pearson & C. Toynbee (Eds.), *Doing social research in New Zealand: Methods, reflections and sources* (pp. 60-95). Wellington: Victoria University.
- Parsell, M., Ambler, T., Jacenyik-Trawoger, C. (2014). Ethics in higher education research. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(1), 166-179.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Penetito, W. (2009). Place-based education: Catering for curriculum, culture and community. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 18, 5-29. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Penetito, Wally. (2010). *What's Māori about Māori education? The struggle for a meaningful context*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Pere, R. R. (1994). *Ako: Concepts and learning in the Māori tradition*. Wellington: Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust.

- Peters, M. A. (2013). Managerialism and the neoliberal university: Prospects for new forms of “open management” in higher education. *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice*, 5(1), 11-26.
- Pihama, L. (1993). *Tungia te ururua kia tupu whakaritorito te tupu o te harakeke: A critical analysis of parents as first teachers*. (Unpublished master’s thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Pihama, L., Cram, F., & Walker, S. (2002). Creating methodological space: A literature review of kaupapa Māori research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 26(1), 30-43.
- Poata-Smith, E. T. A. (1997). The political economy of inequality between Māori and Pakeha. In C. Rudd & B. Roper (Eds.), *The political economy of New Zealand*, (pp.160-179). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Pohatu, T. (1996). *I tipu ai tātou i ngā turi o o tātau mātua tipuna: Transmission and acquisition processes within Kāwai whakapapa*. (Unpublished master’s thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Polit, D. F., & Hungler, B. P. (1995). *Nursing research, principles and methods*. Philadelphia, PA: J B Lippincott Company.
- Pont, B., Nusche, D., & Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving school leadership: Policy and practice*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Prensky, M. (2008). Turning on the lights. *Educational Leadership*, 65(6), 40-45.
- Rata, E. (2003). Late capitalism and ethnic revivalism, ‘A new middle age?’ *Anthropological Theory*, 3(1), 43-63.
- Rata, E. (2005, November). *People power or ethnic elites? New configurations of power in an ethnicised land*. Address to Anatomy of Power Symposium, University of Auckland, New Zealand, 26 November 2005.
- Rata, E. & Openshaw, R. (Eds.). (2006). *Public policy and ethnicity: The politics of ethnic boundary-making*. Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

- Resnik, D. B. (2011, May). *What is ethics in research & Why is it important?* National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, 1 May 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.niehs.nih.gov/research/resources/bioethics/whatis/>
- Resnik, D. B. (2012). Ethical virtues in scientific research. *Accountability in Research*, 19(6), 329-343. doi:10.1080/08989621.2012.728908
- Rice, P. L., & Ezzy, D. (2002). *Qualitative research methods: A Health Focus*. Melbourne, Vic.: Oxford University Press.
- Robinson, V., Hohepa, M., & Lloyd, C. (2009). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why: Best Evidence Synthesis*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988). *The April Report*. Wellington: Royal Commission on Social Policy.
- Royal, T. C. (2012). *Te Ao Mārama – the natural world – The world of light and darkness*. Retrieved from <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/te-ao-marama-the-natural-world/page-3>
- Seashore Louis, K. (2007). Trust and improvement in schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, 8(1), 1-24. doi:10.1007/s10833-006-9015-5
- Seashore Louis, K., Marks, H., & Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers' professional community. *Restructuring Schools*, 33(4), 757-798.
- Sergiovanni, T. (2001). *Leadership: What's in it for schools?* London: Routledge Falmer.
- Sexton, S. S. (2011). Putting 'Maori' in the Mainstream: Student Teachers' Reflections of a Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(12), 33-45.
- Sharken-Simon, J. (1999). *How to conduct a focus group*. Retrieved from <http://www.tgci.com/magazine/HowToConductAFocusGroup.pdf>
- Sharples, P. (1998). Kura kaupapa Maori: Recommendations for policy. *Access: Critical Perspectives on Education Policy*, 8(1), 28-36.

- Shockley, Kmt G. (2008). Africentric education leadership: Theory and practice. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*, 3(3), 1-12.
- Sidorkin, A. M. (2002). *Learning relations*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Silins, H., & Mulford, B. (2002a). Leadership and school results. In K. Leithwood & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Second international handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 561-612). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Simons, H. (2009). *Case study research in practice*. London: SAGE.
- Sleeter, C. E. (Ed.). (2011). *Professional development for culturally responsive and relationship-based pedagogy*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Smith, G. H. (1990). The Politics of Reforming Māori Education. In J. Codd., R Harker & R Nash (Eds.), *Political Issues in N.Z. Education* (pp. 183-197). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Smith, G. H. (1992, November). *Tāne-Nui-a-Rangi's Legacy: Propping up the Sky: Kaupapa Māori as Resistance and Intervention*. Paper presented at the joint conference of the New Zealand Australia Association for Research in Education, Deakin University, Australia, 22-26 November 1992.
- Smith, G. H. (1997). *The development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and praxis*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Smith, G. H. (2003, December). *Kaupapa Māori Theory: Theorizing Indigenous transformation of education and schooling*. Paper presented at the Kaupapa Māori Symposium NZARE/AARE Joint Conference, Auckland, New Zealand, 29 November-3 December 2003.
- Smith, G. H. (2012). Kaupapa Māori: The dangers of domestication. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 47(2), 10-20.
- Smith, L. T. (1999a). *Decolonizing methodology*. London: Zed Books; Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

- Smith, L. T. (1999b). *Kaupapa Māori Methodology: Our Power to define ourselves*. Seminar Presentation, School of Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Smith, L. T. (2000). Kaupapa Māori research. In M. Battiste (Ed.), *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision* (pp. 225-247). Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- Smith, L. T. (2006). *Decolonizing methodologies research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- Smithson, J. (2008). Focus groups. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 357-370). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sorrenson, M. P. K. (Ed.). (1986). *Nā to boa aroha. From your dear friend*. Auckland: University Printing Services.
- Spillane, J. (2006). *Distributed leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Spillane, J., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2000). Investigating school leadership practice: a distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 23-28.
- Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: a distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 3-34.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 435-454). London: Sage.
- Starman. A. (1997). Case study methods. In J.P. Keeves (Ed.), *Educational research, methodology and measurement: an international handbook* (pp. 61-66). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Starman, A. B. (2013). The case study as a type of qualitative research. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies*, 1, 28-43.
- Stokes, E. (1992). Māori research and development: A Discussion Paper. In M. Hohepa & G. H. Smith (Eds.), *The Issue of Research and Monograph*, (pp. 29-50). Auckland: Research Unit for Māori Education, University of Auckland.

- Tamati, A. (2007). *Ko te ira tangata, he ira atuā: exploring an indigenous Ao Māori early childhood curriculum* (Unpublished master's thesis). Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Tangaere, A. R. (1997). Māori human development theory. In P. Te Whaiti, A. McCarthy & M. Durie (Eds.), *Mai i rangiātea: Māori wellbeing and development* (pp. 46-59). Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Te Puni Kōkiri (1998). *Progress towards closing social and economic gaps between Māori and non-Māori*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri (2000). *Progress towards closing social and economic gaps between Māori and non-Māori*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.
- The University of Waikato & Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi (2010). *He Kākanō Te Awe o Ngā Toroa*. New Zealand: Waikato University.
- Thomson, P. (2001). How principals lose 'face': A disciplinary tale of educational administration and modern managerialism. *Discourse*, 22(1), 5-22.
- Thomson, P. (2002). *Schooling the rustbelt kids: Making the difference in changing times*. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen and Unwin.
- Thrupp, M. (2006). *Professional standards for teachers and teacher education: Avoiding the pitfalls*. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.
- Townsend, T. (2011). School leadership in the twenty-first century: Different approaches to common problems. *School Leadership & Management*, 31(2), 93-105.
- Tuuta, M., Bradnam, L., Hynds, A., Higgins, J., & Broughton, R. (2004). *Evaluation of the Te Kaubua Māori Mainstream Pilot Project Report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Van de Grift, W. (1990). Educational leadership and academic achievement in elementary education. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 1(3), 26-40.
- Vaughan, M. (2014). Flipping the learning: An investigation into the use of the flipped classroom model in an introductory teaching course. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 41(1), 25-41.

- Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., & Sinagub, J. (1996). *Focus group interviews in education and psychology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Waitere, H. (2008). Cultural leadership: creating futures our ancestors can walk in with our children. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, 23(2), 34-47.
- Walker, R. (1974). Māoritanga and the teacher. In D. Bray & C. Hill (Eds), *Polynesian and Pakeha in New Zealand education* (vol.II). Auckland: Heinemann.
- Walker, R. (1979). The urban Māori. In *He Matapuna: A source: some Māori perspectives*. Wellington: New Zealand Planning Council.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu mātou: Struggle without end*. Auckland: Penguin Books New Zealand:
- Walker, S. (1996). *Kia tau te rangimārie: Kaupapa Māori theory as a resistance against the construction of Māori as the other*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Wānanga Documents – Te Wānanga o Raukawa (2015). *Guiding Principles of Te Wānanga o Raukawa*. Ōtaki, New Zealand: P. Winiata. Retrieved from [www.wananga.com/index.php/about-us/wananga-documents](http://www.wananga.com/index.php/about-us/wananga-documents)
- Wānanga Documents – Te Wānanga o Raukawa (2015). *Theory and Understanding of Wānanga*. Ōtaki, New Zealand: W. Winiata. Retrieved from [www.wananga.com/index.php/about-us/wananga-documents](http://www.wananga.com/index.php/about-us/wananga-documents)
- White, J. A., & Wehlage, G. (1995). Community collaboration: If it is such a good idea, why is it so hard to do? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 17(1), 23-38. Retrieved from <http://eepea.acera.net>
- White, N. (2010). Indigenous Australian women's leadership: stayin' strong against the post-colonial tide. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 13(1), 7-25.
- Wilkinson, S. (2001). How useful are focus groups in feminist research? In R. S. Barbour & J. Kitzinger (Eds.), *Developing focus group research: Politics, theory, and practice* (pp. 64-78). London: Sage.

- Williams, L. R. T. (2010). Leadership: Some underlying processes. *MAI Review*, 2. Retrieved from <http://www.review.mai.ac.nz>
- Wrigley, T., Lingard, B., & Thomson, P. (2012). Pedagogies of transformation: Keeping hope alive in troubled times. *Critical Studies in Education*, 53(1), 95-108.
- Wrigley, T., Thomson, P., & Lingard, B. (Eds.) (2012). *Changing schools: Alternative ways to make a world of difference*. London: Routledge.
- Wylie, C. (2009, December). *What can we learn from the last twenty years?* Paper presented at the 2009 Herbison Lecture, NZARE Conference, Rotorua, New Zealand, 1-4 December 2009.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Designs and methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 285-305.

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1	Types of schools
Appendix 2	Information sheet for principals, leaders, teachers, parents
Appendix 3	Participation consent forms – individual, focus groups
Appendix 4	Focus group protocol
Appendix 5	Participant interview questions – principals, leaders
Appendix 6	Participant interview questions – teachers, parents
Appendix 7	Ethics approval
Appendix 8	Case studies

## Appendix 1

### Types of schools

There are different types of schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand and for the purposes of this research project some useful explanatory information is provided to indicate the types of secondary schools included this research study and any related data gathering and data results. The main point to make clear is this research study excludes kura kaupapa Māori schools operating under the framework, philosophy and context of Te Aho Matua.

### Secondary School

A student is officially considered to be in the secondary school phase of their education once having reached Year 9. A secondary school can have the following combinations of students ranging from either years 7-13 or from years 9 to 13.

### Kura Kaupapa Māori

Kura kaupapa Māori were legally mandated as a new type of state school and established under section 155 of the Education Act 1989<sup>1</sup>. Kura kaupapa Māori schools (kura) are Māori language immersion schools operating within a philosophy and context of Māori cultural values, knowledge and culture. The Education (Te Aho Matua) Amendment Act 199, amended Section 155 of the Education Act 1989 to make it a requirement for Kura Kaupapa Māori adhere to the philosophy, principles and practices of Te Aho Matua. The amendment sanctioned Te Rūnanga Nui o Ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori o Aotearoa as the kaitiaki (guardians) of Te Aho Matua and the body responsible for the content of Te Aho Matua. Kura Kaupapa Māori can either be a primary school (which can include students from Year 1 – 8) or a Composite School (which can include students from Year 1 – 13).

### Wharekura

Wharekura are Kura Kaupapa Māori and can be either a composite or secondary Māori language total immersion school. Wharekura cater for students above year 8, some cater

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/Boards/LegalObligations/BoardsOfKuraKaupapaMaori.aspx>

for years 1 to 13 and some years 9 to 13. As a point of information not all kura kaupapa Māori change their name when they gain wharekura status.

#### Area School

An area school accepts students from years 1 to 13. Area schools are often located in rural areas.

#### Composite School

A composite school (like an area school) provides both primary and secondary education, but depending on its classification may not provide the full range of year levels to year 13.

#### A Designated Character School

A designated character school is a state school that teaches the New Zealand Curriculum but has developed their own sets of aims, purposes and objectives to reflect their own particular values. For example, religious beliefs or culture.

School deciles range from one to ten. Decile one schools draw their students from low socio-economic communities and at the other end of the range, decile 10 schools draw their students from high socio-economic communities. Deciles are used to provide funding to state and integrated schools. The lower the school's decile the more funding it receives. A school's decile is in no way linked to the quality of education it provides.

## Appendix 2

Information sheet

29 October 2012

### Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori

#### *INFORMATION SHEET FOR PRINCIPALS*

Tēnā koe

Kia mihi te mano tini kua mene ki ngā Hawaiki katoa, rātou te tutūtanga o te puehu, te whiunga o te kupu i ngā wā takatū ai rātou. Heoi, waiho ake rātou ki a rātou, tātou te urupā o rātou mā, ngā waihotanga mai e hāpai nei i ō rātou wawata, tūmanako hoki. Kia ora tātou.

#### **Researcher Introduction**

Ko Tiheia te maunga

Ko Awahou te awa

Ko Tarimano te papa kōhatu

Ko Tawakeheimoa te tūpuna

Ko Puhirua, Ko Orangikahui ngā whakatakotoranga te iwi

Nā Tawakeheimoa rāua ko Te Aongahoro ka puta ko Rangiwewehi

Koia nei te reo o Ngāti Rangiwewehi

Ngā uri o rātou mā

Ko Te Mākaio Bowkett tōku ingoa

I have been involved in education for over 30 years as a teacher, parent and policy analyst Māori in the Ministry of Education. For the past 17 years I have worked on behalf of Māori secondary teachers in my current position as Āpiha Māori for the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA).

I hope to continue further kaupapa Māori educational leadership theory and practice through this research study, and work towards gaining an EdD qualification at Massey University.

#### **Research Description and Invitation**

This research study sets out to investigate Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that could be applied in mainstream secondary schools and kaupapa Māori schools for improving education for Māori students. The aim is to identify schools leadership approaches in two schools that staff and parents there see as supporting and developing teaching and learning practices that are meeting the needs of Māori students, and from this identify whether there are particular Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that are adaptable for other mainstream secondary and kaupapa Māori secondary schools. As you know I am inviting participation from the principals, teachers, and parents of students in a mainstream secondary school and a kaupapa Māori secondary school, as well as two other significant Māori leaders.

Following our discussion in January/February 2012 when you agreed in principle, I am now extending this formal invitation to you to participate in this research study.

### **Research Participants Identification and Recruitment**

I have identified your school as fitting the criteria for the study: that is, it has from my knowledge of secondary schools through my work at PPTA, a significant number of Māori students, staff who place strong emphasis on providing positive learning environments and improving student educational outcomes, and aims to provide effective leadership in those areas.

The significant Māori leaders will also be drawn from those with extensive experience and knowledge of working with Māori in education and are held in high esteem by their communities.

I would appreciate your assistance in setting up meetings for teachers and parents, so that I can give a brief outline of the research, explain focus group interviews and invite them to participate in these focus groups. A copy of the permission letter from the Board of Trustees will be provided.

### **The Procedures**

The method proposed is that of personal interviews with teachers and with parents, each of which will be conducted in an informal and non-threatening context. There will be up to 20 teachers and up to 20 parents from each school.

In the interviews there will be 6-7 questions to consider in light of the research goals. Three main questions of interest are: What support is needed to help professional leaders improve the education outcomes of Māori students? What is your understanding of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership? How might Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership work to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students in schools?

To assist my understanding further, I would appreciate receiving any written summary data on achievement and school policies that you are able to provide.

### **How Many Meetings?**

If you agree to participate there will be one personal interview of approximately 1-2 hours (by negotiation), at a time and a place negotiated with you. After writing up the discussion, I will meet again with you to provide a copy of the transcript so that you can make any corrections you wish. All meetings will be audiotaped. You will also have the opportunity to attend a presentation of the findings if you wish.

I know that with your support, this experience will potentially provide some insights and important thinking about issues and improved outcomes for Māori in education. I am confident that your participation in this research study will be mana enhancing for all concerned.

### **Data Management**

The data will be used for this research study only. Transcripts will be stored on a password protected computer and if printed, will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in

my home. Tapes will be numbered to remove any chance of identifying participants and stored separately from the printed transcripts in my locked home filing cabinet, and consent forms. All tapes and transcriptions will be securely stored for a period of five years and then destroyed. The chief supervisor will be responsible for any disposal of data. Confidentiality of the participants' identities will be protected by using pseudonyms for the people and schools. After the publication of the final report it is hoped to disseminate it through presentations at conferences to interested educators and through the publication of articles in education journals. You will also be sent a summary of the study findings when it is concluded.

### **Participant's Rights**

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study at any time;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher;
- ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview.

### **Project Contacts for Further Information**

You can contact me at:

[temakao@xtra.co.nz](mailto:temakao@xtra.co.nz) or 021 822 038 or

My research supervisors are:

Dr Marian Court: [M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz](mailto:M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz) 06 351 3462

Associate Professor Claire McLachlan: [C.J.McLachlan@massey.ac.nz](mailto:C.J.McLachlan@massey.ac.nz) 06 356 9099

Professor Wally Penetito: [Wally.Penetito@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:Wally.Penetito@vuw.ac.nz) 04 463 5169

If you have further questions please feel free to contact me or any of my supervisors.

### ***Committee Approval Statement***

*This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 12/42. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Nathan Mathews, Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 06 350 5799 x 8729, email [humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz](mailto:humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz)*

## Appendix 2

Information sheet

### Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori

#### *INFORMATION SHEET FOR LEADERS*

Tēnā koe e te rangatira

Kia mihi te mano tini kua mene ki ngā Hawaiki katoa, rātou te tutūtanga o te puehu, te whiunga o te kupu i ngā wā takatū ai rātou. Heoi, waiho ake rātou ki a rātou, tātou te urupā o rātou mā, ngā waihotanga mai e hāpai nei i ō rātou wawata, tūmanako hoki. Kia ora tātou.

#### **Researcher Introduction**

Ko Tiheia te maunga

Ko Awahou te awa

Ko Tarimano te papa kōhatu

Ko Tawakeheimoa te tūpuna

Ko Puhirua, Ko Orangikahui ngā whakatakotoranga te iwi

Nā Tawakeheimoa rāua ko Te Aongahoro ka puta ko Rangiwewehi

Koia nei te reo o Ngāti Rangiwewehi

Ngā uri o rātou mā

Ko Te Mākaio Bowkett tōku ingoa

I have been involved in education for over 30 years as a teacher, parent and policy analyst Māori in the Ministry of Education. For the past 17 years I have worked on behalf of Māori secondary teachers in my current position as Āpiha Māori for the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA).

I hope to continue further kaupapa Māori educational leadership theory and practice through this research study, and work towards gaining an EdD qualification at Massey University.

#### **Research Description and Invitation**

This research study sets out to investigate Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that could be applied in mainstream secondary schools and kaupapa Māori schools for improving education for Māori students. The aim is to identify schools leadership approaches in two schools that staff and parents there see as supporting and developing teaching and learning practices that are meeting the needs of Māori students, and from this identify whether there are particular Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that are adaptable for other mainstream secondary and kaupapa Māori secondary schools.

I am inviting participation from the principals, teachers, and parents of students in a mainstream secondary school and a kaupapa Māori school, as well as two other significant Māori leaders.

I am now extending this formal invitation to you to participate in this research study.

### **Research Participants Identification and Recruitment**

I have identified you from my knowledge of you as a significant Māori leader with extensive experience and knowledge of working with Māori in education and a person who is held in high esteem by your communities. For your information, I have identified two schools as fitting the criteria for the study: that is, they have, from my knowledge of secondary schools through my work at PPTA, a significant number of Māori students, staff who place strong emphasis on providing positive learning environments and improving student educational outcomes, and aims to provide effective leadership in those areas.

### **The Procedures**

The method proposed is that of personal interview with the principals and with 2 Māori leaders, and focus group interviews with teachers and with parents, each of which will be conducted in an informal and non-threatening context.

In the interviews there will be 6-7 questions to consider in light of the research goals. Three main questions of interest are: What support is needed to help professional leaders improve the education outcomes of Māori students? What is your understanding of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership? How might Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership work to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students in schools?

### **How Many Meetings?**

If you agree to participate there will be one personal interview of approximately 1-2 hours (by negotiation), at a time and a place negotiated with you. After writing up the discussion, I will meet again with you to provide a copy of the transcript so that you can make any corrections you wish. All meetings will be audiotaped. You will also have the opportunity to attend a presentation of the findings if you wish.

I know that with your support, this experience will potentially provide some insights and important thinking about issues and improved outcomes for Māori in education. I am confident that your participation in this research study will be mana enhancing for all concerned.

### **Data Management**

The data will be used for this research study only. Transcripts will be stored on a password protected computer and if printed, will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in my home. Tapes will be numbered to remove any chance of identifying participants and stored separately from the printed transcripts in my locked home filing cabinet, and consent forms. All tapes and transcriptions will be securely stored for a period of five years and then destroyed. The chief supervisor will be responsible for any disposal of data. Confidentiality of the participants' identities will be protected by using pseudonyms for the people and schools. After the publication of the final report it is hoped to disseminate it through presentations at conferences to interested educators and through the publication of articles in education journals. You will also be sent a summary of the study findings when it is concluded.

### **Participant's Rights**

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study at any time;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher;
- ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview.

### **Project Contacts for Further Information**

You can contact me at:

[temakao@xtra.co.nz](mailto:temakao@xtra.co.nz) or 021 822 038 or

My research supervisors are:

Dr Marian Court: [M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz](mailto:M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz) 06 351 3462

Associate Professor Claire McLachlan: [C.J.McLachlan@massey.ac.nz](mailto:C.J.McLachlan@massey.ac.nz) 06 356 9099

Professor Wally Penetito: [Wally.Penetito@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:Wally.Penetito@vuw.ac.nz) 04 463 5169

If you have further questions please feel free to contact me or any of my supervisors.

### ***Committee Approval Statement***

*This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 12/42. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Nathan Mathews, Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 06 350 5799 x 8729, email [humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz](mailto:humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz)*

## Appendix 2

Information sheet

29 October 2012

### Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori

#### *INFORMATION SHEET FOR TEACHERS*

Tēnā koutou katoa

Kia mihi te mano tini kua mene ki ngā Hawaiki katoa, rātou te tutūtanga o te puehu, te whiunga o te kupu i ngā wā takatū ai rātou. Heoi, waiho ake rātou ki a rātou, tātou te urupā o rātou mā, ngā waihotanga mai e hāpai nei i ō rātou wawata, tūmanako hoki. Kia ora tātou.

#### **Researcher Introduction**

Ko Tiheia te maunga

Ko Awahou te awa

Ko Tarimano te papa kōhatu

Ko Tawakeheimoa te tūpuna

Ko Puhirua, Ko Orangikahui ngā whakatakotoranga te iwi

Nā Tawakeheimoa rāua ko Te Aongahoro ka puta ko Rangiwewehi

Koia nei te reo o Ngāti Rangiwewehi

Ngā uri o rātou mā

Ko Te Mākao Bowkett tōku ingoa

I have been involved in education for over 30 years as a teacher, parent and policy analyst Māori in the Ministry of Education. For the past 17 years I have worked on behalf of Māori secondary teachers in my current position as Āpiha Māori for the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA).

I hope to continue further kaupapa Māori educational leadership theory and practice through this research study, and work towards gaining an EdD qualification at Massey University.

#### **Research Description and Invitation**

This research study sets out to investigate Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that could be applied in mainstream secondary schools and kaupapa Māori schools for improving education for Māori students. The aim is to identify schools leadership approaches in two schools that staff and parents there see as supporting and developing teaching and learning practices that are meeting the needs of Māori students, and from this identify whether there are particular Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that are adaptable for other mainstream secondary and kaupapa Māori secondary schools.

I will be inviting participation from the principals, teachers, and parents of students in a mainstream secondary school and a kaupapa Māori secondary school, as well as two other significant Māori leaders.

I am now extending this formal invitation to you to participate in this research study. A copy of the permission letter from the Board of Trustees will be provided.

### **Research Participants Identification and Recruitment**

I have identified your school as fitting the criteria for the study: that is, it has from my knowledge of secondary schools through my work at PPTA, a significant number of Māori students, staff who place strong emphasis on providing positive learning environments and improving student educational outcomes, and aims to provide effective leadership in those areas.

The significant Māori leaders will also be drawn from those with extensive experience and knowledge of working with Māori in education and are held in high esteem by their communities.

### **The Procedures**

The method proposed is that of personal interviews of principals and 2 other senior Māori leaders and focus group interviews with teachers and with parents, each of which will be conducted in an informal and non-threatening context.

In the interviews there will be 6-7 questions to consider in light of the research goals. Three main questions of interest are: What support is needed to help professional leaders improve the education outcomes of Māori students? What is your understanding of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership? How might Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership work to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students in schools?

### **How Many Meetings?**

If you agree to participate you will be involved in one focus group interview of approximately 2 hours maximum, at a time and a place negotiated with you. For your information, a focus group interview is a form of group interviewing held with up to eight people, led by a facilitator (or interviewer) in a semi-structured discussion in which people are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs and attitudes on a range of topics or issues. The focus group setting allows people to participate freely with other group members. To ensure discussions are free flowing and not inhibited participants need to agree to respect the confidentiality of others. The interview will be audiotaped. After writing up the discussion, I will send you a copy of the transcript so that you can make any corrections you wish. You will also have the opportunity to attend a presentation of the findings if you wish.

I know that with your support, this experience will potentially provide some insights and important thinking about issues and improved outcomes for Māori in education. I am confident that your participation in this research study will be mana enhancing for all concerned.

### **Data Management**

The data will be used for this research study only. Transcripts will be stored on a password protected computer and if printed, will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in my home. Tapes will be numbered to remove any chance of identifying participants and stored separately from the printed transcripts in my locked home filing cabinet, and

consent forms. All tapes and transcriptions will be securely stored for a period of five years and then destroyed. The chief supervisor will be responsible for any disposal of data. Confidentiality of the participants' identities will be protected by using pseudonyms for the people and schools. After the publication of the final report it is hoped to disseminate it through presentations at conferences to interested educators and through the publication of articles in education journals. You will also be sent a summary of the study findings when it is concluded.

### **Participant's Rights**

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study at any time;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher;
- ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview.

### **Project Contacts for Further Information**

You can contact me at:

[temakao@xtra.co.nz](mailto:temakao@xtra.co.nz) or 021 822 038 or

My research supervisors are:

Dr Marian Court: [M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz](mailto:M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz) 06 351 3462

Associate Professor Claire McLachlan: [C.J.McLachlan@massey.ac.nz](mailto:C.J.McLachlan@massey.ac.nz) 06 356 9099

Professor Wally Penetito: [Wally.Penetito@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:Wally.Penetito@vuw.ac.nz) 04 463 5169

If you have further questions please feel free to contact me or any of my supervisors.

### ***Committee Approval Statement***

*This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 12/42. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Nathan Mathews, Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 06 350 5799 x 8729, email [humanethicsouthbb@massey.ac.nz](mailto:humanethicsouthbb@massey.ac.nz)*

## Appendix 2

Information sheet

29 October 2012

### Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori

#### *INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARENTS*

Tēnā koutou katoa

Kia mihi te mano tini kua mene ki ngā Hawaiki katoa, rātou te tutūtanga o te puehu, te whiunga o te kupu i ngā wā takatū ai rātou. Heoi, waiho ake rātou ki a rātou, tātou te urupā o rātou mā, ngā waihotanga mai e hāpai nei i ō rātou wawata, tūmanako hoki. Kia ora tātou.

#### **Researcher Introduction**

Ko Tiheia te maunga

Ko Awahou te awa

Ko Tarimano te papa kōhatu

Ko Tawakeheimoa te tūpuna

Ko Puhirua, Ko Orangikahui ngā whakatakotoranga te iwi

Nā Tawakeheimoa rāua ko Te Aongahoro ka puta ko Rangiwewehi

Koia nei te reo o Ngāti Rangiwewehi

Ngā uri o rātou mā

Ko Te Mākao Bowkett tōku ingoa

I have been involved in education for over 30 years as a teacher, parent and policy analyst Māori in the Ministry of Education. For the past 17 years I have worked on behalf of Māori secondary teachers in my current position as Āpiha Māori for the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA).

I hope to continue further kaupapa Māori educational leadership theory and practice through this research study, and work towards gaining an EdD qualification at Massey University.

#### **Research Description and Invitation**

This research study sets out to investigate Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that could be applied in mainstream secondary schools and kaupapa Māori schools for improving education for Māori students. The aim is to identify schools leadership approaches in two schools that staff and parents there see as supporting and developing teaching and learning practices that are meeting the needs of Māori students, and from this identify whether there are particular Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership that are adaptable for other mainstream secondary and kaupapa Māori secondary schools.

I will be inviting participation from the principals, teachers, and parents of students in a mainstream secondary school and a kaupapa Māori secondary school, as well as two other significant Māori leaders.

I am now extending this formal invitation to you to participate in this research study. A copy of the permission letter from the Board of Trustees will be provided.

As the study is set within a defined timeframe the participants selected will be restricted to those who volunteer first. Once the required numbers are reached, the focus groups will be closed and all volunteers will be contacted regarding their participation or not.

### **Research Participants Identification and Recruitment**

I have identified your school as fitting the criteria for the study: that is, it has from my knowledge of secondary schools through my work at PPTA, a significant number of Māori students, staff who place strong emphasis on providing positive learning environments and improving student educational outcomes, and aims to provide effective leadership in those areas.

The significant Māori leaders will also be drawn from those with extensive experience and knowledge of working with Māori in education and are held in high esteem by their communities.

### **The Procedures**

The method proposed is that of a personal interview with your principal and focus group interviews with teachers and with parents, each of which will be conducted in an informal and non-threatening context.

In the interviews there will be 6-7 questions to consider in light of the research goals. Three main questions of interest are: What support is needed to help professional leaders improve the education outcomes of Māori students? What is your understanding of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership? How might Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership work to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students in schools?

### **How Many Meetings?**

If you agree to participate you will be involved in one focus group interview of approximately 2 hours maximum, at a time and a place negotiated with you. For your information, a focus group interview is a form of group interviewing held with up to eight people, led by a facilitator (or interviewer) in a semi-structured discussion in which people are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs and attitudes on a range of topics or issues. The focus group setting allows people to participate freely with other group members. To ensure discussions are free flowing and not inhibited participants need to agree to respect the confidentiality of others. The interview will be audiotaped. After writing up the discussion, I will send you a copy of the transcript so that you can make any corrections you wish. You will also have the opportunity to attend a presentation of the findings if you wish.

I know that with your support, this experience will potentially provide some insights and important thinking about issues and improved outcomes for Māori in education. I am confident that your participation in this research study will be mana enhancing for all concerned.

### **Data Management**

The data will be used for this research study only. Transcripts will be stored on a password protected computer and if printed, will be stored in a locked filing cabinet in my home. Tapes will be numbered to remove any chance of identifying participants and stored separately from the printed transcripts in my locked home filing cabinet, and consent forms. All tapes and transcriptions will be securely stored for a period of five years and then destroyed. The chief supervisor will be responsible for any disposal of data. Confidentiality of the participants' identities will be protected by using pseudonyms for the people and schools. After the publication of the final report it is hoped to disseminate it through presentations at conferences to interested educators and through the publication of articles in education journals. You will also be sent a summary of the study findings when it is concluded.

### **Participant's Rights**

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- withdraw from the study at any time;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used unless you give permission to the researcher;
- ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview.

### **Project Contacts for Further Information**

You can contact me at:

[temakao@xtra.co.nz](mailto:temakao@xtra.co.nz) or 021 822 038 or

My research supervisors are:

Dr Marian Court: [M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz](mailto:M.R.Court@massey.ac.nz) 06 351 3462

Associate Professor Claire McLachlan: [C.J.McLachlan@massey.ac.nz](mailto:C.J.McLachlan@massey.ac.nz) 06 356 9099

Professor Wally Penetito: [Wally.Penetito@vuw.ac.nz](mailto:Wally.Penetito@vuw.ac.nz) 04 463 5169

If you have further questions please feel free to contact me or any of my supervisors.

### **Committee Approval Statement**

*This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 12/42. If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research, please contact Dr Nathan Mathews, Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 06 350 5799 x 8729, email [humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz](mailto:humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz)*

### Appendix 3

Participant consent forms

#### Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori

##### *PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM - INDIVIDUAL*

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 agree/do not agree to the interview being sound recorded.

I wish/do not wish to have my recordings returned to me.

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

**Signature:**

**Date:**

.....  
**Full Name - printed**

#### Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori

##### *FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM*

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 agree/do not agree to the interview being sound recorded.

I wish/do not wish to have my recordings returned to me.

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.

**Signature:**

**Date:**

.....  
**Full Name - printed**

## Appendix 4

Focus group protocol

### **Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori**

#### ***FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL***

Focus groups should run between 60 and 120 minutes.

Each focus group should aim for between six and ten participants.

Secure names and contact information and send invitations.

Identify the questions, 6 or 7.

Make sure the questions will provide the information required.

Order the questions from general to specific.

Welcome participants, explain purpose and context, explain what a focus group is, and make introductions. Explain that the information is confidential and no names will be used.

Set a positive tone. Make sure everyone is heard. Keep on track in terms of time and coverage of the questions. Be allowing and non-confrontational.

Ask questions, use probes and follow up questions to explore the key concepts more deeply.

Thank participants, give them contact information for further follow up if requested, explain how the data will be analysed and shared.

## Appendix 5

### Participant interview questions

#### Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori

##### *PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS PRINCIPALS*

1. How would you describe your style of leadership in your school?
2. What are the values and beliefs that underpin your professional leadership?
3. As the professional leader, how have you influenced and shaped the education outcomes of Māori students in your school?
4. What can professional leaders in schools do to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students?
5. What support is needed to help professional leaders to improve the education outcomes of Māori students?
6. What is your understanding of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership?
7. How might Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership work to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students in schools?

#### Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori

##### *PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS LEADERS*

1. What can professional leaders in schools do to improve the education and outcomes of Māori?
2. What is your understanding of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership?
3. How might Kaupapa Māori to leadership work to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students in schools?
4. What can professional leaders in mainstream schools learn from Kaupapa Māori learn from Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership in schools?
5. What are your thoughts on the possibility of successfully adapting Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership in schools for supporting professional leaders in mainstream schools to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students?
6. What support is needed to help professional leaders to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students? Are you optimistic in terms of any likely improvement to the education and outcomes of Māori students? What are the reasons for your response/s?
7. Can you suggest examples of alternative pathways that Māori students in both mainstream and kaupapa Māori schools can benefit from, in terms of improved education and outcomes?

## Appendix 6

### Participant interview questions

#### Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori

##### *PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS TEACHERS*

1. How would you describe the principal's leadership style?
2. From your observations of and professional interactions with the principal, what values and beliefs underpin the principal's leadership?
3. How do you think the principal has influenced and shaped the education outcomes of Māori students in your school?
4. What can professional leaders in schools do to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students?
5. What can professional leaders in other schools learn from your school and/or principal?
6. What is your understanding of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership?
7. How might Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership work to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students in schools?

#### Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Māori

##### *PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS PARENTS*

1. How would you describe the principal's leadership style?
2. What values and beliefs underpin the principal's leadership?
3. How do you think the principal has influenced and shaped the education outcomes of Māori students in your school?
4. What can professional leaders in schools do to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students?
5. What can professional leaders in other schools learn from your school and/or principal?
6. What is your understanding of Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership?
7. How might Kaupapa Māori approaches to leadership work to improve the education and outcomes of Māori students in schools?

## Appendix 7

### Ethics approval



MASSEY UNIVERSITY  
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA

25 October 2012

Makao Bowkett  
6N, Republic 2  
10 Lorne Street  
Te Aro  
WELLINGTON 6011

Dear Makao

Re: **HEC: Southern B Application – 12/42**  
**Collaborative pathways of leadership in education for Maori**

Thank you for your letter dated 18 October 2012.

On behalf of the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B I am pleased to advise you that the ethics of your application are now approved. Approval is for three years. If this project has not been completed within three years from the date of this letter, reapproval must be requested.

If the nature, content, location, procedures or personnel of your approved application change, please advise the Secretary of the Committee.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'N. Matthews'.

Dr Nathan Matthews, Chair  
**Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B**

cc Dr Marian Court  
School of Educational Studies  
PN900

A/Prof Claire McLachlan  
School of Arts, Development & Health Education  
PN900

Prof Howard Lee, HoS  
School Educational Studies  
PN900

Dr Kama Weir, HoS  
School of Arts, Development & Health Education  
PN900

Mrs Roseanne MacGillivray  
Graduate School of Education  
PN900

---

Massey University Human Ethics Committee  
Accredited by the Health Research Council

Research Ethics Office

Massey University, Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand T +64 6 350 5573 +64 6 350 5575 F +64 6 350 5622  
E humanethics@massey.ac.nz animalethics@massey.ac.nz gtc@massey.ac.nz www.massey.ac.nz

## Appendix 8

### Case Studies

#### Case Study 1 Tolaga Bay Area School/Kuranui

This school is a composite area school catering for students ranging from years 1-13. It has a decile rating of 2. The school roll is 261. The gender composition is 52% boys and 48% girls. The ethnic composition is 94% Māori, 4% NZ European/Pākehā, 2% Pacific. The special features of Tolaga Bay Area School include an Immersion Te Reo Years 1 to 6 and Kuranui Immersion Te Reo Years 7 to 13.

#### Case Study 2 Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae

This school is a special character kura catering for students ranging from years 1 to 13. It has a decile rating of 1. The kura roll is 288. The gender composition is 44% boys and 56% girls. The ethnic composition is 100% Māori. The special feature of Te Kura Māori o Ngā Tapuwae is a Māori Immersion Kura Years 1 to 13.