

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.

**An exploratory study: Māori children's bi/literacy
experiences moving from a Kōhanga Reo setting to a Kura
Kaupapa Māori, Bilingual, and Mainstream education
setting.**

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

Masters of Education

in

Education Psychology

At Massey University, Manawatu,

New Zealand.

Sarika Rona

2015

Abstract

This research explored the bi/literacy experiences of three kōhanga reo children as they start school in one of the three school settings: kura kaupapa Māori, bilingual unit, and mainstream. A Kaupapa Māori approach underpinned this research and guided the case study methodology employed. Parents and teachers are interviewed to gain insight into the aspirations and expectations of their child's literacy development. The children's literacy experiences were observed in the school classroom upon school entry. The findings of each case study is discussed and analysed separately and then synthesised and critiqued

Key findings include the importance of home literacy support, relationship building, building on prior literacy experiences and knowledge, and quality language instruction in supporting biliteracy development. The study highlights the obligation for further understanding of biliteracy learning in New Zealand schools by teachers and parents, the need for more bilingual teachers, the urgency for further development of assessment tools appropriate for bilingual children, and the demand for quality resources that support literacy development in all school settings, kōhanga reo, and the home.

Acknowledgements

"Ehara i te pae te tawhiti rawa, ki nga mea e haere tikatia!"

"No horizon is too far, for those properly prepared!"

Tēnei te mihi uruhau ki a koutou kua tautāwhi, akiaki hoki, i ahau i nga tau i whakaoti i te tuhinga whakapae nei. Ki ngā tamariki, ngā mātua, ngā kaiako, ngā kura, ngā kōhanga hoki, tēnā kouotu. I whakatuwheratia e koutou ō koutou kainga, kōhanga me akomanga, e wātea ana māku kia kōrerorero i ngā take o tēnei rangahau.

Ki taku kaitiaki tuatahi, ki a Claire McLachlan. Ka nui te mihi ki a koe, e te rangatira. E kore au e warewaretia i tō kaha whakapakari, tō tautoko e hāpai nei i a au. Ki taku kaitiaki tuarua, ki a Bevan Erueti, ka nui te mihi ki a koe, e te hoa. Nāu ano te ārahi i tautoko mai i ahau.

Ki taku hoa pūmau, tēnā koe mo ngā kōrero, nāu i whakangāwari tōku hinengaro i ngā wa katoa.

Ki taku hoa rangatira, me aku tamariki, arā ko Grant, Zahria, rātou ko Zikyah. Ko koutou ōku poutokomanawa. Mei kore ake koutou kia kore ai au e whakaoti i tēnei mahi. He aha te mea nui o te ao māku, ko tōku whānau.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Rationale for the present study.....	2
Aims and objectives of the present study.....	4
Thesis Structure	5
Chapter Two: Literature Review	7
Introduction.....	7
Historical Overview: Māori, Language, and Literacy.....	9
Pre 1840.....	9
Post 1840.....	11
Māori Language Revitalisation.....	13
Māori Language and Education.....	13
Māori Participation and Education.....	15
Achievement in Literacy.....	16
The Teaching and Learning of Literacy Skills.....	19
Foundational skills in literacy.....	19
The Reading Wars.....	21
Biliteracy Learning	22
Developing literacy skills in bilingual children.....	23
Biliteracy learning in New Zealand.....	26

Assessment	28
Conclusion	29
Chapter Three: Methodology	31
Introduction.....	31
Kaupapa Māori Theory.....	31
Case studies	33
Methodology.....	34
Kaupapa Māori Research.....	35
Data Collection	36
Case Study	36
Participants and Settings.....	37
Case study one	38
Case study two	39
Case study three	39
Observations	40
Interviews	41
Data Analysis.....	43
Ethical Considerations	44
Summary.....	45
Chapter Four: Case Study One	46
Introduction.....	46
Part A.....	47
Background	47
Kimi and Raymond – Mother and Child	47
Whaea Tahi – School Kaiako.....	47

Whaea Ani – Kōhanga Kaiako.....	48
Experiences in Literacy	48
Expectations	51
Aspirations.....	54
Part B	56
Classroom Setting and Resources.....	56
Teaching Strategies and Learning Experiences	58
Scaffolding teaching and learning.....	58
One to One Teaching and Learning	61
Biliteracy Teaching and Learning	62
Relationships	65
Whanaungatanga	66
Ako.....	67
Assessment	68
Summary	69
Chapter Five: Case Study Two	71
Introduction.....	71
Part A.....	72
Background	72
Kelly and Bryce – Mother and Child	72
Whaea Rua – School teacher.....	73
Nanny Elsa – Kōhanga kaiako	74
Experiences in Literacy	74
Expectations	78
Aspirations.....	80

Part B:	82
Classroom Setting and Resources	82
Teaching Strategies and Learning Experiences in the classroom	85
Shared Literacy Learning	85
Small group learning	86
Independent learning	88
One to one teaching and learning	90
Peer Learning	91
Building and Establishing Relationships	93
Whanaungatanga	94
Summary	95
Chapter Six: Case Study Three	97
Introduction	97
Part A	98
Background	98
Ruby and Pani – Mother and Child	98
Whaea Tōru – School Teacher	99
Whaea Tia – Kōhanga Teacher	100
Experiences in Literacy	100
Expectations	102
Aspirations	105
Part B	110
Whanaungatanga	110
Classroom Setting and Resources	112
Teaching Strategies and Learning	113

Scaffolding.....	114
Ako – Tuakana/Teina.....	114
Independent learning.....	115
Meaningful learning.....	116
Biliteracy Development.....	117
Summary.....	117
Chapter Seven: Exploring Literacy across Three Case Studies.....	119
Literacy aspirations and expectations across the case studies.....	120
Experiences which provided positive support for learning to read in Māori and English;	123
Literacy experiences of the children across the three school settings	125
Experiences that best supported the literacy learning of English and Māori, in becoming biliterate	127
Chapter Eight: Conclusion.....	130
Summary of Findings.....	130
Reflections on the methodology	131
Strengths of this approach	131
Limitations of this approach.....	132
Avenues for future research.....	133
Final Words.....	134
References.....	135
Appendices.....	146
Appendix A: Ethics approval letter.....	146
Appendix B: Protocol for school/kōhanga reo teacher interview	147
Appendix C: Protocol for parent interview	148
Appendix D: Teacher information sheet.....	149

Appendix E: Protocol for school and teachers consent	152
Appendix F: Parent Information Sheet	154
Appendix G: Protocol for consent for child and parent participation	157

Chapter One: Introduction

In most languages today, reading is becoming a vital element of learning, and the foundation for reading is built in the child's early years of life and schooling. Around the world and in New Zealand, there is a growing preference for children to acquire proficiency in learning to read and write in two languages, particularly in their native language, that is not English, and English (Harris, 2012). Despite this preference, research into simultaneous biliteracy acquisition in early childhood in New Zealand and across the globe is relatively scarce. In New Zealand, children who attend kōhanga reo, a Māori language early childhood setting, experience different forms of literacy in different contexts. For the majority of these children, English is generally regarded as their first language, this is mostly because English is spoken the majority of time at home and is everywhere else in the general community. Māori is generally regarded as their second language and is often supported by one of the parents or an extended family member speaking Māori, but generally it is at the kōhanga reo where their exposure to te reo Māori is constant.

Children who experience two languages from birth are often referred to as 'incipient bilinguals' where listening and speaking two languages is a natural part of their development (Tabor & Snow, 2002). The quality of each language that they are exposed to generally determines their level of understanding and communication in each of the languages but for the most part they become in tune with the different linguistic structures. There is concern that children who have not been provided with quality communications in either language become at risk in their bilingual and biliteracy development; generally such children have not been spoken or read to in either language well or have been given experiences that builds on their vocabulary (Tabor

& Snow, 2002). Studies show that these levels of risk can be lowered through quality language and literacy experiences at just one of the home, early childhood centre, and again in the first year or two at school (Hornberger, 2003). Pre-school and school development become especially important when the home was not so supportive in language and literacy development. (Burgess, Hecht & Lonigan, 2002; Dearing, Kreider, Simpkins, & Weiss, 2006).

Research shows that many Māori children struggle to acquire literacy on school entry, particularly when the schools main language of instruction is different to their preschool encounters (Tunmer, et al., 2013), and questions around this phenomenon often lead to deficit theories and perceptions. In mainstream schooling, Māori children's bilingual or biliteracy preschool experiences are seldom considered when assessment is undertaken or analysed, largely because Māori is not considered their first language. However, all their literacy experiences and knowledge needs to be accounted for if true analysis is to occur (Caygill, 1999, cited in Tunmer, et al., 2013). Given the important role that literacy skills and children's first literacy experiences have in determining their educational and life experiences, and the growing aspirations and expectations of Māori children to be able to participate fully in Te Ao Māori (The Māori World) and Te Ao Pakeha (The English World), research into how to best support and develop biliteracy in New Zealand schools is of paramount importance.

Rationale for the present study

Having worked as a teacher in mainstream education across all year groups I have worked with children from various backgrounds, cultures, and abilities. Seeing a child's 'lightbulb' moment and listening to their views on various topics was always enlightening, but my best moments were when children who generally had no interest in reading a book themselves became

mesmerised in the stories I read to them, sometimes presenting a book report on it, using vocabulary in their stories, or seeking out other books to read that were similar in context. I always worked to create learning experiences that were fun and meaningful. It was important that I provided children with the skills they needed to participate in their world and I hoped by instilling a love for books it would help with this.

It was not until I had my own children that I started to take notice of bilingualism and its development. Both my daughters went through kōhanga reo, because I wanted them to grow in the language and Te Ao Māori. Although I knew they were accessing te reo Māori at kōhanga, my capabilities were limited because my learning of te reo Māori was discontinued when I started primary school, and only started again at the end of high school. I had concerns about how my girls' languages were developing and how their literacy was developing. I often questioned if they were on the 'right' path to becoming bilingual and biliterate, and what support could be given to ensure that they were. In conversations with other parents I learned that my concerns were shared by others. Kaiako (teachers) also worried about why Māori children seemed to be 'falling behind', not interested in learning, or losing their reo once they left kōhanga reo and entered a school that was not Māori medium. It was disheartening, especially if they were seen to be flourishing at the kōhanga reo. My girls now attend a kura kaupapa Māori, and are at varying levels of their literacy knowledge. I still have concerns as a mother in regards to their progress but my main hope is that they enjoy their learning experiences at kura and outside of it. As an educator I know that their Māori language and literacy development is best supported in a Māori medium setting that provides quality language instruction which is supported in the home, through books, other Māori media, and developing my own reo. Nonetheless, with English as their first language, like many other kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori children, I have often wondered what support is needed

to ensure successful literacy development in both languages and how first school experiences contribute to this, or not. In addition, I was given a ‘hurry up, find out, and do something so our children are the best’ kōrero from a kuia at our kōhanga reo, providing further impetus for the present study.

Aims and objectives of the present study

To advance understanding of the sorts of early biliteracy experiences described, this project explored the literacy experiences of three Kōhanga children and on school entry and how these experiences provided support in their literacy development. The literacy experiences of their Kōhanga teachers, beginning school teacher, and their parent/s, as the children move from kōhanga reo to a primary school were sought to gain further insights into how their experiences influenced their expectations and aspirations of their own child and other children’s biliteracy development. This project provides a foundation for further research into how best to support the development of beginner readers who come from a bilingual background and Māori language education setting, ensure continuity, and provide positive reading experiences which lay the foundation for strong literacy knowledge and skills.

This research study aimed to investigate the following question:

- What experiences do kōhanga children encounter that best supports their literacy learning of English and Māori, so that they grow to become successfully biliterate?

The research objectives were to:

- Gain insights into the literacy aspirations and expectations that the Kōhanga teachers, whānau, and the school teachers have for their children on school entry;
- Examine children’s literacy experiences in each setting and identify which experiences/reading programmes provide positive support for learning to read in Māori and English; and
- Identify and compare the literacy experiences of the children across the three school settings: total immersion, bi-lingual, and mainstream.

Thesis Structure

Following this introduction, Chapter Two reviews the extant literature in on the topic, beginning with a historical overview pre and post 1840. The review then outlines Māori language and its revitalisation efforts as well as statistics of Māori participation in education and achievement rates in literacy. Following this, the teaching and learning of early literacy skills are discussed, finishing with a review of research relating to biliteracy development in children.

Chapter Three describes and justifies the approach and process by which data for this research was collected. Philosophy and practices of Kaupapa Māori in this study combined with the use of case studies, interviews and observations are detailed. The participants are described, as is the method of analysis. Ethical considerations are then presented.

Chapters Four, Five, and Six present and discuss the findings from each of the three case studies. These chapters are organised according to the research objectives and organised around

the emerging themes. Extracts from the interviews and observation notes are used to illustrate discussion points, and supported with literature.

Chapter Seven integrates the findings of the three case studies and addresses the research objectives. Similarities and differences of key themes in the data are identified and experiences that provided support for children's learning or need further attention are highlighted.

Chapter Eight concludes with a summary of the findings, reflections on the strengths and limitations of the methodology and implications for schools, kōhanga reo, teachers, and further research. The next chapter provides a review of relevant literature.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Introduction

In the field of education, literacy, specifically reading and writing, are tools which connect people to their language, their culture, and to the world around them, whilst also maintaining, advancing, and preserving their language (Hornberger, 2008). Whilst endorsing the view that literacy is vital to language maintenance, educational advancement and cultural identity, it must retain its connections to the oral language. Maintaining links to oral language is particularly important for Māori, who have faced near extinction of their language. Through revitalisation efforts, particularly through the establishment of kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa, Māori have helped language to survive. Moving forward, Māori now face the challenge of how to best advance language and literacy in their tamariki (children). Van Hees (2004) emphasises the need for rich oral language experiences among children and high expectations from the children's parents, schools, and communities if they are to develop the literacy levels essential to be able to fully participate in their worlds. For Māori children becoming literate in Te Ao Māori and Te Ao Pakeha is a central aspiration (Durie, 2001). Tabors and Snow (2001) emphasise the critical role of preschool and early school experiences in language development and literacy acquisition, particularly among incipient bilinguals in becoming biliterate. If experiences in schools and preschool influence language development, literacy development, and biliteracy development, then care must be taken in the pedagogies and values from which the literacy teaching and learning methodologies are derived.

This literature review aims to recount historical Māori perspectives of education, pre and post 1840, Māori in print, and provides an overview of the events in New Zealand's education system that led to the oppression of Māori education and its language. It then provides a

synopsis of the movement to revitalise the Māori language through kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori education as well give an overview of statistics of Māori participation in education. Māori achievement of literacy in mainstream education is critiqued followed by a section on the teaching and learning of literacy which outlines what research suggests are the fundamentals in early literacy development and what the ongoing debate is on how best to teach reading. Lastly, literature into biliteracy development is explored providing a critique of what biliteracy learning entails and how to best approach the development of a biliterate child.

An initial search into the literature began with typing in key words such as ‘biliteracy development’, ‘Māori education’, ‘emerging literacy’, ‘Kōhanga Reo’, ‘Kura Kaupapa Māori’ and ‘achievement in literacy’, into the university library search database which included periodicals, books, conferences, articles, and Google Scholar. In addition, a search was conducted of the New Zealand educational theses database, New Zealand Research database, and online Māori research sites such as Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga and Rangahau. Research most relevant to biliteracy development in young children, particularly where the second language was the minority, were prioritised. Research into Māori literacy and language learning, and studies involving kōhanga reo were again prioritised. From these sources, studies that were frequently referred to, other literature, and any new terms, that seemed relevant were noted and searched for.

Historical Overview: Māori, Language, and Literacy

Pre 1840

Prior to the early 1800s, the Māori language was wholly oral in culture. All stories and information was passed on via speech and retained by memory to be told again in forms such as waiata (songs); oriori (lullaby); korero paki (storytelling); performance such as haka; waiataringa (action songs); or portrayed through traditional images and patterns displayed in, for example, raranga (weaving), tamoko (tattoo), whakaairo (carvings) and tukutuku (ornamental lattice-work) (Smith, 1997). There was no written orthography among Maori people and when knowledge was sought, it was obtained and contained with human repositories (Metge, 1984; Newman, 2010).

During the early 1800's, all missionaries learnt the Māori language to fulfil the desire to indoctrinate Christianity into Māori civilisation (Smith, 1997). To enhance the teachings of Christianity, a Māori orthography was also sought after (Jenkins, 1991). Building on the earlier work of missionaries Thomas Kendal and Reverend Samuel Marsden, Professor Lee of Cambridge University, with the counsel of two Māori chiefs, Tuai and Titere, undertook the task of developing an early orthography for Māori (Bauer, 1993, cited in Tahana, 2012; Jenkins, 1991), which is still used today. As a result of European influence, Māori were required to shift from an oral culture to the assumed fixities of the written word. Despite the miniscule time span in which this was done, many Māori communities were able to learn their native tongue in its transposed alphabetic form and relished in setting up their own schools in their own language (Mead, 1997). Teachings were mostly of the scripture but the learning of the written word was empowered by utilising their retentive memories to teach others (Mead, 1997).

Many Māori chiefs adopted the knowledge, skills, and communication methods that they believed added value and prosperity to their people as well as enabling trade with the rest of the world. Iwi, or tribes that were able to speak, write, and read the English language as well as the Māori language, found themselves thriving in trade and resources (Simon, 1998). Mission schools used Māori as the medium of instruction, and the gospel books were translated to spread the message of Christianity. Trade soon became concerned with acquiring books and printed matter as Māori became intrigued in learning the skills of literacy and numeracy to enhance their way of life.

Research supports early claims of the ease at which Māori acquired the skills of literacy and numeracy, with many soon passing on these skills and teaching in their own villages (Irwin, 1994; Jackson, 1975 as cited in Simon, 1994). One of the consequences of the upsurge of literacy acquisition was that Māori became subjected to and influenced by European values, thus systematically minimalizing Māori beliefs and marginalising traditional culture and transfer of knowledge (Jenkins, 1991). Frustration also arose due to the limited access Māori had to learning English. Reading and writing in English was regarded as necessary among Māori, especially as more and more settlers started to arrive. The advantages of knowing, and the detriments of not knowing the written word became apparent for Māori leaders, in particular in leading up to Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. The misinterpretations of Māori words into English translation and vice versa caused many misgivings for Māori afterwards and the debate about what was understood by those who signed still raises debate today (Mulholland & Tawhai, 2010).

Post 1840

After the signing of the Treaty, the British Crown in New Zealand became dominant in power and prioritised policies that focused on asserting their cultural views and language whilst undermining those of the indigenous, essentially employing assimilationist practices (Tangaere, 1997; Walker, 1992). The first bilingual printed newspaper by the government in 1842 began with the aim of assimilation (McRae, 2015). However Māori communities adapted and saw the value in print for trade, communication, and to have their own voice heard in Aotearoa and to the world, so established their own newspaper only in te reo Māori (Curnow, Hopa, & McRae, 2006). The first was Te Hokioi o Niu Tirenī e Rere atu na in 1863, printed on a press gifted to two Waikato men, Wiremu Toetoe and Hēmara Te Rerehau, by the Emperor of Austria in 1859, which they bought back to New Zealand after their travels (McRae, 2015).

With earlier missionary schools becoming abandoned, the Native School Act of 1867 was a means for government to gain access to Māori land as tribes seeking access to schooling had to give land and pay for half the building materials. Māori hoped that setting up these schools would extend their existing body of knowledge, in print and orally (Simon, 1994). However, the intentions of the government were to replace the Māori culture with British and an agenda to prepare Māori for labouring class status through industrial or manual training was introduced into Native schools (May, 2011). Claims that “Māori were suited ‘by nature’ to get their living by manual rather than by mental labour” (Taylor, 1862, cited in Simon, 1994, p. 60) were infiltrated into the schools. Further education assimilationist policies that sought to diminish Māori language in schools in the late 1800s include the 1870 Education Amendment Act which replaced the bilingual policy espoused by the missionaries to one where the language of instruction was to be only English. Expelling any spoken Māori off school premises and,

although it was not a documented policy, severe punishment was given to those who did speak their native language, especially the older children (McNaughton & Ka'ai, 1990). In addition, as a result of the numerous Native Land Acts of the time, Māori communities faced challenges that 'legally' led to the destruction of tribal economies and tribal land ownership, with less than one-sixth of their land remaining in Māori ownership by the late 1890s (Smith, 1994). Over time, this led to an assumed belief among Māori that their cultural practices and language were inferior to that of the European settlers and to survive, one had to rely on seasonal manual labouring for European farmers, something that Māori had feared (Simon, 1994). The events meant that even in the homes and many villages, Māori parents decided not to transmit the Māori language to their children but, instead, replaced it with English and insisted that an English education was best for survival (McNaughton & Ka'ai, 1990; O'Regan, 1999).

In the early 1900s, as war swept across the globe and depression hit New Zealand, rural villages saw those fit to work leave their whānau and move to urban areas in search of economic relief; this movement became known as the 'urban drift'. This, combined with government policies outlawing Māori language in schools meant Māori language diminished (Tangaere, 1997). It was not until the 1950s when a new group of Māori, called 'Urban Māori' who sought to make connections back to their traditional homelands, set out to revive the culture and language. They started with forming singing groups, called Kapa Haka and, in some areas, Marae were built in urban areas on land given back to local iwi from the Crown, thus creating a place for those Māori who left their rural lands to connect with each other (Walker, 1992). Although a durable task, some rural Māori communities still managed to cling to their language and practices proving pivotal in the revitalisation of the Māori language. The main driver of the language revitalisation movement was the introduction of kōhanga reo in 1981 (Ka'ai, 1990;

Hornberger, 2005). The next section of this review will examine the establishment of the kōhanga reo movement and the quest among Maori for cultural and linguistic survival.

Māori Language Revitalisation

Māori Language and Education

In 1900, over 90% of children went to school with Māori as their first language. By the late 1960s, this had fallen to 25% (Biggs, 1968), and by the early 1980s, Māori as an everyday medium of communication within families was becoming non-existent and almost extinct (Ka'ai, 1990). Fluency was restricted to people of middle age and over or those in rural domains, and the number of Māori youth and children who could speak the language had fallen to less than 4%; this statistic raised the alarm for Māori leaders (McNaughton & Ka'ai, 1990). Confronted with the reality of forever losing the Māori language, a plan to revitalise the language became essential. Kaumatua (elders) conceptualised that the key to language survival existed with the mokopuna (grandchildren), since they were regarded as the essential investment into the future (Ka'ai, 1990). Thus, Te Kōhanga Reo - the language nest - was established in 1981. The survival of the language relied heavily upon the traditional process of 'ako', explained by Metge (1984) as having no clear lines between learner and teacher, thus acknowledging the reciprocity involved in teaching and learning (Berryman & Glynn, 2003). In this instance, te reo Māori was shared between the kaumātua (grandparents) and the mokopuna (grandchild).

Based on genuine fears that the Māori language was becoming extinct, Te Kōhanga Reo sought to ensure that Māori was spoken to the children, and practices, values, and concepts under

kaupapa Māori philosophy were taught from the time of birth until the children left to go to school (Tangaere, 1997). Skerrett (2014) discusses the rapid rise and fall of kōhanga reo, built on the momentum of whānau involvement and early success. Kōhanga reo facilities peaked in the early 1990's, but this later dwindled as it shifted into the government's 'education' stream and difficulties arose in the maintenance, consent, recognition, resources, funding, and quality of teachers which led to the closure of almost 200 kōhanga reo in the late 1990's (Skerrett, 2014; Tangaere, 1997). Numbers of children being taught in kōhanga reo however, were still relatively high, so the need for a school to continue with Māori medium education became the next movement to revitalising the Māori language.

This need had to be addressed as many children were entering mainstream education and 'losing' their language within six months of starting school because their previous language experiences were not well supported (Ka'ai, 1990; McNaughton & Ka'ai, 1990). The introduction of kura kaupapa Māori; a Māori medium primary school based on Māori epistemologies, has been encouraging in the revitalisation of the language as it provides a continued path for speaking, reading, and writing in te reo Māori while also continuing with education (Benton & Benton, 2000; Berryman, 2001; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Hill, 2010). The primary goal of kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori is to preserve te reo me ōna tikanga. *Te Korowai* (kōhanga reo) (Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust, 1995) and *Te Aho Matua* (kura kaupapa Māori) (Tākao, 2010) are written expressions of the epistemologies that guide how learning is encouraged and enhanced in these environments (Tangaere, 1997). Continuation of education in a Māori medium has provided avenues of choice for families in Māori medium education that is beyond preschool; perhaps influencing participation of Māori in education.

Māori Participation and Education

Statistics show that prior participation in early childhood education before starting school was 94% for Māori in September 2015, an increase from 89% in 2004 (Ministry of Education, 2015). About 30% of all Māori enrolments were in Te Kōhanga Reo and another 7% in another form of Māori medium, early childhood setting. Of all children enrolled in primary school, approximately 44% identified as Māori, and approximately 2.3% of the total school population were enrolled in Māori medium education (Ministry of Education, 2015). A Māori medium setting is defined as being taught curriculum in Māori for at least 51 percent of the time and are at Māori language immersion levels 1-2. A review of statistics identifying the number of children who move from kōhanga reo to a Māori medium setting shows that just over 60% of kōhanga reo children move to a Māori medium setting. (Ministry of Education, 2015). This finding shows positive continuation of Māori in Māori medium education from early years through to primary, which has seen a dramatic increase over the last two decades. Murray and Galvin (2004) state that during the period 1993-2003, there was a 164% increase in Māori medium enrolments, reflecting the increase in the number of Māori immersion schools and classrooms being offered. However, the large proportion of Kōhanga children that go onto mainstream or partially taught Māori (less than 51%) education (Ministry of Education, 2015) highlights the need for children to be given support during their transition and first literacy experiences. These first school experiences need to be positive and familiar to their prior literacy experiences in kōhanga reo, thus to ensure the continued development of Maori literacy.

If children do not have positive and familiar experiences, research shows that this can lead to a reluctance to attend school, potentially leading to poor effort and work output, poor

behaviour, low learning achievement, prejudiced teacher attitudes towards them, and subsequent struggles in literacy learning (Ka'ai, 1990; McNaughton & Ka'ai, 1990; Stanovich, 1986). Support in literacy learning is critical as literacy levels have shown to be good indicators of projected success in school (Clay, 1979; Wells, 1986; Prochnow, Tunmer, & Arrow, 2015). If children are learning more than one language and their prior knowledge of literacy is somewhat different to the literacy environment, for example from kōhanga reo to mainstream or Kindergarten to Māori immersion, it is imperative that children be given extra support as they enter school if achievement in literacy is to grow.

Achievement in Literacy

With the large number of Māori children in mainstream education it is important that their literacy needs are supported, particularly if the schools cultural capital is different to their own. Research has shown how cultural differences between school, home and child can impact negatively on learning achievements (McFarlane & McFarlane, 2013). The New Zealand Ministry of Education's Statement of Intent 2009-2014 states that every child should be supported to their individual needs to learn literacy, and Māori students should enjoy education success as Māori (Ministry of Education, 2009). Together, this implies that regardless of a student's ethnic background, all children are to be taught how to read according to their needs, and assessments are reflective of their prior learning experiences and approaches.

Tunmer et al. (2013) argue that New Zealand's efforts to reach such goals and reduce the disparities in achievement outcomes between good and poor readers over the past 15 years has failed. Largely they argue that this is because research done on the topic shows that there has been no significant change in assessment data studied over the years. Studies of literacy

achievement in the 1990's revealed that New Zealand had the largest gap between the lowest readers and the top compared to other first world countries, such as Britain, America, and Canada, with Māori children largely representing the lowest achievers. Further disparities were seen between Māori and Pākeha students on literacy skills at school entry, which increased over the first years of schooling (Elley, 1992; Gilmore, 1998; Nicholson, 1997; Wagemaker, 1993).

In response to these growing concerns, New Zealand's Ministry of Education established a Literacy Taskforce to help reach the goals of every child being able to read and write by the age of nine, and to close the gap in achievement between low and high achieving readers (Ministry of Education, 1999). However, in spite of a group of literacy experts sanctioned by the government and tasked with advising the Literacy Taskforce on latest research developments in literacy, their recommendations were rejected. The leading recommendation was a shift to move away from the whole language strategy in reading to focus on phonemic development. Instead the Ministry of Education continued to financially endorse policies in literacy that focused on the whole language approach (Turner et al., 2013). However, Reynolds and Wheldall's (2007) review of the whole language intervention approach 'Reading Recovery in New Zealand', highlights that Reading Recovery does not work for the students most at risk of failing to learn to read, namely Maori and pasifika children (Lee, 2011). Furthermore, the latest Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) (2011) reports show no real change to the previous reports of 2001 and 2006. The PIRLS data shows that children who did not have the pre-requisite skills of literacy at school entry tended to be from economically and educationally disadvantaged homes compared to students who had early literacy skills and who largely also came from economically and educational affluent backgrounds. Those at the tail end were predominately children identified as Māori or Pasfika.

To address the literacy needs of those most at risk of reading failure research shows intensive phonics instruction in the first six weeks can make a difference to children's learning especially if preschool preparation was limited (Tunmer & Nicholson, 2011).

Furthermore, the PIRLS 2011 report claims that children's early childhood experiences with literacy were related to their reading literacy achievements in school (Ministry of Education, 2015). Every child has different experiences therefore every child's literacy needs will differ in the amount of reading-related skills, knowledge, and experiences they bring to the classroom. Tunmer et al. (2013) refer to this as literate cultural capital, drawing on Bourdieu's (1986) notion of cultural capital. If their early experiences and specific learning needs are addressed in their first year of schooling, then this will have a significant influence on children's literacy achievement into high school and adulthood (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson, 2003; Tunmer, Chapman, & Prochnow, 2003). Current research examining the important precursors of early literacy skills, a child's literate cultural capital on school entry, and the role this has on later literacy achievements reveals the need to shift from a 'one size fits all' approach to being able to teach and meet the specific literacy needs of each child (Arrow, 2007; Burgess, 2002; Lonigan & Shanahan, 2009; Morais, 2003; Tunmer et al., 2013). To meet the specific literacy needs of a child and to help raise the achievement of children in literacy requires differentiated instruction, teaching to where children are, rather than the year level. This requires knowledge of how to teach specific literacy skills, and specific knowledge of where children are on the continuum of literacy acquisition, but is beneficial to the child's literacy growth (Arrow, McLachlan, & Greaney, 2015).

The Teaching and Learning of Literacy Skills

Foundational skills in literacy

Phonology, transferring from speech to print, is one of the key components that make up language. Phonological awareness is part of phonology (Gillon, 2004). Arrow's (2007) doctoral study of 110 four-year-old children in NZ with no formal literacy teaching supports the idea that phonological development occurs as a continuum. The study found that letter-name knowledge (although not significant) is a precursor of rime awareness, with rime awareness a precursor to phoneme awareness. There are two main types of phonemes; vowels and consonants. Phonemic awareness, although distinctive, is part of phonological awareness. According to Kamhi and Catts (2012) and Ryder, Tunmer, and Greaney (2007), phonemic awareness is crucial to learning to read and is a prerequisite for learning to read, spell, and write. This is also highlighted in The National Early Literacy Panel Report (Lonigan & Shanahan, 2009) which names 11 predictors of reading acquisition for both pre-schoolers and children in their first year of schooling. These include six conventional skills that showed large predictive correlations in later reading achievements as well as five additional early literacy skills that proved to be moderately correlated to later reading achievements. The 11, outlined in Lonigan and Shanahan (2009, p. 3-4), include the following;

- *Alphabet knowledge (AK)*: knowledge of the names and sounds associated with printed letters.
- *Phonological awareness (PA)*: the ability to detect, manipulate, or analyse the auditory aspects of spoken language (including the ability to distinguish or segment words, syllables, or phonemes, independent of meaning).
- *Rapid automatic naming (RAN) of letters or digits*: the ability to rapidly name a sequence of random letters or digits.

- *RAN of objects or colours*: the ability to rapidly name a sequence of repeating sets of pictures of objects (e.g., car, tree, house, man) or colours.
- *Writing or writing a name*: the ability to write letters in isolation on request or to write one's own name.
- *Phonological memory*: the ability to remember spoken information for a short period of time.
- *Concepts about print*: knowledge of print conventions (e.g., left-right, front-back) and concepts (book cover, author, text).
- *Print knowledge*: a combination of AK, concepts of print, vocabulary, memory, and PA.
- *Reading readiness*: usually a combination of AK, concepts of print, vocabulary, memory and PA.
- *Oral language*: the ability to produce or comprehend spoken language, including vocabulary and grammar.
- *Visual processing*: the ability to match or discriminate visually presented symbols.

The 11 variables consistently predicted reading ability in the preschool and early school years. When reading levels increase, early phonological awareness, and oral language skills such as vocabulary knowledge, decoding ability, and comprehension become critical (Kamhi & Catts, 2012; Lonigan & Shanahan, 2009). The numerous factors that contribute to literacy learning and later reading achievement has underpinned the debates over how best to approach the teaching and learning of literacy. The debates over which strategy is best for promoting early literacy are explored next.

The Reading Wars

There are many controversies about reading instruction in the early years of school which have led to theoretical debates about what is the best method to teach children who are learning to read. In general, there are two main approaches used to teach reading: the *Whole Language* approach; and the *Phonics* approach (Kim, 2008). As mentioned previously, New Zealand education is heavily invested in the whole language approach to reading despite current research making strong recommendations to teach phonics early in the reading programmes (Kamhi & Catts, 2012; Tunmer et al., 2013). How this should be done is not specified, which leaves many schools sourcing their own funding for reading programmes and interventions if a phonics approach is adopted.

The whole language approach to reading is centred on the belief that children will learn to read just as they learnt to speak; based on their environment. It is a top-down model in which children learn to read through their experiences with print and pictures and then learning letter-sound knowledge as a result (Smith & Elley, 1994; Thompson, 1997). Children are not generally taught specific reading skills, rather, they are instructed as the need arises. They are encouraged to read for meaning and attempt difficult words by using the cues surrounding them such as context, pictures, predicting and self-correcting (Clay, 1985). Specific recognition of phonics only occurs when the teaching moment is required (Nicholson, 2000; Tunmer, Prochnow, & Chapman, 1999).

In contrast, the phonics approach has an emphasis on letter-sound correspondence and is based on a bottom-up form of instruction, meaning that letter knowledge and sounds are taught first, with meaning developing out of reading accuracy (Stahl, 1992, cited in Arrow, 2007).

Following this, children are then taught the blending of phonemes to read unfamiliar words, especially if the word is also unfamiliar to their spoken vocabulary knowledge (Adams, 1990, cited in Arrow, 2007). Tunmer et al. (2013) examined a wide range of literature that supported the effectiveness of systematic phonics instruction on learning to read, especially in children beginning school and those most at risk such as Māori and Pasifika. The overwhelming conclusion was that “explicit attention to alphabetic coding skills in early reading instruction is helpful for all children and crucial for some” (Tunmer et al., 2013, p. 21), thus highlighting its important position in learning to read and in literacy development.

As previously mentioned, numerous studies have shown variable skills predictive for early literacy learning, emphasising the necessity for children to be explicitly taught fundamental knowledge and skills for reading and writing prior to and on school entry using age appropriate pedagogies (McLachlan, Nicholson, Fielding-Barnsley, Mercer, & Ohi, 2013). However, there are limited studies that reflect how such skills effect bilingual children’s literacy learning and the best approaches for bilingual environments. The next section of this review will consider this issue in relation to biliteracy development.

Biliteracy Learning

Reading in more than one language is becoming a reality for many children all over the world. Despite the global phenomenon of learning to read in more than one language in an increasing number of countries, research into the early literacy acquisition of young bilinguals in becoming biliterate is scarce (Garcia, 2000; Gort & Bauer, 2012). Hornberger (2003) refers to the fundamental level of biliteracy as any occasions when communication via reading/writing is in two or more languages. This does not exclude the important skills of listening and speaking

in literacy, but rather recognises the continuum between oracy and literacy (Cahmann, 2003). Linguistic knowledge is interrelated, but not relied on (Moll et al., cited in Gort & Bauer, 2012) for the literacy development in children, so in the case of a child who participates in a multilingual and multicultural context, they experience and create knowledge in more than one linguistic and literate world. Thus their literacy development must be understood to be distinct from the literacy experiences of a monolingual child and that their “literacy behaviour is a result of their bilingual and bicultural contexts” (Bauer & Mkhize, 2012, p. 16).

The *Ka Hikitia – Managing for success* Māori Education strategy 2008-2012 (Ministry of Education, 2009) illustrates some success in this field. For example, in 2011 the introduction of Ngā Whanaketanga Rumaki Māori gave an equivalent literacy professional development programme for Māori medium settings and the 20 hours of free Early Childhood Education (ECE) care for 3- and 4-year-olds was extended to include children in kōhanga reo in 2010, thus enabling an increase in Māori participation in early childhood education (Ministry of Education, 2009). However, this is in contrast to what predominantly occurs in New Zealand’s mainstream education system, with literacy programmes, assessments and analysis still framed on the developments of literacy achievements of a monolingual or English contextualised child (Rau, 2004).

Developing literacy skills in bilingual children

Literacy knowledge and skills in one language aid the learning of literacy in another (Hornberger, 2003). Although there is research that suggests that literacy skills and strategies learned in either language influence or transfer to the other (Gort & Bauer, 2012), it is critical that the learner is not restrained by rules of what might be their first, or strongest language,

because often there is not a direct transfer of rules and structure from one language to the next (Gort & Bauer, 2012; Hornberger, 2003). Bauer and Mkhize (2012) review several studies which show that bilingual children, similar to monolingual children, benefit from literacy-rich contexts. In these contexts, both languages are used to develop the fundamental understandings of texts, letter and sound correspondence, as well as concepts of print and knowledge. Phonemic awareness is considered a critical skill in learning to read for bilingual children. In Bauer and Mkhize's (2012) review of research, they found that when bilingual students learn phonemic awareness and phonics within literacy rich contexts, with multiple texts, they eventually learn to distinguish the sounds in both their languages and eventually apply to print. Buckwalter and Lo (2002), for example, found in their three month daily study of a Chinese child whose orthography of his language was different to English, it was revealed that his understanding that each Chinese character provided him with different information than the letters in English. Similar results were found in studies where children were able to distinguish when both languages used letters but were made distinct through the use or lack of diacritical marks above, below, within or between letters (Reyes & Azuara, 2008; Roberts, 2008). Gottardo, Gu, Mueller, Baciú, and Pauchulo (2011) found that language one and language two phonological awareness skills are highly related but mediated by variables such as quality of exposure and experience in one or both of the languages, child, and demographic factors. Bilingual children, when given the support early, are able to develop their fundamental literacy skills whilst also being able to distinguish between languages and even orthographies. Whilst they can distinguish their languages, they do not separate them, in fact research has shown that children deliberately switch between languages (code-switch) to best construct meaning of their context (Bauer & Mkhize, 2012).

The potential to develop biliteracy is greatest if empowered from a micro (child, family, classroom, teacher), meso (unit, school), and macro system (wider community level) (Cummins, 2000). Research shows that an “additive” approach, one where children are adding a second language rather than replacing one, is most effective when families, school and the wider community set it as a benefit to know two languages (May, Hill & Tiakiwai, 2006). The micro domain role in supporting a young person’s bilingual and biliteracy development has been captured in work from Berryman and Glynn (2003), McCaffery and Tuafuti (2003), Caldas (2006) and Hohepa, May, and McCarty (2006), to name a few. Each one’s work has highlighted the role the home and/or school shape in the child’s biliteracy development through shared reading experiences, oral language development, and developing emerging literacy skills. In addition, Cooper, et al. (2004) point out that having high expectations and taking the time to read and talk to the child is significant in successfully acquiring and using language and literacy. Hancock (2002) and Koskinen, et al. (2000) found that pre-school children who took books home in their target language (other than English) developed more enhanced pre-literacy skills. For example, their development of concepts of print in their target language were much more so than if just English books were given and taken home. Understanding how language is learnt at home is important in continuity to how it is learnt at school. Bauer and Mkhize (2012) provide an example of where a child and mother are reading at home in a minority language, and to understand the content of the text, the child switched to English part way through to express her view. The mother overlooked the code-switch, instead focused on the meaning of what the child was trying to construct from the text. This example shows the importance of interplay between languages to facilitate and construct meaning of text. Recognition of this learning strategy, by the parent and by the school, is important to enhancing a child’s biliteracy development. Code switching is typical among bilingual individuals, but is

often misinterpreted as language learning difficulty or made to be corrected in the language of instruction (Genesse, Paradis, & Crago, 2004).

Biliteracy learning in New Zealand

Immersion education is a key form of bilingual education, because the language of instruction is generally the child's second language, and has proven to be successful in achieving bilingualism internationally (May, Hill & Tiakiwai, 2006). The beginning years of a child's life is critical in setting foundations in language acquisition. Te Kōhanga Reo recognises this critical time by providing a 'home' environment that uses Māori language and practices Māori values (Smith, 1987). There is often fear from parents and teachers that children become confused when learning two or more languages which Tabors and Snow (2002) show is not accurate. Most children in kōhanga reo have English as their first language, and are most likely exposed to literacy in English as well as Māori at home and at kōhanga reo (Hill, 2010). The exposure to both languages facilitates the development of metalinguistic awareness, a heightened functioning of the brain that allows children to cross boundaries and apply what they learn in one language to their other language, thus providing foundations in which biliteracy development can occur (Gort & Bauer, 2012; Gonzalez & Reyez, 2012). The misgivings in literacy development occur when kōhanga reo children are removed from their immersion setting and enter a school setting that does not build on their experiences and knowledge and so become at risk of reading failure (May, Hill & Tiakiwai, 2006). Research carried out by McNaughton, et al. (2004) looked at how Māori medium teachers effectively taught children with varying language and literacy profiles. They found that in the first year of formal instruction in reading, well designed instructional activities around reading and writing, and quality language output from the teachers capitalised children's language and literacy

development, consistent with Bialystok (2004) who notes that quality language instruction is paramount for successful biliteracy development. However, McNaughton, et al. (2004) noted that expressive output from the children was not so forthcoming, which is consistent with Hornberger's (2008) work on bilingual children's development in finding their 'voice'. Hornberger (2008) also concludes that this should not be viewed as a deficit rather a matter of encouragement, and finding meaningful context to express. Further research by McNaughton, et al. (2004) found that hearing and responding to language over a long period of time in school and at home can impact on the early stages of learning to decode which is consistent with other longitudinal studies in English medium settings in New Zealand (Tunmer, Chapman, Ryan, & Prochnow, 1998) and studies in Māori medium settings (Cooper, Arago-Kemp, Wylie & Hodgen, 2004; Hohepa, 2000).

In addition, and consistent with research abroad (Tabors & Snow, 2002), the preschool experiences and early school experiences relating to language and literacy exposure, impact developmental literacy skills, vocabulary, and later comprehension. Children learn from the input they receive, so the higher the quality of input the greater the development (Cooper, et al., 2004). Nonetheless, full biliteracy development or any literacy development, in this case of kōhanga reo children entering school, will be difficult if the children are not viewed as coming from a bilingual context, regardless of whether it is their first language or not (Hornberger, 2008). A view point into literacy learning from a bilingual lens, as opposed to a monolingual lens, should change the pedagogy of the classrooms they enter into. In addition any other literacy programme and assessments that seek to 'improve' or best support Māori children's literacy levels needs to viewed from a bilingual perspective.

Assessment

When assessing literacy in bilingual children it is widely recommended that both languages be given attention (Snow & Van Hemel, 2008), as vocabulary development is distributed across the languages (Snow & Oh, 2011). It is also important for teachers of bilingual students to understand that code switching (switching between languages) and language mixing (substituting single words into the sentence of the other language) are all part of second language acquisition (Snow & Oh, 2011), and therefore, should not be viewed as being compared to their monolingual peers (Espinosa & Lopez, 2007). Furthermore, research suggests that if new entrant children were: a) assessed during regular learning instruction; b) received the instructions in their preschool or home rather than just their school; c) with someone they were comfortable with and; d) in culturally appropriate context and language, then a truer indication of their knowledge will be identified (Espinosa & Lopez, 2007; Snow & Oh, 2011).

The issue around the appropriateness of assessments for students in kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori is well known to those working in such settings (Cooper et al., 2004). Assessments in these settings need to be able to ascertain what Māori cultural aspirations and practices are central to the development and analysis of the assessment tools and under no circumstances should the children be compared to the development of their peers in English medium settings (Bishop, et al., 2001). There are assessment tools in Māori medium schools, but these have been inconsistent in use (Bishop, et al., 2001). Cooper et al. (2004) found the need for diagnostic tools in literacy to be developed and legitimised within the framework of Māori language and culture. The recent development of Ngā Whanaketanga, a tool to monitor and report student's progress and achievement on kōrero (oral language), pānui (reading),

tuhituhi (writing) and pāngarau (mathematics) (Ministry of Education, 2014) is a step in this direction.

Conclusion

Education is about preparing people to actively participate as citizens of their own world, and for Māori children this means in Te Ao Māori (The world of Māori) and Te Ao Pakeha (The world of English) (Durie, 2001). History showed that early on, Māori participated in both worlds relatively freely, adapting to the printed word and using the knowledge of two languages to their advantage. When this conflicted with the British Crown's goals, assimilation practises heightened and as a result the effects of colonisation worsened. As a result, the loss of land became inconceivable, the values and status of Māori culture was degraded, the population of Māori were nearly eradicated, and the Māori language was close to extinction (Smith, 1995; Walker, 1992). Despite the process of colonisation, Māori have shown resilience and successfully revived the language through the establishments of kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori (Tangaere, 1997). Meeting the aspirations for Māori to be successful bilinguals and achieve biliteracy is the challenge Māori now face in education advancement. Research highlights that Māori children in mainstream education tend to be at the negative end of the literacy achievement spectrum compared to non-Māori, as a result of not having the fundamental literacy skills prior to school and lack of support, quality literacy instruction on school entry, and poor experiences (Tunmer et. al, 2013). The research evidence highlighted the critical importance of developing phonological awareness skills, which are transferable between languages, and so important to note in biliteracy development (Gort & Bauer, 2012). The review highlighted the necessity to understand the literacy development of bilingual children, and teaching pedagogies especially when considering assessment tasks and analysing

assessment results (Hornberger, 2008; Snow & Van Hemel, 2008). Finally, children having language skills in te reo Māori and literacy is paramount to educational advancement and aspirations of Māori for children to become successfully bilingual and biliterate. The next chapter discusses the methodology employed in conducting this research.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter describes the case study approach employed to explore and organise the literacy experiences of kōhanga reo children as they started school in one of three settings: kura kaupapa Māori, bilingual, and mainstream. The study utilised Kaupapa Māori theory principles to guide the data gathering process of participant observations (children) and participant interviews with children's parents, kōhanga reo teachers, and school teachers. The data was inductively analysed by codes and then grouped according to themes. This chapter will introduce Kaupapa Māori Theory (KMT), the methodological framework that underpinned this research. Followed by a discussion on how a case study approach was best suited for data collection, within the KMT framework. The chapter ends with a synopsis on how the data was analysed and outlines any ethical considerations within this research.

Kaupapa Māori Theory

Western traditions and perspectives of research have historically portrayed Māori as the victim or being in state of crisis, resulting in a sense of suspicion and distrust by Māori of the notion of research (Smith, 2012). The research process that underpins this study challenges that mainstream worldview of research by favouring a process whereby structured assumptions, values, concepts and priorities are in accordance with Māori terms of practice (Smith, 2012). This research is informed by a view that there is not one Māori epistemology, but rather there are a different variety of Māori worldviews built on the philosophy that Mātauranga (knowledge) is forever transforming and is almost like a metaphysics that includes, but is not limited to, philosophy, astronomy, mathematics, language, history and so forth (Rona, 2014).

There is no ending to Mātauranga Māori, as it comes with the people, the culture, and the language and will continue to live through them further strengthening and expanding their production of knowledge (Mead, 2003). The research framework that has Mātauranga at the centre is referred to as Kaupapa Maori research. Kaupapa Māori research forms the basis for how pedagogy, philosophy, values, aspirations, beliefs, and practices to engage, construct, and conduct research, aims to make a positive difference for Māori (Bishop, 2003; Nepe, 1991). Smith (1999) expressed the view that when the researched becomes the researcher, their questions are developed differently, participation is different, and priorities change. Consequently, Kaupapa Maori research has offered a framework for Māori being researched and for Māori researchers to be engaged in a ‘culturally safe’ practice (Irwin, 1994). Ultimately, a respectful and cautious approach that seeks the betterment of the Māori people reinforces the motives in research methodologies; as such it is often described as research by, with, and for Māori (Smith, 2012). Cram (2001) and Smith (1999) identify seven guiding values that provide a solid basis for carrying out kaupapa Māori research. These values include:

1. Aroha ki te tangata A respect for, and allowing the people to establish research context whilst sharing findings and allowing for feedback.
2. Kanohi ki te kanohi Providing a face to the research; this, helps build trust and communication.
3. Titiro, whakarongo, Take the time to listen and take in realities and aspirations.
kōrero
4. Manaaki Be generous with time, expertise, and look after the people.
5. Kia Tupato Collaborate with elders and/or the communities to help guide research and to be cautious and culturally safe.

6. Kāua e takahia te mana o te tangata Do not trample on the mana (dignity) of the people, collaboration in the entire research process is key to uplifting the people.
7. Kia Mahaki Be humble, gracious, and accountable.

A tailored methodology guided by Kaupapa Māori research principles and values was central to this research, as a) the researcher is Māori, and b) the study concentrates on the needs and aspirations of the participants with Māori values at the heart (Bishop, 2005; Smith, 2012). In sustaining the values aforementioned a case study methodology was justifiable.

Case studies

Collecting data via a case study method was symbiotic in working within a kaupapa Māori research framework, as demonstrated in research studies by Coffin (2013), Flavell (2012), Hill (2010) and Ka'ai (1990). Their research supports the notion that case studies portray a detailed and descriptive account of each participant's context, thoughts, and feelings (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). Further to this, it complements a Kaupapa Māori approach as participants are at the centre of the research (Coffin, 2013), relationships are formed on the values of trust and manaaki (Flavell, 2012), and the information is accessible to those who participated and the wider community (Hill, 2010). In line with Cram (2001) and Smith's (1999) KMT values, each research project that used a case study approach and KMT, provided autonomy for each participant to contribute their knowledge and experience to the project.

Validity of qualitative research involves determining whether findings are accurate using validity strategies such as triangulation, member reviewing, replication, chain of evidence, rich

description, and reflectivity (Creswell, 2014) A case study methodology commonly employs research methods such as interviews and observations together to assist validity via strategy of triangulation of data sources (Stark & Torrance, 2005; Yin, 2003). For this research, the main methods sourced for data collection in each case study were observations and interviews because it allowed multiple perspectives to be responded to. The data gathered information in a real life context and explored the participant's responses to the interview questions, while providing an avenue for further discussion. This allowed the researcher to gain insight into each participant's experiences and aspirations of kōhanga reo children's bi-literate development. Each case study provided an opportunity to compare and contrast the participants' views and experiences within, and between each case. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) highlighted that case studies can be heavily influenced by researcher's interpretations of the data and their own worldviews. Yin (2003) posits that comparing and contrasting multiple cases, as well as an in-depth analysis within each case allows for stronger discussion when theorising the results. How the research was carried out will be explained next.

Methodology

As previously defined, the approach employed is primarily qualitative, which, in this project, means that the data captured is based on the multiple contextual realities and viewpoints of the participants according to their contextual and holistic understandings. A Kaupapa Māori theoretical approach to research underpins the methodology of this research and is maintained throughout the case study method employed. In this section, to assist in reliability of this research, the process of data collection is described and it is explained that by incorporating multiple data sources, such as interviews and observations, the credibility of the data within each case study was validated (Creswell, 2014).

Kaupapa Māori Research

A genuine partnership approach to the research was employed in order to gain maximum benefit for participants and the researcher. To achieve quality participation and involvement in the research and development of Māori children in education, it is critical to firstly build a positive relationship with all those involved (Bishop, 1996), thus modelling ‘aroha ki te tangata’. In the first instance, a ‘kanohi ki te kanohi’ (face to face) hui (meeting) was required between the researcher, and the local Kōhanga Purapura (i.e. a Kōhanga Purapura is a collection of representative Kōhanga from a city or region), to ensure a physical introduction and development of a relationship by both groups could be achieved

The whakapapa or genealogical ties of all representatives at the hui were shared to express identity and further develop the relationship beyond the physical to cultural ties and spirituality. Whakapapa was shared again after the initial hui between the researcher and each of the whānau who participated in the research thus allowing a more familiar relationship which promoted information sharing. Bishop and Glynn (1999) affirm the importance of sharing whakapapa as it stimulates discussion and allows for all groups involved in the research to, ‘titiro, whakarongo, kōrero’, to reveal their aspirations, and also share the kawa (protocol) and tikanga (customs) of each whānau. Tikanga and kawa differ from iwi to iwi, and this was noted also with this research. It was vital that these differences were discussed, defined and understood by the participants.

A benefit to this kaupapa Māori research was that the researcher was actively involved in the participating communities of one of the kōhanga reo and the kura kaupapa Māori. This

promoted the value of ‘kia tupato’ and aided in the development of the initial ideas of the research to practicality. In addition to this, as a current and involved whānau member of a kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori, support was in place for me as a researcher before approaching the wider kōhanga reo and kura whānau community. This support was integral before meeting with the purapura representatives of the wider kōhanga reo community assisting in the consultation procedures put in place. After this consultation support was given for this research and care was taken to best represent participants’ viewpoints and experiences. Accountability to the whānau and kōhanga reo community became paramount.

According to Kana and Tamatea (2006), accountability to the whānau takes priority in kaupapa Māori research. Trust is given when information is shared by the participants to the researcher for the purpose of the research, so the knowledge gained must be given back. Participants said they felt safe and comfortable to share their experience to support this research as they felt it would be beneficial to the whānau and its wider community. Therefore, this research had to be accountable to ensure that the journey is fulfilled, shared back to the whānau, and the knowledge gained is used for the betterment of all its people.

Data Collection

Case Study

It is important that data collection methodologies are closely aligned to the principles of Kaupapa Māori research. For this reason, each case study focused on individual children from different education settings such as kura kaupapa Māori (full immersion te reo Māori), bilingual unit (mixture of English and te reo Māori) and mainstream (English). The number of cases was considered to be practical within the thesis timeframe, and a ‘few’ (Coolican, 2013)

or three to five participants is considered sufficient for case study research. There is no general rule or agreement as to how big or small the participant sample size should be, however the common thread amongst researchers is that with smaller designs, better relationships between the researcher and participant consequently facilitate richer discussions, and allow studying individual experiences in depth (Crouch & McKenzie, 2006; Dreher, 1994; Onwuegbuzie & Collins, 2007; Yin, 2014). A multiple case study design, compared to a single case study design, provides more analytic benefits, especially if the contexts are varied (Yin, 2003; Yin, 2014). Consequently, this research approach emphasises appropriate selection of participants and settings and provides the most information-rich data possible in multi-case research.

Participants and Settings

The research involved three kōhanga reo children, aged four years, who were turning five and starting school in the year of the study. Their kōhanga reo teacher/s, parent/s, and beginning school teacher and classroom were also involved. Kōhanga reo in the local area were approached to ask for involvement and help in participant selection for the research. An invitation was given to me by the kōhanga reo forum in the area to attend a hui (meeting) so that the project and its intentions could be presented, heard, and questioned. Permission was given from the kōhanga reo purapura (cluster) to go ahead with the research, and the Kōhanga representatives asked the parents of children who fit the 'criteria' if they would like to participate.

The criteria for participation included the following: a) the child must have been at kōhanga reo for a minimum of two years; b) the child must be four years old and turning five; c) and the child must be starting a mainstream, kura kaupapa Māori or bilingual school in the year the

research project was being carried out. In total, there were eight children who fit the criteria. All parents of the children were contacted to discuss the research involved and answer any further questions. From this eight children, five children/families remained interested in participating. In this instance, there was no exclusionary process outside the selection criteria, so all children were invited to participate. Two of the five were starting kura kaupapa Māori schools, two starting mainstream, and one starting in a bilingual setting. The schools that the children intended to start were contacted, and letters sent to them to show that parents' permission was granted. Four of the five schools agreed to participate and one declined.

Interviews with each of the four children's Kohanga provider were carried out, as well as interviews with each child's parents and new entrant teacher before the child started school. In total, three different Kōhanga were interviewed (two children came from the same Kōhanga), with four different teachers – from three school settings, and four families participated. Before the commencement of one child starting school, the family relocated to another area of the country, meaning that observations of that child's experiences in school could not be done. In the end, three children were observed, one in each school setting.

Case study one

Child participant one is a Māori male and the oldest child of four in his family. He had attended kōhanga reo for at least two years and started school in a bilingual classroom that is closest to their home and within walking distance and also across the road from their kōhanga reo. The school is a mainstream full primary school (Years 1 to 8) that has an attached bilingual unit from years 1 to 3. The school roll sits just over 120 pupils, with 75% enrolled and identified as Māori. The school largely caters for the families of the local military camp and the local

farming community surrounding it. His parents are both Māori, and his mother attended a kura kaupapa Māori school setting during her primary school years and then attended a mainstream high school. The father attended mainstream schooling. Te reo Māori is encouraged and spoken at home, generally by the mother. The mother participated in the interview, as did his new entrant classroom teacher, a Māori woman with over 20 years teaching experience. His kōhanga reo head kaiako (teacher), who has been involved with kōhanga reo for five years and is currently completing her Bachelor of Early Years teaching degree extramurally as part of a Māori immersion university, was also interviewed.

Case study two

Child participant two is a Māori/Samoan male and the youngest of four. He had attended kōhanga reo since he was one year of age and had started school in a mainstream school that is closest to their home and within walking distance. The school's back field is adjacent to the kōhanga reo and local kindergarten. As recently as 2009, the school had two bilingual units; however, these were discontinued because of their falling rolls. The school caters for students from Years 1 to 6 and has just over 100 students, 63% of whom are Māori. His father is Samoan, and his mother is Māori/European. The child is exposed to Samoan, English, and some te reo Māori at home. The mother participated in the interview, as did his new entrant classroom teacher, a Māori woman in her second year of teacher registration, and his kōhanga reo head kaiako, who has been involved in kōhanga reo since its beginning in 1993.

Case study three

Child participant three is a Māori female. She had attended kōhanga reo since birth as her mother is a kaiako at the kōhanga reo she attended. She had started a kura kaupapa Māori

setting. It is not within walking distance of their home, and travel is by private vehicle. The school is a full primary (Year 1– 8), with a roll of just over 130 students, 98% of whom are Māori . It is one of two kura kaupapa Māori schools in the area. Te reo Māori is generally spoken at home. The mother participated in the interview, as did her new entrant classroom teacher, a Māori woman with over 15 years of teaching experience in kura kaupapa Māori, and her kōhanga reo kaiako, who became involved and gained her kōhanga reo teaching qualifications whilst attending with her own child over 10 years ago.

Observations

This research involved non participant observation which required no direct interaction with the children, but to be like a ‘fly on the wall’ (Lyons, 2015; Saldana, 2011). This has value in capturing reality and in the moment action and interaction and to be absorbed into the entire contextual and holistic reality of the setting, enabling greater understanding and interpretation of each experience recorded (Caldwell, 2005; Saldana, 2011). This kind of observation is commonly used in research as it promotes objectivity (Caldwell, 2005), but its purpose in this research was for protection of the child participants. This protection, as an ethical consideration and Kaupapa Māori grounded principle, was to avoid transferring poor quality language onto the participants, thus potentially causing harm.

Observation research requires good memory, clear focus, and accurate methods of recording, and are beneficial in being able to capture the moment by being present (Yin, 2014). In this respect, children were observed in their educational setting for a time period of no less than 45 minutes and no more than one hour and 30 minutes, three times a week, for two weeks or until six sessions had been observed at the most practicable times for the classroom teacher. Running

records and anecdotal observations of each child's literacy experiences were noted, along with any running comments made by the child and children or adults who may have been interacting with the child during the time of observation. The reason for a series of observations is that observing in a similar situation over a period of time helps to validate the data by lessening the researcher effect of participants behaving differently due to the researcher's presence (Guest, Namey, & Mitchell, 2013; Scott & Marshall, 2009) and possible bias of action from the participant and interpretation from the researcher (Guest, Namey, & Mitchell, 2013; Lyon, 2015). To counteract this, attending the participants' kōhanga before observations began in their school classroom established a 'normalisation' of our relationship between myself, as the observer, and participant. To further help in reducing researcher effects, my role as observer was explained to the children by the teacher so that roles and boundaries were set and children understood that the researcher was there to 'watch' them only. This was explained during pre-visits and then repeated when 'official' observations began. Therefore, there was greater ease for the researcher to walk in and out with minimal disturbance and interaction (Guest, Namey, & Mitchell, 2013). Although the use of observation in research is an insightful tool, it is often not considered credible when used alone and is regularly used in conjunction with other collection methods, such as interviews (Burns, 1990; Guest, Namey, & Mitchell, 2013; Lyons, 2015). The use of interviews to increase the validity of the research is explained in the next section.

Interviews

Interviews were conducted with a Kōhanga teacher, the parent and/or whānau members, and the new entrant teacher. The interviews were no more than one hour each in duration. The interview environment was always arranged and chosen by the interviewee; in most instances

it was the place that was most convenient and comfortable for them. For the school teachers, this was their classrooms; for the kōhanga teachers, this was in the office of their kōhanga; and for the parents, it was in the home, except for one parent who worked at the kōhanga, so her interview was conducted just after her colleague. It was important that the participants were comfortable and felt at ease for best dialogue to occur (Burn, 1990; Guest, Namey, & Mitchell, 2013; Lyons, 2015).

All interviewees were informed that the conversation would be recorded and all gave written consent for this to happen. Recording the sessions provided an opportunity to transcribe the interviews later, with more time to reflect on the questions and responses (Barbour, 2008). Recording all the interviews also allowed for a more engaging conversation as there was no need to stop and write notes (Guest, Namey, & Mitchell, 2013).

The interview used a semi-structured protocol with an interview schedule involving a few focused questions specific to the research objectives (see Appendix B, Appendix C). This allowed for flexibility to let the researcher delve deeper into the conversations if needed, and also provided an opportunity for the participants to ask questions themselves (Barbour, 2008). Lyons (2015) advises that a semi-structured approach is more appropriated to exploratory research. This structure also encourages ‘kanohi ki te kanohi’, which generally gives greater motivation for participants to talk, especially if a good rapport is established. In contrast, this type of interview technique, on a large scale, can take a long time and is not cost effective when compared to surveying (Guest, Namey, & Mitchell, 2013). Responses could also be unpredictable and restrained, which may deter from the research focus or give an interviewer effect, where factors such as age, educational level, tone of voice, and probing may bias an interview (Burn, 1990).

Data Analysis

Data analysis was primarily inductive. This strategy is a bottom up approach and begins with the data through interaction until concepts or themes emerge (Yin, 2014). Inductive processes are generally influenced and shaped by our own interpretations of the data, therefore throughout the analysis process it is essential to be aware of researcher bias (Stark & Torrence, 2005; Yin, 2003).

This research aimed to let Matauranga Māori underpin the interpretative analysis. For example, collating the data and coding manually allowed a stronger connection with the data. It also aided in furthering comprehension, and the researcher's knowledge of the cultural concepts that laid within (Yin, 2014). Initially, the research question and objectives provided a baseline, a set of a priori of codes (Barbour, 2008) to analyse and provide some coding to the interviews and observation content. For example, specifically tagging words or ideas that emoted participants' aspirations, expectations or experiences, in relation to literacy development was part of data analysis. As analysis progressed, additional codes developed as new ideas emerged. Interrelated codes were then grouped and themes later developed. This provided a thematic approach to the organisation and analysis of each case. Extracts from observation and the interview were presented italicised to differentiate between each participant's voice and the text. Each case study was analysed and reported on before the next case study was examined. This was to avoid interpretation assumptions and to allow each case its own resolution. Once each case study had been analysed, data from the three cases were compared and contrasted and the syntheses of findings are discussed in Chapter Seven.

Ethical Considerations

This project was approved by Massey University's Ethics Committee (see Appendix A).

In accordance with the Kaupapa Māori research framework, this project aimed to provide the opportunity to work as partners to help develop Māori children and their literacy learning for the betterment of their whanau, hapū and iwi. On conclusion of this project, families, schools, and Kōhanga will be provided with a summary of the findings and given the opportunity to give feedback. Kaupapa Māori practice is about sharing the knowledge gained to benefit the community (Pipi, Cram, Hawke, Huriwai, & Mataki, 2004). Possible ethical concerns for risk that were considered included the following:

- *Consent to participate.* Each participant, school, Kōhanga, and child's parent/caregiver were given information of the research projects, its goals, and what their participation entailed. The child's parents gave verbal consent once they had talked to their child about the research. Appropriate information must be provided for consent to be handed over (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).
- *Potential communication barriers and the risk to participant.* Communication barriers were considered in the design of this project. The researcher is of Māori descent and could understand some te reo Māori, but was not confident to speak in an immersion setting. For this reason it was decided that to reduce the effects of poor language skills, a non-participant observation method was employed. The option for the adult participants to communicate in te reo Māori was given, which could have been achieved with the support of the cultural supervisor, the second supervisor for the present study. However, all adult participants chose to do their interview in English.
- *Privacy and confidentiality issues with data storage.* All transcripts and observation notes were kept on electronic file on a computer. Access to the files was via security password only. Signed consent forms were kept in a cupboard under lock and key

(available only to the researcher) in the researcher's work office, accessible by staff key only.

- *Researcher influence in observation times of participating child and other children in the classroom.* To reduce researcher effects, a meeting was arranged to be introduced to the child's classroom. It was explained to them, by the teacher, that I would be entering and exiting the classroom on various days at varying times. It would be acceptable to greet however minimal engagement was preferred.

Other ethical concerns that needed to be accounted for involved assessing and managing stress to the researcher and participants. In this project, having a Māori researcher who engaged with all Māori research participants minimised the cultural differences, as shared cultural values and concepts could be better understood (Bishop, 2003). Having the extra support of a cultural supervisor provided oversight on the research design.

Summary

This chapter has outlined the research design and methodologies used. This thesis employed many of the principles that underpin a Kaupapa Māori research approach. Kaupapa Māori practice is about collaboration, ensuring that the processes of gathering, analysing, sorting, storing, and sharing the information is carried out in collaboration with all the participants, their whānau, and the researcher (Bishop, 1996). A multiple case study approach was used to allow for greater collaboration and participant ownership (Yin, 2014). Methods of interviews and observations were employed to explore each child's literacy experiences and used to gain insight into literacy aspirations and expectations of the adult participants. The findings of each case study are presented in the next three chapters.

Chapter Four: Case Study One

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from case study one. Interviews took place towards the end of June 2014, at the kōhanga reo, first with the mother and then with the kōhanga reo teacher. The school teacher was interviewed on another day in her classroom. The classroom setting was categorised as a bilingual level 2 unit, which dictates that Māori be spoken 50-80% of the time, and was attached to a medium decile (4-7) primary school. A total of six observations were conducted within the first two weeks of the child participant starting school, of which all observations lasted one and half hours. Participants in this chapter will be referred to according to pseudonyms to ensure privacy and confidentiality: the participant will be referred to as Raymond; the kōhanga reo teacher will be referred to as Whaea Ani; the school teacher will be referred to as Whaea Tahi; and the participant's mother will be referred to as Kimi.

The literacy experiences of Raymond are outlined and insight into the expectations and aspirations of Kimi, Whaea Ani, and Whaea Tahi are explored in this chapter. Observation notes and interview transcripts were analysed and organised around frequent and commonly used words, ideas, and events, which were then identified and organised as themes. The themes to be discussed included the following: backgrounds of all participants; Kimi's, Whaea Ani's and Whaea Tahi's expectations and aspirations on biliteracy and literacy development; classroom settings and resources; teaching strategies and learning experiences; relationships; and assessment. These themes will be used as sub headings within this chapter.

Part A

Background

Kimi and Raymond – Mother and Child

Raymond had just started at the school when data collection commenced; Raymond's mother, Kimi, described him as clever, yet shy. When Raymond started school, the classroom consisted of 16 children, from new entrants to year three, with four other students also coming from the kōhanga reo. Raymond is the oldest of four children. Kimi is from the East Coast and started her education in the local kōhanga reo. She then attended kura kaupapa Māori until the end of intermediate, and then went to a mainstream local high school, as there was no wharekura (total immersion high school) within the region.

Whaea Tahī – School Kaiako

Whaea Tahī was an experienced teacher, having taught in bilingual, mainstream, and total immersion classrooms. Her childhood education began in a small country mainstream school, where her mother was her teacher. Both her parents are educators and can speak fluent te reo Māori. Whaea Tahī learnt te reo Māori at high school, and again in a bilingual initial teacher education programme later in life. Poor marks at high school in sixth form meant she had to wait until she turned 22 to go to Palmerston North College of Education (Teacher's College). During her years before her initial teacher education Whaea Tahī worked in various jobs including in the Department of Social Welfare, kōhanga reo, a takeaway store, and a supermarket. After graduating from the bilingual teacher education programme at Palmerston North College of Education in 1995, Whaea Tahī's work involved teaching te reo Māori in bilingual units, working as a Resource Teacher of Māori for mainstream and Māori immersion

schools, and also working as a relieving principal at a kura kaupapa Māori, before settling into her current position as a bilingual teacher for the last eight years.

Whaea Ani – Kōhanga Kaiako

Whaea Ani was new to her position at the current kohanga, but had experience teaching in Kōhanga for just over three years. She was near the end of completing her degree in Early Childhood Teaching, which she has been studying through a Maori immersion tertiary provider. Whaea Ani did not attend Kōhanga because of the limited availability in the region, so her mother enrolled her into a kindergarten when she was three. Both her parents spoke English in the home, so she considered English to be her first language. Nonetheless, she learned Māori from her kuia, who spoke only to her in te reo Māori. Her parents then pushed for her to attend a bilingual class, which transformed into a full immersion primary school and later, a Wharekura. During her high school years, Whaea Ani chose to attend a mainstream high school, a decision she later regretted.

Experiences in Literacy

Recent studies have shown how early experiences of literacy contribute to the structure and functioning of the brain, and literacy learning capacity later in life (Ramey & Ramey, 2006). All three interviewees discussed their experiences with books and literacy growing up and today.

Whaea Tahī's early exposure to books were primarily in English. Although Whaea Tahī can speak Māori and teaches in Māori education, she prefers to read in English, stating "*because I don't have to struggle with kupu I don't know*". Whaea Tahī gave credit for her love of reading to her mother saying, "*she instilled in all of us a love of reading*". This fuelled her desire to be

a teacher and her father's involvement in Māori education sparked her interest to pursue Māori education teaching endeavours.

Kimi talked about how her family pushed for her siblings to know both Māori and English, highlighting this as the reason they sent her to a Māori total immersion school. Kimi discussed how reading Māori was easy because “*that's all we did*”. However, when she had to start at a mainstream high school in third form (year nine), she found it hard to make the transition to learning and reading everything in English, as she explains below:

It was really hard to transfer from knowing just all Māori things to going to high school and everything was in English. I felt I didn't know much and it wasn't a good experience, it took me a long time to actually figure things out and to learn in English. Sometimes I would write words and put 'te' instead of 'the' and would get told off. I lost confidence and the teachers just would think if I can speak it (English) then I should be able to read and write it properly.

Kimi's experiences have influenced her to encourage Raymond to read books in both English and Māori. Kimi's fondest moment, when faced with the challenges of mainstream education, was being involved in Kapa Haka, the school's Māori performing arts cultural group.

Whaea Ani's situation differed slightly to Kimi's because she wanted to and chose to go to a mainstream high school after spending her primary years in kura kaupapa Māori. At first, Whaea Ani stated that she was eager to go to an English speaking school, looking forward to the learning, people, and activities all being in English. What she did not understand at the time

were the challenges that she would have to overcome in starting a mainstream school after being at a kura kaupapa Māori for 10 years prior. As she explained:

I got sick of it (Kura), mainly because of being around the same people, my cuzzies (laughs), and I became interested in the world of Pakeha.....it was probably one of my biggest mistakes though because I failed a lot, you know in English, I probably only got two school C subjects and then left school at 16 to work. I was in the workforce for 10 years but felt lost, and then I saw a sign advertising (in Matauranga Māori) to become a teacher, I knew I wanted it, I was crying for my reo again.....it's just grown my passion since being here (at the Kōhanga).

After seeking out mainstream education, Whaea Ani's experiences in literacy and learning were not entirely positive. Similarly, Kimi's literacy experiences in English, when attending a mainstream high school after being at a kura kaupapa Māori were not positive.

Whaea Ani remembered how she loved to learn to read in Māori and in English. She recalled having a favourite book (in English) that she would read over and over because she got good at it. Yet she lost interest in reading English in her primary school years because it became too hard when no one would read, or teach her how to read, the other English books that her grandmother had sent her. As a result, it was later difficult to get motivated when reading in English became compulsory at high school.

Participants' personal accounts of their upbringing within education, combined with their experiences in literacy, provides insight into how their aspirations and expectations for literacy

development have been shaped. The expectations and aspirations discussed are primarily focused on children moving from kōhanga reo into school.

Expectations

Expectations of what Raymond should know when starting school differed between interviewees. His mother recognised that at kōhanga reo, and just before starting school, Raymond knew the letters of his name, and in te reo Māori could sing and understand waiata, rehearse colours, and count to 10. In addition, he could sing the alphabet song and count to 10 in English. Kimi was confident in his ability to learn and his desire to succeed.

Raymond's Kōhanga teacher had corresponding views of this knowledge based on her own anecdotal observations. *"He knew his colours, the Māori alphabet song"* and she was amazed at all the words Raymond would say that began with the letter they were focusing on. For example, she would say *"A, A, A", and he would call out 'Anuhe' (Catapiller) or 'Apōrō' (Apple)"*, also speaking about his motivation and eagerness to learn new things. Based on her accounts with Raymond, it appeared that he was confident, and that she expected he would do well at school.

The interview with Raymond's school teacher revealed some discrepancies in Raymond's knowledge between Kōhanga, home, and school when he started. The school usually administers a school entry assessment of all new entrant children in order to gauge an idea of what knowledge they hold. Whaea Tahī administers the test in English, but will use Māori if she knows the child has come from a kōhanga. After his school entry assessment, Whaea Tahī agreed that he knew his colours in Māori better than he did in English, and that he could count

to 10, but noted he could not easily recognise the numbers in Māori or English. He knew the sound of the letter O (in English) and the letter A (in Māori). She said his alphabet letter and sound knowledge was limited in both English and in Māori. Even so, after three days at school focusing on high frequency words (in English), he was starting to read and write small sentences such as ‘I am Raymond’, and ‘I like Mum’. Though he could write his name, he did not appear to know all the letters in his name as stated previously by Kimi.

The need for collaboration and communication between home, school, and Kōhanga became apparent as each interviewee shared their expectations of what a child should know when starting school. Research affirms that success in school is strongly determined by a combination of home, school/preschool, and child factors (Ramey & Ramey, 2006; Zigler & Styfco, 2004). In Whaea Tahī’s experiences, it is advantageous for the child to start school “*knowing their letters and sounds*”, otherwise they are generally playing ‘catch up’ and in the process their interest in literacy can dwindle. In relation to this she states:

Kids have no idea about their own abilities until they realise that they started school and all these kids started after me and I’m still here and they are there, and you then start to see their sad face and attitude to reading change..

A large number of children that have started in her classroom do not know half of the letters of the alphabet (Māori or English), and that their knowledge with the sounds associated to each letter is even more limited. Whaea Ani also thought that it was important each child be able to recognise letters, know them, and maybe even the sounds, but that she did not regard this as a priority. Whaea Ani’s philosophy is to “*give our children whakamana (freedom of choice) to explore their interests and their passions.*” In her experiences in working with pre-school

children, priority should, and is given, to the developmental motor and emotional skills, along with teaching them how to be responsible, sociable, caring, and inquisitive young people.

About her expectations, Whaea Ani states:

I expect children to be able to put on and take off their clothes, tie their shoe laces, carry their bags, clean up after themselves, be kind and share with their peers, play, and if they like or know about something then we need to support that instead of focusing on what they don't know.

Whaea Ani's expectations of the school, especially in the first year, was to continue to provide opportunities for children to explore their interests; continue in their development of te reo Māori; and most importantly be empowered to learn, explore, investigate, read, write, draw; and "*not be dictated as to what to learn*".

Interestingly, Kimi said she did not have many expectations of what her son or other children should know when starting school. She recognised that reading books was something desired and encouraged from the Kōhanga, and continued at school, as well as the ability to write and understand their name. Largely her expectations were of herself, as a parent, to ensure her children were happy, talked to, and listened to. Her most prominent expectation was also her most aspired: that her child grows to be confident in an English and Māori world. Both Kimi and Whaea Ani hoped that the development of Māori literacy was not limited to just Kura and that schools, particularly mainstream and bilingual units, would continue the development of kōhanga reo children in learning Māori, both spoken word and text. Whaea Ani explained one of her more sombre reflections:

It's hard to see kids you taught a year or two earlier at kōhanga not really talk Māori back to you, it's worse if they can't understand anymore.

If a bilingual child started mainstream, regardless of why, then identifying their language and literacy learning prior to school should be acknowledged and supported (Snow & Oh, 2011). They should not be expected, as stated by Kimi, to “*just know English*”, when learning to read and write. Further hopes, desires, and aspirations for better support in biliteracy development was also revealed during the interviews by all participants.

Aspirations

All interviewees had aspirations for Raymond and other kōhanga reo children in becoming bi-literate. Kimi aspired for Raymond to grow and learn in both worlds confidently and successfully, as highlighted below:

We want him to excel not only in Māori but also in English too, I don't want him to learn everything just in English I want him to have both because he is Māori so I want him to hold on to his culture.

Kimi's aspirations for Raymond to be confident in a Māori world and a Pakeha world was shared by his kōhanga teacher and school teacher. There was the aspiration that children will continue to develop the learning of te reo Māori no matter which school setting they enter into.

Kimi notes:

I want them (the school) to be able to still keep Māori a part of his daily life, so he doesn't lose it, that's the one thing I don't want him to do is lose his reo. I want them to help him excel in his reading and writing in both languages.

In the bilingual unit in which this case study was conducted, students are specifically taught how to read and write in Māori after they have grasped the alphabetic principles and developed phonological awareness of English. The reasoning behind this is because the majority of the student's first language is English, and come from an English speaking preschool, however, if it is clear that Māori is the child's first language, Whaea Tahi would accommodate to this. Although reading and writing in Māori is learned later, te reo Māori is communicated throughout each day through instructions, and specifically taught later, with Whaea Tahi stating that:

Once they have hit Level 18 (of English readers) they are pretty fluent readers, so we can make the transition to expose to Māori readers then.

To support reading development in schools, Whaea Tahi hoped that the home and kōhanga were as much involved in the journey too. When children take a book home, her wish was that they would be given the time to read the book to an adult, or have a book read to them. There was no preference as to what language the book is read in, Whaea Tahi explained, as long as they are comfortable, and are reading. Furthermore, she hoped that Kōhanga could build and develop the children's interests and desire to read by exposure and having fun with books, singing and dancing to waiata, role plays and storytelling, and other activities where literacy, both oral and written, could be developed. These aspirations are supported by research which shows that capitalising on children's experiences to enhance vocabulary teaching in the early

years should be done through playful engagements and classroom conversations (Harris, Golinkoff, & Hirsh-Pasek, 2011). Whaea Tahi also hoped that all preschools were more direct and taught phonological awareness, particularly in the six months before children transition to school. There is agreement amongst researchers that direct teaching of phonological awareness skills does lead to growth and improvements in phonological awareness, but focus on that alone limits growth in vocabulary skill building. Justice, et al. (2009) highlight the effectiveness of developing print knowledge through print referencing when reading storybooks as a means of early intervention in literacy learning. Referencing to specific features such as, pointing out the letter M, and tracking the word that follows the letter M with their finger heightens children's attention and interest in print. The benefits of this approach have been linked to improvements in phonological awareness as well as vocabulary (Justice, et al., 2009) and later comprehension skills (Juel, 2006). Tabors and Snow (2002) established that it is the early school years experiences in literacy skills, vocabulary building and phonological awareness that sets the foundation for learning more literacy skills. Children with a range of literacy experience from their environments have greater literate cultural capital on school entry (Prochnow, Tunmer, & Arrow, 2015). Similarities in aspirations for the child to be happy, safe and continue to grow to be literate in te reo Māori and English provide a focus for which his classroom experiences can work towards. The school classroom environment and literacy experiences of Raymond are explored next.

Part B

Classroom Setting and Resources

The way in which the learning environment is set up can support or constrain literacy development in a child's early years of literacy learning. Print and literacy activities need to be

accessible and at the children's eye level (Roskos & Neuman, 2002). On approaching the classroom there was a small cloak bay before the main door to the class where shoes and bags were neatly stored. A sign, in Māori, on the main door to the classroom asked for shoes to be removed. When entering the room it was warm and light. The wall displays were predominantly in English, with a section of the wall next to the front white board, dedicated to English high frequency words such as 'is, a, the, and, of' and others similar in nature. There was also a section explaining what adverbs, adjectives, verbs, and nouns are, which were referred to in the writing lessons before the children returned to their desks to write. The following observation illustrates how the teacher used these:

Teacher: "What is the adjective in the sentence, use that to remind you? (points to class display). Remember it is the describing word in her sentence?"

Class: "exciting"

Directing children's attention to print resources around the room to their learning allowed them to make meaningful connections between what they see, do, hear, and say (Roskos & Neuman, 2002). Displays in te reo Māori included the class birthday display, the months of the year, days of the week, subject headings, with the majority of art work also being of a Māori theme. Roskos and Neuman (2002) suggest that the class library be inviting, suggesting that it be a clearly defined space with comfortable seating and relevant texts, aspects of which were reflected in the classroom library within this case study. The class library contained a mixture of fiction and non-fiction reading material, and two books were identified as being written in the Māori language. During 'fruit break', which occurred in every observation at approximately 10 a.m., children had the choice to listen to a story being read by the teacher, or they could choose their own book and read independently. In the first observation, three children chose

one of the Māori books to read for their own pleasure, but this was not observed at any other time.

There were a variety of literacy resources, other than wall displays, situated around the classroom. These included English alphabet letter puzzles, consonant and vowel matching games, blends and homonyms word picture cards, sets of flash cards with letters, high frequency words, and pictures with words. Māori literacy resources included ‘Kei a wai games’ – numbers and numerals and activities and actions. Raymond was observed once choosing a ‘Kei a wai’ game during a fruit break. During the other times, he chose to sit and listen to the story read by the teacher.

In another classroom, which Raymond experienced at least once a week, displayed on the wall, in English, were letters of the alphabet with pictures, high frequency words, colours, shapes, and children’s stories. During observation six, Raymond was overheard reading the words ‘am’, ‘I’, and ‘the’ from the high frequency word display. The portability of resources between contexts is important in building coherence and continuity between contexts (Roskos & Neuman, 2002). In Raymond’s case, there was continuity with the English literacy resources between learning environments, but this was not so with Māori resources, suggesting potential incontinuity in learning.

Teaching Strategies and Learning Experiences

Scaffolding teaching and learning

Language acquisition is often obtained in a social context, thus it should not be assumed that a child will decipher the complexities of a language on their own. The teaching process of

scaffolding, a term coined by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) but based on Vygotsky's (1962; 1978) theory, enables a child to learn a skill or complete a task with assistance, which would otherwise be beyond their learning capacity if unassisted. The 'assistant' essentially controls what is done, permitting elements that are within the learner's range of competence. Vygotsky's (1978) examination of the gap between what a child cannot do to what the child can perform independently, conceptualised this area as the child's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) – the area that the child can perform with the support of a more able person. Once they have internalised the appropriate skill and knowledge, their ZPD shifts and new learning can occur (Smith, 1998). This technique was seen in use in all of the observations. The following are some whole class examples that showed positive learning support in literacy via the scaffolding technique.

The class were shown examples of sentences that followed the structure; “*Blue is* (adjective) + (noun) *and* (adjective) + (noun)” by the teacher (P1, Ob1, D1). The teacher's expectations were explained and she continued by pointing to each word displayed on the classroom smart board. She read the sentence in full, and then again in parts with the class repeating each word. Each sentence also had pictures to show the meaning of any new words. The pattern was repeated a further three times with different examples given to help build vocabulary, as demonstrated with the following examples:

Example 1: “Blue is a deep ocean and a bright sky”

Example 2: “Blue is a soft blanket and a grumpy smurf”

Example 3: “Blue is a warm jersey and a whistling bird”

Afterwards the students were sent to their desks to write their sentence in their book. All of the children settled quickly into their writing because they all knew what they had to write.

Another example of scaffolding observed was during a lesson when the class was directed to focus back to the previous lesson and their 'Blue' stories. The teacher then gave a new colour – 'Yellow'. Almost instantly Raymond put his hand up to give an idea:

Raymond: "Yellow is the sun?"

Teacher: "Yes, great idea Raymond, what is the sun doing?"

Raymond: "Shining?"

Teacher: "Yes, Yellow is the shining sun."

Raymond: "Yellow is the shining sun aaannnd uuuummm a yummy banana?"

(Observation 4).

Raymond's previous experience of the activity was successful and appeared to have given him confidence to speak out in this lesson. The teacher was then able to provide another step for Raymond to work towards improving his vocabulary knowledge and understanding of the sentence structure and objective. When children are guided through a writing or language activity that is broken down into small steps, the pace of the learning then becomes regulated to the learner. Consequently, early literacy skills are developed by realisation of print and the purpose it serves (Hedegaard, 2012; Henry & Pianta, 2011; Phelps et al., 2012).

This case study provided some insight as to how the technique of scaffolding learning can provide supported and positive experiences that encourage the child's willingness to participate

in whole class structured literacy learning. The benefits of this technique are also highlighted next in a one to one context.

One to One Teaching and Learning

One to one teaching and learning is considered a highly effective approach to preventing reading difficulties in children who are new to structured teaching of reading and remediating those who are at risk of reading failure (Juel, 1996; Torgesen, Rashotee, & Alexander, 2001). One to one learning was observed to be effective in advancing Raymond's understanding of the English language in areas of letter name and sound recognition, sight word recognition and writing a word. Research supports the importance of focusing on word-level skills during the beginning of one to one sessions, especially if children are new to language and to reading instruction (Juel, 1996; Kamhi & Catts, 2012; Wasik & Slavin, 1993).

In the following example, Raymond was working one to one with the class teacher aide (TA1).

TA1: "Yes 'a' is next, how do we write 'a', what letter is 'a'?" (Encourages Raymond to look at his alphabet chart)

Raymond: Turns to his alphabet chart and starts going through the letters by sounding them out, "a (said is in car), bih, don't know, don't know, e (said as in egg)"

TA1: "so this is (points to the letter a), the letter 'a' and is said a (as in lane), next is 'b' (as in bee), next is 'c' (said as in sea)" and continues to say the rest of the alphabet as it would be said in English.

Raymond: Points to and names the first four letters "a, b, c, d"

TA1: Yes and which letter writes the word 'a'.

Raymond: Points to the letter a

TA1: "Yes that is correct, Blue is a" (Observation 1)

The TA1 continued to work alongside Raymond until his sentence was completed. She guided him through the English alphabet each time until he discovered the letter that was making the first sound. According to Bodrova and Leong (2006), the use of a pictured alphabet chart, along with the teacher guiding how to use it, helps develop the child to self-assist. After completing his writing Raymond looked pleased and drew a picture to accompany it. He seemed to have developed a sense of ownership and pride in his work thus giving him the confidence to then read his sentence to Whaea Tahī and his class peers. According to Juel (2006) and Pressley (2002), there is a small window of opportunity to build or sustain a child's confidence in literacy. The first year of learning to read is critical in keeping children's self-esteem high. In general, younger children are more likely than slightly older children "to attribute their literacy problems to effort rather than ingrained ability" (Juel, 2006, p. 416).

Biliteracy Teaching and Learning

How the literacy curriculum is delivered in the classroom can influence the experiences of the literacy learner, especially if the child has knowledge of more than one language. Pandey (2012) stresses the importance of developing positive linguistic experiences with children who have knowledge of more than one language through incorporating biliteracy resources.

Tabors and Snow's (2002) work with Spanish speaking children demonstrated the best resource is the usefulness of having a bilingual teacher to speak with, and to support the desire to communicate, be it in any language. During observation five, the teacher played a game with Raymond to reinforce English sight words. She would alternate between Māori and English depending on what language Raymond would speak to her. At times, she would speak in Māori to help him differentiate between his knowledge of the sounds of the letters common to the Māori and English alphabet, as the following example illustrates.

Whaea Tahi: "Shall we play 'ika ika'"

Raymond: "Yip I like this game"

Whaea Tahi: "Ika ika kei a koe te kupu 'am'?"

Raymond: "Kao hī ika, Ika ika kei a koe te kupu 'is'?"

Whaea Tahi: "Ae, ka rawe Raymond"

Raymond: "I'm good at games"

By engaging in regular visits with the Kōhanga, the teacher was able to recognise Raymond's prior knowledge of Māori language. She then used this knowledge to encourage and help him understand and differentiate between Māori and English literacy. After this activity Raymond got up and hugged Whaea Tahi before returning to his desk with his flash cards to practice. The types of interaction highlighted in this case study has been shown to support and impact upon children's literacy outcomes and language support by providing children with emotional and instructional support (Henry & Pianta, 2011; Tabors & Snow, 2002).

Another pedagogical technique noted during observations five and six that was used to develop literacy, particularly Māori literacy, was through waiata (song). Songs to learn the months of

the year and body parts were introduced first by the teacher singing, followed by the teacher singing, and the children repeating each line. Whaea Tahī's justification for this was as follows:

It's all repetition.....it is the key and exposure for them to read and write so they have more chances to do it.

Vygotsky's (1978) cultural historical theory emphasises the importance of collective participation as the key to assisting performance, promoting learning from a lower to higher cognitive functioning, thus internalising new concepts. In this example the children were presented with the song, stimulating the lower cognitive functioning process. Once established, the song was repeated, and the words were talked through with meaning. Within 15-20 minutes, the majority of the children had arguably transitioned to higher cognitive functioning processes (Bodrova & Leong, 2006).

All three adults that were interviewed believed that the home is equally important in developing the language skills of their child, more so if more than one language is spoken, a view supported by research (Juel, 2006; Ramey & Ramey, 2006; Scheffner-Hammer, Scarpino, & Davison, 2011). Interestingly, Whaea Tahī expressed her understanding that a child must be fluent and proficient in one language before teaching another, with the view that the child would develop a sense of confusion or develop mediocre levels of competency in each language. Whaea Ani replicates the idea when stating "*you need to be able to focus on one at a time. Like there's a time to learn Māori and a time to learn English, but I don't know if it's right to do it at the same time*". Although there has been plenty of research that has advocated the many benefits attached to learning more than one language at the same time, there was a generalised lack of

understanding or belief evident in the interview data. Despite the commonality of the beliefs between parent and teachers, however, the bilingual relationship between Raymond and his class teacher appeared to be a beneficial factor to Raymond's literacy learning and could be seen in all the observations.

Relationships

Building and establishing positive relationships are critical in any aspect of learning. An embrace of affection was often seen from all the children towards Whaea Tahī, and she commented on the use of affection in her approach to teaching and learning:

I think it's important for kids to have a familiarity of the classroom and the teacher, and if they can form a relationship before they start then great. But if that doesn't happen it can be very different. I think there are different expectations from my class to mainstream, I think I'm like a nanny/aunty, whereas in a mainstream it can be different. I'm more about awhi (embrace), and tau (settle).

The affection and close physical proximity, between Raymond and his classroom teacher, appeared to be a contributing factor to building a positive relationship, thus invigorating his motivation to keep learning and participating in the classroom, which is a technique supported by Pianta (2006). Relationships support literacy learning by providing language stimulation, activating self-belief and interests in words, print, and meanings. To advance children's linguistic and literacy skills relationships should be free from language conflicts between the child and whomever they are conversing with (Tabors & Snow, 2002). Building relationships

through positive interactions, such as an embrace, a smile, and/or a physical presence, nourishes the bond that is whānaungatanga (kinship bonds) (Bishop, 1996).

Whanaungatanga

The whanaungatanga bond is a critical aspect in the learning development of children (Macfarlane, 2004). Whaea Ani spoke about how traditionally, right from birth, all whānau members were responsible for the upbringing of the child, as highlighted below:

You know I have learnt that in the past children were around adults most of the time, even in hui, and they had time to speak. A lot of the time now we're like shut up, or don't have them around. It's like, we have a lot to learn from a child because they are the next generation...they knew they were raising the next generation... ..everyone was involved in raising them, it wasn't just the mum at home, dad at work, everyone needs to take more responsibility.

This claim is supported by Pere (1994), who discussed how, in some practices of raising children, such as the collective approach, whānau have strayed from those of their ancestors. However, Pere (1994) argues that by embracing the collaborative process of whanaungatanga and therefore strengthening the connections among everyone involved with the teaching and learning of the child, empowerment to learn is nurtured. Within whānaungatanga, and a Maori view of knowledge and relationships, is the concept of ako.

Ako

The concept of ‘ako’ suggests that teaching and learning is not just a one way process between teacher and student, it is interchangeable (Pere, 1994). Children have a lot to learn but they also have a lot of knowledge and experiences to share, which other students and adults can learn from them too (Rona, 2014). This teaching and learning process involves a reciprocal relationship between teacher and learner – often referred to as tuakana/teina or older sibling/younger sibling relationship. This relationship is reciprocal as the teacher and learner roles are fluid and may alternate depending on context, experience and knowledge of those involved in the experience. Regardless of the role, each person learns and grows together (Bishop, 1996).

During observation three, children from the Kōhanga visited the classroom, which they did at least once a fortnight. When the younger students entered the classroom Whaea Tahī and other children greeted the Kōhanga and immediately adopted their tuakana-teina roles and ‘buddied up’. Raymond was very keen to be a tuakana to a younger person from Kōhanga and took his buddy’s hand to sit together on the mat. He explained to him how to sit, and reminded him about listening to the teacher. Both teachers taught a waiata (song) that they had been learning. This gave an opportunity for each tuakana-teina pair to engage in the concept of ako, through sharing the role of teacher and learner as each waiata was played.

Classroom activities and speaking during the visit was encouraged to be only in te reo Māori. Raymond seemed delighted in helping his peers who had been at school one or two years longer, understand some of the language that was being spoken. Other students recognised this and also asked him for help. Tamati (2005) mentions how in promoting an environment that

promotes 'ako', the role of learner and teacher can be fluid and children are able to identify and accept what their role may be in any learning situation and any given time. This is an important consideration when assessing children on their literacy development.

Assessment

Awareness of the child's prior learning and knowledge are important aspects for ensuring a smoother transition into further literacy development in schools. Additionally, it is important that children with bilingual tendencies not be viewed as being compared to their monolingual peers (Espinosa & Lopez, 2007) as vocabulary development is distributed across the languages (Snow & Oh, 2011). However, gaining insight into a child's prior learning raised some concern for Whaea Ani and Kimi as detailed below:

I often wonder on how they (the school) evaluate, I hate those test when they start school like can you count to 10. I don't think you should be evaluating on that, I think you should be evaluating on how do they take interest because if they are not interested in something that should be grown first.....I do understand that literacy is important but if you can get them to take interest in it first then that's going to benefit later.

A scarcity of research around how to assess early literacy skills in bilingual children highlights and supports the concerns raised by Whaea Ani and Kimi. Westerveld (2014), raised concern on the limited assessments available for bilingual children and her study, which addressed the emergent literacy skills of bilingual Samoan-English children, suggested the need for assessment tasks to be of both languages.

Summary

The background information, which outlined the interviewee's experiences in literacy, was important in gaining insight into possible influences that framed their expectations and aspirations for children, in particular Raymond. One such influence, common in all interviews, was that having the support of just one person made the difference to their experiences in reading being positive or negative. The expectations of literacy development in Kōhanga children like Raymond illustrated the need for communication and collaboration between home, school, and Kōhanga. The aspiration for better outcomes in literacy, and the desire for Raymond and Kōhanga children to be confident in both English and Māori was shared by the interviewees.

The observations revealed that Raymond showed confidence when the teacher gave transitional instructions in te reo Māori and during waiata, but not so when formal instruction began in learning to read some English words. However, his confidence did increase as he became more familiar with English words and learned more letter sounds for his writing. His eagerness to participate in whole class lessons and in one to one instruction also improved when the teacher would clarify some information through using both English and Māori language when necessary. In this case study, positive experiences in literacy promoted further literacy learning by use of the following techniques: a) deliberate placement and use of classroom resources; b) effective teaching and learning pedagogy including scaffolding and one to one approaches (Roskos & Neuman, 2002); and c) the ability to draw on prior language and literacy knowledge through interaction with a bilingual teacher. These effects were amplified when trusting relationships were built and based on culturally relevant values such as, in this case, the concepts of whanaungatanga and ako. The views of how, why, and what literacy knowledge is assessed at school entry were split between school, home, and Kōhanga, but highlighted the

significance for education facilities to understand biliteracy development, provide professional development, assign appropriate evaluated assessment, and support its growth. The next chapter is another case study which explored the literacy experiences of a child moving from kōhanga reo into a mainstream education setting.

Chapter Five: Case Study Two

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from Case Study Two. The interviews took place in the family home with the mother, at the kōhanga reo with the kōhanga teacher, and at the school with the classroom teacher. The observations took place at the end of July and beginning of August in a mainstream new entrant classroom. At the time the observations began the classroom consisted of 15 New Entrant and Year 1 students. The classroom was one of five in a small, low decile (1-3) primary school, with 17 students, 80% of whom identified as Māori, 2% Samoan, and the remainder were European. A total of six, one hour to one and a half hour observations were done. These started when the child started school full time, as requested by the parents, as he was attending half days each day of the week prior to the observations. The observations were spread over a span of four weeks to accommodate for the child being absent from school due to illness and other factors. Using the format used to report the other cases in Chapters 4 and 6, participants will be referred to using pseudonyms: the child participant is renamed Bryce; the Kōhanga teacher will be Nanny Elsa; the school teacher will be Whaea Rua; and the child participant's mother will be Kelly.

The data from the interviews and observations were analysed the same way as the data from case study one, using content and thematic analysis. The themes from case study one were not used to predetermine the ideas for analysis for this case study, however similar concepts did emerge, resulting in similar themes between the two contexts. The similarities and differences will be explored further in Chapter 7.

Part A

Background

Kelly and Bryce – Mother and Child

Bryce had been through a long transition period, of about 15 weeks, from Kōhanga to school before and after turning five years of age. Bryce had attended Kōhanga for four years before starting his transition. He had been clinically assessed as having high functioning autism. His whānau and Kōhanga regarded him as a child with exceptional abilities in some areas and needing extra help in other areas, particularly in social contexts. The Kōhanga was situated behind the school, across a large field. During transitions, Bryce would often walk back to the Kōhanga because his mother said it provided him with a sense of security and familiarity. Over time those occurrences became less frequent and the family and Kōhanga felt it was time he attended school full time. Bryce's father is Samoan, and his mother is of Māori and Pakeha descent. They are both actively involved in the kōhanga reo and Primary school having served as board of trustee members and executive committee members at the kōhanga reo.

Kelly has four children aged 21, 19, 14, and 5. She attended primary, intermediate and high school in Auckland. During her early primary years a kōhanga reo opened next to her school. She was able to attend the kōhanga one period a day three times a week to learn some te reo Māori. She did not complete high school due to becoming a mother, but completed a Level 2 course in computing and worked in administration, plus gained experience as a mortician in a funeral directory while her baby was young. Following this she attended Massey University and graduated with a Bachelor of Social Work and later a Bachelor of Arts (Philosophy), along with acquiring certificates in many other courses focused around business administration,

accounting, computing, and cosmetology. Bryce's father is of Samoan descent. He was born in New Zealand, is fluent in the Samoan language, but only speaks in Samoan to his elders and when in Samoa. He left high-school in sixth form, with the equivalent qualifications to NCEA Level 2. He works as a chef, trained by his mother, in the kōhanga reo and also at a faculty in Auckland which he travels to on many occasions. He has a certificate in Te Ara Tuatahi, a first level kōhanga reo qualification. Kelly has Te Ara Tuatahi as well as the next level qualification, Te Ara Tuarua.

Whaea Rua – School teacher

Whaea Rua grew up in the country in central North Island. She attended a small country primary school before transferring to another primary in the bigger town adjacent. After college, Whaea Rua went to Massey University to do a Diploma in horticulture, however did not complete as she did not like the engineering components. Afterwards she worked in the travel industry before starting her initial teacher education in early childhood teaching. She stopped studying after two years to care for her firstborn, followed by three more children thereafter. When her youngest child started school Whaea Rua became a teacher aide. After years of being a teacher aide, her colleagues encouraging her, and her own learning experiences from her years as a mother, she decided to complete her teaching degree as a mature student in primary education through Massey University. She is in her second year working as a teacher, and her husband, a fluent Māori speaker, is the principal of the school.

Nanny Elsa – Kōhanga kaiako

Nanny Elsa is from a small town in the Coromandel. “*The flat bush*” is how she referred to it, as it would always get flooded and she and her whānau would have to walk the hills to safety or use the “*turn handled phone with the operator*” to say that she was safe somewhere. Nanny Elsa only attended school to the age of 13 years because she was required to look after her brothers and sisters when her mother fell ill. Her father was no longer living with the family, so the responsibility to care for the children fell on Nanny Elsa. Her responsibility to look after her whānau meant she could not attend high school even though she enjoyed school, and remembers her first teacher fondly and her favourite subject being arithmetic. Not being able to go to school was an upsetting experience for Nanny Elsa, as she described;

I cried because I wanted to go to school, I cried all day, and when I grew up I thought gee I mustn't let my kids go through that, I must encourage them to go to school.

This experience shaped Nanny Elsa’s view on education, based on her life she decided that she would not let her children or any other children miss out on an education. Other experiences of Nanny Elsa with education, as well those from Kelly and Whaea Rua, are explored next.

Experiences in Literacy

I love reading, I love learning, I get a buzz from it. (Kelly)

All three interviewees discussed their experiences towards books and literacy learning in the Māori and/or English language. Kelly accredited her passion for reading to her mother, and her passion for learning to her first teacher in primary school. She remembered her mother trying

to support her Māori language learning through reading her books in Māori even though her mother was not Māori, but Scottish. It was not until she was older that she appreciated her mother's efforts in reading to her in English and in Māori almost every day.

The first experience that Whaea Rua remembers of learning to read in Māori was when she was about eight years old. She remembered being taught waiata (song) but was not specifically taught how to read. It was not until she started in her early childhood teacher education at Massey University that she became conscious of learning the sounds and letters of the Māori alphabet. She then used this knowledge to read to her son in Māori who at the time had started at the kōhanga reo from which Bryce had just graduated, but this was just over 20 years ago. Whaea Rua's earliest memories of reading in English were of being in the lower level groups. She was interested in reading but struggled with it. As an adult, Whaea Rua looked forward to reading and was confident, but wished she had been taught the skills that she now teaches the children in her own classroom. Whaea Rua explains;

I think I just did not have the skills phonemically, even my own kids.....I sort of feel like I want to teach my own kids right from the start now about phonemic awareness and how to decode words because I feel like they have missed that.

The knowledge that she has now about phonemic awareness and teaching these skills to the children in her class has assisted Whaea Rua in being able to specifically help her own children. Two of her children have struggled with reading, so after listening to them read as a parent, she has been able to explicitly work on their areas of phonological development using her knowledge as a teacher of reading. This strategy is supported by the findings of Berryman and

Glynn (2003), who found that parents who were provided with strategies to help their child's reading were more inclined to read with their child, thus improving their reading efforts. Parents who did not have the specific knowledge found it easier to approach other parents they knew, who had been trained, over approaching the teacher or school for help (Landry & Smith, 2006).

Nanny Elsa's literacy experiences she recalled from school were "*learning to read 'Janet and John' books*". She attended "*a Pakeha school*" on most days. Although there were no strict rules that they could not speak Māori at school, it was not encouraged. Her teachers were not Māori but they could speak and understand the language because "*they were part of the community*" she had grown up in. Nanny Elsa mentioned there were no Māori books that she could remember, instead stories were shared through oral story telling by the kaumatua (elderly), as she described: *They told us stories, talking in myths and in legends and we got our purākau (stories) from there. We talked about the ngāhere (forest), hauora (health), it was easy but we had to listen, our lessons were always taught to us by the elderly people, how to know when it was going to flood for example and where to go to for safety.*

The teaching and learning process described is similar to intent participation (Rogoff et al., 2003). Intent participation is the term applied to the tradition, prominent in many indigenous communities, in which children learn through "keen observation and listening, in anticipation of participation" (Rogoff et al., 2003, p. 176). However, Nanny Elsa teaches the tamariki (children) at her Kōhanga today slightly differently to how she was taught as a child by her kaumatua. She still puts great significance on the traditional component of telling stories orally,

but “*I think it is important that we now read to our tamariki because they need to learn that too now*”. She incorporates a lot of books that have pictures and text, that support her oral telling. This is so the children hear the words, sight the words, and develop understanding of the context through listening and observing.

At this Kōhanga, the large majority of language teaching is Māori. The second language taught in this context is English. However, English is not taught deliberately, but in a rather adhoc manner. When a child has a non-Māori name, Nanny Elsa said that they will teach them the letters in their name according to the English alphabet. They will not teach the entire English alphabet, but will teach them that there are two alphabets. Time will be shared with teaching the letter as it is said in the Māori alphabet if the letter is in both. For example if they child had the letter ‘a’ in their name, they will get taught it from the perspectives of English and Māori alphabets. It often depends on the children as to what and how much deliberate teaching of letter knowledge, letter writing and word identification is taught. Nanny Elsa shared that their priority is to talk to the children in Māori, do activities, play, and sing with them.

Kelly and Whaea Rua and Nanny Elsa’s past experiences in literacy have influenced their efforts and approach to how they interact and read to their children. For example, Kelly reads books to Bryce in English, Māori, and the Samoan language, Whaea Rua used her newly found knowledge of phonological awareness in reading, and teaches such skills to her own children and those in her classroom, and Nanny Elsa intertwines her traditionally oral experiences in literacy with books, print and graphics. Literature reflects the importance of such experiences and the critical role experiences and teachers have on early literacy development and learning (Bauer & Mkhize, 2012; Hornberger, 2003; 2008). As well, the expectations and/or aspirations

of a child's home and school can influence literacy development too. In the next section, the expectations of Bryce's literacy knowledge and development of the three interviewees are explored.

Expectations

Kelly expected Bryce to be either at or above his age level for reading and was hoping that he remains above his level over the years when starting school. Nanny expected him to know his colours, numbers to 10, and be able to speak some Māori and some English. Whaea Rua revealed that Bryce knew a lot when he started school. Through her entry level assessments, she discovered that he knew how to count to 20 in Māori, knew the vowels and had concepts about print. Whaea Rua expected that children who have attended kōhanga reo and start in her mainstream classroom will not have the English letter knowledge that some of the other children may have. Her expectations of children starting school are that they know the alphabet, how to write their name and the letters in their name, and be familiar with books, i.e. be comfortable with having a story read to them and know which way to hold a book.

That's half the battle won, majority of my kids are coming here they don't know how to write their name, they don't know the letters of the alphabet. So I have to spend a large amount of time teaching this first (Whaea Rua).

Having the knowledge and experiences before starting school is advantageous to successful learning in language and literacy, as indicated in The Literacy Learning Progressions (Ministry of Education, 2010).

Kelly recognised that kura kaupapa Māori would have been the best environment to have enrolled her son for best continuity of te reo Māori, however due to many factors, including location, this was not a viable option and so chose to send her son to their nearest school, which was a mainstream school. Nanny Elsa also felt that continuity of the language is important, however she expected that mainstream schools should support children in maintaining their reo knowledge, as she explained:

My expectation of the school is that our kids don't lose te reo Māori...once they have come from Kōhanga, they have that grounding.....schools should support that.....or they will get lost in mainstream.

With the school being mainstream, Kelly said she expected that English would be the main language of instruction, however she also expected, due to the school being in New Zealand, that Māori would be incorporated into the classroom. She expected his everyday speaking of te reo to reduce, but his prior knowledge upon school entry should be accounted for and supported as best as is possible. Nanny Elsa had concern for Bryce starting a mainstream school for fear that his reo would diminish, but felt passionately that Kōhanga and schools must teach children to grow confidently in Māori and English. Whaea Rua explained that because her class is a mainstream classroom, teaching the English language and English phonics programme is the priority. In Bryce's case, she recognised his prior knowledge in her assessments, however she said she did not have the time or resources to continue to teach Māori literacy to him.

Aspirations

Strengthening the Māori language to be on par with the English language in New Zealand was a shared aspiration for all interviewees. They each described their ideal New Zealand would be one where children are able to learn in both Māori and English and Sign Language, which is the third official language of New Zealand. This would then provide a future for people growing up and living in New Zealand to really be part of a multilingual society.

Kelly voiced her aspiration to have school environments where there was not big contextual transitions from preschool, to school, to intermediate, to high school, but rather situated together, or extremely close to each other. Such schools do exist in Māori education and are called Whare Kura which go from Kōhanga to Year 13. However she was limited to enrolling her son in this type of school due to her lack of Te Reo fluency. Nanny Elsa aspired for similar context, a Whare Kura, somewhere that children didn't feel lost and in culture shock, a place where children can thrive in both worlds, she described;

We want our kids to not find school hard.....or get lost.....I really want for our Kōhanga children growing up confident and not fearing English language or the Māori language and enjoy it as much as each other.

Whaea Rua expressed the wish that more emphasis was given, in preschool and kōhanga reo, on learning the alphabet. In addition, she hoped that when children started school they were confident in saying and identifying their numbers from one to ten. If this was the case, she felt that children would be able to grow exponentially in their first year at school. Instead, in her

experience, she has encountered only a handful of children who started with this prior knowledge, whom she saw excel. For those who don't have the knowledge upon school entry, she explained,

Some can pick it up, but some really struggle and it's not until they are about six years old until it starts clicking for them.

The School Entry Level test is carried out upon starting school, and the teaching programme is generally tailored to the results of these. Whaea Rua was aware that all children have different abilities, however, and expressed her concern about having to meet the National Standards, something she did not agree with. According to Nicholson (2005) approximately 25% of children do not develop the literacy skills needed to manage at school. Hence, she aspired that all children came to school with such prior knowledge to avoid having to play catch up and fall short on meeting the standards.

To enable the teachers to better support the children in their biliteracy learning, in particular learning Māori literacy, all three interviewees felt it would be good for teachers and families to have some professional and/or personal development in the language. Access to quality language instruction and/or resources is significant in the development of becoming biliterate (Roskos & Neuman, 2002). Whaea Rua noted that at her school, teachers often ask her or the Principal, who is a fluent speaker, for help to pronounce the words. There was a teacher aide who could speak some Māori, which she believed the teachers enjoyed having in their classrooms, as well as the children. Whaea Rua expressed that if classes had a teacher aide or

support person, who could speak and read Māori, the benefits for the children and the teacher would be plentiful.

All three adult participants, regarded as the child's three key influences, shared a background that was diverse in history and experiences. For example being schooled according to traditional Māori pedagogy by family whilst in conjunction with strict European pedagogy of the system at the time, as well as learning in a time when Māori language revitalisation movements were occurring. Their formative and primary school years' experiences in literacy revealed a common thread, which is the role that teacher and family support had in inspiring them to learn to read and write. Furthermore, these common experiences had shaped their expectations and aspirations of Bryce in his literacy learning journey into school. The data from the observations, reported next, provide insight into Bryce's literacy experiences at school entry.

Part B:

Classroom Setting and Resources

When entering and looking around the classroom it was noticed that each child had a placemat with their name, the alphabet, and numbers 0-20. Around the room, there were 29 wall displays of word endings and examples (for example, at....cat). Against the wall a magnetic whiteboard stood with magnetic words for students to build sentences, along with examples of sentences for students to copy. Further in was a 'Word Wall', with the months of the year, high frequency words, words that children might write often from around the community e.g. LIDO, park, Kmart, McDonalds, Esplanade, a blends chart, synonyms, thematic focused words, word

families, and animals with pictures and words. On the whiteboard was a handwriting section, an example of a recount for writing, the class timetable, the day (in English and Māori), month, and weather. On the class cupboards the school motto was displayed, plus numbers, shapes, feelings (in Māori with pictures), and some colours in English and Māori. An area was dedicated to display the children's examples of written stories or handwriting. The class shelves were lined with the children's book trays, each filled with books children have read successfully. Lastly, strategically situated in the room were a variety of literacy themed games and activities, 10 iPads, two computers, a Smart T.V (an integrated television device with web features), and a library corner, with a collection of fiction, non-fiction, and picture book stories (all English).

Whaea Rua referred to her classroom as being well resourced, with each resource having a purpose throughout her literacy programme. She was aware that sometimes having too many resources can hinder a programme or result in insufficient use. However, in her instance, the amount of resources allowed her to alternate between them, and the wall displays were often changed and referred to in her teaching, keeping the students stimulated and interested.

In contrast, with little money at the time to buy resources for their newly founded Kōhanga, Nanny Elsa recalled how she would take the tamariki out with plastic bags and collect items such as stones, leaves, and sticks, which then became their resources for the day. These resources were used for counting, art, and other language activities. The trips connected the children with the world outside and gave lots of opportunity to "*korero with the mokopuna*". The lack of resources did not stop her from teaching te reo Māori and she felt that in the beginning the teaching and experiences were real. She approved of the resources that are

available today, but considered that more appropriate literacy resources suitable to kōhanga reo and their whānau should be appropriated.

We are still making the resources ourselves...I went to the school and saw some of their resources and asked for them, they have awesome stuff, and I asked how did they get that, we don't have that, it would help with their writing, from left to right, and their alphabet. So I took a copy and then made it work for us (Nanny Elsa).

The need for better suited resources was also raised during the interview with Whaea Rua. Her view was that there are many great English teaching applications for computers and iPads however to find ones suitable for the children and the classroom can be time consuming, not to mention costly if there is a purchase charge. In addition, Whaea Rua alleged that the English on them are not always that of New Zealand spoken English meaning the vowels and pronunciation are more inclined to be of British or American English. She wished that there were better and more apps relatable to New Zealand's English language and context. An app being developed to coincide with Yolanda Sorryl's New Zealand phonics programme, which she uses in her literacy lessons, has apparently been aforementioned. When asked about what Māori literacy focused computer programmes or apps she had or were available, Whaea Rua was not aware of any, but if some were accessible and appropriate to her classroom programme then she would integrate more Māori literacy learning activities into her classroom teachings.

Teaching Strategies and Learning Experiences in the classroom

It became apparent through the six observations that this classroom had a strong focus on literacy development. The class programmes observed were dedicated to specific literacy learning and development, and were supplemented with resources in varying forms. The way in which it was taught and experienced involved a variety of collaborative processes that encouraged literacy development. Thus literacy was promoted via whole class practices, small groups, independent activities, one-to-one instruction, and peer learning activities.

Shared Literacy Learning

Shared class practices were mostly used for teaching about letter formations in handwriting, explaining how to use apps on the iPads, singing literacy focused songs, sharing stories about their experiences outside the classroom, reading a book/poem to the class each day, learning the days of the week, months of the year and describing the weather. During this time, the teacher also used te reo Māori for simple instructions, such as; “*E huri*” (turn around), “*e noho*” (sit), “*ata whakarongo*” (listen carefully), “*titiro mai*” (look here), as well as stating the day of the week in te reo Māori. Observation four began with a shared poem, and children reading through it with the teacher. Beginning a lesson with the sharing of a book or poem is typical of many New Zealand classrooms and “sets the scene for cooperative learning” (McLachlan, et al., 2013, p. 198) as part of a community. This approach, sometimes referred to as implicit teaching (Thomson, 1997), does not teach skills specifically, rather children learn through the whole experience of reading. The teacher may ask questions about particular vocabulary, point out letter patterns (e.g. ‘ing), discuss punctuation, refer to the illustrations for context of the story or poem and encourage the reader to look for patterns. The teacher may use a variety of texts, to scaffold children’s developing knowledge of print and encourages

children to use a mixture of sources to work out words and meanings (Button & Johnson, 1997). This approach does not teach specific letter-sound skills, which Greaney (2011) suggests, is needed for those students who fall at the tail end in the journey to learning to read. However, quality instruction of print referencing in book sharing does help building print knowledge, subsequently making the journey to phonological awareness less restricting (Justice, et al., 2009). Teaching which focused on the skills of learning to read, e.g. letter-sound correspondence, were largely observed in small groups.

Small group learning

A skills based approach generally offers specific teachings in phonological awareness, mainly using the phonics approach. In Bryce's classroom, Whaea Rua uses small groups to teach phonological awareness. Phonological awareness occurs across a continuum (Nicholson, 2005), and so teaching and learning in small groups offers an opportunity to develop a community of learners with relatively similar skills (Ministry of Education, 2010a). Phillips, Clancy-Menchetti, and Lonigan (2008) advocate that groupings should also be flexible so that children can be regrouped when assessment is continuous. Teaching phonics alone is not sufficient to learning to read but does provide the tools for the learner to work out the 'code' of letters and words in text, proving beneficial when introduced to more difficult words. In Bryce's group the focus was on learning the initial letter sound of 'p' in words, using Yolanda Soryl's phonics programme. An example of a small group session is detailed below:

Teacher: "Ok I am going to sound/say these pictures" (holds up cards, emphasises 'p' sound in each)

- *Pumpkin, pyjamas, penguin, person (repeats) and asks children for other words beginning with the p sound*

Child 1: "p p p pig"

Child 2: "p p p poop"

Bryce: "p p p pepi"

Child 4: "p p p pen"

Teacher: "p p p popcorn, p p p people, what are some more?"

Bryce: "b b b banana"

Teacher: "We want p p like pig, banana starts with b b like bus and bubble"

The teacher then shows how to form the letter p (upper and lowercase) for their writing.

Teacher: "This is the big P or the capital P and this is the lowercase p or the small p"

Children start to copy and practice on their lined whiteboards.

The small group sessions observed with and without Bryce seemed to provide positive literacy experiences. Arguably the sessions were successful because they were relatively short in time frame, no longer than 10 minutes, specific in topic, and the children were always able to draw on prior knowledge as well as learn something new, supporting the approach advocated by Phillips, Clancy- Menchetti and Lonigan (2008).

Independent learning

Bryce worked enthusiastically in his groups with his teacher and/or the teacher aide. During observation two he was encouraged to go and write a sentence using two high frequency words, 'I' and 'am', that he had just learned in the small group. After this, the teacher aide encouraged him to read the words and find the words on the display wall, which he did. Engaging with the resources of the classroom help children to absorb and interact with their environment better, confirming other studies (Roskos & Neuman, 2002). Following this, Bryce was to work independently through the rotation literacy activities. Each child had three activities assigned to their name, each activity worked on a timed rotational basis, so when the class timer went, the child moved to the next activity. Some activities included the following:

- getting to know the English alphabet by hanging up letters (letters are on socks and a make shift washing line and pegs is set up in the class), they can find pairs of the letters, lower and upper case or match beginning letter to words; matching smaller and upper case letters on a train and putting in order,
- practice handwriting boards,
- building words with letter pieces and word cards,
- memory games of words and pictures, or words,
- iPad activities,
- reading from reading boxes,
- listening posts,
- puzzles,
- spelling practice (for senior class students), and
- buddy reading.

Research suggests that opportunities for choice and control such as these are positive features in a classroom that support the development of literacy because the activities are non-threatening and often empowering to the child (Vassallo, 2014). The independent rotation activities allowed the teacher to work with individuals or groups of children whilst a teacher aide would roam between the independent activities interacting when necessary. Bryce's first activity was to hang up plastic socks with a letter attached, on a clothes line, in alphabetical order. He did not put them in alphabetical order, instead he hung the letters randomly and sounded out words he knew. For example:

“r r r for running, u u u for uenuku, b b b for bullets, o o o for oh no, g g g for giant gorilla, h h h for hangi, a a a for āporo, I I I for I am aaaaand ika aaaand igloo”.

When he got to a letter he didn't know he put it to the side, and said *“hmmmm, this one needs to wait”*, and continued on.

A well designed literacy environment that offers opportunities to independently explore, play, and construct their own learning has shown to be beneficial for the child (Phillips, Clancy-Menchetti, & Lonigan, 2008; Vassallo, 2014). In this case, although Bryce was not arranging the letters in alphabetical order, he was working independently, engaging with the activity, and developing his literacy understanding by distinguishing letters and sounds he knew with those he did not. He had redefined the task and drew on his vocabulary knowledge of English and Māori words, to establish his knowledge base. Research suggests that children's activities during independent time must be paid attention to and not just be a time filler. It is during these times that teachers can observe and take note of children's interactions with the activities, and develop some understanding of their problem solving processes (Diaz et al., 1990; Hadwin &

Järvelä, 2011; Vassallo, 2014). Insight into how children engage during independent activities can assist in the teaching of the child during one to one interaction.

One to one teaching and learning

One to one teaching is considered a highly effective approach to teaching children how to read because of the specific teaching agendas and goals tailored to each individual child's literacy learning needs (Juel, 1996; Kamhi & Catts, 2012). Bryce was involved in one to one instruction with the classroom teacher, in the majority of the observations, and supported in follow up activities by the teacher aide. During observation two, he was called to read with the teacher. He sat down and after reading through the book alongside the teacher he attempted to read it alone. He pointed to the words but they did not correspond to what he was saying. The teacher was able to teach how the words we speak need to go with the written words we read. Drawing on Bryce's previous experience with the word 'is', she made a goal for Bryce to point to the word 'is' as he read aloud.

Teacher: "Can you find the word is"

Bryce: "Dad is"

Teacher: "So where's is?"

Bryce: Points to dad

Teacher: "I thought that read Dad"

Bryce: Points to "is"

Teacher: “Yes, now have a look, what does it look like? Begins with the letter I, then the letter s which makes the word ‘is’ (points to the word is)”

Bryce: Points to “is”

Teacher: Changes energy of activity to a quest – “Right let’s go on a mission and see if we can find the word is on every page, let’s do it fast and then slow and then fast again and then slow”

Bryce: As the teacher turns each page he finds the word is, fast and slow

Teacher: Pulls out essential word list and asks Bryce to find the word is

Bryce: finds it

Teacher: “Can you write is on this whiteboard?”

Bryce: “Yip easy” (Begins to write the word is 10 times)

Following this moment, Bryce read through the book again and this time was able to correctly point to the word ‘is’ as he was reading. This one to one opportunity provided specific support to Bryce in his experience in learning to read. It was positive as it identified a learning need, was interactive, and offered a sense of accomplishment for Bryce. Similar responses can also be found in observations of peer learning.

Peer Learning

Drawing on Vygotsky’s (1978) work that learning is a social activity, the interactions, such as collaborative talk, play, negotiating, between peers also becomes an integral component in constructing language and literacy (Bialystok, 2004). The peer does not have to be older than

the other, they just need to be able to offer some form of guidance. The following is an example from observation six where Bryce and a year two student were working on a rotational activity using playdough.

Child: "what are you making?"

Bryce: "nnnnnn, it's in my name"

Child: "Yes and this is in your name to rrrrrrr"

Bryce: "rrrrr" grabs the r card and forms that letter too.

Child: "can you find the other letters in your name"

Bryce: looks at his name on his place mat card and starts searching for the other letters, he finds the letter y

Child: "that's the letter y"

Bryce: Starts to make the letter y "this is in my name too, hey and it's in your name"

(Both children laugh)

In this instance the role of the peer was to offer Bryce encouragement, guidance, and someone to have fun with. Another example, from observation five, was during a school assembly. Six senior students of the school (years' five and six) received sports awards, at the same time they were able to choose a book, from the selection given through the 'Duffy' books initiative. Six preselected junior students, were then able to go and choose a 'Duffy' book and go with one of the senior students to have their book read to them. Haworth et al. (2006) established that

older children who work with younger children take on a nurturing and caring role, scaffold their peers learning and co-construct learning together.

Building and Establishing Relationships

A key way to building children's competence in education is through ensuring positive relationships are formed. Research suggest that when a close and trusting relationship has been made between the teacher and child then other factors that may hinder language and literacy development are not so influential (Baker, 2006). Relationships built on trust and respect promote language-rich interactions, which has a key role in literacy development (Oades-Sese & Yibling, 2011). Whaea Rua expressed that establishing a trusting relationship involves acknowledging and valuing children's needs and cultures, not just culture as an ethnicity, for example, Māori or French, but the literacy culture of their home too, for example, the amount of exposure to literacy and the language/s spoken. Although she desired children to be at a certain level of preparedness when they start school, she was aware that every child's home culture is different. Having experienced practices that ignored her own children's culture, through mispronunciation of names to ignoring the knowledge acquired at a full Māori immersion when starting in mainstream, Whaea Rua was adamant that she would do all she could to learn about each child, where they came from, and who they were as a person, thus to establish an environment where each child felt safe and could develop a sense of belonging.

I probably care too much...half the time I want to understand what's going on in their head, what else are they dealing with. I try to make things fun, but sometimes they are somewhere else (in their minds) and I have to deal with that first.

In Bryce's case, Whaea Rua spent time in the long transition process learning about him. She often spent time talking to his parents, and set aside time to talk to him, as well as the teachers at the kōhanga reo. She discovered that Bryce had the support of a community and endeavoured to do her best to help teach and guide and continue this in his learning too. This sense of community is one of the underlying values that kōhanga reo operates on, known as 'whanaungatanga'.

Whanaungatanga

We have one word that will cover six of theirs, you know whakawhanaungatanga, that covers heaps and I think it's really good to know (Nanny Elsa).

Whakawhanaungatanga is the process of establishing relationships in a Māori context, of which whanaungatanga is formed (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai, & Richardson, 2003; Macfarlane & Macfarlane, 2013). Culturally responsive practices, like whanaungatanga, have been researched as a positive contributing factor towards success in education (Macfarlane, 2004; 2007; Macfarlane, 2009). In Kōhanga, Nanny Elsa stated that she ensures that all children are nurtured, loved, and cared for by herself and all the teachers that work there. She said she feels strongly that all children are to feel safe, be loved for who they are, and each family needs to contribute to the support and well-being of the child.

You have to love the whole lot of them, the snotty nose, the scabby kids, the runny ears, you have to have those qualities in you (Nanny Elsa).

Both Nanny Elsa and Whaea Rua's responses parallel the research that advocates for building and maintaining positive, trusting relationships (Macfarlane & Macfarlane, 2013).

Summary

The background of each interviewee in this case study was diverse in experiences, upbringing, and even timeframe. Common to each, as in case study one, was that they accredited their positive literacy experiences to a person or people whom they had a trusting relationship with. Each interviewee's expectations and aspirations were fuelled by their own experiences which may have been positive and/or negative. The main expectation of Bryce was that he had or would have the relevant literacy knowledge that is generally expected of children who start school, which was confirmed as accurate by the teacher after her school entry assessment and her own anecdotal observations. The main aspiration for Bryce was that his prior learning in Māori would be acknowledged, supported and further developed even though he was starting in a mainstream setting.

The observations revealed that his prior knowledge was acknowledged by the classroom teacher and not once did she reprimand or correct him when he used te reo Māori, but due to her limited fluency and lack of resources she was not able to continue in the development of his Māori literacy. The observations revealed how literacy development can be promoted through various instruction approaches involving whole class, small groups, independent and peer learning contexts. The value of quality resources in a well-designed literacy environment, was also highlighted. As with case study one, the classroom in this case study used phonics as the main approach to teaching reading, which arguably makes them different to the majority of New Zealand primary schools (Tunmer & Chapman, 2015). Also similar to case study one was

ensuring that the classroom environment, contexts, and pedagogy were culturally relevant, and in this case the concept of whanaungatanga was again highlighted. The next chapter, the third case study, provides an account of a child moving from a kōhanga reo into a Māori immersion education setting.

Chapter Six: Case Study Three

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from case study three. Interviews took place at the end of September, with the mother, followed with the Kōhanga teacher, at the Kohānga Reo on the same day. On another day the school teacher was interviewed in her classroom. Upon request, the classroom teacher was given an outline of the questions to be asked before the meeting so that she could better prepare herself because the interview time together was very short. As with all the cases, only the three adult participants were interviewed. The school is a Māori medium kura kaupapa Māori, starting from new entrant level to Year eight. A total of six observations were conducted, within the first month of the child participant starting school. Although the observation notes were recorded in English, all observation experiences were in te reo Māori, unless otherwise stated, and all dialogue was recorded as it was heard, in te reo Māori or English. Participants in this chapter will be referred to according to pseudonyms: the child participant is named Pani; the participant's mother is Ruby; the kōhanga reo teacher is Whaea Tia; and the school teacher is Whaea Tōru.

Data from this case study were analysed in a consistent way to that used with the previous case studies. Coding of the data for this case did not begin until case study two was complete in order to avoid confusion with this case. As with the other cases, similar themes have emerged. The emergent themes to be discussed in this chapter are divided into two parts. Part A outlines the interviewees' background information, their experiences in literacy, as well as their expectations and aspirations in literacy for Pani and other children. Part B discusses the integral theme of relationships, describes the classroom setting and resources, explores the teaching strategies employed, and concludes with insights into promotion of biliteracy development.

Part A

Background

Ruby and Pani – Mother and Child

I te taha to ōku kaumātua

Ko Taranaki rāua Ko Tararua ngā maunga,

Ko Manawatu te awa,

Ko Kurahaupo te waka

Ko Rangitaane te iwi

Ko Ngati hineaute te hapu

I te taha o tōku māmā,

Ko Taipiri te maunga

Ko Waikato te awa,

Ko Tainui te waka

Ko Raukawa te iwi

Ruby was raised by her grandparents in the Manawatu and Whanganui regions. She did not attend a kōhanga reo when she was younger, instead she attended the local kindergarten. Due to her family relocating, she attended three primary schools, one intermediate school, and two high schools, between the Hawkes Bay, Manawatu and Whanganui. At the end of sixth form (Year 12), Ruby left school and got a job teaching at a primary school in Whanganui. After one year teaching she returned to the Manawatu and gained employment at a kōhanga reo, where she stayed for 10 years. She took a break from kōhanga reo moved to Australia and returned to

New Zealand to start her family. She did not anticipate working in a kōhanga reo again, but gained employment at another kōhanga reo, from which her daughter Pani has just graduated, and which her other two children have attended or are attending. Ruby was raised with the Māori language as both her grandparents would speak to her in te reo Māori. Pani is the second child of three. She has a sister one year older than her, and a younger brother who is one year of age. Pani attended kōhanga reo for five years. Ruby reads to Pani every night because that is what she felt she missed out on growing up and explained “*it is important for me to be able to do that*”. Being an educator, Ruby is aware of the research and benefits reading to a child at home has on a child’s literacy development (Justice, et al., 2009). Ruby pointed out that Pani enjoyed books when she was at Kōhanga and would often choose books to look through at her own will. In the school classroom, Pani was reluctant at first to choose books to look at on her own, opting to sit with a peer, however as the days progressed she was observed in her school classroom to be choosing books at leisure also.

Whaea Tōru – School Teacher

Whaea Tōru has had 13 years teaching experience within a full primary Māori medium school setting (Years 0-8). The majority of these years were in kura kaupapa Māori schools teaching all levels from New Entrants to Year 8. As a child, Whaea Tōru did not read texts in te reo Māori. She was educated within a mainstream schooling system and all text books given to her were in English. Her mother spoke Māori and so she heard the language often spoken from her mother, her aunts and her uncles. “*The hook for me for wanting to learn Māori*” was wanting to know what her aunties and uncles were talking about when they had hui (meeting). Her curiosity motivated her to learn the language and so for five years, in her late teens, she enrolled in a rangatahi (youth) wananga (course) run by Ngati Raukawa. The courses were one week

long, in total immersion, and usually held over the holidays. Her reo “*at that time was ok*” but she believed she “*was still very much learning.*” After school, Whaea Tōru completed her teaching degree which was delivered in Māori immersion, at Massey University College of Education in Palmerston North. She commented that the three years in total immersion was the “*springboard for her reo, it is where it accelerated.*” The following 10 years she kept striving to improve her te reo Māori, enrolling and attending a variety of courses offered. For example, she completed Te Pinakitanga, a Māori language course delivered by Te Wananga o Raukawa and currently attends Kura Reo classes for one week, in total immersion. The Kura Reo courses were run by Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori but are no longer offered. Various locations have various providers; the one Whaea Tōru attends is offered by Kounga Ltd and located in Otaki.

Whaea Tia – Kōhanga Teacher

Whaea Tia attended a kindergarten during her preschool years. Following this, she attended a bilingual primary and high school. After high school, Whaea Tia went straight into working in a child care centre in her local community. She worked at the centre for two years before moving to Palmerston North where she gained employment in her current position as a kaiako at the kōhanga reo in this case study.

Experiences in Literacy

Ruby recalled feeling upset during her first year at school. She did not quite understand why but concluded it could have been she had grown up in a Māori environment, and although she went to a Kindergarten, school “*was very different*”. Ruby’s best experiences in high school were her times involved in Kapa Haka (Māori performing arts). She recalled the experience

being made more enjoyable because of the bond she had with her Māori teacher in class and in Kapa Haka as she explained “*I love Kapa Haka so being involved in Kapa Haka, she was a big part of that*”.

Although her grandparents spoke to her in te reo Māori, they did not read to her because her grandmother “*was illiterate, but a native speaker*”, and so she had a good grasp of listening to and speaking the language, but not reading it. At the time of the interview, Ruby still did not feel confident reading in te reo Māori, preferring to get someone to read it to her so that she could listen and understand that way. Ruby did not start to learn to read Māori until she got to high school, even though it was her first language. Her high school Māori teacher, “*she was a kui, and was very understanding*”, provided her with small steps so that she could get better at it which Ruby says she did, and now can read Māori.

Having the time to sit down with your child to talk to them and read to them is what Ruby believed to be the best way to support a child’s literacy learning. Her experiences with Pani and watching how Pani interacted with books at home and at Kōhanga inspired Ruby to sit down with her and teach her how to hold a book, turn the pages and have fun with telling a story. She found that after one week of sitting with her every night and making reading enjoyable Pani began to imitate their time together and started telling her own stories. It is generally accepted that certain family and home conditions promote literacy, including an abundant supply of books and other reading material, detailed conversations between adults and children about the books they read, and other such practices (Sénéchal, 2006; Snow et al., 1991).

Whaea Tia did not recall having any experiences with learning to read and write in te reo Māori during her school years but did with English. She's not too sure if she really enjoyed it because she did not class herself as a 'reader'. At the time of the interview she commented that she now preferred to read Māori, as the structure and sounds make more sense to her, indicating that she had written a couple of Māori books for her children and the Kōhanga.

Whaea Tōru recalled enjoying reading at school. She did not know if she struggled with it but rather concluded that her learning to read was *"like any other child my age – a pretty average ability to read and understand"*. As a result of growing up and learning to read in English, English literature is the material sought for first if information is needed quickly, however because her current work context is saturated in Māori literature, Whaea Tōru is *"at ease with which ever language is presented"*.

Each interviewee's early literacy experiences in this case do not appear as positive as the previous two case studies, with only one indicating a rather positive experience. However, each interviewee had embraced their Māori language and literacy background and now immerse themselves in a Māori language context almost every day. Their past as well as current experiences influence their expectations and aspirations of children, in this case, Pani.

Expectations

Ruby did not think she had any expectations of other children learning to read. She became aware, through her own observations and time with Pani at Kōhanga and at home, that Pani was starting to recognise letters. Ruby pointed out that Pani knew the sounds (in Māori) to

these letters E, K, O, U, M, I, A, and the letters, K, and M in English. Pani could identify numbers up to 14 in te reo Māori and could also count to 26 in English. She was starting to use her finger to point to the words as her mother read to her and would sometimes imitate words back to her. Ruby expected Pani to begin to develop this literacy knowledge in te reo Māori because of her Kōhanga experiences as well as her home experiences. She expected Pani to have some knowledge of the English alphabet too because she reads to her at home in English and Māori. She wanted Pani to continue learning to read and write in both languages, but her understanding was that the Māori immersion school expects children to have more knowledge of Māori literacy, than English, especially if they are transitioning from a kōhanga reo. Ruby expected that the school would expect her child to know how to write her name (which she could), be able to count to 10 forwards and backwards, know some colours and shapes before starting school, and all in te reo Māori because it is a full immersion primary school. She did not expect the school would enrol a child who had come from an English preschool unless that family could show their commitment to supporting the Māori language development at home too.

Whaea Tia believed that children should be expected to know some letters of the alphabet, in Māori, if they are going to a Māori medium school setting. She commented that it would be difficult for the child to learn the English alphabet at kōhanga reo because they only work with the Māori letters and sounds. If the family decided to send their child to an English medium school after being at a kōhanga reo, Whaea Tia expected that the parents and maybe the school, take responsibility in getting the child prepared. She said she was “*not a big fan of kids knowing how to write their name before they go to school*” but felt that schools expect kōhanga reo to teach this, along with numbers and counting to 10, shapes, and colours. Whaea Tia had expectations of the kura in that the children would continue to have experiences provided that

develops and extends their vocabulary. In addition, Whaea Tia expected teachers to be encouraging and supportive of learning sounds and letter names to aide in learning to read and write. Her expectations of the home were for parents to support their child's learning, through reading to them, helping with their homework and being "*in the know*" of what their child is learning at school.

Whaea Toru acknowledged that children enter school with varying levels of knowledge in literacy which is dependent on a variety of factors such as "*socio-economic backgrounds, any family historical issues with learning, the child's unique self, and the level of commitment parents have to the kaupapa*". Whaea Tōru expressed that children who have had exposure to reading will generally show this in their behaviours when holding or reading a book, i.e. they will hold the book up the right way, know to start from the left hand side and will look at the pictures to help them understand. Whaea Tōru said that she expected that all children starting Kura would be able to sustain being immersed in a Māori medium setting for an entire day and are able to follow simple instructions and commands for example, "*haere mai, e noho, e tu, e mahi, tikina tō pukapuka, haere ki kora noho ai*". It is acknowledged that many children who begin a Māori medium school also have skills in the English language, either because their first language at home is English or because "*we live in a society which is English saturated*" but there is no expectation or assessment of what English literacy they may have. An assessment for Māori literacy knowledge is carried out when children begin school, and this assessment usually dictates the early expectations for the child. For example, one assessment is checking what letter knowledge the child may have. "*Recognising letters within their own names is another good starting point*" after which building on from letters to blends then onto decoding or reading two blends that make up a word, i.e. wha + re = where. "*Correct pronunciation (and annunciation) of letters, blends, and words in te reo Māori is an absolute!*"

There are some commonalities in expectations of the child in literacy development across the interview data. For example, recognising letters of the alphabet, being interested in books, knowing their name and how to write it, all of which concur with the literature on essential fundamental literacy skills (Lonigan & Shanahan, 2009). The differences in expectations highlight the need for communication between the domains of home, school, and kōhanga reo. Communication between the domains is vital to ensure that expectations are consistent and established for learning progression during transition from kōhanga reo (Hopeha, May, & McCarty, 2006)

Aspirations

Ruby supported the development of her children's Māori language, which is why she sent them to a total immersion Māori school. She did have concerns that her children's biliteracy development would not be what she hoped it would be because of the fact that the school does not deliberately teach English until they are older. This added to her other concern about what would happen to her children if they were to start in a mainstream classroom.

This is where I am in two minds. I'm worried about the English development at Kura, and then I don't want them to have to go to a mainstream and they then lose their reo, and they lose them. For them it's their identity.

If for whatever reason her children had to go to a mainstream classroom, she would hope the school could offer support to them through a lot of one to one contact to help with the transition and to continue with their biliteracy development. It was important to Ruby that schools do

karakia, waiata, and mihimihi every day. It did not matter whether they were a mainstream, bilingual, or full immersion school, because those practices are culturally important and she considered they should be a regular component of any classroom.

Ruby hoped that the Kura would continue to develop Pani's love of reading in te reo Māori and provided rich development in the language. She also hoped that the school could teach English once a day or a couple of times a week, "*for an hour*", so that her children could develop their literacy skills in both languages from a younger age.

I know a lot of the learning comes from the home. We have to support their Māori learning, and then we also want to support their English learning so that they can know both really well. But there's a lot of kids who just don't get that, either Māori support or English support. I mean I work full time, have three kids, and read to them every night their books from school and from Kōhanga. I know they won't agree to that (teaching English) being done in Kura but I think it's important too.

Ruby was well informed about the need to be immersed in te reo Māori to really flourish in the language, however she felt that there was room for the children to get taught direct English skills such as sounds, "*like how the Māori sounds are taught in English schools*", especially if children have English names they will be able to identify better with the letters of their names and others. She was concerned that if children wait until they are older they will have little understanding of how to figure out English words as well as comprehend it. Waiting until they are at the end of primary school they end up using their spoken English, "*which most of the*

kids can speak” and write sentences like “do you gotta pen?” Her end aspiration is for her children to be confident speakers, readers, writers, and listeners of Māori and English.

I’d love my kids to be linguists and know heaps of languages and read them all and understand them. I think it opens up heaps of doors, they can travel, work here or overseas.

To achieve this dream she hoped that mainstream schools make learning Māori compulsory for all levels, from new entrant to when senior English becomes a choice. She hoped that Māori immersion schools teach English too. In addition, *“I’d love to be fluent in all languages of New Zealand and I’d love that for my kids and all kids of New Zealand”*, including teaching and learning sign language.

Whaea Tia felt it to be very important too, that children know how to read and write in English and in Māori so that they can live in both worlds comfortably and informed.

When you go out into the big world, if you pick up a paper, reading signs or something, then you will know what it is about.

She, like Ruby, supported the development of children in total immersion learning to read English from an earlier age, but not at the expense of teaching and learning good quality Māori. However, Whaea Tia understood that it was not part of the school philosophy so had accepted this because she did not want to send her child to a mainstream school for fear of no Māori language development. Whaea Tia spent time with her own child, from birth, reading in English

and reading in Māori. However, when her child started to prefer Māori readers over English, Whaea Tia supported this and focused on her Māori literacy development with some English literacy support. Research supports the practice of supporting Māori language and literacy development through parents reading children's readers with them at home (Hohepa, 1999).

At the age of seven she noticed her daughter starting to refuse to speak Māori at home, instead she would only speak Māori at school, and only sometimes with her kura friends in town. She only spoke English at home and preferred to look for English information over Māori. Whaea Tia did not have a definite reason for why this happened but felt that her daughter's spoken English was below average and worried about her progress in the English language. As a result, she had wished that she had developed her English literacy skills alongside her Māori literacy skills earlier, so that her daughter could go between both worlds comfortably with proficiency. Whaea Tia felt it was important for children to learn both languages "*so that they are not lost*". The 'hows' and 'whens' to begin formally teaching English literacy in kura and Māori literacy learning in mainstream classroom was not clear to her; she said she was rather perplexed.

Whaea Tōru reflected her understanding of research supporting the benefits of being multilingual from a young age. Her viewpoint of this was that children must have a strong foundation in one language, Māori or English or another, as it "*bodes well when applying a new language to your skill set*". The ability for children to learn and grow in two or more languages and also be able to effectively communicate orally and with print would "*be fabulous*". Whaea Tōru aspired for all tamariki at her school to learn a third or fourth language.

If our tamariki are to become global citizens then having the ability to read, speak, and communicate in two or more languages is very advantageous and puts our tamariki on a different level.

For mainstream schools with classrooms such as bi-lingual or immersion units, Whaea Tōru recommended utilising specialist advisors of te reo Māori/educators to assist with building programmes and or accessing particular programmes to teach children to read in Māori. In addition, buddying up or forming a cluster with a proven high performing Māori immersion school to share ideas and expertise would be for the betterment of all the children learning to read, in Māori and English. Based on her experiences the teaching of English in a Māori immersion school is an area that Whaea Tōru believes should be reserved for the later primary schools.

I am of the opinion that the formal instruction of English language (learning to read and write in English) within a Māori medium setting should be taught at a later stage of schooling, such as in Year 6. By this time children have a strong foundation in reading and writing in their chosen language of instruction (te reo Māori). In my experiences of teaching tamariki who have not had a solid foundation in one language struggle to pick up a second or third. Confusion is seen when tamariki mix up the sounds and blends of one language with another.

The view that a grounding in one language should be adhered to before the teaching of another is a shared conception by the three adult participants. This is true to a point, as research supports the transferability of skills from one language to the other. However, there is a point where explicit instruction of both languages literacy skills becomes advantageous (Bialystok, 2004).

Pani and Whaea Tia remain unsure at what age should their child be learning and explicitly taught English literacy when they are in a Māori immersion setting indicating a need for research on this area. Both languages can be used to develop the fundamental understandings of literacy when provided with quality instruction and experiences in each (Bauer & Mkhize, 2012).

In line with the previous case studies, there is the underlying aspiration for kōhanga reo children to become speakers, readers, and writers in te reo Māori and English. Whaea Tia and Ruby were satisfied with the Māori development of Pani and other kōhanga reo children in kura, but had concerns about their English development. Their main concern is that without explicit teaching of English literacy earlier in their schooling, their reading and writing of English will be substandard. Their concerns are substantiated by research which emphasises literacy skills of the ‘other’ language needs to be explicitly taught. Relying on the development of speech alone as a means for literacy knowledge to develop is not sufficient. Research indicates that transfer of phonological awareness skill does occur, to a degree, but specific teaching of these skills is a necessity to make advancements in reading and writing (Gort & Bauer, 2012). The next part of this chapter explores the experiences of Pani in her literacy learning journey.

Part B

Whanaungatanga

All three participants believed that whakawhanaungatanga, building and establishing relationships. is developed out of key communications amongst Kōhanga, home, and Kura. Channels of communication is critical to provide for better support in biliteracy learning and development of the child (Hornberger, 2003). In addition, establishing a network and or cluster

so that resources can be shared and face to face hui (gatherings) can be established would encourage the communication. This would also benefit in sharing the expectations of each child's key influences, as mentioned earlier.

Building and establishing a sense of whānaungatanga is an essential element in kura kaupapa Māori. Pani's first day at school involved being part of the powhiri (welcome) for new students, of which she was one. During the powhiri process, Pani was surrounded by an eloquence of te reo Māori oratory through karanga (call), whaikōrero (speech), and waiata (song). As part of the powhiri, Pani's pepeha was declared and a current child of the kura walked over, greeted with a hongi and took her hand from her mama to walk with her to sit with all of the school children. When a child starts school a process which involves the 'handing over' of a child from whānau to the kura is symbolic of the transition in starting school, but more importantly represents the relationship and connection from whānau to school and vice versa (Macfarlane, 2004). It provides reassurance to the whānau that their tamaiti (child) will be safe and cared for.

A week later she watched her class peers as they prepared for a powhiri whakatau for the schools senior Kapa Haka group, who had just won the regional primary school competition the day before. After the preparations the children returned to class to do their morning mihimihi and whakatau, a daily practice. This involved four children, each assigned a role on the class paepae. One child was responsible for holding the rakau to do the mihi, karakia, school pepeha, and waiata. The rakau was passed on for each and then handed back to the classroom teacher who then transitioned into the days' instruction. The protocol of the class paepae is symbolic of the protocol and processes that typically occur on the paepae in the school powhiri

and on a marae. Built on traditional practices of learning via listening and speaking, the class paepae provides opportunity for children to grow in their reo. Berryman and Glynn (2003) highlight the importance of oral literacy experiences that are authentic to build skills and knowledge for further language and literacy development. In Pani's case, the experiences involved in powhiri laid the foundation for whakawhanaungatanga, as well as provided rich oratory experiences, critical to literacy development. In this experience the most influential resource were the people involved.

Classroom Setting and Resources

On entering the classroom, there were A1 sized poems displayed around the room at an adult eye level when standing, along with A4 sized displays of the children's names and examples of children's writing, displayed lower than the poems. There were also tukutuku boards for children to look at and make their own, along with a waiata chart. There was a large whariki (mat) on the ground which was the students' main area to gather as a class when working with the teacher. Three tables with chairs were spaced around the room but interestingly, only two students returned to their table and chair to write their stories during a writing lesson. The remainder of the class situated themselves around the room by lying on the floor with cushions and a hard board to rest their book on, or sitting on bean bags.

Ruby and Whaea Tia felt that more resources such as puzzles, activities, books that provide rich language and supported the teaching and learning of Māori literacy in the kōhanga reo and in the homes were needed in their environments. Hohepa (1999) supports the benefits of providing home readers for parents and children to grow the child's Māori literacy knowledge in the early stages of reading. Whaea Tōru agreed to the benefits of home readers and provided

books each night for children to take home to read with their parent/s. In addition to home readers, Whaea Tōru hoped that the development of other appropriate resources in the classroom would continue to grow along with professional development to support how to best utilise the new resources in her teachings.

Teaching Strategies and Learning

Whaea Tōru agreed with Pani and Whaea Tia that the home “*is a very powerful base in which positive behaviours and a love of reading can be positively established*”. Furthermore, sitting with the child to read, discuss, and to look at a variety of books helps to build a child’s experiences with books, with reading. As she explained,

Setting time to read one on one with your child, to look at the pictures and draw personal experiences into what they’re reading or the pictures they are looking at provides deep and meaningful experiences to reading, to literacy – all very positive experiences.

Reading at home for enjoyment with a child supports reading practices that occur in school (Juel, 2006). Having patience, providing opportunity to explore, and scaffolding experiences in meaningful contexts are key elements that Whaea Tōru deemed essential in teaching children how to learn to read and grow in te reo.

Scaffolding

As mentioned in case study one, it should not be assumed that children will naturally learn to read and write a language on their own. Scaffolding their language learning allows the child to interact with their experiences orally and then be provided with assistance to transfer their oratory to writing (Phelps, et al., 2012). A writing lesson observed, focused on writing a recount of the children's experiences at the recent Kapa Haka Festival. There was a lot of discussion between the teacher and class about the event. As this was done, the teacher wrote up key words such as *poi*, *whakaeke*, *haka*, *wiriwiri*, *tū pakari*, *Kapa Haka*, *harikoa*. As each word was written the teacher would ask the class to spell the word with her and repeat. She did this five times, separating the pū (sounds) so that the children could see and hear how each word was made up. Pani watched and listened, and the students were instructed to use at least one word from the board when writing their stories. Pani started to write her story beginning with the word 'I' (used before verbs and stative to indicate past tense), attempts to write 'haere' (went), writing the letters 'h', 'r', and 'e', and then writes the words 'poi' and 'haka', copying them from the board. This example showed that Pani has had conversations discussing going somewhere as she immediately began with the sentence structure 'I haere'. She drew on her letter sound knowledge in an attempt to write the word 'haere', and used the new vocabulary that had just been presented in the lesson.

Ako – Tuakana/Teina

During observation five Pani participated in a literacy experience using an iPapa (iPad). There was one iPapa for each child if needed. While the teacher rotated and worked with two children and their writing pieces every 10 minutes, the remaining children were instructed to work on the iPapa. A support teacher roamed the classroom to help, and checked on task activities.

However the children seemed familiar with the routine, appeared on task, and could navigate between the different applications that were available to use. New children to the classroom, including Pani, often sat with an older member of the classroom and asked for their help, demonstrating tuakana/teina properties. Tuakana/teina is a practice that is embedded in kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa classrooms (Tangaere, 1997), and appeared to be a natural phenomenon requiring no prompts from the teacher or teacher aide. Tuakana-Teina relationships offer children the opportunity to offer their ‘knowledge and expertise’ to another peer (Macfarlane, 2004; Macfarlane, 2009).

Independent learning

It became apparent that the iPapa motivated children to self-direct their engagement in a variety of literacy activities. The issue however became the quality of iPapa Māori language literacy applications that were available. The majority of literacy applications that were observed to be used by the children were English applications, altered, as best as she could by the teacher, so that they could be partially or entirely used in a Māori context. Activities that the children were doing on the iPapa involved listening to digital story books; listening to waiata; using the video application to record themselves or their peers singing or telling stories; and creating words on a drawing app. Pani was using an application where she was spelling Māori words (from around the room) using an English keyboard that would say the word back to her but used English phonetics. This observation and the activities highlighted the essential need for applications to be developed that explicitly supported the development of Māori language literacy learning that could be used in new entrant classrooms.

Meaningful learning

Whaea Tōru noted that authentic learning experiences are important in providing the experiences that develop the language of te reo Māori. These experiences support the learning the children do in the classroom by providing meaning and context. For example, (in a mainstream setting) if a class have been learning words or the events about the marae, then going on a Mārae visit would provide the real life context for children to intertwine their classroom learning to what they just experienced. Whaea Tōru expressed that presenting the learning of reading and writing of te reo Māori in a mainstream setting through song, or rhyme is “*catchy*”, and using repetition with actions makes learning fun, “*short, sharp, and snappy*”. In a Māori medium setting, the aim is to also provide authentic learning in authentic settings with learning concepts or building upon these concepts “*by introducing it in a rotarota (rhyme), or whakaari (skit), or waiata (song)*. The main point being that “*teaching children to learn to read and write is not necessarily restricted to a book in the classroom or a pen and paper*”. An example of this occurred during observation six when Pani was introduced to new vocabulary through a song that would enable her and the other children to express themselves. The teacher sang the song first, to capture interest, and spoke about each line of the song using hand actions to illustrate specific words or phrases. Within 30 minutes the children had learned the song, the meaning, the actions, and were overheard using a phrase or word from the song in their general conversations between themselves later in the observation. During this time, Pani did not participate as much as the other children at the beginning, instead it appeared she remained an active observer of the teacher and her peers, gradually increasing her participation through singing the words and later doing the actions. Rogoff et al. (2003) contend that children use observing and listening as strategies to learn from other children before moving towards full participation.

Biliteracy Development

Deliberate teaching of English in the classroom was not observed, which was to be expected, and is in accordance to the kura philosophy of Māori immersion. During the lessons when a child spoke English, which was rarely heard during the classroom observations, they were gently reminded by the support teacher, teacher, or peer with “*Kia kaha ki te korero Māori*”. The times when English was heard was generally between peers. The conversation would start in Māori, go to English, and then finish in Māori. The literature reviewed highlighted the importance of code-switching in children as a natural part in developing their bilingualism. It helps them to make sense of certain contexts and allows another avenue to express themselves when their vocabulary level in one language does not provide for them. Expansion and explanation, rather than suppression, provides the positive support needed to uplift a child’s literacy learning experiences, as does explicitly teaching the literacy skills needed to understand and differentiate between languages (Jones & Yandian, 2002; Pandey, 2012).

Summary

As in the other two case studies, background information, literacy experiences, aspirations, and expectations of the adult participants were explored to gain insight and provide a rounded view of possible factors that influence the child’s literacy development. Each adult participant aspired for the child to be confident in te reo Māori and English and saw that continuing their education in a Māori medium setting was the best method to achieve the development in Māori literacy. The child did not have access to English instruction despite their aspirations but it was what they expected because of the Māori immersion environment. Concerns were expressed about how English literacy would eventually be taught and at which stage in their schooling. The teaching and learning pedagogies of the classroom and school reflected some

traditional cultural practices of Māori which are integral to kura kaupapa Māori, for example whanaungatanga, powhiri, whakatau, waiata, and tuakan-teina, providing meaningful experiences in oral and printed literacy. Resources of Māori literacy and texts were said to be plentiful and well used, however it became apparent in this case study for the need for iPad or android applications that specifically supports Māori language and literacy development. In addition to more shared resources between home and kōhanga reo. The next chapter explores the aspirations, expectations, and literacy experiences across the case studies and provides a summary of the key findings and answers to the research question.

Chapter Seven: Exploring Literacy across Three Case Studies

When children start school, they enter with varying levels of literate cultural capital (Prochnow, Tunmer, & Arrow, 2015). Generally those that have a higher level of literate cultural capital have better experiences and success in school. In New Zealand children who attend kōhanga reo are inclined to experience and develop a literate cultural capital in two languages regardless of whether Māori is their first language or not because of the dominating stature of the English language in society (May, Hill, Tiakiwai, 2006). This study has explored the literacy experiences of three kōhanga reo children as they started school. Using a case study approach guided by Kaupapa Māori values, this study aimed to answer the following question:

- What experiences do kōhanga children encounter that best supports their literacy learning of English and Māori, so that they grow to become successfully biliterate?

To answer this question the study addressed the following research objectives, which were to:

- Gain insights into the literacy aspirations and expectations that the Kōhanga teachers, whānau, and the school teachers have for their children on school entry;
- Examine children's literacy experiences in each setting and identify which experiences/reading programmes provide positive support for learning to read in Māori and English; and
- Identify and compare the literacy experiences of the children across the three school settings: total immersion, bi-lingual, and mainstream;

This discussion addresses the research objectives set out above. First, the literacy aspirations and expectations are shared and compared. Second, the children's positive literacy experiences are discussed. Thirdly, further literacy experiences are identified and compared across each school setting.

Literacy aspirations and expectations across the case studies

The background of each adult participant and their literacy experiences was shown to influence their aspirations and expectations of the case study child. Research on home literacy experiences show distinct associations between shared reading at home and enhancing emerging literacy skills, which in turn, predicts later success in reading (Sénéchal, 2006). Most adult participants across the cases experienced at least one integral figure who supported their own reading development and instigated their desire to want to read. As a result, these adult participants became successful readers and wanted the same for their child. Those who did not have positive experiences in learning to read grew to understand the value and advantages of knowing how to read so wanted to ensure that their child was not disadvantaged through lack of support. They would promote reading at home via reading to their child, singing songs, and/or going through the alphabet. Sénéchal (2011) reports that high expectations of children and hands on literacy teaching in the home environment are key to emergent literacy. All adult participants aspired and expected their children to be literate, ultimately biliterate.

The aspirations and expectations of the key influences in the child's life were explored as they essentially provide and guide the majority of literacy experiences in a child's life. The underlying aspiration across all case studies was for their child and other kōhanga reo children to grow to become confident and literate in te reo Māori and English. Each parent hoped that their child's development in Māori would be continued no matter which school setting they entered into and wished that Māori language was compulsory and taught in all mainstream schools from new entrant level to NCEA level. This signifies that learning of te reo Māori needs to be prioritised in education, particularly in mainstream schooling. Prioritising te reo Māori in schools would provide opportunity for Māori children to participate in te ao Māori,

support Māori commitment to language survival, as well as enable the Crown to meet its Treaty obligations (Bishop, 2003). The findings correlate to the first focus area in The Ka Hikitia – Accelerating Success 2013-2017 strategy, which aims for all “Māori students to have access to high quality Māori language in education” (Ministry of Education, 2013, p. 27) to support and strengthen the Māori language.

Across the case studies there was the awareness that continuing into a Māori medium setting would be best for their child’s Māori literacy development, considering it takes approximately seven to eight years in an immersed environment to fully grasp the complexities of a language (Hill, 2010). However, parents still held aspirations for English literacy to be explicitly taught at an earlier stage than what is currently occurring in kura and for te reo Māori to be upheld in bilingual units. The common concern was that their child’s English literacy development would become stagnant or underdeveloped in the early stages of literacy learning, creating a fear that their child may become “*lost*” or experience “*culture shock*” when participating in mainstream New Zealand. In the bilingual unit, the concern was that the child would become confused or prefer one language over the other limiting growth in both languages. Research asserts the ability for children to develop literacy skills in two languages simultaneously whilst being able to distinguish between orthographies and/or partake in code-switching to make sense of their context (Bauer & Mkhize, 2012). According to May, Hill and Tiakiwai (2006) some Māori medium programmes start introducing English at the junior levels for an hour or two a week, while others wait until students are Year 7 or 8. The concerns and aspirations of the parents and inconsistencies of English instruction across Māori medium education, indicates further research is needed into the advantages and disadvantages of teaching English literacy skills at a younger level in kura kaupapa Māori and its effects on biliteracy development. In the meantime, parents need to be made aware of the advantages of continuing in Māori medium

and the disadvantages of removing their child from kura too early to learn English in a mainstream setting. Research has shown that in this situation children have not developed proficiency in te reo for academic success and end up playing catch up in mainstream education, resulting in poor academic outcomes in both languages (Tangaere, 1997).

Children learn from the input they receive, so the higher the quality of input the greater the development in language (Cooper, et. al., 2004). It was clear across the three cases that all school teachers were aware that children start school with various levels of literacy knowledge. It was hoped that kōhanga reo and the home would provide rich experiences and quality instruction in building emerging literacy skills such as letter name knowledge, concepts of print, and letter-sound correspondence so that the child could get a head start in their journey to learning to read and write. The expectations of each of the school teachers on what a child should know in literacy when starting school were similar across the case studies, corresponding to what is highlighted in The National Early Literacy Panel Report (Lonigan & Shanahan, 2009) of 11 predictors of reading acquisition for both pre-schoolers and children in their first year of schooling. However, there was some disparity between the expectations of the kōhanga reo teachers, the schools, and the homes, particularly about what the child did know, for example numbers, colours, letters in their name, names of letters, and what they ‘actually’ knew according to the teachers’ schools assessments on school entry. Although inconsistencies such as this can be due to the problematic nature of assessment tools available for bilingual children (Snow & Van Hemel, 2008; Westerveld, 2014), further research is needed on creating valid, reliable, trustworthy and manageable assessment methods for use with bilingual children

Experiences which provided positive support for learning to read in Māori and English;

Literacy experiences of each child as they entered school were observed. The observations explored which experiences and reading programmes provided positive support for learning to read in Māori and English and the areas in which practices could be improved. Each case highlighted key areas that influenced the development of literacy and/or biliteracy skills in the children.

In line with their aspirations, the expectations of the parents and kōhanga reo teachers across the case studies was that their child's prior learning would be acknowledged and they would continue to grow and develop in te reo Māori. All schools demonstrated an acknowledgement of the child's prior learning experiences and accommodated this in their classrooms. For example case study one empowered the child's literacy experiences by using his knowledge of te reo Māori to help his understanding of English concepts. Case study two encouraged the use of Māori words as examples for words starting with the focus letter and case study three created an environment where instruction and conversation were only te reo Māori but children were not reprimanded if English was spoken. Consistent with Hornberger (2008), both languages were used to develop an environment that promotes literacy development through finding meaningful context to express their knowledge and understanding.

Each child's literacy experiences were influenced and shaped by the strategies each classroom teacher employed. Case studies two and three showed positive experiences of independent learning through rotational activities using a mixture of purposeful games, books, and applications on iPads. During each independent experience the children appeared motivated and engaged. These data confirmed that opportunities to independently explore, play, and

construct their own learning are beneficial for the child (Phillips, Clancy-Menchetti, & Lonigan, 2008; Vassallo, 2014). Learning experiences that involved scaffolding were positive and shared across cases. In line with Vygotsky's (1978) research on the benefits of working within a child's ZPD, clear examples of scaffolding in this study provided opportunities for the children to experience support and success in their literacy development in whole class/shared learning settings, as well as small groups, peer discussions/tuakana-teina, and one to one situations. These findings support earlier research which showed that when learning skills are guided within the ZPD, and when the person teaching it is able to relate to any prior learning experiences and emotions of their younger readers, they are essentially building a relationship, which influences learning outcomes (Tabors & Snow, 2002; Wasik & Slavin, 1993).

The prevailing theme appearing across each case study that was significant in each child's positive experiences were the relationships that were formed. Relationships support literacy learning by providing language stimulation, activating self-belief and interests in words, print, and meanings (Tabors & Snow, 2002). Building relationships through positive interactions, such as an embrace, as seen in case study one and three, nourishes the bond that is whanaungatanga (Bishop, 1996). Although it might have been expected to observe whakawhanaungatanga in the bilingual unit and kura kaupapa, it was positive to see it in the mainstream classroom too. Whanaungatanga was a key element in all case studies. The approach is collective, culturally responsive and a key component of kōhanga reo (Macfarlane, 2004). Relationships that were built on trust and respect between each participant in each case promoted better language-literacy interactions and experiences for each child. Subsequently, better relationships supported the concept of 'ako', a learning process that was observed in case study one and three. Like whanaungatanga, ako is a concept significant to Māori culture therefore continuing the cultural practices from kōhanga reo into each school setting provided

foundations to better understand the bicultural, thus bilingual, thus biliteracy needs of each child. This supports Macfarlane's (2004) and Berryman and Glynn's (2003) research on the importance of acknowledging the cultural reciprocity involved in teaching and learning.

Literacy experiences of the children across the three school settings

The classroom environment plays a central role in learning and children play an active role in exploring their classroom environment (Roskos & Neuman, 2002). The way in which each classroom was arranged provided freedom for children to move around, providing more potential to learn about literacy. Every classroom had a designated library area with a variety of books and cushions to sit on. As expected the Māori medium setting provided books in te reo Māori and the mainstream setting had books in English, which supported the literacy development of each settings medium of instruction. At the time of the observations, the bilingual setting had a very small number of Māori books compared to the available selection of books in English. Roskos and Neuman (2002) highlight the notion that language and print awareness is enhanced when objects are clustered together to create a schema and as children learn they are guided to make the link between print resources and learning materials. The bilingual teacher regularly linked concepts taught to resources around the room, as did the mainstream teacher. In the kura classroom, the links were made between oral practices such as waiata, haka, and powhiri and its printed form.

Making connections between classroom environments, oral speech, and print relies on quality resources and/or access to supporting resources. The mainstream classroom appeared to be well resourced in English literacy resources but lacking in te reo Māori resources. The analyses highlighted the need for professional development in te reo Māori for the classroom teacher,

as well as the potential benefits of having a support person who has knowledge of te reo Māori. The Māori medium classroom had access to quality text book resources but highlighted the significant need for appropriate te reo Māori literacy and language applications for iPad and tablets. Lastly, the bilingual classroom's most valuable resource was the teacher, who would switch between te reo Māori and English to help the child make sense of what was happening. For example the teacher would speak in Māori to the child to help explain a concept that was being taught in English and respond to the child if they spoke in te reo Māori. The bilingual classroom teacher's teaching practices aligned to Hornberger's (2005) research on best practice in bilingual classrooms by providing the language that was needed to further participation in the lesson. These findings strengthen the argument for teachers to be skilled in te reo Māori and English in mainstream New Zealand classroom and fluent in both languages in Māori medium settings (May, Hill & Tiakiwai, 2006; Tākao, 2010).

The reading programmes used in each setting were remarkably similar but inconsistent to what is used in the majority of New Zealand classrooms (Tunmer et al., 2013), which typically draw more heavily on whole language approaches to literacy teaching. Case study one and two both used a specific phonics approach to teaching reading, while case study three intertwined a phonics and whole language approach but from a Māori perspective. Tunmer et al. (2013) advocate the effectiveness of systematic phonics instruction on learning to read, especially in children beginning school and those most at risk, such as Māori and Pasifika, children from low decile homes and those with specific language difficulties.

When assessing literacy in bilingual children it is widely recommended that both languages be given attention (Snow & Van Hemel, 2008), as vocabulary development is distributed across

the languages (Snow & Oh, 2011) and code-switching is a regular part of bilingual development. It became apparent in each case study that various assessments were carried out on each of the children coming from kōhanga reo. For example, case study one used the school entry assessment (SEA), as did case study two, with the added feature of using Māori instruction to seek clarification of knowledge in either te reo Māori or English. The teacher's anecdotal notes and observations were used in analysis. Case study three did not specifically indicate which assessments were used to assess the learning needs and prior skills of the child at school entry, but the teacher indicated that diagnostic assessments were available and used, as well as ongoing observations from the teacher. This study further supports Bishop et al. (2001) and Westerveld's (2014) view that further assessment tools are needed to accommodate bilingual children, as well as professional development for teachers in understanding and promoting bilingual development.

Experiences that best supported the literacy learning of English and Māori, in becoming biliterate

To conclude this discussion, all three key influences - the home, school, and kōhanga - played a significant role in providing experiences that best supported the biliteracy development of the child, confirming the previous work of Ka'ai (1990) and Berryman and Glynn (2003). Support from the home via shared reading experiences promoted the development of early literacy skills, supporting the work of Sénéchal (2006). It was the relationships between the home, school, child, and kōhanga reo which were integral to building the foundations by which positive learning experiences could occur. As Bishop (1996) and Macfarlane (2004) explain, whanaungatanga and aroha are critical to establishing relationships, and are embedded in Māori cultural learning traditions such as ako. The kōhanga reo provided environments that nurtured

the early development of the whole child in a Māori immersion setting which offered experiences for oral language development. Cahmann (2003) and Tangaere (1997) concur that oral language development is an important contributing factor on the continuum to developing literacy skills. While it is tempting to say that specific literacy skills were taught with quality instruction in the kōhanga reo, this study cannot offer that insight, as observations into the children's literacy experience inside the kōhanga reo were not part of this project. However, this study offered insight into the aspirations and expectations of kōhanga reo teachers which was for their children to continue to be provided with experiences that developed their te reo Māori in any school setting and hope for schools to build on the child's bilingual experiences.

Each school setting provided rich quality instruction, with well-designed instructional activities that resulted in literacy gains in the first few weeks of school in the language of instruction, consistent with the findings of Bialystok (2004), who notes that quality language instruction is paramount for successful biliteracy development. Nonetheless, although the child's bilingual background was acknowledged in each school setting, formal literacy instruction was focused on learning either te reo Māori or English in the first instance before the other was taught. The idea that a child needs to be grounded in one language before learning another is supported by research (May, Hill & Tiakiwai, 2006) but can be misconstrued. Research shows that children can learn languages simultaneously and differentiate between the two (Bauer & Mkhize, 2012). Although transferability of language skills can occur, explicit instruction of each languages print needs to happen (Hornberger, 2003). This study provides insight for schools and policy makers to ensure resources, such as learning support tools and bilingual assessment tools, as well as knowledgeable teachers on bilingual/biliteracy development, are available across all school settings in order to fulfil the expectations and aspirations of the home and kōhanga reo. It also provides an avenue for kōhanga reo and schools to communicate and collaborate a plan

that ensures children are given the best opportunities to develop early literacy skills which are built upon at school.

The next chapter concludes this thesis by summarising the findings, as well as drawing attention to the strengths and limitations of the methodology employed. It outlines possible avenues for further research in relation to this study, finishing with some final words.

Chapter Eight: Conclusion

Summary of Findings

This study set out to explore the experiences of kōhanga reo children as they entered school that best supported their literacy learning of English and Māori so to develop biliteracy. The findings of three case studies of children transitioning from kōhanga reo to a mainstream primary school, a bilingual unit, and a kura kaupapa showed that the aspirations and expectations of a child's key influences plays a pivotal role in the development of literacy in a child. The involvement of parents in supporting home literacy was found to be fundamental to developing positive experiences in literacy at school. The natural progression from kōhanga reo is to move to a Māori medium setting for optimal literacy development in te reo Māori. However, a concern exists regarding how and when English skills will be addressed. For those whom choose to enrol their child into mainstream education or a bilingual unit that is less than 50% te reo Māori, the concern is whether te reo Māori will be acknowledged and supported. There is a need for parents and teachers (kōhanga reo and school) to better understand bilingualism and biliteracy as kōhanga reo children have biliterate cultural capital and so begin school with various knowledge compared to their monolingual peers. Despite this, findings from this study showed that quality instruction, and explicit teaching of literacy skills in the first year of school largely may reduce the risk of discontinuity in the transition and later reading difficulties. Relationships, among key influences, built on trust and which embodied whanaungatanga provided a stronger foundation for literacy learning. In addition reading programmes that were tailored to the needs of the child and incorporated a range of teaching strategies that utilised specific resources provided better literacy experiences for the children. The need for development of further resources and assessment tools to cater for bilingual children was highlighted. Furthermore the value of having a bilingual teacher in the classroom

became apparent, drawing attention to the need for more bilingual teachers in New Zealand classrooms.

Reflections on the methodology

Strengths of this approach

In the first instances, employing a Kaupapa Maori approach to research complemented working within a Kaupapa Māori education setting and was beneficial in working with Māori families and their children because of the shared values (Bishop and Glynn, 1999). In addition, having a researcher that had experience as a teacher and was involved in a kōhanga reo and the kura kaupapa Māori was advantageous in building relationships within these communities. Established connections to the kōhanga reo provided support and guidance when seeking permission to proceed and asking for participation, which Bishop (1996) confirms is critical when working within a Kaupapa Maori framework.

Secondly, a case study approach was symbiotic with a Kaupapa Māori approach as each participant was central to each case and each case was reflective of each participant's voice, consistent with Coffin's (2013) justification on using a case study methodology within a Kaupapa Māori approach. The use of three case studies across three different school settings meant that insights could be gained into the literacy experiences of children who came from a similar preschool setting, kōhanga reo, but were going into different school settings. The cases could be compared and contrasted, looking for similarities and differences in experiences, aspirations, and expectations. Similarities in the data strengthen the validity and trustworthiness of the findings (Cohen, et al., 2007), whilst differences highlighted areas of

need or avenues for further research. Interviewing the three key adult participants in each case meant that the perspectives of each could be triangulated with data collected through observation to determine whether their aspirations and expectations eventuated in the child's experiences. By using multiple cases and multiple methods of data collection the validity of this study was increased (Yin, 2014).

Limitations of this approach

While this study used three case studies, and the sample size was deemed sufficient in this project (Onwuegnuzie & Collins, 2007), a larger sample size that represents a minimum of two case studies from each school setting could have provided another level of analysis between cases within the same school contexts. In planning this research, participant sample size was small and limited. There was concern that not all criterion could be met and time management and data collection was dependent on the sample. Fortunately in this case, each child's school start date was staggered, which was advantageous but, it was not deliberately planned this way

A further limitation was that the observations were reliant on the child being at school. There was one instance when observations could not be done for more than one week due to the child falling ill. Observation timings were also dependent on other work commitments of the researcher. The use of a digital recorder could have provided consistency in observation timings as well as provided opportunity to further explore the experiences of the child. Due to limited time from finding a sample and children starting school, observations in the kōhanga reo were not done. Observations in the kōhanga reo could have provided insight into the literacy experiences preschool and led to better comparisons between each setting.

Limited knowledge in the spoken language of te reo Māori reduced the opportunity to carry out active participation observations with the children in Māori immersion and bilingual settings. Being able to converse with the child could have provided a richer context into their experiences.

This study was unique in that all participants were of Māori descent, including the mainstream school teacher, which was not planned. It must be stressed that findings of this study may not reflect what happens in other parts of New Zealand and the perspectives and experiences of each participant were their own.

Avenues for future research

This study has demonstrated the need for further understanding of biliteracy development amongst educators, policy makers, and the home. While ensuring that literacy skills are grounded in at least one language, further research into the effects of simultaneous literacy acquisition of te reo Māori and English in the early years of school is needed. Research is also needed to investigate the validity of assessment tools for children who have a bilingual background, as the latest PIRLS data continues to show Māori represented in the bottom achievers in literacy in New Zealand in mainstream schooling. It would be useful for future research to do a similar study but with a more representative sample that continued to explore the literacy experiences of the child as they moved through the years in school. A longitudinal study could provide better insight and comparisons of the impacts the child's first experiences in literacy in each school setting have on their longer term biliteracy development and success.

Although not a focus of this study, the literacy development of other bilingual children in New Zealand classrooms using languages other than Māori is also worthy of further research.

Final Words

Being biliterate and able to fully participate in te ao Māori and te ao Pakeha is an aspiration held by many Māori. However research into biliteracy development in New Zealand is relatively scarce. This study was designed to explore the experiences of kōhanga reo children on school entry to give insight into how the literacy needs of these children can be better supported. Early childhood experiences generally determine a child's literacy capital on school entry, but in the case of a kōhanga reo child their literacy capital needs to be understood to be distinct from those experiences of a monolingual child, which is not often reflected in assessment data or teaching practices. Despite the child's background, the future of their literacy learning and development to becoming biliterate depends on the home and teachers' understanding of biliteracy development, as well as the development of assessment tools that appropriately assess the literacy knowledge of bilingual children. What this study has highlighted are ways in which support can be given to ensure the aspirations of biliteracy development are honoured.

Ko te manu e kai ana i te miro, nōna te ngahere.

Ko te manu e kai ana i te mātauranga, nōna te ao.

The bird that partakes of the miro berry reigns in the forest.

The bird that partakes of the power of knowledge has access to the world.

References

- Akhtar, N., Jipson, J., & Callanan, M. A. (2001). Learning words through overhearing. *Child Development, 72*, 416-430.
- Arrow, A. (2007). *Potential precursors to the development of phonological awareness in preschool children* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Arrow, A. W., McLachlan, C. J., & Greaney, K. T. (2015). Teacher knowledge needed for differentiated early reading instruction. In W. E. Tunmer & J. W. Chapman (Eds.), *Excellence and equity in literacy education: The case of New Zealand*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baker, J. A., (2006). Contributions of teacher-child relationships to positive school adjustment during elementary school. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*, 211-229.
- Barbour, R. S. (2008). *Introducing Qualitative Research: A students' guide to the craft of doing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Barnhardt, R. & Kawagley, A.O. (2008). Indigenous knowledge systems and education. *Yearbook of the National Society for the study of education, 107*(1), 223-241.
- Bauer, E. B., & Mkhize, D. (2012). Supporting the early development of biliteracy: The role of parents and caregivers. In E. B. Bauer, & M. Gort (Eds.). *Early biliteracy development: Exploring young learners use of their linguistic resources*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Benton, R., & Benton, N. (2000). RLS in Aotearoa/New Zealand: 1989-1999. In J. Fishman (Ed.). *Can threatened languages be saved?* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Berryman, M. (2001). *Toitū te whānau, toitū te iwi: A community approach to English transition* (Unpublished master's thesis) University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Berryman, M., & Glynn, T. (2003). Reciprocal language learning for Māori students and parents. In R. Barnard, & T. Glynn (Eds.), *Bilingual children's language and literacy development*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Bialystok, E. (2004). The impact of bilingualism on language and literacy development. In T. K. Bhatia & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Biggs, B. (1968). The Maori Language Past & Present. In E. Schwimmer (Ed). *The Maori people in the nineteen-sixties* (pp. 65-84). Auckland, New Zealand: Blackwood and Janet.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whaka Whānaugnatanga*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- 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). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research: third edition*. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Freeing ourselves from neocolonial domination in research* (pp. 109–138). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Glynn T., & Richardson, C. (2001). Diagnostic assessment tools in Māori medium education: A stocktake and preliminary evaluation, Ministry of Education. Retrieved from: <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz>.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S., & Richardson, C. (2003). *Te Kotahitanga phase one: the experiences of year nine and 10 Māori students in mainstream classrooms* (Report to the Ministry of Education). Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.
- Brennan, F., & Ireson, J. (1997). Training phonological awareness: A study to evaluate the effects of a program of metalinguistic games in kindergarten. *Reading & Writing*, 9, 241-263.
- Burgess, S. R. (2002). The influence of speech perception, oral language ability, the home literacy environment, and pre-reading knowledge on the growth of phonological sensitivity. A one-year longitudinal investigation. *Reading & Writing*, 15, 709-737.
- Burgess, S. R., Hecht, S. A., & Lonigan, C. J. (2002). Relations of the home literacy environment (HLE) to the development of reading-related abilities: A one-year longitudinal study. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37, 408-426.
- Burn, R. B. (1990). *Introduction to research methods in education*. Melbourne, Australia: Longman Cheshire.
- Buckwalter, J. K., & Lo, Y. H. G. (2002). Emergent biliteracy in Chinese and English. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11(4), 269-293.
- Button, K., & Johnson, M. (1997). The role of shared reading in developing effective early reading strategies. *Reading Horizons*, 37(4), 262-273.
- Cahmann, M. (2003). To correct or not to correct bilingual student's errors is a question of continuing reimagination. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Caldwell, K. (2005). Non-participant observation: using video tapes to collect data in nursing research. *Nurse Researcher*, 13(2), 42-54.
- Caldas, S. J. (2006). *Raising bilingual-biliterate children in monolingual cultures*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Clay, M.M. (1985). *The early detection of reading difficulties*. Auckland, New Zealand: Heinemann.
- Clifton, R. A. (1981). Ethnicity, teachers expectations, and the academic achievement process in Canada, *Sociology of Education*, 54(October), 291-301.
- Coffin, R. (2013). *Kia mau ko tō Māoritanga. The role of Māori teachers in English medium primary schools*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Coolican, H. (2013). *Research methods and statistics in psychology* (5th ed.). London, UK: Hodder Education.
- Cooper, G, Arago-Kemp, V, Wylie, C, & Hodgen, E. (2004). Te rerenga ā te Pīrere: A longitudinal study of kōhanga reo and kura kaupapa Māori students. Pūrongo tuatahi, phase 1 report, Wellington, NZ: NZCER.
- Cram, F. (2001). Rangahau Māori: Tona tika, Tona pono. In M. Tolich (Ed.), *Research Ethics in Aotearoa*, (pp.35-52). Auckland, NZ: Longman.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Crouch, M. & McKenzie, H. (2006). The logic of small samples in interview-based qualitative research. *Social Science Information*, 45(4), 483-499.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Curnow, J., Hopa, N., & McRae, J. (2006). *He pitopito kōrero nō te perehi Māori: readings from the Māori language press*. Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press.
- Dearing, E., Kreider, H. Simpkins, S., & Weiss, H. B. (2006). Family involvement in school and low income children's literacy: Longitudinal associations between and within families. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98, 653-664.
- Diaz, R. M., Neal, C. J., & Amaya-Williams, M. (1990). The social origins of self-regulation. In L. C. Moll (Ed.) *Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology* (127-154). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Dreher, M. (1994). Qualitative research methods from the reviewer's perspective. In J. Morse (Ed.), *Critical issues in qualitative research methods* (pp. 281–297). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Durie, M. (2001). *A framework for considering Maori educational advancement*. Opening Address. Hui Taumata Matauranga, Turangi.
- Elley, W. B. (1992). *How in the world do students read?* Hanburg, Germany: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Espinosa, L., & Lopez, M. L. (2007). *Assessment considerations for young English language learners across different levels of accountability*. Retrieved from, www.first5la.org/files/Assessment_ConsiderationsEnglishLearners.pdf.
- Flavell, W. I. (2012). *A case study of a Spanish language programme in a Kura Kaupapa Māori*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Franken, M. & Rau, C. (2009). Enabling conditions for professional development of te reo Māori teachers. In S. May (Ed.). LED 2007: 2nd International Conference on Language, Education and Diversity, Refereed Conference Proceedings and Keynotes, The University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand, 21-24 November 2007 [CD-ROM]. Hamilton, New Zealand: The University of Waikato.

- Gillon, G. T. (2004). *Phonological awareness: from research to practice*. New York, NY: Guildford.
- Gilmore, A. M. (1998). *School entry assessment*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Glynn, T., & Berryman, M. (2003). A community elder's role in improving reading and writing for Māori students. In R. Barnard, & T. Glynn (Eds.), *Bilingual children's language and literacy development*, Clevedon, United Kingdom: Cromwell Press Ltd.
- Gort, M., & Bauer, E. B. (2012). Holistic approaches to bilingual/biliteracy development, instruction, and research. In E. B. Bauer, & M. Gort (Eds.), *Early biliteracy development: Exploring young learners use of their linguistic resources*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gottardo, A., Gu, Y., Mueller, J., Baciú, I., & Pauchulo, A. L. (2011). Factors affecting the relative relationships between first and second-language phonological awareness and second-language reading. In A. Y. Durgunoglu & C. Goldenberg (Eds.) *Language and literacy development in bilingual settings*, New York, NY: Guildford Press.
- Greaney, K. T. (2011). 'The multiple cues or "searchlights" word reading theory: Implications for reading recovery'. *Perspectives on Language and Literacy*, 37(4), 15-19.
- Guest, G., Namey, E., Mitchell, M. (2013). *Collecting Qualitative Data, A Field Manual for Applied Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Hadwin, A., & Järvelä, S. (2011). Introduction to a special issue on social aspects of self-regulated learning. Where social and self meet in the strategic regulation of learning. *Teachers College Record*, 113, 235-239.
- Harris, F. (2012). Whānau classroom "lessons" illuminate bicultural and bilingual literacy learning processes for Māori children. In B. Kaur (Ed.). *Understanding teaching and learning: Classroom research revisited*, (pp. 225-238). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Harris, J.; Golinkoff, R. M.; & Hirsh-Pasek. (2011). Lessons from the crib for the classroom: How children really learn vocabulary. In S.B. Neuman & D.K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Literacy Research* (Vol 3., pp. 49-65). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Haworth, P., Culen, J., Simmons, H., Schimanski, L., & Woodhead, E. (2006). *The flight of our kite: The Wycliffe Nga Tamariki Kindergarten story*. Retrieved from: www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/ECE/22551/22571
- Hayes, J. (2013). *Becoming a school child: The role of peers in supporting new entrant transitions* (Unpublished masters thesis), Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Hedegaard, M. (2012). Analysing children's learning and development in everyday settings from a cultural-historical wholeness approach. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 19, 127-138.
- Henry, A. E.; & Pianta, R. C. (2011). Effective teacher-child interactions and children's literacy: Evidence for scalable, aligned approaches to professional development. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.). *Handbook of early literacy research* (Vol 3., pp. 308-321). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.

- Hill, R. (2010). *What is the role of English transition in Māori-medium education?* (Doctorate dissertation), University of Waikato, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/10289/4438/3/thesis.pdf>
- Hohepa, M. K. (1999). *Hei tautoko i te reo: Māori language regeneration and whānau bookreading practices.* (Doctorate dissertation), University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Hohepa, M. K., May, S., & McCarty, T. L. (2006). THE FORUM. *Journal of language, identity, and Education*, 5(4), 293-315.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2003). *Continua of biliteracy: An ecological framework for educational policy, research, and practice in multilingual settings.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2008). Voice and biliteracy in indigenous language revitalisation. In K. A. King, N. Schilling-Estes, L. Fogler, J. J. Lou, & B. Souleup (Eds.). *Sustaining linguistic diversity: Endangered and minority languages and language varieties.* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Huston, A., & Wright, J. (1998). Mass media and children's development. In N. Damon (Ed.), *The handbook of child psychology volume 4* (5th ed., pp. 999-1058). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Irwin, K. (1994). Māori research methods and processes. An exploration. *Sites*, 2-43.
- Jenkins, K. (1991). *Te ihi, te mana, te wehi o te ao tuhi: Early Maori literacy* (Unpublished master's thesis), University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Juel, C. (1996). What makes literacy tutoring effective? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 31, 268-289.
- Juel, C. (2006). The impact of early school experiences on initial reading. In D. Dickinson & S. B. Neuman (Eds.). *Handbook of early literacy research* (Vol. 2, pp.243-256). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Justice, L.M., Kaderavek, J.N., Fan, X., Sofka, A. & Hunt, A. (2009). Accelerating preschoolers' Early literacy development through classroom-based teacher-child storybook reading and explicit print referencing. *Language, Speech and Hearing Services in School*, 40, 67-85.
- Ka'ai, T. (1990). *Te Hiringa Taketake: Mai i te kōhanga reo ki te kura, Maori Pedagogy: Te Kōhanga Reo and the transition to school* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Kamhi, A. G., & Catts, H. W. (2012). *Language and reading disabilities* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Kana, F., & Tamatea K. (2006). Sharing, listening, learning and developing understandings of Kaupapa Māori research by engaging with two Māori communities involved in education. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 12, 9-20.
- King, M. (1992). *Te ao hurihuri: Aspects of Maoritanga.* Auckland, New Zealand: Reed Books.

- Landry, S. H., & Smith, K. E. (2006). The influence of parenting of emerging literacy skills. . In D. Dickinson & S. B. Neuman (Eds.) *Handbook of early literacy research* (Vol. 2, pp.135-148). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Lee, M. (2011). *Annual monitoring of Reading Recovery: The data for 2011*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publication/series/1547/111098>
- Lonigan, C. J., & Shanahan, T. (2009). *Executive Summary. Developing early literacy: Report of the national early literacy panel*. Retrieved from <http://lincs.ed.gov/publications/pdf/NELPSummary.pdf>
- Lyons, A. (2015). Approaches to collecting data. In P. Rohleder, & A. Lyons (2015), *Qualitative Research in Clinical and Health Psychology* (pp. 74-95). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillian.
- May, H. (2011). *I am five and I go to school: Early years schooling in New Zealand, 1900-2010*. Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University Press.
- May, S., Hill, R., & Tiakiwai, S. (2006). *Bilingual Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Key findings from bilingual immersion education: Indicators of good practices*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education, Research Division.
- Macfarlane, A. (2004). *Kia hiwa rā: Listen to culture – Māori students' plea to educators*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER.
- Macfarlane, A. (2007). In search of a culturally-inclusive curriculum. *Reading Forum NZ*, 22(1), 29-33.
- Macfarlane, S. (2009). Te Pikinga ki runga: Raising possibilities. *Set: Research information for teachers*, 2, 42-50.
- Macfarlane, A. & Macfarlane S. (2013). Weaving the dimensions of culture and learning. Implications for educators. In B.Kaur (Ed.), *Understanding teaching and learning: Classroom research revisited* (pp. 213-224). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers
- McCaffery, J., & Tuafuti, P. (2003). Samoan children's bilingual language and literacy development. In R. Barnard, & T. Glynn (Eds.), *Bilingual children's language and literacy development*, Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- McLachlan, C. J., & Arrow, A. (2013). Promoting alphabet knowledge and phonological awareness in low socioeconomic child care settings: a quasi experimental study in five New Zealand centres. *Reading and Writing*, 27, 819-839.
- McLachlan, C. J., Nicholson, T., Fielding-Barnsley, R., Mercer, L., & Ohi, S. (2013). *Literacy in early childhood and primary education: Issues, challenges and solutions*. Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge University Press.
- McNaughton, S., MacDonald, S., Barber, J., Farry, S., & Woodard, H. (2004). *Ngā Taumatua: Research on literacy practices and language development (Te Reo) in Years 0-1 in Māori medium classrooms*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland Uniservices Ltd.
- McNaughton, S., & Ka'ai, T. (1990). *Two studies of transitions socializations of literacy: and Te Hiringa Taketake: Mai i te Kōhanga Reo ki te Kura* (Report funded by the Ministry of Education). University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.

- McRae, J. (2015). *Māori newspapers and magazines – ngā niupepa me ngā moheni*, Retrieved from: <http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/maori-newspapers-and-magazines-nga-niupepa-me-nga-moheni/print>
- Mead, S. M. (1997). *Landmarks, bridges, and visions*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
- Mead, H. M. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Auckland, New Zealand: Huia.
- Metge, J. (1984). *Learning and Teaching: He Tikanga Maori* (Report of research carried out as James Cook Fellow 1981-1983). Department of Education Wellington, New Zealand.
- Metge, J. (1976). *The Maoris of New Zealand: Rautahi* (Rev. ed.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Metsala, J. L. (2011). Lexical Reorganisation and the emergence of phonological awareness. In S.B. Neuman & D.K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of Early Literacy Research Volume 3* (pp. 66-84). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Ministry of Education (1999). *Report of the Literacy Taskforce*. Wellington, New Zealand: Author.
- Ministry of Education (2009). *Ka Hikitia Managing for Success: Māori education strategy 2008-2012*. Retrieved from: <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz>
- Ministry of Education (2010a). *Effective literacy practice years 1-4: Approaches to teaching reading*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media Ltd.
- Ministry of Education (2010b). *The Literacy Learning Progressions. Meeting the reading and writing demands of the curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media Ltd.
- Ministry of Education (2013). *Ka Hikitia Accelerating Success: Māori education strategy 2013-2017*. Retrieved from: <http://www.education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Ministry/Strategies-and-policies/Ka-Hikitia/KaHikitiaAcceleratingSuccessEnglish.pdf>
- Ministry of Education (2015). Retrieved from: <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/early-childhood-education/participation>
- Morais, J. (2003). Levels of phonological representation in skilled reading and in learning to read. *Reading & Writing*, 16, 123-143.
- Mulholland, M., & Tawhai, V. (2010). Introduction. In M. Mulholland & V. Tawhai (Eds.), *Weeping waters. The Treaty of Waitangi and constitutional change* (pp.1-9). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.
- Murray, S., & Galvin, A. (2004). *Hui Taumata 2005: Māori in early childhood education and school*. A report Commissioned by Ministry of Education for the Hui Taumata Steering Committee.
- Newman, K. (2010). *Bible and Treaty: Missionaries among the Māori - A new perspective*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
- Newman, K. (2013). *Beyond Betrayal: Trouble in the promised land - restoring the mission to Māori*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.

- Nicholson, T. (1997). Closing the gap on reading failure: Social background, phonemic awareness and learning to read. In B. A. Blachman (Ed.), *Foundations of reading acquisition and dyslexia: Implications for early intervention* (pp. 381-407). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nicholson, T. (2000). *Reading the writing on the wall*. Palmerston North, NZ: Dunmore Press.
- Nicholson, T. (2005). *At the cutting edge: The importance of phonemic awareness in learning to read and spell*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.
- Oades-Sese, G. V., & Yibling, L. (2011). Attachment relationships as predictors of language skills for at-risk bilingual preschool children, *Psychology in the schools*, 48(7), (707-722). Wiley Periodicals Inc.
- Onwuebuze, A. & Collins, K. (2007). A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social science research. *The Qualitative Report*, 12(2), 281-316.
- O'Regan, H. (1999). If it's good enough for you it's good enough for me: The Hypocrisy of Assimilation and Cultural Colonisation. In J. Brown & P. Sant (Eds.). *Indigeneity: Construction and re/presentation*. New York, NY: Nova Sciences.
- Parlett, M. (1975). Evaluating innovations in teaching. In J. Greenwald & R. West (Eds.) *Curriculum design*. London: Croom Helm.
- Phelps, R., Nhung, H. T. T., Granham, A., & Geeves, R. (2012). But how do we learn? Talking to Vietnamese children about how they learn in and out of school. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 53, 289-302.
- Pipi, K., Cram, F, Hawke, S., Huriwai, T. M., & Mataki, T. (2004). A research ethic for studying Māori and iwi provider success. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 23, 141-143.
- Prochnow, J. E., Tunmer, W. E., & Arrow, A. W. (2015). Literate cultural capital and matthew effects in reading achievement. In W. Tunmer & J. Chapman (Eds.) *Excellence and equity in literacy education: The case of New Zealand*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ramey, S. L., & Ramey, C. T. (2006). Early Educational Interventions: Principles of Effective and Sustained Benefits from Targeted Early Education Programs. In D. Dickinson & S. B. Neuman (Eds.) *Handbook of early literacy research Volume 2*, (pp.243-256). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Reyes, M. L., & Azuara, P. (2008). Emergent biliteracy in young Mexican immigrant children. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(4), 374-398.
- Reynolds, M., & Wheldall, K. (2007). Reading Recovery 20 years down the track: Looking forward, looking back. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 54, 199-223.
- Roberts, T. A. (2008). Home storybook reading in primary or second language with preschool children: Evidence of equal effectiveness for second-language vocabulary. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43(2), 103-130.
- Rogoff, B., Paradise, R., Arauz, R. M., Correa-Chávez, M., & Angelillo, C. (2003). Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 175-203.

- Rona, S. (2014). *Ngā Ara Ako: Māori children's everyday learning over the summer holidays*. Summer internship report to Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga. Palmerston North: Massey University Institute of Education & Te Pūtahi a Toi.
- Roskos, K., & Neuman, S. B., (2002). Environment and its influences for early literacy teaching and learning. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (pp. 281-292). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Ryder, J. F, Tunmer, W. E., & Greaney, K. T. (2008). Explicit instruction in phonemic awareness and phonemically-based decoding skills as an intervention strategy for struggling readers in whole language classrooms. *Reading and Writing, 21*, 349-369.
- Saldana, J. (2011). *Fundamentals of Qualitative Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sadeghi, A., Everatt, J., McNeill, B., & Rezaei, A. (2014). Text processing in English-Persian bilingual children: A bilingual view on the Simple Model of Reading. *Educational & Child Psychology, 31*(2), 45-56.
- Scheffner-Hammer, C., Scarpino, S., & Davison, M.D., (2011). Beginning with language: Spanish-English bilingual pre-schoolers' early literacy development. In S.B. Neuman, & D.K. Dickinson (Eds.). *Handbook of Early Literacy Research, Volume 3*. New York, NY: Guildford Press.
- Schneider, W., Kuspert, P., Roth, E., Vise, M., & Marx. H. (1997). Short and long term effects of training phonological awareness in kindergarten: Evidence from two German studies. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 66*, 311-340.
- Scott, J., & Marshall, G. (2009). *A Dictionary of Sociology*, (3rd Ed. Rev.). London: Oxford University Press
- Seale. C (1999). *The Quality of Qualitative Research*. London, United Kingdom: Sage.
- Sénéchal, M. (2006). Testing the home literacy model: parent involvement in kindergarten is differentially related to grade 4 reading comprehension, fluency, spelling, and reading for pleasure. *Scientific studies of reading, 10*(1), 59-87.
- Sénéchal, M. (2011). A model of the concurrent and longitudinal relations between home literacy and child outcomes. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.) *Handbook of early literacy research: Volume 3* (pp. 175-188). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Simon, J. (1994). Historical perspectives on schoolings. In E. Coxon, K. Jenkins & J. Marshall, L. Massey (Eds.) *The politics of learning and teaching in Aotearoa - New Zealand* (pp. 37-81). Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
- Simon, J. (1998). (Ed). *Ngā kura Māori: the native schools system 1867-1969*, Auckland, NZ: Auckland University Press.
- Skerrett, M. (2014). Crown breaches, neoliberal reforms, and radical pedagogy. In J. Ritchie & M. Skerrett (Eds.) *Early Childhood Education in Aotearoa New Zealand: History, pedagogy, and liberation*, New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, A. (1998). *Understanding children's development*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Smith, J., & Elley, W (1994). *Learning to read in New Zealand*. Auckland: Longman Paul.

- Smith, G. H. (1997). *The development of kaupapa Māori: Theory and Praxis*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, New Zealand: Zed Books.
- Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. (2nd ed.). Dunedin, New Zealand: Zed Books.
- Snow, C. E., & Oh, S. S. (2011). Assessment in early literacy research. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research Volume 3* (pp. 375-395). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Snow, C. E., & Van Hemel, S. B. (Eds.). (2008). *Early childhood assessment: Why, what, and how*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Stanovich, K.E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 360-397.
- Stark, S., & Torrance, H. (2005). Case Study. In B. Somekh & C. Lewin (2005). *Research methods in the social sciences*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Tabors, P. O., & Snow, C. E. (2002). Young bilingual children and early literacy development. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (pp. 159-178). New York, NY: The Guildford Press.
- Tākao, N. (2010). Te Piko o te Māhuri: Ngā āhuatanga matua o te Kura Kaupapa Māori whai angitu. Retrieved from: <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/91416/105966/79522/he-pitihanga-te-aho-matua>
- Tangaere, A. R. (1997). *Learning Maori together: Kōhanga Reo and home*. Wellington, New Zealand: GP Print.
- Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust. (1995). *Te Korowai*. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Thompson, G.B. (1997). The teaching of reading. In V. Edwards & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of language and education Volume 2* (pp. 9-18). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Torgesen, J. K., Rashotte, C. A., & Alexander, A. W. (2001). Principles of fluency instruction in reading: Relationships with established empirical outcomes. In M. Wolf (Ed.), *Dyslexia fluency, and the brain* (pp. 335-355). Timonium, MD: York Press
- Tunmer, W. E., Chapman, J. W., Ryan, H. A. & Prochnow, J. E. (1998). The importance of providing beginning readers with explicit training in phonological processing skills. *Australian Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 3, 4-14.
- Tunmer, W.E., Chapman, J., & Prochnow, J.E. (1999). Science can inform educational practice: The case of literacy. In I Livingston (Ed.), *New Zealand annual review of education Volume 9* (pp. 133-156). Wellington, New Zealand: School of Education Victoria University of Wellington.
- Tunmer, W.E., Chapman, J., & Prochnow, J.E. (2003). *The structure of relationships between language-related factors, achievement-related beliefs, gender and beginning reading achievement: Final Report - Phase II*. Report to the Ministry of Education, Wellington, New Zealand.

- Tunmer, W. E., & Nicholson, T. (2011). The development and teaching of word recognition skill. In M. L. Kamil, P. D. Pearson, E. B. Moje, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 4, pp. 405-431). New York: NY: Routledge.
- Tunmer, W. E., Chapman, J. W., Greaney, K. T., Prochnow, J. E., & Arrow, A. W. (2013). Why the New Zealand National Literacy Strategy has failed and what can be done about it: Evidence from the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) 2011 and Reading Recovery monitoring reports. *Australian Journal of Learning difficulties*, 18(2), 139-180.
- Van Hees, J. (2004). Partnerships at the interface: Classroom, whānau, and community-based language and learning for linguistically and culturally diverse learners. Research report for Research and Evaluation Unit, Ministry of Education, New Zealand.
- Vassallo, S. (2014). Self-regulated learning. In G. G. Goodman (Ed.) *Educational psychology reader: The art and science of how people learn*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Vellutino, F. R., Fletcher, J. M., Snowling, M. J., & Scanlon, D. M. (2004). Specific reading disability (dyslexia): What have we learned in the past four decades? *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45, 2-40.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wagemaker, H. (Ed.) (1993). *Achievement in reading literacy: New Zealand's performance in a national and international context*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Walker, R. (1992). Marae: A place to stand. In M. King (Ed.), *Te Ao Hurihuri: Aspects of Maoritanga* (pp. 15-28). Auckland, New Zealand: Octopus Publishing.
- Wasik, B., & Slavin, R. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-to-one tutoring: A review of five programs. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28, 179-200.
- Wells, G. (1986). Preschool literacy related activities and success in school. In D. Olson, N. Torrance & A. Hilyard (Eds.) *Literacy, Language and Learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Westerveld, M. F. (2014). Emergent literacy performance across two languages: assessing four-year-old bilingual children. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 17(5), 526-543.
- Wood, D.; Bruner, J. S.; Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Child Psychology*, 17, (pp. 89-100). London, United Kingdom: Pergamon Press.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research design and methods (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods (5th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Zigler, E., & Styfco, S. (Eds.). (2004). *The Head Start debate*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Appendices

Appendix A: Ethics approval letter



MASSEY UNIVERSITY
TE KUNENGA KI PŪREHUROA

16 June 2014

FILE

Sarika Rona
50 Matipo Street
PALMERSTON NORTH

Dear Sarika

Re: HEC: Southern B Application – 14/38
An exploratory study: Māori children's literacy experiences moving from a
Kōhanga Reo setting to a Kura Kaupapa, bilingual and mainstream education
setting

Thank you for your letter dated 16 June 2014.

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

Prof John O'Neill, Acting Chair
Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B

cc Prof Claire McLachlan
Institute of Education
PN500

Mr Bevan Erueti
Institute of Education
PN500

A/Prof Sally Hansen, Director
Institute of Education
PN500

Mrs Roseanne MacGillivray
Institute of Education
PN500

Massey University Human Ethics Committee
Accredited by the Health Research Council

Research Ethics Office, Research and Enterprise

Massey University, Private Bag 11222, Palmerston North 4442, New Zealand T 06 3505573; 06 3505575 F 06 350 5622
E humanethics@massey.ac.nz; animaethics@massey.ac.nz; gtc@massey.ac.nz www.massey.ac.nz

Appendix B: Protocol for school/kōhanga reo teacher interview

An exploratory study: Māori children's literacy experiences moving from a Kōhanga Reo setting to a Kura Kaupapa Māori, Bilingual, and Mainstream education setting.

Semi-structured interview with teachers

I would like us to talk about what your views are on children becoming confident readers in both Māori and English.

Experiences:

1. Can you please share with me your education background?
2. Can you please share with me your experiences with reading in Māori?
3. Can you please share with me your experiences with reading in English?
4. Do you like reading in one language more than the other? Please explain.
5. Do you think one language is easier to learn or teach than the other? Please explain.

Expectations:

6. Can you please share with me what your expectations are for a child in learning to read and write in Māori?
7. Can you please share with me what your expectations are for a child in learning to read and write in English?
8. Can you please share with me what level of literacy in te reo Māori you expect of a child who has come from a kōhanga reo upon school entry?
9. Can you please share with me what level of literacy in English you expect of a child who has come from a kōhanga reo upon school entry?
10. Can you please share with me what level of literacy in Maori a child at kōhanga needs when they begin school?
11. Can you please share with me what level of literacy in English a child at kōhanga needs when they begin school?
12. What do you expect a child needs (in terms of literacy) when they begin school?
13. What do you think the school expects of a child, coming from a kōhanga reo, when they begin school?
14. Can you please share what you expect of schools to teach children to read?
15. What do you expect from the home in providing experiences in literacy to children?
16. Would you prefer teaching of reading to be in both languages, or just one? Please explain.

Aspirations:

17. What are your thoughts on children being able to read in two languages? Do you think it is necessary? Why/Why not?
18. What do you think are the best ways children can learn to read and write in Māori?
19. What do you think are the best ways children can learn to read and write in English?
20. In what ways do you think schools/Kōhanga can support our Kōhanga children in learning to read?
21. Is there anything else that you want to tell me about children learning to read in Maori and/or English?

Appendix C: Protocol for parent interview

An exploratory study: Māori children's literacy experiences moving from a Kōhanga Reo setting to a Kura Kaupapa Māori, Bilingual, and Mainstream education setting,

Semi-structured interview with parent

I would like us to talk about your views on children becoming confident readers in both Māori and English.

Experiences:

1. Can you please share schooling background? Where did you attend?
2. Do you have a treasured memory of an experience at school? Can you share that experience please?
3. Can you please share with me your experiences with reading in Māori and/or English.
4. Do you like reading? Why/Why not?
5. Do you to prefer to read in one language more than the other? Please explain.
6. Do you think one language is easier to learn than the other? Please explain.

Expectations:

7. Can you please share with me what your expectations are for your child in learning to read in Maori?
8. Can you please share with me what your expectations are for your child in learning to read in English?
9. Can you please share with me what literacy level in te reo Māori you expect from your child who has come from a kōhanga reo before they begin school?
10. Can you please share with me what literacy level in English you expect from your child who has come from a kōhanga reo before they begin school?
11. What do you think the school expects of your child, coming from a kōhanga reo, when they begin school?
12. Can you please share what you expect of schools to teach your child to read?
13. Would you prefer reading experiences to be in both Māori and English, or just the one?
14. What are your thoughts on children being able to read in two languages? Do you think it is necessary? Why/Why not?

Aspirations:

15. What do you think are the best ways children can learn to read and write in Māori?
16. What do you think are the best ways children can learn to read and write in English?
17. What do you wish for children who move from kōhanga and go onto school and begin formal literacy learning?
18. Is there anything else that you want to tell me about your child learning to read and write?

Appendix D: Teacher information sheet

INFORMATION SHEET

(for Kōhanga Reo/School)

An exploratory study: Māori children's literacy experiences moving from a Kōhanga Reo setting to a Kura Kaupapa Māori, Bilingual, and Mainstream education setting.

Tena koe

Ko Kurahaupo te waka

Ko Waitara te awa

Ko Te Ati Awa te iwi

Ko Puketapu te hapu

Ko Kairau te marae

No Taranaki ahau

Ko Sarika Rona taku ingoa

What is this all about?

I am an experienced and registered teacher currently undertaking study as a student enrolled in Massey University's Masters of Education Psychology programme in 2014. Part of the requirements to complete this qualification is to carry out a research project. The project will be conducted by me under the supervision of Professor Claire McLachlan, and Bevan Erueti, both of whom work for the Massey University Institute of Education.

This project is an exploratory study that will examine the literacy experiences of Māori children who are at a kōhanga reo setting and move to a kura kaupapa Māori, bilingual or mainstream education setting.

Why am I doing this research?

New Zealand is a nation, with three official languages: Māori, English and New Zealand sign language. Being a multilingual nation is not just limited to speaking all languages but also applies to having the right to read in all three official languages. As a mother of two Māori children who have attended kōhanga reo, I would like to know that my children and all of our kōhanga reo children are provided with the best opportunities to become confident readers in both te reo Māori and English, and continue to experience literacy in the language that they have been most exposed to at kōhanga reo and at home, no matter which education setting they begin school in. This research area is quite new, which is why this project will just explore what experiences children have when they first begin school.

Why you?

Your school/classroom has been identified as having one of the children whose whānau have agreed to take part in this project. The child will be beginning school between the months of June 2014 and September 2014 (these dates are to ensure completion of the project before the deadline of the M.Ed Psych programme in which I am enrolled).

I am inviting three whānau to take part, one for each of the three primary school settings: kura kaupapa Māori; bilingual unit; and mainstream primary. To help with completion of the project within the course due dates, the number of whānau to be involved must be kept to three. It would be great if more whānau were involved, however this is not practical for the current project, but could be a possibility for future research.

What happens if I say ‘yes’?

You should only say ‘yes’ if you want to take part. If you say ‘yes’, I will meet with you to answer any further questions you may have, and to sign the necessary consent forms to participate in the project. I will need to arrange an appropriate time and place with you before the child begins school to do an interview with the child’s teacher. The interview will be audio recorded, semi-casual, and will take an hour at the most. You have the option to have the interview in te reo Māori or English. If you would like to speak in te reo Māori please understand that my level of fluency is not great and I will need my supervisor Bevan Erueti to be present for this.

The day after the child’s first day at school I will go into their classroom and observe (using written recordings of what I see and hear) of their literacy experiences for approximately 1.5 hours a day, three days a week for two weeks. The purpose for the observations is to identify what happens for children when they first start school and begin formal literacy learning.

What happens to the voice recordings, consent forms and observation notes?

Your voice recorded interview will be kept in a safe place. The main point of voice-recording is to gain a more accurate account of what is said during the interview. I will not use your voice recording in my research reports, only written extracts if appropriate.

The consent forms will be shredded at the end of the research, and to provide confidentiality your name and your school’s name will not be used in the final report (unless you would like them to). The observation notes will also be kept safe and will be used when analysing all the information that I have gathered and written into the final report.

What happens at the end of the research?

At the end of the project, you can have a summary of the project findings. This can be presented to you, or to you with the participating child’s whānau, at a special school/Kōhanga/whānau hui, or it can be sent to you.

Questions?

If you or your school have any questions you want to ask about the research project, you can ask me (Sarika Rona – seesa25@hotmail.com, [REDACTED]) at any time.

If you have any queries about the project you can contact my supervisors Professor Claire McLachlan on (06) 3569099 , Ext 84390 (or c.j.mclachlan@massey.ac.nz) or Bevan Erueti on Ext 83087 (or b.erueti@massey.ac.nz).

What happens if I want to stop?

We think you will enjoy taking part but if you decide you do not want to carry on, that's OK. Just let me know.

Nga mihi,

Sarika Rona

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 14/38. If you have any concerns about the conduct of the research, please contact Prof John O'Neill, Acting Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 06 350 5799 x 81090, email humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz.

Appendix E: Protocol for school and teachers consent

An exploratory study: Māori children's literacy experiences moving from a Kōhanga Reo setting to a Kura Kaupapa Māori, Bilingual, and Mainstream education setting.

Teacher/School consent to participate

I have met with Sarika Rona, a Massey University student enrolled in the Masters of Educational Psychology programme in 2014. I have read the Information Sheet given to me and had the details of this research project explained to me. Our questions have been answered to our satisfaction. Further, we understand that we may ask additional questions regarding this project at any time. Finally, we understand we may withdraw from the project at any time up until the end of data collection.

- We grant permission to enter the school to participate in events as set out in the Information Sheet.
- We agree to participate in this project under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet.
- We wish/do not wish for our real names to be used in the final report.

School: Name, position and

Date

signature

:

.....

.....

Participating Teacher: Name and Signature

.....

Request for permission letter to School/Kōhanga

To the Principal/Head Kaiako

I am an experienced and registered teacher (registration number: 256047) currently undertaking study as a student enrolled in Massey University's Masters of Education Psychology Masters programme in 2014. Part of the requirements to complete this qualification is to carry out a research project. The project will be conducted by me under the supervision of Professor Claire McLachlan, and Bevan Erueti, both of whom work for the Massey University Institute of Education.

This project is an exploratory study that will examine the literacy experiences of Māori children who are at a kōhanga reo setting and move to a kura kaupapa Māori, Bilingual or mainstream education setting.

Your school/kōhanga has been identified as the education setting where a consented participant in the project has been attending or will be attending. Part of the project requires me to observe the child in their classroom when they begin school. During my observations I will be writing anecdotal notes about what I see and hear of the participating child in relation to their literacy experiences. I plan on being in the classroom three times a week for two weeks and no more than two hours of the day. I do not intend on speaking to the children, and will ask that the teacher explain this. With yours and their permission, I would like to do an interview with the child's teacher.

The purpose of this letter is to ask your permission to be able to enter your school grounds and carry out the observations in the participating child's classroom and to conduct an interview with the child's teacher.

If you would like further information please contact me – Sarika Rona, seesa25@hotmail.com, [REDACTED], at any time.

If you have any queries about the project you can contact my supervisors Professor Claire McLachlan on (06) 3569099 , Ext 84390 (or c.j.mclachlan@massey.ac.nz) or Bevan Erueti on Ext 83087 (or b.erueti@massey.ac.nz).

Thank you for considering this request. All information gathered will be treated as strictly confidential. It will be used for the purpose of the project only and will not be used for any other purpose without consent of the parent or caregiver. Identifying information will be changed in order to preserve confidentiality.

If granting permission please complete the box below:

Your name:	Name of School:
Your role:	Date:
Contact telephone number:	Signature:

Nga mihi,

Sarika Rona

Appendix F: Parent Information Sheet

INFORMATION SHEET

(for parent/guardian)

An exploratory study: Māori children's literacy experiences moving from a Kōhanga Reo setting to a Kura Kaupapa Māori, Bilingual, and Mainstream education setting.

Tena koe

Ko Kurahaupo te waka

Ko Waitara te awa

Ko Te Ati Awa te iwi

Ko Puketapu te hapu

Ko Kairau te marae

No Taranaki ahau

Ko Sarika Rona taku ingoa

What is this all about?

I am an experienced and registered teacher currently undertaking study as a student enrolled in Massey University's Masters of Education Psychology programme in 2014. Part of the requirements to complete this qualification is to carry out a research project. The project will be conducted by me under the supervision of Professor Claire McLachlan and Bevan Erueti, both of whom work for the Massey University Institute of Education.

This project is an exploratory study that will examine the literacy experiences of Māori children who are at a kōhanga reo setting and move to a kura kaupapa Māori, Bilingual or mainstream education setting.

Why am I doing this research?

New Zealand is a nation, with three official languages: Māori, English and New Zealand sign language. Being a multilingual nation is not just limited to speaking all languages but also applies to having the right to read in all three official languages.. As a mother of two Māori children who have attended kōhanga reo, I would like to know that my children and all of our kōhanga reo children are provided with the best opportunities to become confident readers in both te reo Māori and English, and continue to experience literacy in the language that they have been most exposed to at kōhanga reo and at home, no matter which education setting they begin school in. This research area is quite new, which is why this project will just explore what experiences children have when they first begin school.

Why you?

You are invited to take part in this project along with your whānau. You have been identified as a whānau who has a child who is Māori, has been in a kōhanga reo setting for two years or more, and will be beginning school between the months of June 2014 and September 2014 (these dates are to ensure completion of the project before the deadline of the M.Ed Psych programme in which I am enrolled).

I am inviting three whānau to take part, one for each of the three primary school settings: kura kaupapa Māori; bilingual unit; and mainstream primary. To help with completion of the project within the course due dates, the number of whānau to be involved must be kept to three. It would be great if more whānau were involved, however this is not practical for the current project, but could be a possibility for future research.

What happens if I say ‘yes’?

You should only say ‘yes’ if you want to take part. If you say ‘yes’, I will meet with you to answer any further questions you may have, and to sign the necessary consent forms to participate in the project. I will need to arrange an appropriate time and place with you before your child begins school to do an interview. The interview will be audio recorded, semi-casual, and will take an hour at the most. You have the option to have the interview in te reo Māori or English. If you would like to speak in te reo Māori please understand that my level of fluency is not great and I will need my supervisor Bevan Erueti to be present for this.

The day after your child’s first day at school I will go into their classroom and observe (using written recordings) of their literacy experiences for approximately 1.5 hours a day, three days a week for two weeks. The purpose for the observations is to identify what happens for children when they first start school and begin formal literacy learning.

What happens to the voice recordings, consent forms and observation notes?

Your voice recorded interview will be kept in a safe place. The main point of voice-recording is to gain a more accurate account of what is said during the interview. I will not use your voice recording in my research reports, only written extracts, if appropriate.

The consent forms will be shredded at the end of the research, and to provide confidentiality your name and your child’s name will not be used in the final report (unless you would like them to be). The observation notes will also be kept safe and will be used when analysing all the information that I have gathered and written into the final report.

What happens at the end of the research?

At the end of the project, you can have a summary of the project findings. This can be presented to you in person (just you and your whānau), at a special school/Kōhanga/whānau hui, or it can be sent to you.

Questions?

If you or your whānau have any questions you want to ask about the research project, you can ask me (Sarika Rona – seesa25@hotmail.com, [REDACTED]) at any time.

If you have any queries about the project you can contact my supervisors Professor Claire McLachlan on (06) 3569099 , Ext 84390 (or c.j.mclachlan@massey.ac.nz) or Bevan Erueti on Ext 83087 (or b.erueti@massey.ac.nz).

What happens if I want to stop?

We think you will enjoy taking part but if you decide you do not want to carry on, that's OK. Just let me know.

Nga mihi,

Sarika Rona

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, Application 14/38. If you have any concerns about the conduct of the research, please contact Prof John O'Neill, Acting Chair, Massey University Human Ethics Committee: Southern B, telephone 06 350 5799 x 81090, email humanethicsouthb@massey.ac.nz.

Appendix G: Protocol for consent for child and parent participation

An exploratory study: Māori children's literacy experiences moving from a Kōhanga Reo setting to a Kura Kaupapa Māori, Bilingual, and Mainstream education setting.

Parent / Guardian

Consent to a child's participation

I have met with Sarika Rona, a Massey University student enrolled in the Masters of Educational Psychology programme in 2014. I have read the Information Sheet given to me and had the details of this research project explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction. Further, I understand that either my child or I may ask additional questions regarding this activity at any time. Finally, I understand we may withdraw from the project at any time and for any reason.

- I agree to allow my child to participate in this project and personally agree to participate in any related interview activities as described in the Information Sheet.
- I agree/do not agree to the interview being sound recorded.
- I wish/do not wish to have my recordings returned to me.
- I wish/do not wish for our real names to be used in the final report.

Parent / Guardian

Date:

Signature:

.....

Your Name and child's full Name (printed):

.....