Figure 1. Researcher’s own School Certificate examination artworks, 1986, 15 years old

Figure 2. Ponga frond from researcher’s own garden

Figure 3. Researcher’s own School Certificate examination artworks, 1986, 15 years old
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Chapter 1: THE BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 Locating myself in the research

In the early 1980s, as a young Māori student at the local secondary school, I experienced for the first time what I can now articulate as realising my potential as Māori. This potential was explored and interpreted through the subject of visual arts, where my realisation of success in being Māori was nurtured by the innovative and visionary practices of my Pākehā art teacher. From that moment on, the ponga seed was planted and the koru within began.

I chose the koru metaphor because of my personal association with the symbol in my work as an artist and teacher, and how I communicate this form to my students, from a Māori perspective. There are many interpretations of what the koru means, but for my research it symbolises the concept of perpetual movement. Its inner coil suggests a going-back to the origin – our whakapapa. It also resembles the way in which life both changes and stays the same. The internal fronds are often associated with nurturing, rebirth and the personification of the strength and bonds between people.

1.2 What motivated this research topic?

When I started teaching visual arts in 1999 the Art Education: J1-Form 7 Syllabus for Schools (Department of Education [DoE], 1989), provided direction for secondary school art. The overt communication directing art teachers to embrace the bicultural imperatives of Te Tiriti o Waitangi–The Treaty of Waitangi to include Māori art was pioneering. The subsequent curriculum statements, The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education [MoE], 2000) and The New Zealand Curriculum (MoE, 2007), have contributed to new concepts and approaches for visual arts today, especially in terms of the positive achievement for Māori students. Recent research on Māori student achievement in other curriculum areas proclaims Māori achieve well when learning from a kaupapa Māori paradigm and when Māori students are taught by teachers of Māori ethnicity (Bishop, 2003; Durie, 2004; MoE, 2008). However, there are very few Māori art teachers in secondary schools and research on art education in Aotearoa-New Zealand, which focuses on Māori student achievement, is extremely limited (Smith, 2005, 2010). These factors provided the motivation for my research.

1.3 What was the aim of the research?

Having been blessed with such positive art educators during my secondary school years and through my secondary art teaching qualification, I wanted to investigate how and why Māori students achieve in visual arts, regardless of whether their teachers are of Māori or non-Māori ethnicity. Over 80% of Māori students are enrolled in state secondary schools in Aotearoa-New Zealand and 75% of their teachers are of European/Pākehā ethnicity (MoE, 2004). The paucity of data on Māori student achievement in art education, as well as the teacher demographic, strengthened the rationale for my research topic. Rather than investigating Māori under-achievement, my focus was on the positive narratives endorsing Māori students succeeding authentically as Māori.
Influenced by the limitations of this small scale study, my enquiry into Māori achievement was not about students making Māori art, but their achievement in the context of the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) Visual Arts Level 1 used for assessment in mainstream secondary schools. Identifying Māori students’ expressions of their own cultural milieu through their art making was also an important factor of this research. While discourses beleaguer educational achievement for Māori, which does not take place within a kaupapa Māori paradigm, this study did not take a kaupapa Māori position. Rather, it was underpinned by a culturally responsive pedagogical stance.

1.4 The research question

My success as a Māori secondary school student was measured predominantly in academic terms, despite my cultural identity rather than because of it. Beyond the Koru implies a challenge for art teachers to consider educational success for Māori which includes initiatives within art departments that encompass Māori pedagogy and epistemology. It also implies a move which goes beyond the arbitrary painting of the koru that dominated the vision of Māori art education in the 1980s-90s.

The title, Beyond the Koru, also sought to answer my internal dialogue. Have we evolved in our learning of Te Aō Māori (the world of Māori) from the handcrafts of the natives over time as art education has developed in response to political and social motivations? Have secondary school art teachers moved their students beyond replicating the koru as a motif, often repeated as kowhaiwhai patterns without understanding its form and significance? Finally, how far has art education come in what it can offer Māori students today in realising their potential and success in being Māori?

1.5 The significance of the research

There is a scarcity of research data and literature on Māori student achievement in secondary school art education in Aotearoa-New Zealand. At the time of embarking on this study, no other research could be located which focused on the perspectives of secondary school art teachers and/or Māori students taking Visual Arts at NCEA Level 1.

Due to the small number of Māori art educators in secondary schools, teaching Māori students and Māori art education will inevitably be shared among a multitude of teacher ethnicities. As a Māori art teacher, I accept that in the past art education for Māori students was shaped by historical and political factors originating in colonisation. I also accept that changes for the teaching and learning for Māori and Māori art have altered over time in response to socio-economic and political directives. But we now have more knowledge of how Māori students can achieve, and behind that is the support of national curriculum and assessment processes that enable Māori students to succeed as Māori. While my research is small in comparison to the wider implications of my hypothesis, I am limited by the requirements of the university degree and my experience as a researcher. I hope that the investigation will provide information which may be of use to art educators and curriculum developers, and anticipate that future Māori art students will experience art education as culturally intact beings – where success begins with being Māori.
Chapter 2: HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORARY CONTEXTS - POSITIONING MĀORI IN EDUCATION

2.1 Introduction

This research began with an examination of the literature on historical and contemporary developments in education, including art education, in Aotearoa-New Zealand from the 1840s to the present. The aim was to establish the position for Māori students, over time, when developments affecting them were influenced by political motivations and theories of cultural assimilation, cultural adaptation, biculturalism, and more recently, multiculturalism.

2.2 Historical developments in education and art education for Māori students: 1840-1970s

Developments in education and art education for Māori students cannot be separated from the socio-cultural and political climate of the time. Policies and initiatives during nineteenth-century New Zealand, which played an integral part in its history, commenced with British colonisation leading to the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi-Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. Walker (1973) claims that these policies contradicted the intent of the Treaty to create an equal partnership between Māori and Pākehā, and from the time of its signing the British Colonial Office and settler government were greatly concerned with assimilating Māori into European culture.

Acts of assimilation - the civilising of Māori

Willmot (1989) maintains that the intention of the assimilation policy was to replicate British society and inform Māori children that while they were New Zealanders they were also citizens of the Crown. However, Māori were considered “not genuine citizens” (p. 4) of this country because they were different and Pākehā viewed them as being able to be civilised. As Smith (1999) expresses, the colonist’s view was “to get Māori to practise in the art of civility” (p. 25) so that Māori would have greater acceptance of the new order. The aim was to educate Māori to conform to the new colonialist order by luring them away from their practices and beliefs or Māoritanga (Simon & Smith, 2001).

The arrival of Pākehā missionaries purportedly allowed Māori to participate in the exchange of enlightened thought and new knowledge (Simon & Smith, 1998). For some missionaries, educating the natives in the mission schools was viewed as an opportunity for Māori to extend their aspirations beyond the village. By inviting Māori to attend the first mission school in 1816 at Rangihoua Thomas Kendall, the first European teacher, sought to free Māori from their afflictions and replace these with the “habits and usages of Europeans” (Simon & Smith, 1998, p. 2). Kendall thought he was saving Māori from themselves by means of assimilation into European culture but a report on the mission schools by school inspector Hugh Carleton (Appendices to the Journals of the House of
Representatives [AJHR], 1862) reinforced that “schools were aiming at a double object, the civilisation of the race and the quietening of the country” (E-4, p. 1).

A major policy shift was signalled with the Native Schools Act of 1867 when the government replaced missionary schools with secular village schools as a separate system running parallel with public schools (Simon, 1998). These Native Schools purportedly gave Māori opportunity to take a proactive role in educating their own people in the ways and methods of Pākehā as a means of understanding and achieving in their domain. By schooling their own people in European education, Māori sought to maintain their tino rangatiratanga (sovereignty) and enhance their lives. However, Māori society was openly denigrated through the educative practices within the Native Schools with Pākehā knowledge and cultural values being promoted instead (Simon, 1998). Not only were the Native Schools used by the state to control the amount and type of knowledge made available to Māori, but the suppression of Māoritanga denied them “further opportunities to be creators of their own culture and own nation” as well as “the validity of indigenous peoples’ claim to existence, to land, language and cultural knowledge” (Smith, 1999, p. 1). It was argued by rangatira (Māori chiefs), such as Te Mātenga from the Bay of Islands, that for Māori to survive in a Pākehā dominated society it would be necessary for them to complement their learning of Pākehā skills and knowledge with their own traditional culture (Simon, 1993; Simon & Smith, 2001). Sharing this learning among their own people was a way to preserve their mana (pride) their ihi (life force) and their tūrangawaewae (home ground) (Jones, Marshall, Morris Matthews, Smith, & Smith, 1990). Such knowledge included practical experiences of day-to-day living and cultural dimensions such as gathering kai (food) whakapapa (geneology), whakairo (carving) and other observational and performance activities.

**Acts of assimilation – effects on art education for Māori students**

The Native Schools Code of 1880, which followed the 1867 Act, changed the way schools operated by providing guidelines for subjects included in the curriculum (Simon & Smith, 2001). Relevant to this research, ‘elementary drawing’ and ‘craft’ were included. However, Simon and Smith (1998) maintain that because Māori pupils were still not fully Europeanised at this time crafts were seen as aiding assimilation of Māori by teaching domestic skills such as needlework for girls and simple labour skills for boys. Elementary drawing comprised a series of graduated drawing exercises deriving from the British South Kensington System of the 1850s (Chalmers, 1990). Formal drawing was considered a useful and vocational skill for Māori children who were required to draw “suitably civilized and British objects for study” (p. 177). Listed in the Regulations Relating to Native Schools (New Zealand Gazette [NZG], 1915), Māori children in the Junior Division (Standards I-II) were required to draw:

```
Coloured beads or buttons (in groups), skipping-rope, hoop, wooden spoon, gridiron, wire netting, envelope, slate, kite, knife, axe, football, toy flags, toy animals, ninepin, bow and arrow, horse-shoe, carrot, plum, apple, unserrated leaves, pansy, daffodil. (NZG, 1915: 1170)
```

Senior Division (Standards III and IV) students also drew predominantly European objects:
Picture and photo frames, toasting fork, fan, croquet-mallet, spade, broom, cricket-bat, tennis racquet, school-bag, tambourine, basin, wood-shaving, clock-spring, bag of sugar, lantern, serrated and subdivided leaves, sprays of three or four leaves, twigs and small boughs, fruits, feathers, shells, butterflies, fish. (NZG, 1915: 1170)

The list for Standards V and VI pupils comprised:

Bottle and vase forms, school bell, paper scroll, boot, hat, linen cuff, flower-pot, toy yacht, Indian club, Japanese umbrella, draped shawl or curtain, doll, woodwork and garden tools, kitchen utensils, fern and palm trees, grasses and rushes, celery and rhubarb sticks. (NZG, 1915: 1170)

Smith (2007) claims the drawing examinations “imposed on Māori children a Eurocentric notion of the arts as utility” (p. 83). For Simon (1998), the lack of acknowledgment for Māori pupils to use Māori motifs and themes both reinforced assimilationist policy of colonialism and denigrated Māori culture.

**From assimilation to adaptation – small changes in art education for Māori students**

The move from assimilation to adaptation began when Native Schools began to use the 1929 *Syllabus of Instruction for Public Schools* (DoE, 1929). The ensuing *Regulations Relating to Native Schools* 1931 allowed for the cultural adaption policy to be implemented within the Native Schools (Simon, 1998). This policy was premised on theories which sought to “adapt the cultures of native people to the new environments of colonisation, whilst sustaining the intrinsic social fabric and its arts, music and language” (Smith, 2007, p. 85). Until this time there had been “no official approval or encouragement for the schools to include Māori crafts or to incorporate Māori themes or motifs in their drawing programmes” (Simon, 1998, p. 106). The 1931 *Regulations* sought to incorporate aspects of Māori cultural knowledge that were deemed worthy of inclusion in New Zealand culture (Jones et al., 1990). Thus, from the 1930s some schools offered traditional skills in whakairo (carving), raranga (weaving), whai (string figures) and kowhaiwhai (painting). However, Pākehā Department of Education inspectors were responsible for what constituted Māori art and the appropriateness of the art to be taught in schools. Despite regulations to enable Māori arts and crafts to be a vehicle for Māori cultural knowledge, the status of arts and crafts during this period of cultural adaptation remained inferior (Smith, 2007).

It was the election of the first labour Government in 1935 that prompted initiatives in art education for Māori (and Pākehā) students at primary and secondary levels. Due to the enlightened thinking of Peter Fraser, the new Minister of Education, “changes in the school system (were) grounded in notions of equality of opportunity in education” (Smith, 2007, p. 88). Of particular significance for art education was an invitation extended by Fraser to two prominent educationalists, Dengler and Lister, to visit New Zealand. Both commented on the lack of progress in art education in New Zealand and that “art should have a central place in the education of all children” (Collinge, 1978, p. 13). The liberal views of Fraser and Clarence Beeby, Director of Education, opened pathways to
educational reform. In primary schools, in particular, there was a call for art to be child-centred (Campbell, 1938). Formal drawing, which had dominated schooling for a century, was replaced by a focus on art and craft. Beeby (1992), believing that art should play a central role in the education for all children, established the Art and Craft Specialist Service within the DoE. In 1946 he appointed Gordon Tovey as the first National Supervisor of Art and Craft.

**The influence of Gordon Tovey on art education for Māori students**

From the 1940s the new approach to teaching art, including Māori art, was influenced by Tovey’s rejection of adult themes and art instruction based solely on skills and techniques that were the hallmark of colonial attitudes towards art making (Blumhardt, 1992). Tovey embraced the uniqueness of New Zealand culture and advocated for art education to be child focused and inter-curricula (Henderson, 1998). Although the role of the Art and Craft Specialist Service was to oversee the introduction of Western arts and crafts to all, Tovey’s greatest influence was promoting art for Māori children in the Native Schools where the use of Māori tradition was encouraged. Tovey recruited thirteen Māori art advisors between 1948 and 1961 to implement programmes that were grounded in Māori arts and crafts (Smith, 2001). Traditional imagery, such as kowhaiwhai and tāniko patterns, were used in the planning and delivering of Māori art and craft work, and well as in inter-curricula activities.

Much debate has ensued about Tovey’s approach. Te Awekotuku (2007) suggests that using art to emphasise a Māori student’s personal and creative development could be in conflict with Māori tikanga (Māori customs) and kawa (protocol) because such education in Māori arts and crafts was not something for tamariki (children), but viewed as an honorary role bestowed upon an older and more talented apprentice worthy of such stringent kawa (protocol) and tikanga. Furthermore, the examination of traditional Māori arts and crafts as an aesthetic for art education had never been tested, let alone becoming part of the school curriculum (Henderson, 1998; Smith, 2008). Bell (2005) suggests that Tovey’s charisma may have had more to do with his success in art education than his methodologies and that some of Tovey’s alleged weaknesses were his lack of provision in implementing clear models of instruction and strategies and the rationale behind them. Nonetheless, Tovey’s initiative for actualising traditional Māori art and craft in mainstream schools was innovative and exciting. Smith (2007) suggests that the fostering of tikanga Māori in the curriculum after 1940 not only acknowledged the bicultural principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi but gave Māori “a strong sense of collective security in the face of a dominantly Pākehā system” (p. 91).

**The implications of the Thomas Report for Māori students in secondary schools**

While art in primary schools flourished during the 1930s-40s, largely due to Tovey’s initiatives and Art and Craft Advisors visiting schools throughout the country, art in secondary schools remained unimportant (Murdoch, 1943). The first major shift was signalled in the Report of the Committee appointed by the Minister of Education: The Post-Primary School Curriculum (the Thomas Report) (DoE, 1944). The report advocated a balanced education for all students through a mix of
compulsory core and optional subjects, including the addition of music, arts and crafts. This gave art the status of a compulsory core subject, with an endorsement suggesting that an “intelligent parent” would want their child to have a “reasonable degree of skill in art and craft”, and “would wish a daughter to have, in addition, the knowledge, skill, and taste required to manage a home well and make it a pleasant place to live in” (DoE, 1944, p. 17). Homemaking, and associated crafts, was subsequently included as a core subject in the first Native District High Schools for Māori which opened in 1941 (Simon, 1998). Although Smith (2007) regards the Thomas Report as important because it advocated curriculum parity for music, art, and crafts, she is critical of its focus on homemaking which perpetuated the expectations of women, including Māori girls, in the Native District High Schools.

Following the Thomas Report, new School Certificate Regulations included drawing and design (Collinge, 1978). Despite this, art education maintained a desultory journey throughout the 1950s-60s. This was embedded in the Hunn Report (1961) and Currie Report (1962) which reflected economic, social and educational changes, predominantly for Māori who were going through a process of urbanisation. The Hunn Report (1961) advised Māori into “technical schools to equip them for better conditions in the skilled labour market” (p. 26), a position echoed in the Currie Report (1962) that “Māori be trained as technicians and tradesmen” (p. 432). Unlike the Thomas Report, which advocated for the arts, these two reports recommended a focus on the three ‘r’s’ as a means of lifting Māori performance. Thus, art education for Māori was relegated to the antiquated and assimilative teaching practices of the 1900s. Until the 1970s, there was to be little reference to Māori art being included in the curriculum of secondary schools in Aotearoa-New Zealand (Smith, 2008).

2.3 Contemporary developments in art education for Māori students: 1970s to the present

A turning point came in the 1970s when the Labour Government responded to Māori protest, supported by a liberal and humanist sector, over grievances concerning Māori rights in Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Rata, 2000). The subsequent Treaty of Waitangi Act of 1975 opened the way for legislation which honoured principles of the Treaty, including that which determines the shape of education. The impact of this Act was felt in the School Certificate Art Prescription (DoE, 1974) in which there was a focus on the relationship between art, culture and society. It required for the first time the study of Māori art, thereby providing a way in which art education could be culturally responsive to Māori learners. The Act also influenced the first art syllabus in Aotearoa-New Zealand.

Conscious biculturalism… or continuing paternalism?

Official bicultural policy influenced the development of the Art Education Junior Classes to Form 7 Syllabus for Schools (DoE, 1989). The statement, “an art education for New Zealanders”, stressed that “two major traditions, Māori and European, contribute to an art that is distinctive” (p. 4). Guidelines accompanying the syllabus, including a section written by Māori art teachers and artists,
illustrated support for all teachers to learn and teach about Māori art education (MoE, 1991). Under the section on Whakawahi (painting), teachers were encouraged to introduce Māori painting "through study of the Māori art form 'kōwhaiwhai'...or of a single koru shape" (p. 60). Positive aspects of the syllabus included the use of te reo Māori for the first time without English translations, and indicated "a consciousness of the bicultural environment" (Smith, 2007, p. 104). Art works cited for study were primarily from the Western tradition and continued to “differentiate between Western art and the cultural production of others, including indigenous art, which does not conform to the western aesthetic” (p. 101).

The next initiative was *The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum* (MoE, 2000) for use in mainstream schools, and a parallel curriculum statement, *Ngā Toi i Roto i te Marautanga o Aotearoa* (MoE, 2000) for use in Māori medium education. In the mainstream curriculum the emphasis on students gaining understanding of how and why individuals, communities, and societies make art was carried over from the 1989 syllabus. There were, however, many more references to the *tangata whenua* (the nomenclature replacing the syllabus use of Māori). In the document there are numerous references to toi Māori (the arts of the Māori), traditional Māori art forms, the significance of toi Māori in different contexts, contemporary Māori art, and the requirement for teachers to understand aspects of reo, tikanga, and whakapapa. Although Mane-Wheuki (2003) questions this “insistent bicultural vision” (p. 83), Smith (2008) argues that the emphasis on Māori and European art education (in secondary schools, at least) has resulted in its continued dominance over study of other cultures, regardless of the increasingly multicultural student population in Aotearoa-New Zealand.

The current curriculum for all mainstream schools, *The New Zealand Curriculum* (MoE, 2007), states that “it will help schools give effect to the partnership that is at the core of our nation’s founding document, Te Tiriti o Waitangi/the Treaty of Waitangi” (p. 6). The Vision is for “young people… who will work to create an Aotearoa-New Zealand in which Māori and Pākehā recognise each other as full Treaty partners…” (p. 8). In terms of art education it is stated that “an understanding of Māori visual culture (no longer called visual arts) is achieved through exploration of Māori contexts” (p. 21).

### 2.4 Summary

The literature shows that art education for Māori learners from 1840 to the present day was influenced by historical events, education policies and a predominantly Eurocentric ideology which have, in differing ways, influenced the kind of art education available to Māori. Te Tiriti o Waitangi–The Treaty of Waitangi has been significant in underpinning successive contemporary curriculum documents. In the next chapter, these historical and contemporary developments in art education for Māori are set against a background of theoretical positions which purport to support Māori achievement in secondary schools in Aotearoa-New Zealand.
Chapter 3: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON MĀORI ACHIEVEMENT

3.1 Introduction

Theories about Māori student achievement are predicated on challenges facing education in Aotearoa-New Zealand through the social, economic and political disparities within the country today (Bishop, 2003). Education for Māori has been shaped by cultural assimilation, adaptation, and biculturalism through acknowledgment of Te Tiriti o Waitangi–The Treaty of Waitangi (Simon, 1993). Addressing issues of educational disparities among Māori learners has led to resurgence in gaining understanding of how educators can be more culturally responsive in supporting Māori student achievement. Being culturally responsive is a popular discourse that appears regularly in attempts to address inequitable outcomes in education for minority group students. Culturally responsive practice is seen as encouraging educators to understand their students as culturally centred participants in their learning (Sleeter & Grant, 1988). This language is the latest in approaches to achievement disparity whereas previous accounts have used terms such as difference and assumed a deficit in the student, rather than foregrounding the teachers and their school’s cultural response to Māori.

3.2 Māori initiatives

Te Kotahitanga: Supporting Māori achievement

In Aotearoa-New Zealand there has been a review of policy for Māori student achievement during the last 10 years. Much of this has been attributed to Russell Bishop who, in 2001, initiated Te Kotahitanga, a Ministry of Education funded kaupapa Māori initiative that sought to improve the educational achievement of Māori students in mainstream secondary schools (Bishop, Berryman, Takiwai, & Richardson, 2003). Bishop’s culturally responsive hypothesis of Te Kotahitanga was: How might a better understanding of Māori student experiences in the classroom and analysis of these experiences lead to improved policy, teaching and learning? (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). The aim of research that informed the project was to investigate how education could make a difference to Māori student achievement. It focused on raising achievement through refinement and remodelling of teacher practice. Bishop and Glynn (1999) argued that despite social and economic barriers to learning for Māori, a major identifier for Māori students is deficit theorising by teachers. Bishop (2003) suggests that historical and current power imbalances that exist within mainstream classrooms, and in education policies and practices, have allowed for the acceptance of a culture of victim blaming as a result of the “heritage of colonial dominance in this country” (p. 5). Bishop (2003) elaborates on deficit theorising as that which “seeks to blame the victims and collectively see the locus of the problem as either lack of inherent ability, lack of cultural appropriateness or limited resources” (p. 6). He notes that deficit theories pinpoint the responsibility to change as lying with the victims, in this case Māori students, thereby removing the teacher’s perceived responsibility to become an agent of change. He sought to examine the appropriate Māori cultural metaphors and couple this with creating learning contexts for teachers within their classrooms so that they could
create a culturally responsive environment for Māori students to ensure success in achieving their learning goals:

Where power is shared between self-determining individuals within non-dominating relations of interdependence; where culture counts; where learning is interactive, dialogic and spirals; where participants are connected to one another through establishment of a common vision for what constitutes excellence in educational outcomes, we term this pedagogy a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations. (Bishop, 2003, p. 4)

Bishop (2003) argues that the power imbalance that exists in the education system means that “teachers remain dominant in classrooms mainly by creating a teaching context of their own design” (p. 7). Bishop and Berryman (2010) claim that to change this power imbalance among Māori students and their teachers there needs to be a shift in paradigm for the teacher. Having a culturally responsive ideology may assist the teacher and their students in a more positive outcome as successful learning occurs when a student is able to connect their cultural experiences to learning within the classroom. Te Kotahitanga is premised in the belief that Māori students are more likely to achieve when they see themselves, their whānau, hapu and iwi reflected in the teaching content and environment and are able to be Māori in all learning contexts (Bishop et al., 2006). Durie (2003) agrees that culturally responsive leadership is one of the key strategies in meeting the needs of our diverse Māori learners. In his view, “Māori synergies emphasise that collective Māori strategies for education have the capacity to reshape expectation and harness a level of energy that comes from collective and concerted action” (p. 4).

The need for culturally responsive pedagogy has been signalled by the long brown tail of underachievement that has political, economic and social implications for Aotearoa-New Zealand. However, Robinson, Hohepa and Lloyd (2009) maintain that it is school leadership which is responsible for improved achievement for all students, including Māori, and that widespread disparities in achievement are best tackled through partnerships between leaders in schools and external expertise. Bishop and Glynn (1999), and Durie (2003) agree in the broader sense that motivation for learning can come from both internal and external sources. Durie also claims that positive relationships between teacher and learner are necessary in raising student achievement as “aspirations overlap… and teachers can engage with learners at a personal level” (p. 4). External sources can come in the form of data collection, goal setting and teacher professional learning. Providing teacher professional learning on how to improve Māori achievement can allow teachers to create a culturally responsive context for learning, reactive to evidence of student performance and understandings (Bishop & Berryman, 2010). Supporting teachers through methods such as data analysis can help them to better understand their Māori students, as well as enable school leaders and the wider school community to focus on changing school structures and organisations to more effectively support teachers in raising Māori student achievement (Tomlins-Jahnke, 2008).
Earl and Katz (2006) claim that using data and information wisely can help leaders organise ideas towards clearer directions and decisions for improving student achievement. Such information can allow teachers to recognise what they don’t know, and gain a deeper understanding from their beliefs and assumptions to develop strategies to help raise student achievement. Aitken and Sinnema (2008) agree that student achievement needs to be grounded in student data but there also needs to be accountability from the teacher to “inquire into the impact of their actions on their students and into interventions that might enhance student outcomes” (p. 52). Where teachers are given opportunity to reflect on their practice and inquire into the effectiveness of that practice through professional learning they are more likely to allow for improvement of student achievement (Robinson et al., 2009). Yet, Timperley (Timperley et al., 2007) is wary of attributing teacher input as the sole instigator for student achievement. She maintains that “most teachers reflect daily on their practice as they go about their work… if they knew how to change in ways to improve their effectiveness they would have already done so” (p. 7). In terms of Māori student achievement, Bishop (2003) agrees with Robinson et al about the need for teachers to promote learning by creating culturally appropriate and responsive contexts for learning. This requires adapting teaching strategies conducive to the learning needs of Māori, therefore “making the system fit the student, rather than the student fit the system” (p. 4).

**Māori succeeding as Māori: Realising Māori potential**

*Māori succeeding as Māori* is the latest Māori critique of mainstream education. Durie (2003) asserts that realising Māori potential in education needs to take a holistic approach, one that encompasses knowledge, whānau, well-being and the environment in which students live. He argues that the potential approach is the basis for an educational experience for Māori students where achieving success is broadly promoted and is not limited to the traditional precursors of what success should look like. *Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy 2008-2012* (MoE, 2008) was the first government-initiated national Māori education strategy to have mandatory implementation across all schools in Aotearoa-New Zealand. *Ka Hikitia* directed schools to make clear and explicit steps to “manage the success of Māori students and to ensure Māori are enjoying educational success as Māori” (MoE, 2008, p. 10). It is holistic in its approach and recognises that Māori learners bring with them their own culture, language and identity. These three points are the guiding principles and are reinforced in a report by the Education Review Office (2010):

For Māori to achieve greater success in education it is crucial that all educators in New Zealand recognise, support and develop the inherent capabilities and skills that Māori students bring to their learning. (p. 1)

Durie (2004) argues that the challenge lies with educators to recognise, understand and embrace those skills and capabilities that are fundamental to Māori, and contribute to their uniqueness of being Māori before we position ourselves on the tenet *success as Māori* as the only realisation. For the first time, *Ka Hikitia* encouraged conversations within schools around the ideology of what success as Māori might look like. The strategy was succinct in its definitions of Māori potential and
broad enough to allow schools to develop a culturally responsive environment to form better relationships with their Māori communities and actively determine how best to make the system fit the student. While imperatives of Māori potential within the strategy focused less on deficit theorising, it also emphasised the importance of Māori enjoying education success as Māori as a direct consequence of Te Tiriti o Waitangi—The Treaty of Waitangi. This is further reiterated in the introduction to *Ka Hikitia*:

The Treaty of Waitangi is central to, and symbolic of, our national heritage, identity and future. *Ka Hikitia* – Managing for Success acknowledges the Treaty of Waitangi as a document that protects Māori learners’ right to achieve true citizenship through gaining a range of vital skills and knowledge, as well as protecting te reo Māori as a taonga. (MoE, 2008, p. 11)

However, one of the foci for *Ka Hikitia*, investing in people and local solutions, becomes a paradox as the strategy fails to financially support the very people responsible for bringing about change. Schools were provided with few resources, implementation strategies, professional development or clear guidelines on how to deliver the Ministry of Education’s directive. The challenge to shift teacher beliefs based on deficit theorising to that of Māori succeeding as Māori becomes exacerbated as support for teacher professional learning is now dependent on the cultural responsiveness of the leadership within the school in meeting the needs of their diverse learners (Bevan-Brown, 2003). Bishop (2003) reiterates that it is also organisational and structural change that is necessary to create contexts in which Māori potential can be responded to, supported and enhanced so that Māori student achievement can improve and disparities reduced.

### 3.3 Summary

Māori student achievement in secondary schools has experienced tumultuous beginnings, with discussions predominantly centred on academic underachievement. There are arguments for educators to adopt a more culturally responsive pedagogy of relations in order to attain academic success for Māori students in secondary schooling. Ideally, success as Māori should be a partnership between a school and its Māori community. Making the student fit the system is not only challenging but ignores the complexities of the learning needs for each individual. Schools can support their teachers and Māori learners by fostering a culturally responsive pedagogy which recognises Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the bicultural status of Aotearoa-New Zealand. As Karen Sewell, Secretary for Education, noted in *Ka Hikitia* – Managing for Success, “we know that success in education for Māori relies on them achieving that success as Māori. The two are inextricably linked. Māori success is of course New Zealand’s success” (MoE, 2008, p. 5).

My research on Māori achievement sought to establish whether promotion of Māori student success by a sample of secondary school art teachers could create positive learning contexts and allow Māori to participate as Māori on their own terms and conditions so that success as Māori is *being Māori*. The curriculum context for the research is presented in the next chapter.
Chapter 4: NCEA – THE CURRICULUM CONTEXT FOR THE RESEARCH

4.1 Introduction

Although *The New Zealand Curriculum* (MoE, 2007) provides official policy for English-medium teaching and learning in years 1-13, its educational direction is applied primarily at years 9-10 in secondary schools. While art education during these years sets the scene for years 11-13, senior students seek to gain achievement through *The National Certificate of Educational Achievement* (NCEA), Levels 1-3. This research focuses upon Māori achievement at year 11 through assessment of NCEA Visual Arts level 1. The Visual Arts achievement standards at this level are not content specific, with the exception of Achievement Standard 1.1 which requires students to “demonstrate understanding of art works from Māori and other cultural contexts using art terminology” (NZQA, 2012b, p. 1). The matrix for Visual Arts (see Table 1) shows opportunity for students to research artists and art works, develop ideas through drawing, and participate in making art works at each of the three NCEA levels. With five Achievement Standards available at Level 1 (30 credits in total), teachers have to select standards which provide a realistic programme of between 18-24 credits. One aim of this research was to determine which Achievement Standards were offered by the research schools and, of particular interest, whether teachers gave their Māori students opportunity to study Achievement Standard 1.1.

4.2 The Visual Arts Achievement Standards

With the advent of the new Curriculum in 2007 the realignment of NCEA standards to coincide with the curriculum framework is apparent:

The New Zealand Curriculum provides the basis for the on-going development of achievement standards and unit standards registered on the National Qualifications Framework, which are designed to lead to the award of qualifications in years 11–13. These include the National Certificate of Educational Achievement and other national certificates schools may choose to offer. (MoE, 2007, p. 41)

A review of NCEA level 1-3 was necessary and 2011 saw for the first time, implementation of the new NCEA level 1 Achievement Standards (AS) being offered in secondary schools. For art education, teachers were presented with slight variations of previous level 1 Achievement Standards where small changes were made to credit weightings, art exemplars, and Achievement Standard identification numbers (see Table 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 90913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>AS91305 AS91306 AS91307</td>
<td>AS90515 AS90659 AS90660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS91308 AS91309 2.1</td>
<td>AS90661 AS90662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate understanding of</td>
<td>Research and analyse approaches within</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>art works from Māori and</td>
<td>established design/painting/photography/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other cultural contexts</td>
<td>printmaking/sculpture practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>using art terminology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 credits Internal</td>
<td>4 credits Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 90914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>AS91310 AS91311 AS91312</td>
<td>AS90516 AS90663 AS90664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS91313 AS91314 2.2</td>
<td>AS90665 AS90666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use drawing methods and</td>
<td>Investigate and use ideas and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skills for recording</td>
<td>methods in the context of a drawing study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information using wet and</td>
<td>in design/painting/photography/printmaking/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dry media.</td>
<td>sculpture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 credits Internal</td>
<td>4 credits Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 90915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>AS91315 AS91316 AS91317</td>
<td>AS90517 AS90667 AS90668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS91318 AS91319 2.3</td>
<td>AS90669 AS90670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                 | Use drawing conventions to  | Produce original work within design/painting/
|                 | develop work in more than    | photography/printmaking/sculpture to show    |
|                 | one field of practice.      | extensive knowledge of art-making methods    |
|                 | 6 credits Internal          | and ideas.                                  |
| AS 90916        |                              |                                              |
| 1.4             | AS91320 AS91321 AS91322     |                                              |
|                 | AS91323 AS91324 2.4         |                                              |
|                 | Produce a body of work      | Produce a systematic body of work that       |
|                 | informed by established     | shows understanding of art making            |
|                 | practice, which develops    | conventions and ideas within design/painting/|
|                 | ideas, using a range of     | photography/printmaking/sculpture.           |
|                 | media.                      |                                              |
|                 | 12 credits External         | 12 credits External                          |
| AS 90917        |                              |                                              |
| 1.5             | AS91325 2.5                 |                                              |
|                 | Produce a finished work     | Produce a resolved work that demonstrates    |
|                 | that demonstrates skills    | control of skills appropriate to cultural    |
|                 | appropriate to cultural     | conventions.                                |
|                 | conventions.                |                                              |
|                 | 4 credits Internal          | 4 credits Internal                           |
Achievement Standard descriptors

Derived from the curriculum, the Visual Arts Achievement Standards at Level 1 contain four internally assessed standards for a total of 18 credits and a fifth externally assessed standard worth 12 credits. As previously discussed, AS 1.1 “demonstrate understanding of art works from Māori and other cultural contexts using art terminology” (NZQA, 2012b, p. 1) is the only one to reference Māori content, and is the only literacy standard. To gain Achievement, this standard seeks students’ understanding of how to identify and describe art works from Māori and other cultural milieu, albeit from a particular social or ethnic group, and specifically in the student’s own words and description through the use of art terminology. The definition of art terminology refers to “a choice of words or vocabulary used to describe the conventions, processes, procedures, materials and techniques used in the production of art and art works” (NZQA, 2012b, p. 1).

The inclusion of Māori art as a component of NCEA Visual Arts level 1 denotes the bicultural imperative initially included in the Art Education Junior Classes to Form 7 Syllabus for Schools (DoE, 1989) and reiterated in the current curriculum. The explanatory notes clarify the cultural context for this Achievement Standard as “contexts may include gallery or museum; marae; public or private collections; urban or natural environment; and studio or workshop situations” (NZQA, 2012a, p. 1).

Similarly, AS 1.5 “produce a finished work that demonstrates skills appropriate to cultural conventions” (NZQA, 2012b, p. 4) places emphasis on the physical task of making art or using various forms of media, according to an art-making intention. This standard also expects students to produce a finished work which is appropriate to the cultural conventions in which that art work was made. Achievement Standard 1.5 shares the same cultural ethos which is homogenous to the culture milieu of AS 1.1:

Cultural conventions are defined as the customs, formalities, practices and protocols that relate to the shared knowledge and values of a specific society, cultural or ethnic group. Traditional and/or contemporary practices may include: whakairo, salon painting, street art, siapo, tuakutuku, tattooing, mask making, tivaevae, jewellery making. (NZQA, 2012b, p. 4)

This achievement standard specifically includes whakairo (Māori carving) and tuakutuku (woven lattice work) and shares with AS 1.1 a bicultural (and multicultural) structure which embraces Māoritanga (Māori ways of knowing) and validates Te Tiriti o Waitangi - The Treaty of Waitangi in providing equity among Māori and non-Māori students.

When NCEA was introduced in 2002 (NZQA, 2012a), it was intended to recognise a wider range of skills and knowledge as well as reflect the emerging flexibility of learning environments within schools. The newly reviewed Achievement Standards for Visual Arts level 1 have unified these developments and provided consensus among many art teachers in secondary schools. Achievement Standard 1.2 “use drawing methods and skills for recording information using wet and dry media” (NZQA, 2012b, p. 3) is a common Achievement Standard offered in many schools’ level 1
art programmes. This standard draws upon the fundamental characteristics of art making within the classroom in allowing students to draw and paint using a range of media and techniques for example, “drawing refers to an on-going thinking, working and decision making process, which may involve different processes, procedures, materials and techniques” (p. 3).

The popularity of AS 1.2 is partially due to the inclusion of all five art disciplines (Photography, Sculpture, Printmaking, Painting, Design) from which any one or all can be used in the art making process and be recognised as valid methods and skills for recording information. Previously, the flexibility in this standard was limited and gave cause for art teachers to use alternate level 1 Visual Arts Achievement Standards to supplement students’ final credit accrual. Pertinent to this research, this achievement standard makes no reference to any cultural contexts or Māori art making.

Achievement Standard 1.3 takes into account those students who want to extend their art practice. “Use drawing conventions to develop work in more than one field of practice” (NZQA, 2012b, p. 5) builds upon recording information seen in AS 1.2. Thus, the formal drawing elements such as line, space, colour, shape, texture and form, inform the principles of harmony, balance, contrast and rhythm are seen in established practice. This standard requires students to build upon ‘technical and/or conceptual ideas in a series of art works’. An Excellence level of achievement is awarded by students being able to:

Use ‘drawing conventions with comprehensive understanding’ to the arrangement of formal elements (line, shape, space, colour, tone, point, texture, form, mass) and principles (balance, harmony, rhythm, tension, contrast, etc), demonstrating how and why these particular conventions from established practice are used. (NZQA, 2012b, p. 5)

Achievement Standard 1.4 “produce a body of work informed by established practice, which develops ideas, using a range of media” (NZQA, 2012b, p. 6) remains steadfast within art departments across Aotearoa-New Zealand. It is the only achievement standard that is externally assessed and is worth 12 credits. Two A1 folio boards are presented with students’ works to show “a systematic body of work is defined as individual, related works that form a series or sequence to show generation and development within the art-making process. This involves editing, selecting and ordering work” (p. 6).

The newly revised NCEA Visual Arts level 1 Achievement Standards are in their second year of delivery. Comparisons between the former level 1 Visual Arts achievement standards and those currently in use can be scrutinised and debated further. The implications for Māori students are discussed in Chapters 6 and 7, but the revised standards appear to be a step in the right direction towards realising Māori student potential.
4.3 Summary

The Visual Arts Achievement Standards provide immense freedom for art teachers to plan programmes that are appropriate for their students and which enable them to demonstrate art making knowledge and skills. Another advantage is that the standards are content free, in that there are no requirements for students to study any particular artists or participate in specific art making activities. This is vastly different from the kind of art education offered to Māori students from the 1840s-1930s. Then, students were confined to making academic drawings of British-based objects or participating in utilitarian crafts (see Chapter 2). The intention of the current standards-based criteria for reporting student achievement is for students to be challenged and motivated in their learning. NCEA was designed to give schools more flexibility in developing programmes of learning which cater for the specific needs of all students. NCEA Visual Arts level 1 exemplifies this flexibility. The findings of the research are discussed in Chapter 6 and show which Achievement Standards were offered by the research schools and the extent to which Māori students are achieving in this subject.
Chapter 5: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the research paradigm, methodology, methods of data collection and analysis, and ethical issues. It is important to note that this study was not positioned in the context of research on Māori student achievement in other curriculum subjects, which shows that Māori students achieve well when learning from a Kaupapa Māori framework and are taught by teachers of Māori ethnicity (MoE, 2008). In my field of secondary school art education there are very few Māori art teachers in secondary schools [in Smith’s survey (2005) 83% of Heads of Art Departments in the greater Auckland area were European/Pākehā, and only 4.3% were Māori]. Furthermore, research on art education in New Zealand which includes any focus upon Māori students studying art or art teachers’ practices is confined to studies by Smith (2001) and Sutherland (2004). Therefore, it was not possible for me to investigate Māori students’ achievement in art education within a kaupapa Māori framework.

This research was positioned, instead, as a small scale study using traditional social science methodology and methods, complemented by visual documentation of Māori students’ art work. It sought to investigate why and how a purposively selected sample of secondary art teachers (of either Māori or non-Māori ethnicity) promote Māori student achievement in NCEA Visual Arts level 1 at year 11 from analyses of teachers’ perspectives and perceptions of what success as Māori looks like in delivering the curriculum. While there is a plethora of research on Māori student underachievement, including theories about the underachievement of Māori learners, this study focuses on a positive paradigm to include successful Māori student achievement in visual arts. Another aim was also to test the hypothesis that, not only can Māori achievement be enhanced by an effective teaching profile, but can be achieved whatever the ethnicity of the art teacher.

The literature in Chapters 2 and 3, and the educational context in Chapter 4, provided the key directions for this research. These included the bicultural imperatives arising from the Te Tiriti o Waitangi—the Treaty of Waitangi. Ensuring that the research process was consistent with the provisions of the Treaty was an aspect of the study as it endeavoured to strengthen and celebrate the place of Māori students in NCEA Visual Arts Level 1. As noted earlier, the primary focus of the research was on achievement, not under-achievement.

5.2 The research methodology

Social science research is underpinned by four predominant paradigms: positivist and postpositivist, interpretivist, critical social theory and pragmatism (Cresswell, 2003). A paradigm can be explained as “a loose collection of logically related assumptions, concepts of propositions that orient thinking and research” (Bogan & Biklen, 2007, p. 24). Punch (2005) describes paradigms as being “about the epistemology and philosophy of science and inform beliefs about how science should be done”
(p. 6). The paradigm in which this research was conducted takes a phenomenological approach, which can also be described as interpretivist (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Interpretivism is common to a range of qualitative methodologies and draws upon the notion of understanding. In my attempt to gain a better understanding of my own assumptions of how teachers promote success as Māori within art education, an interpretivist approach was utilised with the purpose of finding facts and causes to my questions (Neuman, 2003). Patton (1990) infers that it is personal experience based on direct observation of, and interaction with, people that equates to having an empathetic understanding required in qualitative research. This is in contrast to positivism, where science is explained based on direct experience and “scientific knowledge is objective and only scientific knowledge is valid, certain and accurate” (Crotty, 1998, p. 29). The interpretivist researcher, on the other hand, assumes there are multiple realities or interpretations of phenomena and therefore takes a relativist ontological view - that social interaction and change is integral to qualitative methodological research (Cresswell, 2003). Merriam (2002) maintains that using naturalistic or site-based inquiry enables researchers to construct knowledge as opposed to finding it, thereby generating inquiry that is inductive rather than an inquiry process of deduction. Although constraints were determined by the small scale of this research, a consistent method of data analysis, cross checking of that data, and comparability enabled a focused qualitative inquiry of a phenomenon (Silverman, 2001).

From an interpretivist viewpoint, I sought to investigate the complexity of teacher views and clarify participants’ social phenomena. My intention was to interpret participants’ responses to my questions thematically, potentially create new meaning, and gain a better understanding. The study also sought to understand how professional leadership, beliefs and attitudes, and the art education practices of the participants can be shown to support Māori students’ achievement. Thus, my hypothesis is that art teachers, whatever their ethnicity, can play a critical role in Māori students’ achievement. More specifically, this study sought to clarify:

- What role do art teachers play in leading learning for Māori student achievement in visual arts education in mainstream New Zealand secondary schools?
- What other factors might contribute to this achievement?

5.3 The research participants and settings

The depth and scale of this research was premised on the nature of qualitative inquiry which is characterised by small scale samples which are purposively selected as opposed to random selection (Denzin, 2005). The selection of the research settings and participants was achieved through a sequence of steps. The first was to access and scrutinise the 57 pages of statistical data on the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) Visual Arts Level 1 results for all 348 secondary schools in Aotearoa-New Zealand from 2009–2011 (NZQA, 2012). The decision to focus on NCEA Level 1 Visual Arts was determined by these achievement standards being common to all students assessed in visual arts at this level. The second step was to refine the search by limiting it
to the total number of year 11 Māori students across all secondary schools who were studying NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 during 2011. While the general overview of the statistical data did not, at this stage, display the academic achievement of Māori students it did present options in deciding where the research could be located. The third step was to scrutinise the results to locate schools which were recorded as having Māori achievement in most or all of the NCEA level 1 Visual Arts standards. Further refinement led to step four, identifying four secondary schools in the Auckland-North Auckland regions located in areas of high Māori population (Statistics New Zealand, 2012), with at least 10% Māori students in their school, and for which there was evidence of achievement in NCEA Visual Arts level 1. This selection process was influenced by Miles and Huberman’s (1994) argument that in qualitative research there needs to be flexibility in sampling decisions to help clarify patterns, view contrasts and identify exceptions or discrepancies. The process was also informed by Earl and Katz (2006) who claim that leaders of learning need to interrogate achievement data as it is fundamental to teachers’ inquiring into their own methods and practice for enabling student achievement.

The four secondary schools selected as potential participants comprised three co-educational schools and one single-sex boys’ school. Once The University of Auckland ethics approval had been gained, I contacted the Principals of these schools by letter (Appendix A1, Principal Participant Information Sheet), followed with an email. After granting consent for access to their site (Appendix A2, Principal Consent Form) the art departments in those four secondary schools were asked for an art teacher to volunteer their time, expertise and experience to help with this study. The art teachers who agreed to be participants were sent information and consent forms (Appendix A3, Art Teacher Information Sheet and Appendix A4, Art Teacher Consent Form).

The four schools were given pseudonyms in te reo Māori, based on colours. Thus, Kura Tuarua Koura (gold secondary school), Kura Tuarua Whero (red secondary school), Kura Tuarua Pango (black secondary school), and Kura Tuarua Tawa (purple secondary school) are referred to by these names throughout this dissertation. The four art teachers, of whom one was Māori, two were Pākehā New Zealanders, and one was from overseas, were all female. They were also given pseudonyms and are referred to by these names in relation to their schools, i.e. Kaiako Koura (gold teacher), Kaiako Whero (red teacher), Kaiako Pango (black teacher) and Kaiako Tawa (purple teacher).

As a further dimension of the research, the art teachers were invited to nominate two Māori students studying NCEA Level 1 Visual Arts whose art making and art works they considered represented their programme to support Māori success. These students and their parents/guardians were given information and consent forms (Appendix A5, Māori student/Parent Information Sheet and Appendix A6, Māori student/Parent Consent Form). Once consent had been gained from the students and their parents they were given pseudonyms, for example Tauira Koura (gold student), Tauira Whero (red student), Tauira Pango (black student) and Tauira Tawa (purple student), as seen in Table 2.
Table 2

The research participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Art Teachers</th>
<th>Year 11 Māori students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kura Tuarua Whero (Red)</td>
<td>Kaiako Whero</td>
<td>Tauira Whero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura Tuarua Koura (Gold)</td>
<td>Kaiako Koura</td>
<td>Tauira Koura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura Tuarua Tawa (Purple)</td>
<td>Kaiako Tawa</td>
<td>Tauira Tawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura Tuarua Pango (Black)</td>
<td>Kaiako Pango</td>
<td>Tauira Pango</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 The data collection methods and processes

Once consents had been obtained data collection commenced using a ‘mixed method’ approach. 
Cresswell (2003) notes that qualitative research is particularly suited to the educational environment, especially where inexperienced teacher researchers who gather and interpret information for the first time are able to procure data generated in contexts that have a significant degree of familiarity for them. While Cresswell advocates for the novice researcher to settle on one strategy, it was decided to use more than one method so that data was richer and would enable cross-referencing between data.

For each data collection method (see ii-v below) the art teachers and students were invited to post material on a specially constructed secure research project website available only to me and them. Each participant had their own web page with a unique password, and was not identifiable to each other. This electronic data collection method was chosen because of the limited timeframe for this small-scale study, the logistics of using schools in both Auckland and Northland, and the informal nature of using a website at any time that suited the participants up until data collection ceased on 12 August, 2012. The following data collection methods were used:

(i) Statistical data analysis

For this research it was important to gather and analyse data from NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 (NZQA, 2012a) as well as statistical information from national examinations (NZQA, 2012b). As these documents were publicly available there was no need to seek approval from the Principals and their Boards of Trustees. The analysis of these documents was critical in deciding where my study should be anchored, as it provided insights into the achievement of Māori students at year 11 and the potential to make further inquiry. The data from each school shows the NZQA results from 2011 for Māori secondary school students for NCEA Level 1 Visual Art (see Chapter 6).

(ii) Survey questionnaire with the four art teachers

Merriam (2002) claims that questionnaires are important “if you want to understand a phenomenon, uncover the meaning a situation has for those involved, or delineate process (how things happen)” (p. 11). Punch (2009) maintains that self-administered questionnaires need to have clear layout and an absence of ambiguity. There are no standardised questionnaires on teachers’ philosophies or
attitudes to art education in secondary schools in Aotearoa-New Zealand thus the survey I constructed was to aid my inquiry into Māori student achievement in secondary art education [Appendix B1(i)]. Participants were given the questionnaire to complete from the secure website. This was followed up with emails to develop a sense of ownership for the participants and to make sure there was no ambiguity in the findings.

(iii) Document analysis of the schools’ NCEA level 1 schemes/programmes

The rationale for examining the NCEA Level 1 Visual Arts scheme/programme in each school was to ascertain the level of Māori Kaupapa included in their programmes. I also wanted to examine how or whether schools’ schemes/programmes included strategies to support the educational achievement of Māori students, enabling Māori to succeed as Māori. While this study was not conducted in a kaupapa Māori research paradigm, Bishop and Glynn (1999) argue for educators to approach learning from an indigenous methodology that is mutually inclusive and which focuses on the group rather than the individual. It was important to make comparisons between what the scheme/programme claimed to do and what the teachers said about how they taught. The aim was to discover if the schemes/programmes indicated whether the teacher’s approach to teaching Māori was different, and what opportunities were provided for Māori to gain educational success in art.

(iv) Questionnaire with the Māori students and documentation of their art work

As part of the information and consent process the art teachers were asked to select two Māori students in their class whom they considered represented their promotion of success for Māori in NCEA level 1 Visual Arts, and who were willing to participate in the research. From the questionnaire (Appendix B2) the aim was to investigate the degree of involvement for each Māori student in making art that reflected themselves, their sense of achievement in NCEA, and how their art teachers had supported them. From the documented art work I wanted to establish whether the Year 11 level 1 art programme catered for group success for Māori, and in what ways (if any) Māori students interpreted the programme to incorporate their culture. As Durie (2004) says, success for Māori is more about the collective needs and successes of the group rather than the individual.

(v) Art teacher self-reflection

Typical of qualitative research data analysis commenced as soon as data was available (Cresswell, 2003). It became apparent from the initial data analysis of the survey questionnaire that I had not provided sufficient opportunity for teachers to provide a detailed account about their perceived influences on success of their Māori students. Additional questions [Appendix B1(ii)] sought further information from the teachers to gain greater understanding of their personal journeys in teaching art, especially in schools with a high proportion of Māori students. Bogdan and Biklen (2007) note that further interviewing of participants for qualitative data can provide contextualised rich descriptions that offer plausible explanation, when collected from multiple sites.
5.5 Validity, reliability and ethical considerations

This research took into account the issue of anonymity and followed the protocols and processes surrounding ethics. As Miles and Huberman (1994) explain, the validity of research needs to ensure that a critical and objective view of the process and data is maintained. The qualitative researcher also depends upon their ethical responsibility in ensuring that no harm comes to participants (Punch, 2009). While it was possible that the schools in this research could potentially be identified from the Ministry of Education website, because data on schools with a sizeable Māori student population is in the public domain, there were more schools than the four selected which aided in providing anonymity. As explained above each school and corresponding participants were given pseudonyms in te reo Māori. The students were not anonymous to their teachers but in the reporting of the research all student identities were disguised as explained in the Participant Information Sheets.

All participants were provided with details of my background and the scope of the research. While a conflict of interest could be perceived because I am a secondary school art teacher, and Māori, my own school was not used in the research and it transpired that three of the four art teachers who agreed to participate were unknown to me. Although confidentiality could not be guaranteed (this was explained in the information sheets), every attempt was made to keep confidential the identity of the four schools, four art teachers and the two Māori students in each school whose art works were used to support the teachers' approaches to promoting success. The use of students' images for the research was clearly explained in the information sheets.

The combination of mixed methods used for data collection can allow for findings to be a mix of thick or rich descriptions which enhance plausibility (Merriam, 2002). However, validation of this research cannot be accurately attributed a method of true triangulation of data, because of it being such a small scale study (Hammersley, 2008). Where the researcher seeks the criteria of trustworthiness and credibility, they need to look for variations in the process and explore the differences in experiences and outcomes which are important to the research participants (Patton, 1990).

5.6 Data analysis strategies

The qualitative data was analysed from a variety of gathered resources and conducted from an interpretivist paradigm, consistent with the research parameters of this study. Wolcott (1994) advises researchers to work through description, analysis and interpretation to derive meaning, while Patton (1990) affirms the value of interpreting the documents and meanings that are embedded within them. I was concerned with the meanings within the documents and understanding the reasons and contexts in which they were written (Merriam 2002). Cresswell (2003) and Merriam (2002) recommend the essential tasks of analysing qualitative data rely upon collection, reduction, organisation and interpretation of that data. In order to obtain a general sense of the data, I organised them into categories or participant language to generate themes. As Cresswell notes, analysing data into chunks can indicate how the findings will appear and be interpreted, as well as asserting the accuracy and credibility or validity of the findings. Document analysis of NCEA Level 1
Achievement Standards, and gathering schools’ statistical data on their results, was conducted before and during the data collection from teacher interviews. The intention was to critique those documents to determine how they influenced teachers’ decisions about teaching visual arts at NCEA level 1 to promote Māori students’ achievement.

To process sufficient data to describe a problem and discuss the perspectives pertaining to the questions that arise from the hypothesis, data collection and the process of collecting data need to be transparent (Silverman, 2001). It was essential to the integrity of my research that I was non-judgemental in my responses to the interviews with the teacher participants as well as remaining transparent in the process. Merriam (2002) advises that the key to getting good data from interviewing is to ask good questions. While still a novice in research, my experience as a teacher lent itself to facilitating the responses of the interviewees when I needed to. The challenge was most evident in gaining full responses from the year 11 student participants. At times it was necessary to conduct further interviews with some of the students in order to interpret their responses more accurately.

Where topics and themes were analysed to discern the connections between them, they provided relevant data for thick description for this research (Merriam, 2002). Because data analysis is an ongoing process incorporating reflective practice, the re-viewing of that data allowed me to make sense of the information and understand better the outcomes (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). While conclusions from the data were made, they were also recognised as being limited due to the scope of the study.

5.7 Limitations of the study

The sample and data from this research is limited by the size of the study and timeframe in which the research was conducted. On the other hand, there is scope for further contributions to be made to a larger body of knowledge (Punch, 2003). This research could be replicated at a regional and national level. While the number of Māori teachers in art education in secondary schools is limited, and could possibly affect the validity of this research, Punch (2005) defines validity as “denoting the extent to which the data represent the phenomena for which they stand” (p. 29). This research therefore hypothesised that success as Māori in secondary school visual arts education can be conveyed in numerous ways and is not limited to the ethnicity of the art teacher.

5.8 Summary

This chapter outlined the research paradigm, methodology, methods of data collection, and ethical implications of the research. It presented the criteria for selection of the research participants via data from the public domain. It has presented my hypothesis that art teachers, whatever their ethnicity, can play a critical role in Māori students’ achievement. The findings pertinent to the research questions are discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter 6: FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH: PROMOTING MĀORI STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

6.1 Introduction

The rationale for the research topic was motivated by the paucity of data on Māori achievement in secondary school art education in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Existing empirical research on the underachievement of Māori, and subsequent strategies to alleviate deficit theorising (Bishop & Glynn, 1999), still dominates education imperatives in the secondary sector. It is important to note again that my research was not premised upon Māori underachievement in secondary school art education, or even on Māori students’ achievement in making Māori art, but rather on their achievement in the context of the NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 (NCEA VA L1) achievement standards being used for assessment in mainstream secondary school art departments.

The analysis of data is a descriptive culmination of the voices of the four art teachers and eight of their Māori students, across a small sample of Northland and Auckland secondary schools, and their perspectives on NCEA VA L1 to support Māori achieving success as Māori. This research was positioned in an interpretivist paradigm. It sought to gather context-rich interpretations of the phenomena in order to gain an insight and understanding into the issues surrounding the research question - how and why do Māori students achieve in NCEA VA L1 at year 11, regardless of whether their teachers are of Māori or non-Māori ethnicity? Also deliberate in my approach to the research was to take a non-Kaupapa Māori theoretical stance due to the small scale and limited timeframe of the study and the paucity of literature and research on Māori students studying art in secondary schools in Aotearoa-New Zealand (see Chapter 2). However, it became evident in the findings of the eight Māori students that kaupapa Māori was inherent in their expressions of their own cultural milieu through their art making and could not be separated from their own sense of self in defining what success as Māori looks like. This incidental finding is explained further in section 6.6.

6.2 School support for Māori student achievement

Table 3
The research schools

| Kura Tuarua Whero | Kura Tuarua Koura | Kura Tuarua Tawa | Kura Tuarua Pango |

An incidental finding from the process of selecting research participants was that the four schools were all part of the Te Kotahitanga model, under which each had made a commitment to creating a culturally responsive context for learning based on evidence of student performance and understandings (University of Waikato, 2012). The findings indicated that this commitment impacted on the level of support for Māori achievement in visual arts. It was also found that each school was located within two of the largest iwi (tribe) in Aotearoa-New Zealand (Te Kāhui Māngai, 2012). While focus in the research was on the strategies art teachers employed to enable their Māori students to
gain educational success in NCEA VA L1, other questions arose in the research such as how might these geographical, biological and emotional conditions affect these students gaining educational success and, more importantly, success as Māori? Bishop (2003) and Durie (2003), for example, infer that a factor for Māori student achievement could be positioned within a cultural component of Te Aō Māori, whereby Māori have an innate desire to belong. These authors explain that a sense of belonging can be understood as either a physical space which one acknowledges as being home, such as a school or marae, or belonging as an emotional state whereby home is distinguished through fostered relationships, albeit biological and/or community. Evident in the overall school data was one particular aspect which resonated with a sense of tūrangawaewae - or belonging. From viewing the data, the geographical location of secondary schools within Aotearoa-New Zealand could be interpreted as a contributing determinant for the number of Māori students enrolled, as well as those who were studying visual arts at NCEA level 1. Upon analysis, where obvious iwi (tribe) affiliations were designated, and the corresponding schools within that district were situated, the Māori student roll was greater than for those secondary schools otherwise located within a predominantly non-Māori populous of Aotearoa-New Zealand. As a consequence, there was an increase in Māori students in NCEA Visual Art Level 1 in Māori-populated areas. While the triangulation of the research findings doesn’t include the hypotheses as to why Māori inhabit certain areas of Aotearoa-New Zealand, Walker (2004) claims that the majority of Māori favour areas where other Māori reside because of their attachment to particular geographic locations, and through their attachment to the whenua (land) and their tūrangawaewae (sense of belonging). Vaithianathan (1995) supports Walker in saying that Māori are more likely to live in their traditional iwi (tribe) and support local schools and marae, rather than Māori who live outside their iwi.

The school charters

While the four school Principals were not directly involved in the research they were asked to provide their school charters and mission statements, some of which are not in the public domain. The charters showed they were all Te Kotahitanga schools, but it was unclear why they had opted to follow this model for professional learning and development for staff and students. I assumed it was due to their high proportion of Māori students. This commitment to Te Kotahitanga was expressed explicitly in their documentation. Goal setting is identified as an effective tool for self-management and motivation, particularly when underpinned by learning and reflection on that learning (Lantham, 2004). This was evident in the mission statement for Kura Tuarua Koura “kei a au te turanga, kei a au te ako, kei a au te tutuki – I belong, I learn, I succeed”. Similarly, Kura Tuarua Whero’s mission statement was “he wahi whai mana ki te rapu matauranga – a positive place of learning”.

Both schools endorsed the values and philosophy of Te Kotahitanga, thus strengthening the strategic alignment of Ka Hikitia (MoE, 2008). Kura Tuarua Pango’s mission statement also built upon the fundamental philosophy of both to incorporate community partnerships within their charter, “to have strong and effective relationships with the Māori Community and to continue to support enhancement of positive attitudes and achievement of Māori students”.
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A similar message was reflected in Kura Tuarua Tawa’s simple mission statement “Cast your nets”. This seeks the importance of people and relationships as a foundation for successful learning partnerships through their four core value statements of tumanako (hope/aspirations), pono (being true to ourselves), aroha (love) and ako (learning). From the review of the school charters, it was evident that the four schools had made a commitment to providing high support for Māori students and their families and were committed to fostering on-going relationships with the school and wider community in order to raise Māori student achievement. This support underpinned the culturally responsive environment which was a feature of each art teacher’s philosophy.

6.3 The effects of teacher disposition in promoting Māori student achievement

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kaiako Whero</th>
<th>Kaiako Koura</th>
<th>Kaiako Tawa</th>
<th>Kaiako Pango</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The four art teachers, one of whom was Māori, two were Pākehā New Zealanders, and the fourth was from overseas, were all female. The formal interviews and additional conversations with the teachers contained a mix of structured and semi-structured questions (Cresswell, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln 2005). From these, a detailed picture of the art teachers’ perspectives of teaching NCEA VA L1, especially to Māori students, was gained. The differing cultural ethnicities of the teachers provided a range of positive experiences and viewpoints, all with similar dispositions towards helping Māori gain educational success as Māori. Kaiako Koura, the only Māori participant in this study, was an accomplished art teacher with over 15 years art teaching experience. Kaiako Whero had taught for over 20 years and was “very proud of her Pākehā roots”. Like Kaiako Koura, she felt very privileged to be working in a school and community with a high proportion of Māori. Kaiako Tawa was a young Pākehā woman who was the least experienced of the four, but had significant positions of responsibility including the role of Te Kotahitanga facilitator for her school. Kaiako Pango was the only art teacher not born or teacher trained in Aotearoa-New Zealand, and does not hold a formal qualification in secondary art education. However, Kaiako Pango considers Aotearoa-New Zealand her “turangawaewae” (home), despite having “taken years of perseverance to be accepted as an Art teacher by my peers”.

While the intention was to have a totally random selection of participant art teachers from varying schools the coincidental finding that they taught in Te Kotahitanga schools provided evidence of a strong awareness by each art teacher “to create a culturally responsive context for learning, which is responsive to evidence of student performance and understandings” (University of Waikato, 2009, p.3). For example, Kaiako Koura incorporates her identity as a young Māori woman, as well as a practising artist, into her everyday teaching:
I have a sincere desire to see our Māori kids achieve. Being Māori, I can relate to them as Māori – which is an added bonus. We try to eliminate any potential barrier that might stop them from achieving. The Te Kotahitanga programme aids us further in supporting Māori learners. We prioritise Māori achievement. Māori achievement is a permanent agenda item that features at every Learning Area meeting – we prioritise Māori succeeding.

Also sharing that vision, Kaiako Tawa was unequivocal in her position as a Pākehā art teacher and conscious of the decisions she makes for her Māori students in order for them to achieve educational success. When describing her philosophy of teaching Māori, Kaiako Tawa said:

I have high expectations of my students, especially my Māori students because I know that they all can achieve. I am always honest with them and I think they trust what I say and they know that I care for them as Māori – that their identity and background and experience counts… that I will do as much as I can to support them to achieve their highest potential.

Kaiako Tawa credited this context for understanding her Māori students through the Te Kotahitanga programme, in particular ‘The Effective Teacher Profile (ETP)’ (Bishop & Berryman, 2009):

The ETP in particular, has helped me to break down some of what we do in our department, manaakitanga – establishing a caring, secure and safe environment for learners as culturally located individuals, mana motuhake – having high expectations for learners to achieve and be self-determining individuals, whakapiringatanga – a well-managed learning environment.

Kaiako Tawa’s responses reflected an understanding of her own identity in relation to her Māori students, but also accentuated the fundamental premise of being a culturally responsive teacher.

The determination to succeed within secondary art education was two-fold for Kaiako Pango. Firstly, this was as tauwi (foreigner/immigrant) in a predominantly Māori populated secondary school and, secondly, as an informally trained, co-opted secondary art teacher. Kaiako Pango elaborated on her struggle to gain acceptance as an art teacher:

The same people who now have respect and admiration for me, did not believe I could take art without having gone to a tertiary art school. Maybe this attitude and my compassion and motivation for teaching, made me even more determined to support my students.

Having similar difficulties, Kaiako Whero described her struggles as more to do with her own culture and the historic misconceptions that led her to teach art in a secondary school “full of Māori kids”. Trained as a primary school teacher, Kaiako Whero returned home to her turangawaewae (belonging) for “some awhi” (nurturing) and to “start again”. Her time with the strong Māori community led to her being “whangai” (adopted) into the local school’s bilingual unit where she was the “chief guitarist for the kapa haka group”, and eventually gained a position as an art teacher within the school. Although not trained in secondary art education, Kaiako Whero felt an affinity with Māori
and therefore chose to teach in secondary schools with a high Māori student population. When asked what she wanted from her Māori art students, Kaiako Whero said:

I want all students achieving to their potential. When Māori students achieve, or achieve highly, there is perhaps an expanded depth of celebration within myself, perhaps an added pride in them, knowing that another successful young Māori person is on their way forward, another role model is out there for others to follow, knowing the scales have tipped a bit more in our school and in our country in a positive way, and because sometimes those students have had to break through more barriers than others to gain that success.

It was evident in the findings that the four art teachers’ personal dispositions and professional philosophies contributed to their desire to promote achievement for their Māori students.

6.4 The impact of NCEA Visual Arts Achievement Standards in promoting Māori achievement

From the findings it was evident that programme planning for NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 was a key factor in supporting Māori student achievement. Each school’s programme exemplified the aim of NCEA to provide standards that would recognise a wider range of knowledge and skills and reflect a more flexible learning environment to suit the specific needs of students within secondary schools. The four art teachers agreed that NCEA was a welcome reprieve from the norm-referenced assessment systems of the past and that a particularly rewarding aspect of NCEA was seeing their less able students achieving.

The analysis of the NCEA VA L1 Achievement Standards offered by the participating schools was limited to 2011. Published by NZQA in July 2012 (NZQA, 2012a), it was pertinent to find out which NCEA VA L1 Achievement Standards were offered in 2011 by the four schools [see Table 3]. From these statistics I gained a picture of where the emphasis lay for each art department. Along with their stated pedagogical stances, this information informed my analysis of the impact of the art teachers’ decisions on programme planning.
Table 5  
2011 NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 Achievement Standards offered by each school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools 2011</th>
<th>AS 90913 – 1.1</th>
<th>AS 90914 – 1.2</th>
<th>AS 90915 – 1.3</th>
<th>AS 90916 – 1.4</th>
<th>AS 90917 – 1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kura Tuarua</strong> Whero</td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kura Tuarua</strong> Koura</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kura Tuarua</strong> Tawa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura Tuarua Pango</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the statistics I found that Kura Tuarua Pango (the boy’s school) was the only one that offered AS 1.1 (the standard with Māori content specified). It also had the least number of Māori students enrolled in the school and within NCEA VA L1. Their 2011-2013 school charter reflected the direction the art teacher sought for the department in an effort to provide further opportunities for Māori students to gain success both educationally and as individuals:

The aim is to improve our processes for identifying the needs of students and provide appropriate learning programmes, and to build a positive culture of individual success, where Māori student achievement will improve. The improvement of literacy for Māori students is a priority, and this is an achievement standard that has literacy credits.

Although the charter for Kura Tuarua Pango aimed for a reduction in the number of Level 1 Achievement Standards being offered across all subjects, the increased retention and achievement results for Level 1, and improving literacy, were priorities. Quality over quantity was a common theme among the schools. In varying degrees, the School Leadership Teams (SLT) in each focussed on school-wide initiatives to offer NCEA VA L1 courses with fewer AS credits and more emphasis on the quality of the programme, including literacy. To attempt this Kaiako Koura said her department offered AS 1.1 (the standard with Māori content) to year 10 art students regardless of whether they intended to take Visual Arts at year 11:

Offering a research standard to the year 10 art students means we are giving them an opportunity to understand some of the requirements for NCEA level 1. It also allows the students to bank some of those credits for the following year. It gives the students a taste of academic achievement, especially for our Māori kids.
Kura Tuarua Tawa offered AS 1.5 (producing a finished work with skills appropriate to cultural conventions) to year 10 art students for the same reasons as stated by Kaiako Koura. Rationalising her decision, Kaiako Tawa said:

Concentrating on fewer credits at NCEA level 1 fits with our programme and can allow the students a better level of achievement. With the year 10 doing AS 90917 earlier, they get used to the language of NCEA and bank some credits for their level 1 even if they do not take art next year.

Kaiako Tawa maintained that scaffolding NCEA VA L1 across year levels can lead to the refinement of NCEA programmes, and possibly even early identification of “at risk learners, namely Māori”. Focusing on literacy and numeracy was also a strategic goal within Kura Tuarua Whero. Kaiako Whero explained that they try and accommodate literacy in NCEA VA L1 to be included and delivered across the three achievement standards they offered, thereby not limiting literacy to AS 1.1, which isn’t available to their students. Kaiako Whero accounted for the exclusion of AS 1.1 by saying:

It’s about taking a look at the bigger picture...we haven’t taught the research standard in our level 1 programme for about 7 years. We found it took too much time to cover the work needed to gain the credits with our students, at the expense of the practical dimensions of the programme.

In justifying this statement, Kaiako Whero related their NCEA VA L1 programme back to the department goals, which were aligned with the school goals and the strategic implementation of Te Kotahitanga. She stated that:

Our overall duty is to the educational achievement of our students. In line with the school goals we hope to raise student achievement, reduce disparities in achievement and connect with parents and whānau. It is our continued focus to improving achievement in NCEA qualifications for all our students that drives the method of our programmes. We are also very conscious in our department to help raise Māori student achievement so that Māori students are achieving at the same level as other students.

There was evidence that the disparities between Māori and non-Māori achievement in NCEA was at the forefront of the four art teachers’ departmental goals and had been made a priority both within their schools and their art departments. Kaiako Koura was astutely aware of her own ethnicity and how her identity could be communicated in a positive way to enable Māori students achieve educational success. She believed that by having “Māori in front of Māori” related to the bicultural obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi-The Treaty of Waitangi and is also a fundamental aim of Te Kotahitanga; “because I am Māori, I advocate for my Māori students to be successful”. Kaiako Koura has incorporated into their art department scheme a bicultural ‘reminder’ as a reference to support other art staff in having a better understanding of Māori students and their whānau. Kaiako Koura explained her bicultural vision for the art department:
The Visual and Media Arts Learning Area has full awareness of and recognises the Treaty of Waitangi as a living document embracing biculturalism in Aotearoa. Staff are encouraged to undertake professional development opportunities, and are mindful of Treaty imperatives in the Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum documents and the National Certificate of Educational Achievement, to assist our students in gaining educational achievement.

However, Kaiako Koura was mindful that the NCEA VA L1 programme for Kura Tuarua Koura did not include AS 1.1, despite literacy imperatives throughout the school and the on-going responsibility to the Te Kotahitanga programme in raising Māori student achievement. She did not see the omission of AS 1.1 as disadvantaging the students but, rather, believed in the integrity of the NCEA VA L1 programme as a means of:

Providing for variation in the learning experience for our students at level 1. Although we try and keep the level 1 programme stable, we are governed by what fits best with our students, and how well we think they will cope. This year (2012) we have included an Art History Achievement Standard in level 1 as a way to introduce more literacy learning. In the past our students have not performed well in the level 1 research standard (AS 1.1).

One of Kura Tuarua Koura’s art department goals was “to continue to enhance the academic potential and improve achievement levels of our Māori and male learners”. To do this, Kaiako Koura said they must, as a department, “minimise barriers to learning with these particular cohorts to ensure they are able to attain higher levels of achievement”. For Kaiako Koura, catering for the needs of the students by trialling mixed methods of delivery and reviewing NCEA VA L1 Achievement Standards, was one way of closing the gap for achievement disparities amongst Māori and non-Māori students.

The underlying premise of knowledge and recognition of Te Tiriti o Te Waitangi—The Treaty of Waitangi underpinned the NCEA Visual Arts programmes. The bicultural imperatives derived from The Treaty were evident in the philosophies of the four art teachers to recognise tikanga (customs) and kaupapa Māori (Māori ideology) in the teaching and learning for their Māori students. In conjunction with the Te Kotahitanga (Bishop, 2003) initiative, the professional development and learning for these teachers in understanding how Māori can succeed in being Māori, has also enabled them to provide pathways for academic achievement within NCEA VA L1. As discussed in Chapter 3, addressing the issues of educational disparities among Māori learners has led these four art teachers to being more culturally responsive in supporting Māori student achievement. Evidence of their cultural inclusivity and culturally responsive practice was seen in the NCEA VA L1 programmes of the four schools.
6.5 The role of the art teachers in promoting success as Māori

A number of factors were found to have contributed to the way in which the four art teachers promoted success as Māori. One of these was the nature of the NCEA visual arts programmes designed by the art teachers. Another was the effect of the teachers’ quality relationships with their Māori students, regardless of their own ethnicity.

**Enabling students to succeed through NCEA Visual Arts programmes**

A key finding of this research was that the four schools all gave Māori students the opportunity to gain educational success as Māori through programme planning and a commitment to providing a culturally responsive pedagogy through their NCEA VA L1 programmes. Although the programmes were different for each school, a serendipitous coincidence was an underlying theme of identity and belonging among them. This coincidence was not investigated due to the small scale of this study but hypothesised as being schools aligned to *Te Kotahitanga*.

In minimising barriers to learning, Kaiako Koura emphasised that the Visual Arts programmes were developed thematically to reflect the cultural milieu and interests of learners – with particular regard to Māori students. Some learning activities had been modelled on prior learning and therefore built upon the existing level of technical skill and analysis necessary for student achievement. Kaiako Koura acknowledged that as “mana whenua” (territorial rights), she had an obligation to impart to Māori students’ knowledge of the local area, iwi (tribe) and the stories associated with it. These, she said, were fundamental to the theme of their NCEA VA L1 programme, where navigation became the starting point for Māori students’ own discovery of identity and personal journey:

> In this programme students are navigating towards the story of their whakapapa, whānau and personal identity. They draw on their own experiences and their experiences of their whānau, and express this in their art making. This is sometimes difficult for students but at the same time they are excited about it.

As Kaiako Koura explained further, “It means that if students want to work within that cultural context we can draw from similar experiences to help shape ideas - knowing what they can and can’t do in relation to tikanga”.

In their NCEA VA L1 programme Kura Tuarua Tawa, a non-Māori teacher, explored issues of personal identity ‘Ko tenei ahau – This is me’, through the genres of landscape, portraiture, ta moko (traditional Māori tattoo) and street art. Students were encouraged to draw upon their own culture and background for subject matter to extend and personalise the set theme, as well as investigate a variety of international and national artist models, especially Māori art and artists. Opportunities for
Māori students to express themselves in NCEA VA L1, within their own cultural milieu were, as Kaiako Tawa asserted:

Affirming and culturally diverse. Providing culturally appropriate contexts for learning for Māori students means providing the resources, images, language, support and even kai - just to make sure that they are affirmed as Māori and can express who they are in all their interactions and in their work.

Kaiako Tawa, had developed her NCEA VA L1 programme with a student-centred focus “enabling students to select themes relevant to their own interests and cultural background, and encouraging them to explore their own identity”.

Identity, further explored as self-portraiture at Kura Tuarua Pango, reiterated the sentiments of Kaiako Tawa. Kaiako Pango, the non-Māori art teacher at the boy’s school, sought to support Māori in their programme by:

Continually and openly placing value in their art...giving Māori students a chance to show who they are, to represent their iwi, whānau and themselves visually, and also motivating the students to achieve to their potential in art.

Kaiako Pango expressed her passion for Visual Arts, especially NCEA level 1, and the ability it had to foster Māori student achievement if “the right programme” was offered. She was also conscious to include in the NCEA VA L1 programme an “historical context of Māori art and tikanga…to inspire and develop an appreciation within the students of their own culture and its place in New Zealand”.

Themes of journey and navigation, with the sub-text of “where did we come from?” underpinned the learning and the delivery of the NCEA VA L1 programme at Kura Tuarua Whero. While the formula of the programme had a generic dimension, each student had opportunity to integrate their own sense of identity and ownership within it. Students were encouraged to develop ideas “through brainstorming a theme of personal interest, which can evolve throughout the course of the year”:

I try to provide for lots of opportunity for students to bring their personal interests and culture into their work. Giving them lots of student choice as possible in this programme is vital to developing their own style and individuality. From this one theme there usually emerges mini themes of culture, Māoritanga, kaimoana and waka.

Kaiako Whero reiterated working collaboratively with art staff to develop activities that provided lots of student choice in the NCEA VA L1 programme, so that “each student develops personalised outcomes and can experience success”. Kaiako Whero was reminded of the conditions that art teachers unconsciously enrol themselves into, such as the countless hours resourcing for student success. For her, it meant:
A lot of one-on-one time with them to help generate ideas. It allows for genuine personal connections with students and enables me to get to find out information about them on a more personal level. It also gives me an opportunity to express value for their culture and a personal interest in them.

The aim of cultural inclusiveness was also apparent across the three other art departments, thereby making it conducive to the goals of the school and Te Kotahitanga. For example, Kaiako Tawa's Māori title and theme for their NCEA VA L1 programme gave Māori students opportunity to reflect on their Māori values and to design and integrate their learning within a kaupapa Māori framework. Assignments and student task sheets were written in both English and te reo Māori, with resources and references on Māori artist models being provided. This non-Māori art teacher sought advice on Tikanga Māori (custom) from the school Kaumatua (tribal elder of great respect) for the cultural appropriateness of the programme, as well as providing an answering point for Māori students. In an attempt to reciprocate the respect, and encourage her Māori students, Kaiako Tawa had attended several Kapa Haka practices and sports games to “make sure I take time to learn from them, about customs and language”. Tauira Tawa 1, in support of his teacher Kaiako Tawa, said that “to me being in my art class means being given the opportunity to express my individuality through my artwork, expressing who I am in both myself and my culture”.

From my analysis of the responses of the art teachers, it was evident that they all shared a discerning view of cultural responsiveness towards teaching Māori. Included in their individual philosophies on teaching and learning was a constant dialogue of reflective practice. As one art teacher said, “Listening is the key to realising Māori student potential. I am Pākehā and certainly no expert, but I try to be responsive to the needs of my Māori students, and that’s what counts”.

Enable students to succeed through teacher-student relationships

A finding of the research was the effect in the four schools of the Government’s mandated Māori education strategy – Ka Hikitia (MoE, 2008). This strategy was influenced by findings of the Best Evidence Synthesis (BES) programme (Alton-Lee, 2007) that the provision of Māori educational services at the time were poorly represented. Alton-Lee emphasised the low inclusion of Māori themes and topics in English-Medium schools, fewer teacher interactions, less positive feedback and failure to uphold mana Māori in education. These, she claimed, were substantial reasons for Māori underachievement. From this evidence, Alton-Lee pointed to the importance of teacher-learner relationships and professional development programmes as having a positive impact on Māori student achievement, thus allowing for Māori achieving education success as Māori.

All participating art teachers gave emphasis to their relationship with the students. All extended their obligations beyond the classroom hours as they believed it was imperative to give their Māori students a chance at gaining educational success through their achievement in NCEA VA L1. Frequent after-school and weekend art workshops were considered ‘the norm’ for each teacher, often coaxing students along with kai (food). Both Kaiako Pango, the non-New Zealand art teacher,
and her Māori counterpart, Kaiako Koura, were actively involved with extra and co-curricular activities that coincided with the majority of their Māori students from their art classes. Kaiako Pango said she felt fortunate to work alongside her Māori students in a different context from Visual Arts and added, “Māori students have such a rich identity and knowledge of belonging which is so intertwined with visual representation, something missing from my own culture and upbringing”. She saw the extension of her time outside the art room as a means to bestow confidence and trust amongst her Māori students. She believed that “all the Māori students in my classes just really want to know you genuinely care about them personally, that you are prepared to listen to them, give them the time of day and make an effort to know them”. This statement was implied by all four art teachers, who felt that they sincerely cared for all their students, both Māori and non-Māori. As Kaiako Koura noted, “we as a team operate on the concepts of manaakitanga (nurturing) and mana motuhake (autonomy) – there is a balance of soft caring and hard caring… students know that they can go to anyone they feel best supports their learning needs”.

The auxiliary workload of these four art teachers, in addition to their classroom teaching for NCEA VA L1, contributed to a major finding of this research. Nurturing the ‘whole’ student was a prevalent factor common to all four schools. Regardless of whether the art teacher was Māori or non-Māori, this enabled their Māori students to achieve. Whether it was in the art programmes, watching them at sports practices, providing kai (food), or simply asking about their day, it was apparent that Māori students in NCEA VA L1 in these four schools were achieving on their own terms and predominately in an environment where ‘success is being Māori’.

6.6 The voices and art works of the year 11 Māori students

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tauira Whero</th>
<th>Tauira Koura</th>
<th>Tauira Tawa</th>
<th>Tauira Pango</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Female</td>
<td>1. Female</td>
<td>1. Male</td>
<td>1. Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alongside the teacher interviews, eight Māori students nominated by the participating art teachers were also invited to give a brief view of their opinions and participation in NCEA VA L1. Four of the students were female and four were male. While the interview questions were generally framed within the context of NCEA VA L1, and the ways in which their art teachers had supported them, students were also asked to describe their views on culture, identity and whānau (family).

The Māori student participants were confident in citing their pepeha (introductions/tribal affiliation) and affirmed their whakapapa towards their parents’ lineage. When asked if they embraced kura kaupapa Māori in their everyday living, Tauira Pango 1 said “we are not fluent in te reo, but respect kura kaupapa Māori”. A similar finding was echoed by other students, where tikanga (ways of
knowing) and kawa (protocol) were symbiotic with their daily living, yet lack of fluency in te reo caused students to question their own integrity and authenticity of living fully in a kura kaupapa Māori ethos. In contrast, Tauira Tawa 1 said “occasionally we speak te reo in our home, and we do embrace Māori culture a lot, especially in our home and whānau. It’s just how it is, I don’t really know anything different”. While this research was not premised upon a kura kaupapa Māori framework separating the students and their teachers from this paradigm proved, at times, to be difficult. Experience in kura kaupapa Māori, as Hall and Bishop (2001) maintain, can lead to improved educational outcomes for ethnic minorities.

A strong cultural component from all four schools’ NCEA VA L1 programme was inherent in the teaching of each of the level 1 Achievement Standards. Culture, was to be interpreted from the viewpoint of the students and from their own understanding of what culture meant for them. On culture and art making, Tauira Koura 2 said “we are able to do this in art by drawing things that are relevant to our culture and things that identify us within our culture”. Yet Tauira Koura 1 reported that “we have the opportunity to express our culture through drawing Māori patterns and things like that, but I don’t actively express my culture when in art”. The definition of culture for Tauira Koura 1, was speaking te reo at home, and doing kapa haka (Māori performance) at school, both of which are areas where she was able to express her cultural identity and feel a sense of achievement as Māori.

Māori achieving educational success as Māori (MoE, 2008) was interpreted in varying degrees across all four art departments, whether it was explicit in their schemes or implicit in the students’ art works and/or their responses. In an attempt to capture and homogenise participating Māori students’ aspirations, students were asked: What does it mean to be Māori? What does success as Māori looks like? How does being Māori influence you in making art? Tauira Tawa 1, whose NCEA programme for the class focused on students exploring issues of personal identity Ko tenei ahau – This is me, through the genres of landscape, portraiture, Ta Moko (traditional Māori tattoo) and street art, said:

I don’t really show my culture, I express my culture in other ways and art is one way I do this. Art is a place where I can be silly and serious at the same time, I can be happy and angry in my work, and I can be Māori and me. Enjoying success means being successful as Māori in a Pākehā world and not turning Pākehā, which is really hard not to do.

The response from Tauira Whero 1 resembled most of the other students’ way of thinking, in that there was a concealed intention that went beyond the boundary of individualistic success in gaining NCEA VA Level 1. Success for these students was ultimately about making their whānau proud, as Tauira Whero 1 elaborated:

---

1 From the course outlines and units of work of the four art departments, I could see no written explanation or examples on the definition of culture.
As Māori, being successful means having a sense of achievement from being able to do something independently which comes from within ourselves. I have many Māori friends who struggle with literal subjects such as Maths, Science and English, but in art, they feel free, and that is an important thing for them, and me. If I am successful in art, I’m going to go to university and then afterwards get a good job, maybe as an animator.

Tauira Whero 1 also attested to the commitment of her teacher, Kaiako Whero, through her many after school and weekend art workshops, and one-on-one support. This student said “she always makes sure we have all the tools and resources we need, and she takes the time to make sure we have all the information and research we could possibly use to build ideas and create art.

Teacher support, was expressed amongst the student participants as being critical to their own success in NCEA VA L1. Tauira Tawa 2 explained that:

With my art teacher, I don’t have to explain my culture or being Māori, it is a part of who I am, like having arms and legs. Even though she is Pākehā, we share and learn from each other, she does try and push us to be more expressive and not be afraid to explore our Māori culture.

Equally positive, Tauira Tawa 1 said:

She tells us to embrace our culture, to be Māori and not change anything about how we see ourselves. That’s why I really like art and te reo because I connect with both subjects and they make me feel good about who I am. As well, these subjects have the best teachers!

Tauira Pango 2 attributed his overall success in school to the relationship he had with his art teacher and her constant belief in him to succeed even though he wants to be a dairy farmer. He described his art class as somewhere he could be “heard” and be “allowed to do things that mattered, and make me feel good about who I am and what I wanted to do”

Issues of identity and independence – coincidentally, within a cultural framework of Te Kotahitanga, enabled the four art teachers to use the flexibility of NCEA VA L1, to create dimensions of achievement for their Māori students. The variety of NCEA VA L1 programmes showed enormous shifts from the culturally insensitive art teachings first offered to Māori in the Native Schools during the 1880s (see Chapter 2). As eagerly reminded by one student:

Being in art means somewhere I can express myself through my work. It means somewhere I can socialize and listen to music, which is a relaxing, enjoyable environment. And most of all, it gives me a sense of independence, since we are not being told what to do, and how to do it. We are given options.
6.7 Summary

The framework of NCEA VA L1 allows art teachers to design student-centred programmes where focus is on learning by inquiry, critical thinking, processing information and problem solving. The principal factors expressed by the four art teachers as enabling them to successfully teach Māori students were the support they received from the school, the flexibility of NCEA VA L1, and their own positive attitude. Further insight into the personality of each teacher was limited but, nonetheless, I inferred from their interviews and those with the students, that the teachers’ belief towards their Māori students achieving was a factor that contributed to the overall success gained in NCEA VA L1. Kaiako Whero’s attitude to teaching Māori students reflected those of the other three art teachers:

I value and genuinely care that all of my students succeed. I value and actively develop positive relationships with my students. Respectful - determined to find a way to help each one of them achieve, even to the last minute... I try to develop personal connections within the classroom... try to be relaxed, positive and cheerful, and enjoy them... believing in them, even when they don’t believe in themselves.

The responses of the eight Māori students painted a very positive picture about what it meant to be Māori in their personal contexts of whānau and, relevant to the research question, in their art making for NCEA VA L1. This finding was not unexpected because the art teachers were invited to nominate two students in their year 11 class whose performance in art they considered represented their support for Māori success. As illustrated through their ‘voices’ these students were very confident in who they were as young Māori and what they believed they could achieve in art.

One of the most significant findings of this research was that there were no indications from any of the six students who were taught by the three non-Māori art teachers that they felt disadvantaged in any way by not having a Māori art teacher. A common theme in the interview responses was the confidence they felt in their teachers. Another significant finding was that there were few indications in the art works of the other two students at Kura Tuarua Koura that their art teacher was Māori. All four teachers had enabled the eight Māori students to achieve success as Māori.
“Art helps me to show who I am, where I am and what I am thinking. I am surrounded by culture.”
“Where did we come from, who am I? I am me, I am a part of something special and being Māori is the added bonus.”
“Navigating my identity. Finding the pathways to my future means looking to the past.”
“My ancestors are responsible for my being. I have a responsibility too, to be successful and hold on to my culture, my identity”
"Ko tenei ahau – This is me. When I do art, it’s my culture and my whānau that I call on.

Being Māori is everything to me and to my whānau. Being Māori is who I am."
“Being Māori is like being a part of something special and unique. I am able to express myself through patterns, whakapapa and the things around me. It’s a part of who I am.”
Figure 1. Tauira Pango 1

“My portrait, my identity. I know who I am, where I come from, and where my roots are. It’s not just about me, it’s about succeeding in life as people, as Māori.”
“This is who I am. Being Māori, I am proud of what I have, I am proud to be Māori.”
Chapter 7: DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

7.1 Introduction

This chapter evaluates whether art education for Māori students has ‘gone Beyond the Koru’, and the degree to which each of the four secondary school art teachers promoted support in achieving success for Māori students studying NCEA Visual Arts level 1. Because the four secondary schools were selected on the basis of their Māori student populations, enrolment in NCEA and, most importantly for this research, their success in NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 (explained in Chapter 5), the findings presented in the previous chapter are, not unexpectedly, very positive. The aim of the research was, after all, to determine the factors that support Māori student achievement and their success in being Māori. However, the findings identified a few issues and raised some critical questions which are presented in this chapter.

7.2 Has art education for Māori students in 2012 gone Beyond the Koru?

In the history of art education for Māori students (see Chapter 2) the koru did not feature, either as a symbol or as patterns deriving from the native ponga frond. The latter was not included as one of the plants that students were required to draw in the Native Schools during the colonial period of assimilation in the 1800s. Simon’s (1998) research confirmed that there was no evidence of Māori themes, patterns or motifs being acknowledged or incorporated even in the Native Schools – Curriculum, 1902 (AJHR, 1905). This inclusion was not given approval or encouragement until the Regulations Relating to Native Schools, (NZG, 1915) during the adaptation period after which schools offered some activities in Māori art making.

During the 1960s, when Māori artists became art advisors under the Tovey era, many used stylised koru forms to construct painted kowhaiwhai patterns for meeting houses, wharekai (main dining hall) (see Figures 12 and 13) and other structures [see Art in Schools: The New Zealand experience (DoE, 1978, pp. 281-299)]. The use of painted kowhaiwhai patterns deriving from the koru were used predominantly in the depiction of Māori myths and legends. The influence of these Māori art advisors/artists was felt in schools where students constructed patterns featuring the koru, and other forms such as the manaia (carved figure). From 1975-2001 the new internally assessed School Certificate Art prescription required students “to demonstrate that they have some knowledge of the significance and form of some examples of Māori art” (p. 2). The School Certificate 1996 Chief Moderator’s Report for Art (DoE, 1997), for example, reported that “there was an increase in the number of submissions that developed ideas based on…Māori legends and symbols” (p. 3). An analysis of School Certificate Benchmark Photographs indicated, however, that while the ‘form’ of the koru translated into kowhaiwhai patterns was well understood there was less understanding of its significance. As a 15 year old student studying School Certificate art in 1986, drawing koru and kowhaiwhai patterns was the predominant vision of what Māori art education was about at the time (see Figure 14).
Figure 12. Painted mural, using the koru form, in the Wharekai at Whangaparāoa marae.

Figure 13. Māori artist Cliff Whiting, painting the mural in the Wharekai at Whangaparāoa marae.
Figure 14. Researcher’s own School Certificate examination art works 1986, 15 years old
The first art curriculum, *Art Education: J1-Form 7 Syllabus for Schools* (DoE, 1989), addressed the issue of students depicting Māori symbols and patterns without evidence of understanding by publishing a substantial section on Māori Art Education. This was designed to inform all art teachers of the kaupapa, tikanga Māori, and ways of introducing Māori art. With the introduction of *The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum* (MoE, 2000) and *The New Zealand Curriculum* (MoE, 2007) there has been a subtle move away from conscious use of Māori imagery, mainly due to misappropriation and the lack of the context and meaning in using Māori artefacts and symbols within schools.

Maintaining a sense of cultural integrity within the current curriculum has laid the foundations for NCEA to encourage students to explore subject matter from their own cultural milieu. The purpose of collecting data to include art works by the eight Māori students in the research was to determine how they interpreted success and whether they had the opportunity to identify themselves in their own culture in making art works that enabled them as Māori to gain success as Māori. I was also interested in seeing whether the art works made by these students had gone *Beyond the Koru*.

**How has there been a shift from successful Māori to success as Māori?**

The eight Māori student participants all held firm beliefs of what it meant to be Māori and how this could be communicated in their art work. For these students, overall academic success was the predominant factor in their future aspirations of getting a “good job” and Visual Arts was one subject that was verbalised as having the capacity to help them achieve this goal. Therefore, the question for the four art teachers was how could they create positive learning contexts for Māori, regardless of their own ethnicity, which enabled Māori to participate as Māori on their own terms and conditions so that success as Māori is being Māori?

Evident in the student work, and briefly communicated by the students, Māori success is often measured in terms of academic achievement, in this case NCEA VA L1 results. For these students, who had gained good results so far and are seen as being successful, it is apparent that their success has not come at the expense of being Māori but rather because of it. Success as Māori has been realised by the four art teachers, who include strategies to develop a positive Māori identity for their Māori students. These strategies included working and learning as a collective, belonging to a whānau, realising their potential as Māori and engaging in the rewards and responsibilities that come with being Māori. Success as Māori, according to the Māori student participants, was about the willingness to participate in Te Aō Māori (the world of Māori) in any way, and achieving academic success because of, not despite, their Māori identity.
7.3 What Issues / questions were raised by the research?

Culturally responsive pedagogy

The discussion about success as Māori is essentially about identity and belonging. While the issue of identity was not a particular focus for this research it was, nonetheless, an undercurrent to the complexities that surrounded this study. Separating identity from that of the Māori student’s own experiences and understanding of themselves within their cultural milieu could not be compromised or divided. Identity, as Durie (1998, p. 58) claims, is “an amalgam of personal attitudes, cultural knowledge, and participation”, and contributes to the continual development and understanding of who we are. Durie (1997) also reminds us that “identities continue to be made and remade as life circumstances change, so that even the submerged can recover a Māori identity given sufficient confidence and opportunity” (p. 157). The eight Māori students said they felt secure in their identity as Māori and what that meant for them in the context of gaining academic achievement in NCEA VA L1. Whether a sense of identity for these Māori students was influenced by their own whakapapa (ancestry), was not investigated in this study, but raises this as a potential issue for further research.

The four secondary schools contained a critical mass of Māori students living in communities populated by Māori. It was found, incidentally, that all four were Te Kotahitanga schools. This raises the question of whether achieving ‘success as Māori’ is more likely to occur in this situation, where the ethnic majority of students, in this case Māori, dictates the type of professional development programme deployed by a school that may contribute to Māori student achievement. It raises the question of whether improving the educational outcomes for Māori students is more likely to occur in such schools where establishing a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations means having mission statements and Art Department schemes that align with Te Kotahitanga principles. Tomlins-Jahnke (2008), for example, suggests that for most Māori students in Aotearoa-New Zealand there is a disjuncture between the culture within their home and within school. While emphasis on nurturing the whole student to improve the educational outcomes for Māori was a goal for these schools, it also raises the question of whether a critical mass of students is necessary for this to happen.

The effects of curriculum decisions by art teachers

Of significance for this research, only one of the four art teachers offered NCEA VA L1 Achievement Standard 90913-1.1. This Achievement Standard is the only literacy standard, and the one that cites Māori content. Analysis of all four school charters indicated similar strategic goals. Two of those strategic goals could be aligned to Achievement Standard 90913-1.1 such as: raising Māori student achievement in literacy and numeracy, and providing programmes that allow Māori to succeed as Māori. While adhering to the strategic goals in school wide and national policy, only one of the four art teachers had addressed these imperatives. Issues of student motivation, lack of resources and the art teacher’s own personal judgments on students’ literacy competence and adequacy were some of the reasons why the other three schools did not offer Achievement Standard 90913-1.1. For these three schools, a consequence was that efforts to avoid deficit theorising (Bishop, 2003) was
not actioned in their art programmes. From their previous experiences in delivery of this Achievement Standard all three art teachers felt their Māori students had little to gain from the research and had struggled with the literacy component of this standard. One art teacher went so far as to say:

I don’t think we'll have time to do 1.1, we’ll see how we go with the other Achievement Standards and see if we can fit it in at the end if the kids are needing extra credits…and to be honest, the kids don't like this standard anyway, it has too much writing in it, they'd rather just paint or draw.

As Te Kotahitanga schools there is an obligation for teachers to promote, monitor and reflect on outcomes that lead to improvements in achievement for their Māori students, and that positive classroom relationships are built on non-deficit theorising (Bishop & Berryman, 2010). The decision of the three art teachers to not include Achievement Standard 90913 -1.1 could be viewed as deficit thinking. In a sense, these art teachers were effectively upholding other aspects of Te Kotahitanga in that they were providing mana motuhake (caring for the performance of their student) and whakapiringatanga (creating a secure, well managed learning environment by incorporating routine pedagogical knowledge with pedagogical imagination). Nonetheless, their failure to offer the only Achievement Standard that cites Māori content raises questions about their role in supporting literacy achievement for their Māori students.

7.4 What conclusions have I drawn?

Capturing Success

Despite the issues raised above, the research established that the following factors contributed to the success of the Māori students, both academically and intrinsically as Māori, regardless of their art teacher’s ethnicity:

- **Te Kotahitanga** - enabling teachers to create a culturally responsive context for learning which is responsive to evidence of student performance and understandings
- **Ka Hikitia** – Realising Māori student potential and achieving educational success for and with Māori.
- Nurturing the whole student
- Critical mass of Māori students
- Programmes enabling Māori students to express themselves within the context of their own cultural milieu, whether it was *explicitly* or *implicitly* conveyed through their art works
- Freedom of NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 Achievement Standards
- Professional and personal interest in their Māori students
- Relationships between students and their teacher
The freedom that exists within NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 allowed these art teachers to create a context where success as Māori could be realised. They nurtured relationships, encouraged collective learning and encompassed a broader notion of success in academic achievement where focus was on whānaungatanga (relationships) and on culture and identity. Māori achieving success as Māori in NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 was realised through, and because of, the clear relationships between Kaiako (teacher), whānau (family) and students. The eight Māori students emphasised the importance of having a “good” teacher. This was consistent with literature on the relationship between student achievement and teacher affiliation (Bevan-Brown, 2003; Bishop, 2003). Advocated by Bishop and Berryman (2010) is the discursive collective teaching and learning for Māori students that “reflect non-dominating relations of interdependence” (p. 735). Thus, success in NCEA VA L1 for these Māori students meant having discursive pedagogical practices that allow Māori to bring their own experiences, culture and identity into the learning, so that students become active learners whilst respecting their own contributions to learning.

7.5 What does the future hold?

Maintaining focus

There is potential for a range of educators to engage with this work. The ability to “best address the particular needs, interests and circumstances of the schools’ students and community” (MoE, 2007, p. 37) can enable schools, their leaders and other teachers to better understand the potential, challenges and rewards of enabling Māori students to succeed as Māori (Durie, 2004). For Māori, teachers are a critical factor in student achievement (Robinson, Hohepa, & Lloyd, 2009). In this small study, I found that the four art teachers were critical to the achievement in NCEA VA L1, of their Māori students regardless of their own ethnicity.

The challenge to forge a pathway for art education, from the historical constraints of the Native Schools Act in 1867, has moved from marginalisation of Māori students to that which seeks to deconstruct the cultural assumptions of learning and deficit theorising which disadvantaged Māori in the first place. Also, it cannot be discounted that proponents of Te Kotahitanga, coupled with the freedom of NCEA VA L1, has enabled art teachers to become enlightened to a culturally responsive construct that realises Māori student potential by creating art programmes that celebrate Māori succeeding as Māori.

Common threads emerged from this small scale study that would be of benefit to future stakeholders in secondary school art education in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Fundamentally, the first is the positive relationship between Māori students and their art teacher. The second, as indicated in all four school charters, is using tikanga Māori (Māori customs and knowledge) in understanding intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for Māori students. This motivation is understood through the notion of kotahitanga (unity) to provide a sense of competency, autonomy and relatedness. Finally, it is the integrity, perseverance and patience of the art teacher in promoting success as Māori that is at the
heart of this research. The unselfish commitment of the art teachers in understanding tikanga Māori such as whānaungatanga (relationships), manaakitanga (caring) and wānanga (distinctive contribution) has contributed to their Māori students developing a sense of self-esteem, cohesion and self-efficacy. All of these can lead to the inherent juncture of relatedness, culture and identity.

**Postscript:**

In a personal communication with Kaiako Koura (the Māori art teacher) following the research, she acknowledged that her art department was doing a disservice to their Māori students by not offering Achievement Standard 90913-1.1. She elaborated by saying that while many of their students gained places in tertiary art institutions, success for them had been hindered by a lack of literacy competency. On reflection, following her participation in this research, Kaiako Koura said she is making a commitment to offering Achievement Standard 90913 - 1.1. for all future students taking NCEA VA L1, especially for Māori students.
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A1 Principal Participation Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet - Principal / Chair, Board of Trustees

Principal / School:

Researcher: Kiri Turketo

Title of research: Beyond the Koru: Promoting Māori student achievement in Visual Arts

Date: April 2012

Dear

This letter is to ask if you would kindly assist me with a research project I am conducting as part of the requirements for my Master of Professional Studies degree at the University of Auckland under the supervision of Dr Jill Smith. The research is motivated by my experiences as a secondary school art teacher.

The aim of my study is to investigate why and how a selected sample of secondary school art teachers (of both Māori and non-Māori ethnicity) support Māori students' achievement in NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 at year 11. In comparison with research that has focused on Māori under-achievement, my study will seek to understand the professional leadership, beliefs and attitudes, and the art education practices of the participants which have been shown to support and promote Māori students’ achievement. My hypothesis is that art teachers, whatever their ethnicity, can play a critical role in Māori students’ achievement.

For this research I have selected four secondary schools in the Auckland and Northland regions, including yours. Each school has a sizeable Māori student population and there is evidence of Māori achievement in NCEA Visual Arts Level 1. I have obtained this demographic and student attainment data from the Ministry of Education website.

The art teacher from your school whom I wish to invite to participate in this research is...........The purpose of writing to you is to gain your approval to approach her/him to participate in this research.
My research will use three data collection methods - document analysis, an interview, and collection of teacher-selected samples of NCEA Level 1 art work by two Māori students. For each data collection method the art teacher participants will be invited to post material on a specially constructed secure research project website available only to me and them (I have technical expertise in website construction). My computer is password protected and cannot be accessed by anyone else. Each participant will have her/his own web page with a unique password known only to each individual and me. The participants will not be identifiable to each other. This electronic data collection method has been chosen because of the logistics of having participants in both Auckland and Northland schools, and because it enables participants to post material at any time that suits them up until data collection ceases on July 12, 2012.

- The document analysis will involve an examination of the art teacher’s/art department’s scheme/programme for NCEA Visual Arts Level 1. The objective is to gain a picture of which Achievement Standards are being offered to NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 students, including those of Māori ethnicity.
- The second method requires the art teachers to respond electronically to interview questions posted on their individual web page on the research website. These questions will focus on their perceptions of their role and any external factors that have supported Māori students’ achievement in Visual Arts. I anticipate that the interview questions would require a response time of 40-60 minutes in total, including any self-editing that may occur. The interview data, which I will transcribe from the website, will be known only to me and my supervisor.
- The third method is for the teachers to select examples of art works by two Māori students which represents/illustrates what they consider reflects their leadership in Māori student achievement. The examples would need to be drawn from work completed between 2009-2011. [These could comprise previously documented ‘benchmark’ samples]. I anticipate that selection and posting of the examples would take less than 60 minutes.

I understand that I require approval from your school, the two students, and the students’ parents/guardians for examples of the art works to be photographically documented and posted on the secure website. The examples would be included in my masters dissertation and, in addition, may be used for professional development and at art education conferences. The images of students’ art works will not be used in any written or commercial publications (e.g. articles, books, book chapters). In the research report all information will be presented objectively and anonymously. I will provide a pseudonym in te reo Māori for each school and will invite each art teacher to nominate a first-name pseudonym which reflects their gender and ethnicity. The students will be known to their teachers, but in any reporting of the research their identity will be disguised. Their art works will be identified in relation to their school and gender.

I wish to give you the following assurances. The participation of the art teacher is voluntary, as will be the participation of two students via their art works. Your school and the teacher have the right to withdraw from this research at any time, or withdraw information that has been provided up until data collection ceases, without giving a reason. I anticipate this will be on July 12, 2012. To protect the identity of participants, consent forms and data will be stored separately and securely by my supervisor at The University of Auckland. These will be kept for a period of six years and then destroyed. Hard data will be shredded and the website disestablished. Every attempt will be made to protect the identity of your school and the teachers, through coding and pseudonyms, although anonymity cannot be guaranteed. I also seek your assurance that the art teacher’s decision to participate or not in this research will not affect their employment status or relationship with the school. At the completion of the study your school and the art teacher will receive a summary of the main findings, to be available to the students and their parents/guardians.
If you have any further queries please contact me or my Supervisor. I do hope you will agree to the art teacher in your school participating in this research. If so, I would appreciate you signing the Consent Form and returning it to me in the envelope provided.

Yours sincerely

My contact details are:
Kiri Turketo
Phone: (H) 09-6363 999; Mobile: 021 2644 804
ktur018@auckland.ac.nz

My supervisor is:
Dr Jill Smith
School of Arts, Languages and Literacies
Faculty of Education
The University of Auckland
j.smith@auckland.ac.nz
Phone: (09) 623 8899 extn 48713.

For ethical concerns please contact:
The Chair
The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee
The University of Auckland
Office of the Vice-Chancellor
Private Bag 92019
Auckland 1142
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A2 Principal Consent Form

School of Curriculum and Pedagogy

Consent Form - Principal / Chair, Board of Trustees

This form will be held for a period of six years

Principal / School:

Title of research: Beyond the Koru: Promoting Māori student achievement in Visual Arts

Researcher: Kiri Turketo

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, and I have understood the nature of the research and why I have been asked to give permission for the researcher to approach the art teacher in my school to participate in this study. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

- I agree that the researcher may approach the art teacher at my school to participate in the research.

- I agree that the researcher may have access to the school’s NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 documentation.

- I agree that the researcher may have access to examples of art works by two Māori students’ produced for NCEA Visual Arts level 1, which he/she believes reflects their support and promotion of Māori student achievement.

- I agree that the teacher may have access to the two students’ contact records should they have left the school.

- I understand that the art teacher will self-edit their interview responses on the secure website and that the data will be transcribed by the researcher.
I understand that I may withdraw my permission for art teacher to participate in this research at any time, without giving a reason.

I understand that I may withdraw information that has been provided by the teacher at any stage up until data collection ceases on 12 July 2012, without giving a reason.

I understand that data will be kept for 6 years, after which they will be destroyed.

I understand that this Consent Form will be securely stored separately from the research data for six years beyond the completion of the research, when both will be destroyed.

I understand that neither my name, nor any identifiable information about me, the school, the art teacher, or the students will be used in the research report. I also understand that while every attempt will be made to protect these identities through coding and pseudonyms, anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

I understand that the participation of the art teacher is voluntary, and I give my assurance that the decision of the teacher to participate, or not, in the research will not affect their employment status or relationship with the school.

I understand that the participation of two Māori students, via their NCEA Level 1 Visual Arts art work, is voluntary.

I understand that the school will receive a summary of the research findings.

I agree to ....................... participating in this research project (please circle one)  YES       NO

Principal’s signature.................................................................

Date.................................................................
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Participant Information Sheet – Art Teacher

Teacher / School:

Researcher: Kiri Turketo

Title of research: Beyond the Koru: Promoting Māori student achievement in Visual Arts.

Date: April 2012

Dear

Your Principal has given permission for me to approach you to participate in a research project I am conducting as part of the requirements for my Master of Professional Studies degree at the University of Auckland under the supervision of Dr Jill Smith. The research is motivated by my experiences as a secondary school art teacher.

The aim of my study is to investigate why and how a selected sample of secondary school art teachers (of both Māori and non-Māori ethnicity) support Māori students’ achievement in NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 at year 11. In comparison with research that has focused on Māori under-achievement, my study will seek to understand the professional leadership, beliefs and attitudes, and the art education practices of the participants which have been shown to support and promote Māori students’ achievement. My hypothesis is that art teachers, whatever their ethnicity, can play a critical role in Māori students’ achievement.

For this research I have selected four secondary schools in the Auckland and Northland regions, including yours. Each school has a sizeable Māori student population and there is evidence of Māori achievement in NCEA Visual Arts Level 1. I have obtained this demographic and student attainment data from the Ministry of Education website.
My research will use three data collection methods - document analysis, an interview, and collection of examples of NCEA Level 1 art work by two Māori students. For each data collection method you will be invited to post material on a specially constructed secure research project website available only to you and me. My computer is password protected and cannot be accessed by anyone else. You will have your own web page with a unique password known only to us. The participants will not be identifiable to each other. This electronic data collection method has been chosen because of the logistics of having participants in both Auckland and Northland schools, and because it enables you to post material at any time that suits you up until data collection ceases on July 12, 2012.

- The document analysis will involve an examination of your own or your art department’s scheme/programme for NCEA Visual Arts Level 1. The objective is to gain a picture of which Achievement Standards are being offered to NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 students, including those of Māori ethnicity.
- The second method requires you to respond electronically to interview questions posted on your individual web page on the research website. These questions will focus on your perceptions of your role and any external factors that have supported Māori students’ achievement in Visual Arts. I anticipate that the interview questions would require a response time of 40-60 minutes in total, including any self-editing that may occur. The interview data, which I will transcribe from the website, will be known only to me and my supervisor.
- The third method is for you to select examples of art works by two Māori students which represent/illustrate what you consider reflects your leadership in Māori student achievement. The examples would need to be drawn from work completed between 2009-2011. [These could comprise previously documented ‘benchmark’ samples]. I anticipate that selection and posting of the examples would take less than 60 minutes.

Your Principal has given approval for examples of the two students’ art works to be photographically documented and posted on the secure website. I will also seek the formal approval of the two students you have nominated and their parents/guardians and will make it clear to them that their participation is voluntary. The examples would be included in my masters dissertation and, in addition, may be used in oral presentations with other teachers and at art education conferences. The images of students’ art works will not be used in any written or commercial publications (e.g. articles, books, book chapters). In the research report all information will be presented objectively and anonymously. I will provide a pseudonym in te reo Māori for your school and will invite you to nominate a first-name pseudonym which reflects your gender and ethnicity. Students’ art works will be identified in relation to their school and gender, not their names.

I wish to give you the following assurances. Your participation is voluntary. Your school and you have the right to withdraw from this research at any time, or withdraw information that has been provided up until data collection ceases, without giving a reason. I anticipate this will be on July 12, 2012. To protect your identity, consent forms and data will be stored separately and securely by my supervisor at The University of Auckland. These will be kept for a period of six years and then destroyed. Hard data will be shredded and the website disestablished. Every attempt will be made to protect the identity of your school, yourself, and the two students whose art works you select, through coding and pseudonyms, although anonymity cannot be guaranteed. Your Principal has given their assurance that your decision to participate or not in this research will not affect your employment status or relationship with the school. At the completion of the study you and your school will receive a summary of the main findings which the Principal will make available to the two students and their parents/guardians.
If you have any further queries please contact me or my Supervisor. I do hope you will agree to participate in this research. If so, I would appreciate you signing the Consent Form and returning it to me in the envelope provided.

Yours sincerely

**My contact details are:**
Kiri Turketo  
Phone: (H) 09-6363 999; Mobile: 021 2644 804  
ktur018@auckland.ac.nz

**My supervisor is:**
Dr Jill Smith  
School of Arts, Languages and Literacies  
Faculty of Education  
The University of Auckland  
j.smith@auckland.ac.nz  
Phone: (09) 623 8899 extn 48713.

**For ethical concerns please contact:**
The Chair  
The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee  
The University of Auckland  
Office of the Vice-Chancellor  
Private Bag 92019  
Auckland 1142
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Consent Form - Art Teacher

This form will be held for a period of six years

Teacher / School:

Title of research: Beyond the Koru: Promoting Māori student achievement in Visual Arts

Researcher: Kiri Turketo

I have read the Participant Information Sheet and have understood the nature of the research. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

- I agree to the researcher having access to my own or the art department’s NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 documentation, and am willing to post this on my secure website page.

- I agree that the researcher may have access to examples of two Māori students’ art works produced for NCEA Visual Arts level 1 which I have selected to reflect my support and promotion of Māori student achievement, and am willing to post this on my secure website page.

- I understand that I will self-edit my electronic responses to the interview questions on my secure website page and that the researcher will transcribe the data from the web page.

- I understand that I may withdraw from the research at any time, without giving a reason.

- I understand that I may withdraw information that I have provided at any stage up until data collection ceases on 12 July 2012, without giving a reason.
• I understand that data will be kept for 6 years, after which they will be destroyed.

• I understand that this Consent Form will be securely stored separately from the research data for six years beyond the completion of the research, when both will be destroyed.

• I understand that neither my name, nor any identifiable information about me, the school, or the two students will be used in the research report. I also understand that while every attempt will be made to protect these identities through coding and pseudonyms, anonymity cannot be guaranteed.

• I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary, and that the Principal has given his/her assurance that my decision to participate, or not, in the research will not affect my employment status or relationship with the school.

• I understand that the participation of the two students, via their art works, is voluntary.

• I understand that I will receive a summary of the research findings.

I agree to participate in this research project (please circle one) YES NO

Art Teacher’s signature

Date
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A5  Student/Parent Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet – Student and Parent/Guardian

Student:

Parent/Guardian:

School:

Researcher: Kiri Turketo

Title of research: Beyond the Koru: Promoting Māori student achievement in Visual Arts.

Date:

Dear ....................................................... and ..........................................................

My name is Kiri Turketo and I am an art teacher at an Auckland secondary school. This year I am doing a research project to complete a Master of Professional Studies degree at the University of Auckland under the supervision of Dr Jill Smith.

The aim of my study is to investigate why and how a selected sample of secondary school art teachers (of both Māori and non-Māori ethnicity) support Māori students’ achievement in NCEA Visual Arts Level 1 at year 11. In comparison with research that has focused on Māori under-achievement, my study will seek to understand the professional leadership, beliefs and attitudes, and the art education practices of art teachers who have been shown to support Māori students’ achievement.

For this research I have selected four secondary schools in the Auckland and Northland regions, including yours. Each school has a sizeable Māori student population and there is evidence of Māori achievement in NCEA Visual Arts Level 1. Your art teacher, .........................................................., has agreed to take part in the research.
For this research I will be looking at your art teacher’s NCEA Visual Arts level 1 programme at your school. I will also be interviewing them about the way they teach art at year 11, and how they have contributed to the achievement of Māori students in art. The reason I am writing to you is that I have also asked the art teacher (with the approval of the Principal) to provide examples of NCEA Visual Arts work by two Māori students. Your art teacher has recommended that I invite you to be one of these students.

If you agree to participate, your art work would be photographed and included in my written dissertation before it is examined. Images of your art works may also be used in oral presentations with other art teachers and at art education conferences, but would not be used in any written or commercial publications (e.g. articles, books, book chapters).

To protect the identity of your school, the art teacher, and yourself, you will be given pseudonyms in te reo Māori. Your work would be identified in relation to your school, but not with your name. All the research findings and Consent Forms will be stored separately and securely by my Supervisor for six years and then destroyed. When my research is completed the art teacher and the school will receive a summary of the findings that will be available to you from the Principal. I want to assure you that your participation in this research, via your art works, is voluntary. You can withdraw your art works from being included in the research at any time, without giving a reason, before data collection ceases in July 2012. The Principal and your art teacher have given me their word that your decision to take part, or not, will not affect your relationship with the school. If you have any further queries please contact me or my Supervisor. I do hope you will agree to participate in this research. If so, I would appreciate you signing the Consent Form and returning it to me in the envelope provided.

Yours sincerely

My contact details are:
Kiri Turketo
Mobile: 021 2644 804
ktur018@auckland.ac.nz

My supervisor is:
Dr Jill Smith
School of Arts, Languages and Literacies
Faculty of Education
The University of Auckland
j.smith@auckland.ac.nz
Phone: (09) 623 8899 extn 48713.

For ethical concerns please contact:
The Chair
The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee
The University of Auckland
Office of the Vice-Chancellor
Private Bag 92019
Auckland 1142
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Consent Form – Student and Parent/Guardian

This form will be held for a period of six years

Student:

Parent/Guardian:

School:

Title of research: Beyond the Koru: Promoting Māori student achievement in Visual Arts.

Researcher: Kiri Turketo

- We have read the Participant Information Sheet and have understood the nature of the research. We have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to our satisfaction.

- We agree that the researcher may have access to examples of the student’s art works produced for NCEA Visual Arts level 1.

- We understand that photographs of the student’s art works will be included in the researcher’s dissertation, and may also be used in oral presentations. We understand that the art works would not be included in any written or commercial publications.

- We understand that the student’s art works may be withdrawn at any stage up until the researcher completes her data collection in July 2012, without giving a reason.

- We understand that the Consent Form will be securely stored separately from the research data for six years beyond the completion of the research, when both will be destroyed.
- We understand that the student’s name, or any identifiable information about them, will not be used in the research report.

- We understand that the student’s participation in this research is voluntary, and that the Principal and art teacher have given their word that the student’s decision to participate, or not, in the research will not affect their relationship with the school.

- We understand that a summary of the research findings will be available to us.

**Student:** I agree to participate in this research project (please circle one) YES NO

**Parent/Guardian:** I agree that the student can participate (please circle one) YES NO

**Student’s signature**........................................................................................................................................

**Parent/Guardian’s signature**...................................................................................................................

**Date**..........................................................................................................................................................
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**Art Teacher Questionnaire**

**ART TEACHER WEB QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Part 1: Personal background**

1. What is your cultural background, including ethnicity/ies that you identify with?

2. If you are Māori, what is/are your tribal affiliation/s?

3. What country were you born in?

4. Which country have you lived in the longest?

5. What other personal aspects of art (for personal fulfilment) are you involved in outside of your art teaching position?

**Part 2: Professional background**

1. What secondary school did you attend?

2. What fine arts (or fine arts-related) qualifications do you hold?

3. At what institution did you gain this qualification, and what year did you graduate?

4. What art teaching qualifications do you hold?

5. At what institution did you gain this qualification, and what year did you graduate?

6. What motivated you to enter secondary school art teaching?

7. What position do you hold in the art department?

8. What motivated you to teach at your current school? (e.g. geographical location, nature of the community, type of school (co-ed, single sex, secular/religious), school decile, special character of the school, etc.)

9. How many art teachers are there in your art department?

10. If you are Māori, are you the only Māori art teacher in your art department?
### Part 3: Art teaching profile

1. *How long have you taught at your current school?*

2. *What year levels do you teach art at?*

3. *What is/are your areas of specialisation in senior art?*

4. *What other art-related areas are you interested in? (crafts, etc.)*

5. *What extra-curricular activities, if any, are you involved in that include Māori students?*

### Part 4: Art teaching in NCEA Visual Arts level 1 in your class

1. *What achievement standards are you using for NCEA Visual Arts level 1?*

2. *Why are you using these achievement standards?*

3. *Are these achievement standards different from previous years, and if so, why?*

4. *How do you think your beliefs and attitudes support Māori student achievement in art?*

5. *How do you think your teaching practices (e.g. teaching style, methods, resources, etc.) support Māori student achievement in art?*

6. *What opportunities are there for Māori students in your class to contribute their ideas to the NCEA Visual Arts level 1 programme (e.g. opportunities for them to express themselves within their own cultural milieu, etc.)?*

7. *If you are Māori, what does this mean to you in the context of teaching art to Māori students?*

8. *If you are non-Māori, how does this affect your teaching art to Māori students?*

9. *Whether you are Māori or non-Māori, do you seek the support of Māori people in the context of teaching art (e.g. students, other teachers, people in the community, students’ families)？*

10. *What other factors outside your classroom (e.g. school structure and personnel, school community, etc.) have supported you to address Māori student achievement in art?*

11. *Thinking beyond ‘success’ in NCEA Visual Arts, what does Māori student ‘achievement’ in art mean to you?*
B1(ii) Art Teacher Supplementary Questions

ART TEACHER SUPPLEMENTARY WEB QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Can you elaborate on your personal journey in teaching at your current school?

2. What motivated you to teach in a school with a high Māori student population?

3. Do you consciously or subconsciously give more attention to your Māori students?

4. Is spending one-on-one time with your Māori students any different than the rest of your students? How? Why?

5. When you are planning for NCEA Level 1, how do you keep your Māori students in mind? How do you cater for them?
Part 1: Personal background

1. Where are you from? What is the name of your hapu and marae?

2. What is your cultural background, including ethnicity/ies you identify with?

3. What country were you born in?

4. Do you and your whānau embrace kura kaupapa Māori in your everyday living? (speak te reo, use appropriate tika and kawa when and where necessary, identify and embrace your Māori culture)

5. Do you know what you would like to do in the future? What is it that you would like to do?

Part 2: Educational background

1. Is this the only secondary school you have attended? If not, where else did you go and why did you choose this school now?

2. What are you favourite subjects and why?

3. Did you take art at year 9 and year 10? If not, why? And why did you take art at Year 11?

4. How well do you do in your other subjects? And why?

5. Does the school have a marae and do you use it? For what purpose?

6. What would you like to do in art?

7. What does being in your art class mean to you?
### Part 3: Being Māori

1. **What does being successful mean to you?**

2. **How will you/do you know that you have been/will be successful?**

3. **What does being Māori mean to you?**

4. **Are you able to express your culture when you are in art class and how do you do this?**

5. **What are your influences in making art about your Māori culture?**

6. **What opportunities do you have to do/learn things Māori in art class, that you would not have anywhere else? When does this happen? Can you give me an example?**

7. **What tools and information is shared by your art teacher to allow you to express your Māori culture when making art?**

8. **How important was your art teacher in your success?**

9. **Did you feel disadvantaged by having a non-Māori teacher? (Only answer if you didn’t have a Māori art teacher)**

10. **Did your art teacher support and promote your success in art?**

11. **What does the statement “Māori enjoying success as Māori” mean to you?**
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