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ABSTRACT

Formal assessment for secondary schools commenced in the mid 1940's with School Certificate for Form 5 ākonga (students), however at that time, te reo Māori was not taught in schools. At that time, te reo Māori was still suffering the effects of colonialism and past government policies such as the 1867 Native Schools Act, where this act stated that the school curriculum was to be delivered in English. Māori tamariki (children) were punished by their teachers for using te reo Māori in school.

In the 1970's, te reo Māori was implemented into secondary education as a teaching and an assessed subject in School Certificate. Although it was included into the classrooms as a learning subject, te reo Māori was not considered as an academic subject and was ranked at the bottom of the learning subjects ranking. Learning subjects were ranked where the ranking system only allowed a specified number of ākonga to pass examinations. At this time, Latin, French and other Foreign Languages were ranked the highest learning subjects.

An overhaul of the national assessment commenced in 1997 and between 2002 and 2004 saw the induction of a new method of national assessment for secondary schools called the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) for Years 11 to 13. Te reo Māori continued to be a learning subject in secondary schools and used NCEA to assess learners. Between 2011 and 2014, NCEA assessments were aligned to the new New Zealand Curriculum (NZC) and te reo Māori in English medium schools had its own curriculum document called Te Aho Arataki Marau mō te Ako i Te Reo Māori – Kura Auraki: Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools (te Marau). Te reo Māori NCEA assessments aligned to the achievement objectives of the Marau and changes were made for assessments for te reo Māori. This research attempts to investigate what a culturally appropriate assessment framework for NCEA te reo Māori comprises of and offers thoughts on how this can be achieved and by whom.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This research was undertaken to review the appropriateness of the current assessment of the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) with ākonga (student/s) who are second language learners learning te reo Māori in English medium secondary school settings. Furthermore, te reo Māori as a learning subject in secondary schools, has been a nationally assessed subject since the 1970's and is currently an assessed subject under NCEA. According to research published by the Ministry of Education, Te Whatu Pōkeka (2009) stated that assessment should do no harm. However recent NCEA data showed that there was a drop in the number of ākonga learning te reo Māori from Level 1 NCEA to Level 3 NCEA. Furthermore, fewer ākonga choose to take the Kōrero (speaking) internal assessment compared to the Whakarongo (listening) and Waihanga Tuhinga (writing) internal assessments across all NCEA levels. Lastly, discussions have surfaced from kaiako of te reo Māori (teachers of te reo Māori), in the Waitaha (Canterbury) region, regarding the suitability of some NCEA assessments for second language learners learning te reo Māori. Therefore the research question of this study seeks to find: What should a culturally appropriate assessment framework for NCEA Te reo Māori comprise of? How can this be achieved and by whom?

This research heard the thoughts, feelings and experiences of te reo Māori kaiako (Māori language teacher/s) who taught and assessed in English medium secondary schools in Waitaha. It is through their lens and the work of researchers that the research questions will find clarity.

Within this opening chapter, there is a brief synopsis of the national method of assessment of the past, otherwise known as School Certificate, Sixth Form Certificate, University Entrance and Bursary. These assessment tools of the past deserted subjects such as te reo Māori within secondary schools. Proceeding this, is an overview of the current method of national assessment, The National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) including the alignment of te reo Māori NCEA to the new curriculum document, Te Aho Arataki Marau mō te Ako
i Te Reo Māori – Kura Aukaki: Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools. NCEA’s former and present position within our English medium secondary schools will provide information including different terminologies used for assessments. Proceeding this overview, is a personal introduction providing a brief background to who I am. Lastly, an outline on the structure of this research will be presented.

1.1 NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF THE PAST

From the mid 1930’s, School Certificate was introduced and eventually launched in 1945 as a Form 5 (Year 11 today) formal method of assessing within secondary schools in New Zealand / Aotearoa (NZQA, n.d.a). Nevertheless, Māori language was not offered as a subject in secondary schools until in the 1970’s (Benton, 1997). This had come after a long suffering history of assimilation of Māori language and culture into the dominant Pākehā society by government policies that followed not long after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Governor Grey’s 1847 Education Ordinance provided subsidies for church schools to be boarding schools, enabling them to accommodate Māori children and to keep them away from “the demoralising influences of their villages” (Walker, 1979, p. 1). By 1867, the Native Schools Act allowed schools to use “English as the medium of instruction, displacing Māori language altogether” (Walker, 1979, p.1). By the early 1900’s the impact of these policies resulted in English being the main syllabus of instruction and the central subject in schools (Soler, 2000), furthermore, “children were forbidden to speak Māori within the precincts of the school… teachers administered corporal punishment to children who failed to comply…” (Walker, 1979, p. 1). Government policies and the practices of schools from the mid 1800’s to the late 1900’s had been determined by the inferior Pākehā language and culture. Johnstone (1997) described,

...education for Māori [had] been determined by Pākehā, resulting in policies specifying particular criteria which Māori needed to meet in order to ‘achieve’. These criteria have been designed by Pākehā according to their own values and belief
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systems, culminating in Pākehā interpretations of suitable educational initiatives for Māori…these initiatives are based on the criteria of the dominant group, they are unrealistic and alienate Māori (p. 84).

When Māori language was implemented as a subject in secondary schools in the 1970’s, it continued to face adversity. Hana O’Regan (2011) described that, “te reo Māori was allowed back into the classrooms and could be taken as a subject for national qualifications, it was relegated to the back seats of the academic waka – as a no-academic subject” (p. 37). Therefore, Māori language was not considered as an academic subject, according to the national qualifications practiced within secondary schools.

As previously stated, School Certificate, Sixth Form Certificate, University Entrance and Bursary were the standardised method of national assessment from the mid 1940’s. These assessments were controversial especially for Māori language as a learning subject. These assessments did not consider ākonga performance in “a wide range of competencies and skills… Exam marks were scaled so that only a certain number of students could pass each year and internal assessments results scaled to match external assessment results…” (New Zealand Qualification Authority [NZQA], n.d.a, para. 2). It was claimed that this scaling system was unfair and was a “major source of racial bias” (The Treaty Resource Centre, 1984, p. 1), especially to Māori students and the Māori language, as Māori language as a subject was ranked at the bottom (The Treaty Resource Centre, 1984). Subsequently, the scaling system made it difficult for students who were learning te reo Māori to achieve high marks, including students who were in the 90 percentile range who gained a B grade (O’Regan, 2011).
Table 1: School Certificate pass rates by subject grouping 1974-1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Foreign Languages</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Science</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-hand/Typing</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeping</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Drawing</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Textiles</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typewriting</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodwork</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maori</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Pass Rate</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 1974 Department of Education, 1975
1975 Department of Education, 1976b
1976 Department of Education, 1977
1977 Department of Education, 1978
1978 Department of Education, 1979
1979 Department of Education, 1980a
1980 Department of Education, 1980b


Table 1 showed School Certificate pass rates from 1974 to 1980. Subjects were scaled in a hierarchical order, where Māori language was visibly at the bottom. Furthermore, over the seven year period, the percentage of students who passed Māori language dropped from just under 50% of ākonga in 1974 to just over 39% in 1980. Nevertheless, the opposite trend can be seen for subjects that were scaled at the top of the ranking order. Latin, French and other foreign languages in particular saw a considerable increase in pass rates over the seven year period. Despite the inclusion of Māori language into secondary school education and
national assessment, it was claimed that School Certificate did more harm to young Māori students (The Treaty Resource Centre, 1984).

Throughout the 60 years of School Certificate assessment, subjects were not treated equally and fairly and existed in a hierarchical ranking system and te reo Māori was at the bottom. This ranking system scaled subjects so that only a certain number of students could pass assessments (NZQA, n.d.a), and made it difficult for students who were learning te reo Māori to achieve (O’Regan, 2011).

1.2 NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF TODAY

Between 2002 and 2004, secondary education in Aotearoa experienced the inception of National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) as the new assessment tool for learning subjects in secondary schools. NCEA replaced the controversial assessment method of School Certificate that had existed since the 1940’s (Te Ara, n.d.).

NCEA sits under the maru (protection) of the New Zealand Qualification Authority (NZQA) and according to the New Zealand Office of the Auditor General (2012) NZQA, “are responsible for national administration of external assessments (examinations), including producing, marking, and returning examination booklets to secondary school students; and [is responsible for] external moderation of students’ work that contributes to internal assessment for NCEA” (p. 7). NCEA was designed to offer ākonga more of a mixture of internal and external assessments (which is further explained in this chapter) for all subjects in Years 11, 12 and 13. This method of assessing provided, “schools [with] the flexibility to develop a range of programmes to suit the specific needs of their students...” (NZQA, n.d.b). NCEA used two forms of assessment: achievement standards and unit standards. They are described as,

Achievement standards are based on The New Zealand Curriculum... and can be either internally or externally assessed. Students who achieve a standard are awarded “achieved”, “merit”, or “excellence” according to their performance. If a
student does not achieve a standard, their work is graded as “not achieved (New Zealand. Office of the Auditor General, 2012, p. 9).

A majority of unit standards credits are earned through vocational pathways. For many unit standards, grades awarded are Achieved and Not Achieved (NZQA, n.d.c). The focus of this research will be NCEA achievement standards assessed for Levels 1, 2 and 3 te reo Māori.

Between 2011 and 2014 NCEA achievement standards were aligned with the new NZC. Te reo Māori as a learning subject in English medium schools had its own curriculum called Te Aho Arataki Marau mō te Ako i Te Reo Māori – Kura Auraki: Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools (the Marau). Te reo Māori achievement standards were aligned to this document and the external assessment specifications for te reo Māori eventually changed from prescribed topics to generic topics.

Between the implementation years of 2011 and 2014, ākonga sitting achievement standards in the subject te reo Māori were required to collect pieces of assessment evidence in order to create a portfolio of work. Ākonga in NCEA Levels 1 (Year 11), Level 2 (Year 12) and Level 3 (Year 13) were required to collect three pieces of evidence for each internal achievement standard – Whakarongo (listening), Waihanga Tuhiinga (writing), Kōrero (speaking). In 2017, pieces of evidence required for each internal achievement standard dropped to two pieces of evidence. Ākonga were also able sit two external examinations in November/ early December – Pānui (reading) and Tuhituhi. These external examinations were administered by NZQA.

1.3 TYPES OF ASSESSMENT
Within NCEA there are two types of assessment, internal assessment and external assessment.
1.3.1 Internal Assessment

Internal assessments are conducted within school. These assessments focused on skills and knowledge that cannot be assessed in an examination, like that of research assignments and speeches (NZQA, n.d.e). Internal assessments also “encourages learning by inquiry” (NZQA, n.d.b). NZQA encouraged, “assessors [to] use innovative, valid and fair ways of recognising achievement without overburdening themselves or the learner with too much assessment” (NZQA, n.d.d). Exemplars of internal assessments were provided but limited and some were found on ‘Te Kete Ipurangi’ (TKI) website. This website, produced by the Ministry of Education, published internal assessment exemplars for different achievement standards across all learning subjects and levels of NCEA. There is an expectation for kaiako to modify these exemplars and/or to use them as a guide to create their own because ākonga also have access to the TKI website.

According to Anne Davis (n.d.e, as cited in NZQA, n.d.e), an expert in assessment, she stated that it was very important for kaiako to action “a process to create and articulate their assessment criteria and clarify curriculum expectations through the development of [their own] exemplars” (NZQA, n.d.e). Creating assessments connected to the learning content of a classroom created authentic assessment rather than assessing for the sake of assessing. NZQA (n.d.e) stated, “building close links between the learning process and assessment allows teachers or assessors to engage in assessment for better learning”.

Internal assessment can also include a number of assessments to be collected over a period of time for certain achievement standards. This was called ‘assessment over time’.

1.3.2 Assessment over time

The internal assessments of te reo Māori fall into the ‘assessment over time’ model. This is where learners collected pieces of evidence of work throughout a period of time, producing a portfolio of work. Specifically for te reo Māori, ākonga can produce a portfolio of work for each of the achievement standards across Levels 1, 2 and 3, Whakarongo, Kōrero and Waihanga Tuhinga. Throughout the collection
of evidence, assessors were able to provide feedback and feedforward to learners. Feedback and feedforward are further discussed in the Literature Review chapter.

This model was also intended to show progress of learning of the ākonga from the beginning of the year to the final date of submission. NZQA (n.d.e) described that, “evidence is accumulated over time [and] assessors will provide feedback and feedforward at regular intervals during the preparation of a final version for assessment, thus building their knowledge of learner competence”. NZQA (n.d.e) also stated that, “assessment for qualifications does not have to be by a separate event. One off assessment, like that of an external assessment, is likely to be less reliable than a range of assessments”.

Once internal assessments were completed and marked, marks were verified by a moderator or another specialised teacher of that subject. Predominately in mainstream secondary schools, there is only one te reo Māori kaiako, therefore, moderation would normally occur with another kaiako from another school. Moderation is a process requirement from NZQA and is further discussed in the Literature Review and Data Stories chapters.

1.3.3 External Assessment
Like te reo Māori, most NCEA subjects have an end of year examination. Ākonga who undertook these examinations sit a three hour exam for each subject, at the same time. NZQA contract kaiako and other experts to write and mark examinations (NZQA, n.d.e).

1.3.4 Mix of Internal and External Assessment
Depending on the school, the subject and the achievement standards selected to be assessed, ākonga have the opportunity to undertake a mix of internal and external assessments. This opportunity allowed ākonga to have some flexibility with assessments according to individual strength.

The mixture of internal and external assessments for all subjects across Levels 1, 2 and 3, “...was developed to enable maximum flexibility for schools to design
programmes that meet the diverse needs of all their students" (Hipkins & Spiller, 2012, p. 4). The mix of internal and external assessment is commonly the preferred option.

1.4 PERSONAL STATEMENT
I am a New Zealand first born generation Pacific Islander, born and raised in Ōtāutahi (Christchurch). I am of Niuean descent, where both my parents immigrated from Niue in the mid 1970's and were fluent speakers of Niuean and English. Although I attended Niuean language nests when I was younger, the spoken language at home was English. Nevertheless, education was important and pursuing education would enable a better future.

I attended the local primary school where my education was taught in English. Te reo Māori was not formally taught, however the odd waiata (song) like Pōkarekare Ana was taught. Although the primary school I attended had a small number of Māori and Pacific ākonga, the majority of the school was Pākehā.

My secondary education was at an all-girls Catholic secondary school where te reo Māori was taught for one term in Form 3 (Year 9) and French and Latin were full year option subjects. Like my primary school, there were a small number of Māori and Pacific ākonga, and the majority of the school was Pākehā. Nevertheless, I was encouraged to work hard at school.

Upon reflection, I never had a strong sense of my cultural identity. I was Niuean with brown skin, English was my first language and I couldn’t speak my mother tongue. My education from primary school to secondary school was taught under a westernised education setting. Nevertheless, I was and still am internally grateful for all the opportunities my parents gave me.

After a gap year, I enrolled at the University of Canterbury to pursue a Bachelor of Arts Degree. In my first year I enrolled in a stage one te reo Māori paper. It was in this class that I felt a sense of cultural belonging. The strong whakawhanaungatanga (kinship) that was formed under kaupapa Māori (Māori
knowledge) between my class mates and our lecturers filled a cultural void that existed within me. Although I was not Māori, I was accepted as one of the whānau (family).

I continued to learn te reo Māori through to stage three, graduated and enrolled into the one year Post Graduate Diploma in Teaching and Learning to become a secondary teacher. I now have 19 years teaching experience where I have taught te reo Māori, Mathematics and Religious Education. I am also a Dean. Most of my ākonga who are in my te reo Māori classes are second language learners and have taken this subject for varying reasons. For some, they are pursuing a career path that will require them to have knowledge in te reo and tikanga Māori, for example, education and nursing. For others, they enjoy learning te reo Māori. However, I have a number of ākonga who are of Māori descent and are wanting to learn their language, as their parents did not learn te reo Māori for one reason or another. For some parents and grandparents, they grew up in the generation where they were punished for using te reo Māori at school. It is because of this reason, that teaching te reo Māori became more than a vocation. It is an opportunity to promote social justice of the past injustices that was once inflicted onto the language, by returning back the cultural knowledge that was once taken away by education by past government policies is now being taught to the future generation.

Subsequently, a majority of ākonga who learn te reo Māori in English medium secondary schools are second language learners and are assessed under NCEA. As a kaikō, I have observed, heard and experienced the difficulties that come with implementing internal assessments and preparing ākonga for the external examinations for te reo Māori. This is the reasoning for this study.

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THIS STUDY
The introduction provided an overview to the historical and the current face of national assessment for te reo Māori in English medium secondary schools and the influence these methods of assessment had on te reo Māori as a teaching and learning subject for second language learners. Proceeding the overview of the past and present assessment, is the background knowledge of the researcher through the
personal statement. Chapter two, the literature review, will present research regarding internal and external assessment, teaching and learning and the workload of te reo Māori kaiako. Following the literature review, chapter three presents the research methodology and will discuss the relevance of qualitative research and qualitative individual interviews for this type of research. The interweaving of Kaupapa Māori research within the methodology, will also be explained. The method will also provide insight to the steps taken to produce this study. Chapter four will present the main themes from the data stories of the researched kaiako who participated in this study. Their thoughts, feelings and experiences as te reo Māori kaiako teaching second language learners in English medium secondary schools were gathered and analysed repeatedly allowing sub-themes and main themes to appear. These themes were further woven into the literature review which formed the discussion in chapter five. Lastly, chapter six is the conclusion of this study. The research questions will be discussed within this chapter, including the limitations and ideas for further research.

1.6 CONCLUSION

Te reo Māori became a learning subject in secondary school education in the 1970’s. At that time, the language was formally assessed under School Certificate. Although te reo Māori was not considered as an academic learning subject because it was ranked at the bottom of the subject rankings and scaling system. The scaling system dictated the number of ākonga permitted to pass for each subject. Latin, French and other foreign languages were learning subjects ranked at the top.

The face of national assessment changed between 2002 and 2004 with the inception of NCEA. This launched the mixed method of assessment through internal and external assessment. Internal assessments were internally assessed by the classroom kaiako and were conducted throughout the school year. The external examinations were set by outside examiners, otherwise known as NZQA. Te reo Māori was an achievement standards subject and it consisted of a mix of internal and external assessments. However between 2011 and 2014 NCEA was aligned to the new curriculum document and, the method of internal assessments changed for te reo Māori from one off assessment to a portfolio of work for each achievement
standard. This research will provide more detail about NCEA and the affects it had on te reo Māori, on te reo Māori kaiako who taught in English medium secondary schools and their ākonga, where most were second language learners.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Ko te manu e kai ana i te mātauranga, nōna te ao. The bird that partakes in education reigns the world. This whakataukī emphasises that obtaining knowledge can be powerful and influential. The manu in this context are the researchers who have researched education, and it was their work that was used within this literature review. This chapter will interweave research regarding workload of te reo Māori kaiako and how workload contributed to the demands of being the te reo Māori kaiako. NZQA data will sit alongside further research that will examine possible reasons why fewer ākonga have opted to complete the Kōrero internal assessment across all year levels. This will be followed by exploring professional learning development for kaiako. Finally, the literature review will highlight Government strategies and initiatives that have been created to enhance te reo Māori and our Māori learners.

2.1 PRESSURES
Kaiako who teach te reo Māori are unique kaiako who often have knowledge of tikanga Māori and are called upon to take on cultural practices within the wider school. Te reo Māori is normally an option subject in English medium schools and ākonga numbers determine the classroom setting. Within a secondary setting, kaiako and ākonga are bound by NCEA assessments.

2.1.1 Extra workload
The New Zealand Educational Institute (NZEI) and the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers’ Association (NZPPTA) unions have consistently highlighted high teacher workload in both primary and secondary schools and was prominently argued in 2019 during the primary and secondary teacher contract negotiations with the government. Te reo Māori kaiako were called to perform different roles which increased their normal teaching workload and it continues to be problematic for kaiako (NZPPTA, 2016).

The extra workload fulfilled by te reo Māori kaiako has been an ongoing issue for many years. In 1997, Associate Education Minister Brian Donnelly expressed that
Māori kaiako had a higher workload because they were the only bicultural resource within their school and so they were the expert on Māori language and cultural practices. He continued to state that Māori kaiako were more skilled at running Kapa Haka and they were also the vital connection between school, Māori ākonga and their whānau and the wider Māori community, especially in a pastoral role. The Education Review Office (2012) described that, “Māori teachers often undertake additional formal and informal responsibilities beyond their immediate teaching work. These responsibilities include the support of Māori students generally and assistance with the cultural life of the school” (p. 4). The additional support provided by te reo Māori kaiako were official or unofficial roles, meaning that kaiako were either remunerated with management unit(s) and/or time allowance or neither.

The findings described above, were also reflected in Toni Torepe’s research (2011, as cited in Torepe and Manning, 2018), where it discussed the causes and effects of cultural taxation on Māori kaiako in the Waitaha region. The participants of Torepe’s research described that they,

were frequently expected, by their employers and colleagues to organise and facilitate Māori cultural events in their schools and to attend to issues involving Māori cultural activities without renumeration or acknowledgement. Hence, they believed that they had been culturally taxed (p. 117).

Torepe (2011, as cited in Torepe and Manning, 2018) continued to state that, “cultural tasks placed considerable pressure on the Māori teachers… [and] cultural taxation increased their workloads in ways that they considered harmful to their physical, emotional and spiritual wellbeing (p. 117). The extra cultural demands that Māori kaiako “felt culturally obliged” (Torepe & Manning, 2018, p. 117) to complete, created pressure and personal challenges for Māori kaiako. Torepe and Manning further expressed that 50% of Torepe’s research participants were no longer kaiako and had left the profession. This illustrated the effect of a heavy
workload on Māori kaiako and the difficulty of maintaining and enticing te reo Māori kaiako into the profession.

Due to the heavy workload, being a te reo Māori kaiako was not an attractive job (Kupenga, 2019), therefore, there was a need to entice more Māori speakers to join the profession. Another need was to strengthen other kaiako to be culturally competent. Education Conversation (2019) suggested that there needed to be more support for Māori kaiako, such as, reducing workload and paying additional remuneration to recognise the extra work and the vital role kaiako play, and so this would entice more te reo Māori speakers into the teaching profession. Education Conversation (2019) further stated,

There is a need for more professional development and compulsory education for teachers in te reo Māori and Tikanga Māori so Māori values can be brought to the classroom. Calls were made for better teacher training and professional development, more teachers who can speak te reo Māori and who use culturally responsive teaching and learning practices (p. 3).

Although there was a need for more kaiako of te reo Māori, there was also a need to provide more professional learning of te reo and tikanga Māori to all kaiako, in order to have more culturally responsive kaiako. Torepe, Macfarlane, Macfarlane, Fletcher and Manning (2018) stated that, “sustained, proactive and planned school wide professional development in culturally responsive pedagogies would [have] help[ed] mitigate the complex issues that confront[ed] [these] Māori teachers” (p. 56). Therefore, upskilled culturally competent kaiako could assist with school wide cultural practices, other than the Māori kaiako. However, expressed in the research of Torepe et al. (2018), Torepe’s research participants facilitated the culturally responsive professional learning development within their schools, which increased their workload. Nevertheless, upskilling in culturally responsive pedagogy such as te reo and tikanga Māori were also available through night classes, however this can be difficult for kaiako who have worked a full day teaching. Teacher funded release times to attend te reo and tikanga Māori classes during school hours would
prove the importance of these types of professional learning development (Neville, 2018). Te Ahu o te reo Māori – fostering education in te reo Māori was a government initiative that has been established to strengthen and grow te reo Māori.

Te Ahu o te reo Māori is a professional development programme that supported the Governments obligation to increase, support and normalise te reo Māori in all education settings, where te reo Māori will be spoken and heard by all learners by 2025. (Ministry of Education, 2019a). It was directed to all kaiako, including non-teaching and support staff from early childhood to secondary schools, from English and Māori medium. These courses were offered within four regions of Aotearoa as it was projected that there will be Māori population growth in these regions. There was no cost for this course, however a small amount of funding was available to eligible people to cover the cost of relief of kaiako while on the course. In 2018, the government funded $11.4 million over three years for this course to operate (Ministry of Education, 2019a). The Ministry of Education also expressed that Te Ahu o te reo Māori sits along side other initiatives such as Ka Hikitia and Tau Mai Te Reo.

### 2.1.2 Multi-year levelled composition

Composite classes comprise of multi-year levelled classes, meaning more than one year level is taught in the same class at the same time with one kaiako. This teaching environment was otherwise known as mixed-year levelled, mixed grade or multi-grade teaching. Composite classes may exist due to smaller ākonga numbers learning the subject, and according to Lloyd (1997), these classes were also created due to financial contraints. Chamberlain (1993, as cited in Hamilton and Wilkinson, 2003) stated that, “New Zealand has a higher percentage of composite classes than most countries” (p. 221), and most of these classes exist in primary schools (Wagemaker, 1993).

Research has illustrated that there are disadvantages to composite classes. Engin and Ege Univeristy (2018) described these disadvantages as,
...The heavy burden of the teacher, lack of time, difficulty in showing individual attention to the students, difficulty in planning the teaching... not being able to receive in-service training and consultancy, dealing with non teaching tasks... not being able to individualize the teaching (p. 178).

The issue of sharing teaching and learning time between multiple year levelled groups contributed to small amounts of one on one teaching with individuals while trying to respond to the different needs of the class. Lloyd (1997) stated that kaiako who taught in composite classes had a greater workload as kaiako used more time planning and preparing learning programmes. Hamilton and Wilkinson (2003) suggested that, “composite classes might stretch teachers’ capacities to respond to the diversity of instructional needs among students...” (p. 223). The added workload can also increase the possibility of teacher burnout (Lloyd 1997).

Another area that has also arisen from research on composite classes was ākonga achievement. Hamilton and Wilkinson (2003) indicated there can be consequences for teaching and learning for ākonga who learn in composite classes. Kaya and Tasdemieri (2005, as cited in Engin and Ege University, 2018) expressed that the little growth of literacy of ākonga in composite classes is a consequence, because kaiako who taught in composite classes faced more challenges with teaching literacy than single year levelled classes. The cause of this was lack of time for planning and teaching to the diverse range of ākonga who have different skills and needs. In order for kaiako to be confident with teaching in composite classes, there needs to be more experienced kaiako who are able to teach effectively in multi-year levelled classroom environment.

Lloyd (1997) stated that kaiako who had more experience with teaching composite classes, were likely to be more positive about teaching in multi-year levelled classes. Therefore kaiako who were not as experienced with teaching in composite classes could use professional learning development for assistance. Veenman and Raemakers (1995, as cited in Engin & Ege University, 2018) found in their research that their participants who interacted in their professional learning programme on
teaching mixed aged classes (composite classes) saw an improvement with teaching and managing these classes. Therefore the need to participate in professional learning development about teaching in composite classes maybe of value. This was also suggested for kaiako who were training to become kaiako. Undergraduate (and postgraduate for Aotearoa) teaching programmes should provide knowledge on how to teach in composite classes (Engin & Ege University, 2018), such as sending them to schools with composite classes during their teaching sections (Lloyd, 1997). With professional learning and support, effective teaching strategies with teaching in composite classes can be strengthened.

Hamilton and Wilkinson (2003) expressed that an important element to ākonga learning in composite classes was the kaiako. Being highly organised with thoroughly prepared learning programmes could assist with effective teaching. Engin and Ege University (2018), wrote about research conducted by The Office of Educational Research and Improvement in Virginia, the United States of America where they described effective methods of teaching in multi-grade classes. One suggestion was organising ākonga to work in groups and providing those groups with considerable and meaningful independent work while the kaiako work with another group. This research also suggested kaiako organise seating arrangements, assign suitable ākonga as peer tutors, have clear behaviour expectations, be fully prepared before ākonga arrive to class and to have an encouraging and positive attitude.

2.1.3 External examinations
Research has indicated that examinations are not an effective method of assessing cultural minority students, in particular Māori ākonga. Mahuika, Berryman, and Bishop (2011) expressed, “it has been acknowledged that traditional time constrained pencil and paper test have proved unreliable indicators of Māori achievement in the past” (p. 194). The effects of the assessment method of school certificate are past memories where minority subjects, like te reo Māori, were not able to flourish. Time tested writing such as examinations also discriminated against second language learners as it limited what ākonga could produce, as ākonga were required to recall what they could remember (Hamp-Lyons & Condon,
Second language learners who learnt te reo Māori in English medium secondary schools, started at Level 1 of the Marau at Year 9. By Year 11, ākonga were expected to be working at and using grammar at Level 6, therefore ākonga were expected to learn and achieve six curriculum levels in two years.

Furthermore, examinations required ākonga to perform at their best at that time and in the environment prescribed by outside examiners (Cumming, 2002). Therefore pressure was a symptom of examinations for both ākonga and kaiako. The expectation that kaiako had fully prepared their ākonga to sit examinations was a sizeable responsibility (East & Scott, 2011). External examinations defined by H. Douglas Brown (1994, as cited in Ogino, 2011) were assessments that needed to show reliability, practicality and validity, where reliability of the test needed to show consistency and dependability. Reliability was defined by Te Kete Ipurangi (n.d.) as “the extent to which the results from the same assessment can be repeated across time and situations, statistically expressed” (para. 17). Reliability was important for external and internal assessments. Another area questioned about reliability was the Whakarongo internal assessment.

Changing the Whakarongo internal assessment to an external examination in order to improve reliability and validity has been discussed. Other language subjects, such as Japanese externally assess Whakarongo. However, Chang (2008) described, “...high stakes listening comprehension tests [are] particularly stressful” (p. 2). Another factor to consider with whakarongo being a one off examination was the use of audio recording in a suitable setting. Taylor and Geranpayeh (2011) described that, “if the recorded material is standardised in this way, the acoustic suitability of the room in which the listening comprehension test takes place may impact on the performance of test takers” (p. 99). It may also be argued that using audio recording in an examination does not enhance the reality of listening to the language in a real-life situation. Bachman and Palmer (1996, as cited in East & King, 2012) concluded that, “if a listening test is to be useful for its intended purpose and is to be ‘authentic’, the test needs to be measure performance that captures in a representative way language use in non-test situations” (p. 209). Therefore in order to make whakarongo authentic, ākonga should listen to the
language in an everyday setting, where they could complete a task or produce an item, rather than an assessment. Taylor and Geranpayeh (2011) also suggested that replicating listening around real-life situations with the use of facial expressions and gestures may not be depicted in an audio recording.

### 2.2 KÖRERO

NZQA data showed fewer ākonga completed the Kōrero internal assessment across Levels 1, 2 and 3 and the data is represented in Tables 2, 3 and 4 where the results of the achievement standards are based from 2018 results.

#### TABLE 2 - 2018 National Data for NCEA Level 1
te reo Māori Internal Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 1</th>
<th>RESULT RATE</th>
<th>RESULT COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement Standard</td>
<td>Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōrero 91086</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōrero 91086</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōrero 91086</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuhituhi 91089</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuhituhi 91089</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuhituhi 91089</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2 shows the results for 2018 internal assessments for achievement standards for Level 1. Different versions of internal assessments were used in 2018, however the same achievement standards were assessed. Small cohort explained by NZQA (n.d.f) is where there were less than 30 ākonga who completed the assessment. Fewer ākonga completed the Kōrero internal assessment compared to the total
number of ākonga who completed Whakarongo, (where most ākonga in Level 1 completed) and Tuhituhi (Otherwise known as Waihanga Tuhinga).

**TABLE 3 - 2018 National Data for NCEA Level 2**

**te reo Māori Internal Assessments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 2</th>
<th>RESULT RATE</th>
<th>RESULT COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement Standard Version</td>
<td>Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōrero 91285</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōrero 91285</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōrero 91285</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuhituhi 91288</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuhituhi 91288</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3 shows the results for 2018 internal assessments for achievement standards for Level 2. Different versions of internal assessments were used in 2018, however the same achievement standards were assessed. Fewer ākonga completed the Kōrero internal assessment compared to the total number of ākonga who completed Tuhituhi (otherwise known as Waihanga Tuhinga, where most ākonga in Level 2 completed) and Whakarongo.
TABLE 4 - 2018 National Data for NCEA Level 3
te reo Māori Internal Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 3</th>
<th>RESULT RATE</th>
<th>RESULT COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement Standard Version</td>
<td>Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōrero 91651</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōrero 91651</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuhihu 91654</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuhihu 91654</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakarongo 91650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakarongo 91650</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4 shows the results for 2018 internal assessments for achievement standards for Level 3. Different versions of internal assessments were used in 2018, however the same achievement standards were assessed. Again, fewer ākonga completed the Kōrero internal assessment compared to the total number of ākonga who completed Tuhihu (Waihanga Tuhiha, where most ākonga in Level 3 completed) and Whakarongo.

Fewer ākonga nationally across Levels 1, 2 and 3 chose to complete the Kōrero internal assessment compared to the total amount of ākonga who completed Whakarongo and Waihanga Tuhiha. Berryman and Glynn (2003) recognised that second language learners have limited support of fluent speakers and described,

...Most Māori students need to learn their own language as a second language, embedded within a dominant and monolingual (English) language environment, both at school and in the wider community. However, most of these students also lack access to a parent generation that speaks Māori fluently (p. 77).
As explained in my introduction, many of my second language learners were not exposed in the language at home and so, teaching and learning time in the classroom was the main setting where the language was heard and spoken. Subsequently, ākonga required a learning setting where they felt safe to develop their skills to kōrero, in order to grow their confidence to speak the language. A setting such as this can be impeded by the obligations of assessments.

2.2.1 Lack of confidence to speak the language
According to research, progress in learning a second language can be affected by the age of the learner, their personality characteristics and their self-confidence, particularly with kōrero. Lightbown and Spada (2010) suggested that, “inhibition discourages risk taking, which is necessary for progress in language learning … this is more often to be a particular problem for adolescents, who are more self-conscious than younger learners” (p. 61). Many rangatahi (youth) become more self conscious to speak in te reo Māori in front of their peers, due to the fear of saying something incorrectly, therefore they were likely to hold back and become whakamā (shy). Lightbown and Spada (2010) continued to express that with speeches,

... [They] are more likely to find themselves in situations that demand more complex language and the expression of more complicated ideas... [and] are often embarrassed by their lack of mastery of the language and they may develop a sense of inadequacy (p. 68).

Additionally when ākonga were unable to use complex language structures and/or depth to their kōrero they became whakamā and lacked confidence thus reluctant to kōrero in the language. Therefore, more time learning the language to process and practice what they had learnt was needed to help support their confidence and their proficiency in speaking the language.
Merrill Swain’s (1981, as cited in Chaudron, 1988) research of the learning time differences of L1 (first language learners) and L2 (second language learners) stated, that oral and written tests of L2 learners showed less proficiency levels due to the smaller amount of contact time in the language compared to L1 learners. May, Hill, and Tiakiwai (2006) expressed similar findings. Their research connected to immersion levels of te reo Māori where it measured the time ākonga were exposed to in the language. Ākonga who were immersed in the language between 20 and up to 25 hours in a week were classified as Level 1 immersion. Level 2 immersion ākonga were learning the language from 12.5 hours and up to 20 hours a week and Level 3 from 7.5 hours to 12.5 hours. May et al., (2006) expressed that there was a lack of effectiveness of learning a second language when learning in immersion Levels 3 and 4. This view was also reinforced by research conducted by Erlam and Sakui (2006), where assessing oral production placed demands on teaching and time, due to the lack of time. They expressed, “Teacher C commented on the difficulty of assessing oral production. The secondary school teachers demonstrated a clear concern with the demands of formal assessment” (p. 41).

Assessing kōrero placed high demands on ākonga, especially when ākonga were striving to achieve high NCEA grades, like that of Excellence and, or Merit. Therefore rote learning speeches and/or conversations became a consequence of formal assessment.

2.2.2 Kōrero promoted rote learning rather than conversation
Ākonga rote memorised sentence structures, patterns and rules in order to use these correctly within their written and spoken work (Erlam & Sakium, 2006). This method also increased their chance of achieving a higher grade in an examination and/or test, which was supported by Lightbown and Spada (2010) where they expressed, “in some cases the learner’s goal may be to pass an examination rather than to use the language for daily communicative interaction beyond the classroom” (p. 109)

In 2011, certificates of endorsement were included in NCEA (Hipkins et al., 2016), where ākonga could strive to achieve 50 credits or more at Merit or Excellence
level, in order to achieve an overall Merit or Excellence endorsement at Levels 1, 2 and 3. The Merit and Excellence grades was obtained from any subject that assessed using achievement standard assessments. Hipkins et al. (2016) also explained subject course endorsement were awarded when ākonga achieved 14 Merit and/or Excellence grades, providing that at least three credits came from one internal and one external assessment. This was an additive enticement to ākonga who were striving to achieve higher grades. Furthermore, for those who were planning to attend University at the end of Year 13, Excellence endorsements were favourable for scholarships. However, a review of NCEA has prompted the reducing of the number of Achievement Standards offered to ākonga in order to help with workload and over assessment.

2.2.3 Reduced NCEA credits

Over assessment of ākonga has become more recognisable and was part of the discussion of the NCEA review in 2018. Hipkins et al. (2016) stated, “reducing the numbers of credits assessed in courses needs a strong collegial culture in which everyone agrees to lower totals in order to enhance students’ learning experience...[and] to alleviate over-assessment or teachers’ workloads” (p. 186). The Government commenced a review on the future of NCEA, where engagement occurred for schools across Aotearoa. In 2019, the engagement findings were published, and the findings have stated that NCEA will most likely see a number of changes take place. Some examples of these possible changes will see schools offering NCEA Level 1 as an optional level and the number of credits offered at Levels 1 and 2 should not exceed 120 credits and at Level 3, 100 credits (Kōrero Mātauranga, 2019). Some schools have already offer reduced credits less than the amount stated, furthermore schools have the option not to offer NCEA Level 1. Nonetheless, the reduced credits will mean that some Achievement Standards assessments may not be offered.

2.3 PROFESSIONAL LEARNING DEVELOPMENT

Ehara taku toa i te toa tikitahi, engari he toa tikitini. My strength is not that of a single warrior, but that of many. It is through the support of other kaiaiko and educational organisations that provide professional learning for kaiaiko. This
support can appear informal or formal, but it is important that all kaiako are willing participants in professional learning throughout their teaching career. There are different forms of professional learning development and support such as workshops, courses, subject cluster groups, electronic support, senior kaiako and senior management are to name a few. Connecting with some of these forms of support required money. Although in English medium secondary schools, many subject departments have more than one specialised kaiako within their department and so support was easily accessible.

2.3.1 Other kaiako of te reo Māori support

Murrow et al. (2007), published findings from primary school kaiako who participated in the Ministry funded Te reo Māori in the Mainstream Professional Development Pilot Programmes. This programme provided professional development in te reo and tikanga Māori, teaching and assessment planning, second language acquisition and offered future support. Kaiako who participated in this pilot programme recognised barriers that limited them from taking up that support offered. The barrier identified was limited time. In order to receive this support, kaiako needed to travel. This described how most te reo Māori kaiako access support, by travelling to other te reo Māori kaiako at other schools.

There are multiple kaiako in a school who taught core teaching subjects, such as English, Mathematics, Science and Social Sciences. Te reo Māori kaiako in English medium schools are commonly the only te reo Māori kaiako and they travelled to other kaiako at other schools in order to gain professional support for te reo Māori.

DuFour and Eaker (1998 as cited in Blase and Blase, 2006) stated that flexibility with time in order to meet was limited for kaiako. However, like the funded pilot programmes previously described, funded professional days throughout the teaching year provided an opportunity for kaiako to meet collectively and to work collaboratively on teaching and learning programmes and assessments. One provider that assisted with kaiako professional support was Ako Panuku.
Ako Panuku is a Ministry of Education initiative that provided professional learning workshops and professional learning funding. Ako Panuku (n.d.a) was described as,

A Ministry of Education sponsored initiative responding to a Ministerial Review which found that Māori secondary teachers often take on responsibilities [beyond their teaching roles] which lead to additional workload stress. Ako Panuku aims to reduce the impact of workload by providing culturally relevant support designed to acknowledge the critical contribution Māori teachers make to education and the achievement of Māori students (para. 1).

Ako Panuku assisted and supported Te Kahui ā-Rohe (regional teacher cluster groups) where, “regional clusters support Māori language teachers at a local level. Clusters generally meet each term to plan together or workshop new teaching ideas. Clusters are also a great way to access moderation support and share resources” (Ako Panuku, n.d.b). Facilitators of each cluster group could apply for funded or part funded kaiako release days which covered the cost of relievers. It enabled te reo Māori kaiako to meet together during school hours to collaborate, learn further language teaching strategies and provide support for one another especially with assessments. It provided the opportunity and time to develop and create assessments collectively, as Jamentz (1996) described, that assessment development was normally done in “isolation” (p.58), by those who were the only kaiako of their subject and so funding assisted with the elimination of the isolation. In order for this valuable professional learning development time to continue, further long term funding is required (Collins, 1991). Ako Panuku also have a range of courses and workshops available for English and Māori medium kaiako, including electronic resources to assist with planning and assessment. A number of courses were available for te reo Māori, including NCEA workshops for kaiako new to NCEA.
Professional learning development were established in order to support kaiako, however more importantly the benefits will be seen in the classroom. Timperley et al. (2007) stated, “... considerable evidence that positive outcomes for students are typically associated with professional development that increases teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge in the context of the focus on the teaching and learning relationship” (p. 230). Therefore the support and learning during professional learning and support of colleagues has a positive outcome for ākonga too.

2.3.2 Tuakana - teina support

Tuakana-teina support is a Māori concept and the meaning was similar to a relationship between a mentor and mentee, otherwise known as peer mentoring. The tuakana, who has more experience supports and encourages the teina who is less experienced, and in this context, it is the experienced kaiako who are the tuakana and, the teina are the kaiako new to the profession. Ellwood (2010) described tuakana-teina as a “relationship [that] supports and motivates each other’s learning and teaching” (p.19). Although the tuakana takes on the role of ‘mentor’, by supporting and providing their experienced knowledge to the teina, it is through ‘Ako’, that learning and supporting is reciprocated. Glynn and Bishop (1995) illustrated, “the concept of ako offers a distinctly different cultural perspective on peer tutoring, and on the interchangeability of tutor and tutee roles” (p. 38). Therefore, tuakana can learn from teina. Barnett and Te Wiata (2017) expressed,

There is ample evidence to show that tuakana-teina mentoring can be of significant value to mentors and mentees if implemented in a culturally appropriate manner. However, success depends on the adequate resourcing, appropriate staffing, and a framework conducive to Māori values and beliefs (p.16).

Appropriate experienced te reo Māori kaiako with ample resourcing including funding would assist with the success of tuakana-teina and more importantly, to support new te reo Māori kaiako to the profession. I have witnessed a number of
young kaiako leave the profession due to inadequate support and resourcing, and so the role of tuakana-teina would assist with keeping more te reo Māori kaiako in the profession. Another form of support for kaiako who assessed with NCEA is NZQA support.

2.3.3 NZQA support

The NZQA website provided NCEA information and resources for internal and external assessments for achievement standards for te reo Māori including moderator newsletters, assessment clarifications, assessment reports, national moderators reports and exemplar of student work. Past examination papers and their schedules were also found. Clarification of grammar levels provided a guide of acceptable sentence structures required for ākonga to use for each of the eight curriculum levels. A link to the Te Kete Ipurangi (TKI) website connected kaiako to internal assessment exemplars for Levels 1, 2 and 3 for Whakarongo, Kōrero and Waihanga Tuhinga. Best practice workshop information and sign up was also available on the website.

In 2012, NZQA launched Te Rautaki Māori: The Māori Strategic Plan for the New Zealand Qualifications Authority. This updated Te Rautaki Māori of 2007-2012. In 2012, one of the aims that Te Rautaki Māori set out was to “support secondary schools and education providers to accelerate Māori learner success through culturally relevant assessment resources and tools (including NCEA resources and exemplars)” (NZQA, 2012, p. 11). NZQA have updated Te Rautaki Māori strategy that expired in 2017 to Te Kōkiritanga. The outcome of this strategy was, “NZQA contributing to Māori learners [who] are enjoying and achieving education success as Māori” (NZQA, 2018, p. 3).

NZQA initiatives such as Te Rautaki Māori and Te Kōkiritanga are focused on supporting secondary schools with success for Māori learners and using kaupapa Māori themes to support these initiatives is positive for our Māori learners and their whānau.
2.4 PREFERRED METHOD OF ASSESSING

Assessment is a tool used to measure what has been learnt and understood. As discussed in the introduction, NCEA have two methods of assessment; internal assessment and external examinations. Portfolio assessments are the current method for internal assessments for te reo Māori.

2.4.1 Portfolio assessment

Portfolio’s required ākonga to collect pieces of work of different genres that they have developed and re-worked over a period of time. This eventually becomes their evidence of learning and is used for assessments. Portfolio assessment especially benefited writing portfolios. Lam (2015) stated that writing portfolios encouraged ākonga “to embark on a journey of meaning discovery through [their] re-writing” (p. 295). The journey described here, was portfolio’s provided time for ākonga to develop their work. It allowed ākonga time to put into practice what they had learnt in their classroom within their pieces of work. Writing portfolios also empowered ākonga to re-work and edit their work over a period of time, which encouraged ākonga to self-reflect on their learning.

The process of creating portfolios enhanced teaching and learning (Lam, 2015) and enabled ākonga and kaiako to self-reflect on progress and reflect on areas that needed development (Mahuika et al. 2011). Lam (2015) described that writing portfolios, as “...not only equip students with essential composing strategies, including multiple drafting and revision, they also assist them to become more self-reflective and to develop a self-regulatory capacity throughout the text construction process” (p. 295). Ākonga were permitted to edit and re-work their work which enabled them to reflect on their learning and show their understanding of what they have learnt, and also what they may not have understood. As this process is ongoing throughout a period of time, ākonga were required to show that they had worked on this process overtime. Throughout this time, kaiako were permitted to provide feedback and feedforward. Mahuika et al. (2011) described the importance of feedback and feedforward in Te Kotahitanga. “Māori students were clear that they
needed feedback and feedforward of an academic nature... so that they could make progress with their learning” (p. 188).

It is important to confidently know effective feedback and feedforward practices, as Cumming (2002) warned that if kaiako responded too significantly to drafted work that this could reduce the student’s motivation to improve their writing. Lam (2015) also indicated “that teachers, in most L2 (second language learner) contexts, lack adequate knowledge and skills to perform effective feedback practices” (p. 304). Within Mahuika et al. (2011) research, they provided effective methods of feedback to ākonga. They suggested that feedback should:

Focus on the task and the associated learning, confirm for the students that they are on the right track, include suggestions that help the student (that is, that scaffolds their learning), [be] frequent and given there is opportunity for the student to take action, [be] in the context of a dialogue about the learning (p. 188)

This process of feedback and feedforward allowed kaiako to reflect on ākonga learning. During this reflection, if kaiako recognised that their ākonga did not understand how to apply a concept, the kaiako would need to reteach those concepts in a different way than originally taught. Bishop and Berryman (2009, as cited in Bishop 2012) described the Effective Teaching Profile (ETP) in Te Kotahitanga, which encouraged kaiako to shift their teaching practice to one of,

...Agents of change...they [teachers] collaboratively promote, monitor and reflect upon each student’s learning outcomes so as to modify their instructional practices in ways that will lead to improvements in Māori student achievement; and they share this knowledge with the students (p. 41).

Portfolio assessment allowed monitoring and reflecting to occur for kaiako and ākonga individually and collectively. As ākonga were encouraged to work on different genre pieces for their portfolio pieces, it promoted collaboration between
kaiako and ākonga, including shared decision making. Kaiako and ākonga conversed on the type of pieces that the ākonga wanted to include in their portfolio and the kaiako showed their support where needed. Bishop (2012) described this as a Culturally Responsive Pedagogy of Relations. “Such a pedagogy addresses a vision for Māori students’ achievement by reciprocal decision-making … reciprocal and collaborative pedagogies in order to promote educational relationships between students, between pupil and teachers…” (p. 40). Therefore shared decision making where ākonga were given the empowerment (tino rangatiratanga) to take ownership of their learning was powerful.

Portfolio assessment also replaced the one off assessment like that of a class test and examination. Lam (2015) described that portfolios removed, “the excessive focus on examination-oriented syllabi… [allowing] room for process writing to flourish” (p. 301). This method of assessing allowed writing to prosper whereas examinations created stress and asked ākonga to recall work learnt in a controlled period of time. Yates and Johnston (2018) also explained that “…a portfolio of evidence, established over time, under a teacher’s guidance is likely to provide more formative opportunities that a time-limited test” (p. 651). Hence, portfolio assessment allowed formative practices to continually occur, unlike the one off test.

2.5 GOVERNMENT STRATEGIES AND GOALS FOR SUCCESS FOR MĀORI AND MĀORI LANGUAGE

The Ministry of Education (MOE) have implemented a number of national strategies to increase Māori success and Māori language in education. The following strategies interweave similar objectives and goals for Māori students, Māori language and Mātauranga Māori.

2.5.1 Ka Hikitia: Accelerating Success 2013 -2017

Ka Hikitia – Accelerating Success 2013 – 2017 is a continuation of Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success 2008 – 2012. The objective of this strategy is “to improve how the education system performs to ensure Māori students are enjoying and achieving education success as Māori” (Ministry of Education, 2013a, para. 1). A central focus area of Ka Hikitia was to provide access to high quality Māori
language in education for Māori students by strengthening and growing te reo Māori in education (Ministry of Education, 2013b).

2.5.2 Tau Mai te Reo: The Māori Language in Education Strategy 2013 – 2017

Tau Mai Te Reo supported the Māori language objectives of Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success. Tau Mai Te Reo also aimed to assist the revival of Māori language by the Crown and Māori. As described by the Ministry of Education (2013c), Tau Mai Te Reo sets out “what the Ministry of Education and education sector agencies will do for learners of Māori language in education. Māori language in education includes… Māori language in English medium” (para. 2). The initiative aims to “increase the rate of participation of achievement of learners in Māori language in education within the English medium sector” (Ministry of Education, 2013d, p. 37). This document also stated that more research of Māori language in English medium education was needed and that te reo Māori teacher workload is still an issue (Ministry of Education, 2013d). According to the Ministry of Education’s website, Tau Mai te Reo and Ka Hikitia are currently being redeveloped.

2.5.3 Mōu te reo

Mōu te reo is a Government initiative where the objective is for te reo Māori to be spoken and heard by every child and young person by 2025. The Ministry of Education (n.d) has said that, “we want te reo Māori to thrive in all areas of education and to make sure everyone knows the benefits of learning the language. Learning te reo Māori deepens learners’ knowledge and understanding of Māori culture” (para. 2). By this strategy it was also important to increase the number of kaiako who can kōrero in te reo Māori.

2.5.4 The National Education Goals

The National Education Goals (NEGs) have been established by the New Zealand Government for the education system to strive towards and achieve. There are 10 NEGs that are outlined as important areas of focus for our education system, however three are to be highlighted here (Ministry of Education, 2019b).
NEG 2
"Equality of educational opportunity for all New Zealanders, by identifying and removing barriers to achievement” (Ministry of Education, 2019b).

NEG 9
“Increased participation and success by Māori through the advancement of Māori education initiatives, including education in te reo Māori, consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 2019b).

NEG 10
“Respect for the diverse ethnic and cultural heritage of New Zealand people, with acknowledgement of the unique place of Māori, and New Zealand’s role in the Pacific and as a member of the international community of nations” (Ministry of Education, 2019b).

2.6 CONCLUSION
For many years, research stated that the heavy workload of a te reo Māori kaiako was due to extra roles they fulfilled on top of their normal teaching and assessing workload. Te reo Māori kaiako were the expert on cultural practices such as Kapa Haka, language and were the cultural link between school and whānau. They were also asked to pastorally support Māori ākonga. Kupenga (2019) suggested that because of this heavy workload, recruiting more te reo Māori teachers to the profession was difficult. Government initiatives and research have stated that there was a need for more te reo Māori kaiako and more culturally competent kaiako in order to increase the number of kaiako who are culturally competent rather than leave the work to the te reo Māori kaiako. There are a number of professional learning development available for kaiako to upskill their knowledge of te reo and tikanga Māori, such as Te Ahu o te reo Māori.

Multi-year levelled research has conveyed that there were barriers to having two or three different year levels in one class, with one kaiako at the same time. One barrier that research discussed was shared teaching and learning time. This reduced teaching and learning time for each year level in the class. Research suggested that
thorough planning was required of kaiako who taught multi-year levelled classes. Another barrier that was identified was the lack of growth in ākonga achievement. Furthermore, research recognised the extra workload multi-year levelled kaiako had when planning and teaching different year levels simultaneously. Research encouraged professional learning development in order to assist with teaching ākonga in multi-year levelled classes. Research also suggested, places that educate tertiary ākonga to become kaiako, should include courses that educate and prepare future kaiako to teach in multi-year levelled classes.

According to research, external assessments such as examinations was not the best method of assessment for second language learners. This was due to the lack of time second language learners had in learning the language. Because of this, East and Scott (2011) expressed that preparing second language learners for external examinations was a tremendous task asked of kaiako. Research also recognised that external examinations required ākonga to perform at their best at the prescribed time and place set by external examiners. Māori education researchers suggested that this traditional form of assessment, did not support Māori achievement.

NZQA data showed fewer ākonga completed the Kōrero internal assessment. Research indicated that youth were more reluctant to use the language learnt in front of their peers because they feared embarrassment if they made a mistake. Consequently, they were less likely to do speeches. Māori education researchers also suggested that second language learners know fewer people speaking the language around them, as many were raised in a monolingual environment. Formal assessment also required ākonga to include complex language. Research has expressed that in order for ākonga to use these complex sentences correctly they were more likely to memorise, or rote learn speeches, this was so that they could pass and/or increase their chances of achieving a higher grade.

Professional learning development enabled kaiako to further enhance their teaching skills and to meet other kaiako of the same learning subject at the same time. Researchers stated that professional learning development can be limited due to time and cost and, recommended that more funding was required in order for kaiako
to attend these development times frequently. Professional learning development can become costly due to the cost of course and kaiako relief, thus funding would assist. Cluster groups of kaiako who taught the same subject and peer mentoring were other forms of support for te reo Māori kaiako. The support of an experienced kaiako to a kaiako who was new to the profession had many benefits. The concept of tuakana-teina was also discussed by Māori education researchers and provided a Māori cultural lens to mentoring.

Researchers described that portfolio assessments allowed ākonga time to self-reflect on their learning, as ākonga were permitted and encouraged to edit, amend and add new content to their work. Portfolio’s also enabled kaiako to provide feedback and feedforward and, according to Māori education researchers, feedback and feedforward was a tool that assisted with the learning progress of Māori ākonga. Mahuika et al. (2011) provided effective steps to feedback and feedforward and other researchers encouraged kaiako to seek professional development if this was an area that needed further developing. Portfolio’s also allowed kaiako and ākonga to converse about their learning in order to find out what was required by the ākonga to produce their portfolio. Research described that learning conversations such as this, enabled reciprocal learning from both the ākonga and kaiako, which promoted shared decision making. This form of shared decision making enabled ākonga to have autonomy of their learning and assessment. Portfolio assessment also enabled kaiako to self-reflect on their teaching. If kaiako recognised within the portfolio of work that ākonga did not fully understand content that had been taught, it was recommended that kaiako reteach that content differently.

The Government has published a number of education initiatives in order to promote Māori achievement, mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), tikanga Māori (Māori protocols) and te reo Māori. Although Tau Mai te Reo and Ka Hikitia are being redeveloped at this time, they were positive guides for kaiako in all schools.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Whaowhia te kete mātauranga. Fill the basket of knowledge. The methodology discussed in this chapter speaks about how the kete of knowledge was filled. This research used qualitative semi-structured interviews to collect data. Each interview was conducted individually. Grounded theory guided the analysis of the data. Kaupapa Māori research was interwoven throughout this research, where the history and principles will be discussed. Outsider / Insider researcher research proposed the benefits and dilemmas of knowing the research participants. Ethical considerations with a Kaupapa Māori lens will also be highlighted.

3.2 Characteristics of qualitative interviews

Qualitative research in education came into existence because of the criticisms of quantitative research (Hara, 1995). “Qualitative research was developed to overcome some of the perceived limitations of the prevailing methods used to study human behaviour” (Snape & Spencer, 2003, p.5). Qualitative research investigated and verbalised the analysis of human behaviour (Hara, 1995).

Qualitative research enabled the researcher to emphasise their view points in the research, collect rich data and gather wide-ranging descriptions (Hara, 1995). It is through words and pictures that qualitative research becomes descriptive (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Descriptive data is then analysed, creating themes that are discussed throughout the research. Speech quotations can also be used in qualitative research which provide accurate data to the readers, as accuracy has an important role to play with trustworthiness. These words are also supported by the researcher’s statements and theories made along with supporting literature (Ezzy, 2002).

Qualitative research is also “concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes or products” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Snape and Spencer (2003) added,
“those practicing qualitative research have tended to place emphasis and value on the human, interpretative aspects of knowing about the social world and the significance of the investigator’s own interpretations and understanding of the phenomenon being studied” (p. 29). There is no one way of conducting qualitative research, but qualitative researchers focus on finding processes that will lead to a better and deeper understanding of people and their lives, thus producing meaning.

Qualitative methods of data collection involve participant observation, questionnaire, semi-structured, in-depth interviews, focus groups and discourse analysis. These methods help qualitative researchers find “an in-depth and interpreted understanding of the social world of research participants by learning about their social and material circumstances, their experiences, perspectives and histories” (Snape & Spencer, 2003, p. 25). It was the experiences and perspectives that kaiako in this research shared.

3.3 Individual interview

This research will be guided by Bishop’s (2008) research method of using “formal, semi-structured, in-depth interviews and informal interviews as chats…this [is] a culturally appropriate way of recording the research project stories” (p. 8). This enabled in-depth conversations to take place in a relaxed setting.

Qualitative semi-structured interviews allow kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) contact between the interviewer and participant(s), where expressions and body language of the participants can be seen by the interviewer therefore enriching the information shared. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2018) expressed that an “interview is a flexible tool for data collection enabling multi-sensory channels to be used: verbal, non-verbal, seen, spoken, heard…” (p. 506). The flexibility of an interview allows the interviewer to ask further questions in order to seek further clarification and to gain a deeper understanding of why the participant felt that way. Hochschild (2009) stated that interviews provided further information that surveys
did not, as she said interviews enabled, “find[ing] out how people frame their views, why the hold those views... (para. 6). Although qualitative interviews take time to gain a deeper understanding, it provided more information than quantitative data.

There are shortcomings to conducting interviews such as length of time interviews take and the interviewer being biased (Cohen et al., 2018). As the interviewer, being flexible with time and place that will enable to meet the needs of the participants is important, as their stories and views embody the researcher’s study. Therefore it is important to notify the participants the approximate time length of the interview(s). It is also vital to remain impartial and not critical to the opinions of the participants during the interview.

Interviews also need to be conducted in a place where it is conducive to hold oral interviews, meaning a quiet place with limited interruptions. This will enable the interviewer and participant(s) to be fully involved with the interview. However, this may not be an option for all participants.

Questions should support the researcher’s objectives, and/or assist with answering the research questions of the study (Cohen et al., 2018). Semi-structured interviews will have open-ended questions to enable kōrero to flow. Further advantages of open-ended questions are, “...they are flexible, they allow the interviewer to probe, so that she may into more depth... or to clear up any misunderstandings... they encourage cooperation...” (Cohen et al., 2018, p. 513). Although open-ended questions are flexible, the interviewer also needs to be flexible with questioning.

During the interview, the interviewer will need to be able to be flexible with questioning, such as changing questions or changing the order of the questions, in order to work with the flow of the interview. Hochschild (2009) expressed, “... the interviewer may need to change the order of the topics under discussion, to change question wording, to spend a lot (or very little) time on one topic compared with
another, to make questions more or less abstract for a given respondent...” (para. 6). It is important that the researcher remembers that one size does not fit all.

3.4 Grounded Theory

Grounded theory as explained by Denzin and Lincoln (2011) is used in qualitative research where the, “data collection and analysis reciprocally inform and shape each other through an emergent iterative process” (p. 360). Thus, the qualitative data gathered from the interviews are analysed mutually, in order for key words and phrases to emerge. This theory encourages the researcher to “interact with [their] data by moving through comparative levels of analysis” (p. 361). Once sub-themes emerge from the key words and phrases, possible themes appear. The researcher’s interaction with the data allows the researcher to deeply listen to the knowledge shared by their participants and deeply connect with their stories. Grounded theory methods are also used within social justice research as it, “addresses differential power, prestige, resources and suffering among peoples and individuals” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 359). This theory is an accompaniment to why Kaupapa Māori research exists.

3.5 Historical context of Kaupapa Māori Research

The signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 assured the protection of Māori culture, however it was not long after the signing that, “assimilation was official [by] government policy...Māori were encouraged to abandon their culture...in order to learn the ways and processes of the dominant culture” (Bishop & Glynn, 1999, p. 16). This position continued for Māori until the 1970’s when Māori urban movement groups became concerned of the state of Māori language and their culture (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, n.d.). During those times, traditional forms of research were derived from “colonial power imbalances, thereby undervaluing and belittling Māori knowledge and learning practices...denying Māori authenticity and voice” (Bishop, 2008, p. 147). Research conducted by non-Māori “often compared Māori to non-Māori using the supposedly universal norms of western society” (Powick, 2002). Therefore, many researchers were guided by western
principles and theories and bestowed these upon Māori, who for many decades were being assimilated by policies and encouraged to disregard their whakapapa (genealogy) and their culture. Indigenous research like Kaupapa Māori addresses the inequalities of the past and is a “potential means to reclaim languages, histories, and knowledge, to find solutions to the negative impacts of colonialism and to give voice to an alternative way of knowing and of being” (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008, p. 120). It challenges “the corporate institution of research to change its worldview, to confront its past and make changes” (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008, p. 121).

3.6 Kaupapa Māori Research

Kaupapa Māori research comprises of principles that embody tikanga Māori (customary practices). Bishop (1996) described these principles as living taonga (treasures) that have been handed down from Māori ancestors, from generation to generation and give life and guidance to Māori today. These principles validate Māori epistemology as described by Smith (1992), as “the philosophy and practice of ‘being Maori’... has a valid and legitimate social, political, historical, philosophical, intellectual and cultural authenticity” (p. 4). Therefore Kaupapa Māori research is by Māori for Māori in the hope that it creates “a positive difference for Māori that incorporates social change or transformation...” (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008, p.120). Graham Hingangaroa Smith characterised principles of Kaupapa Māori research and further principles were added by other Kaupapa Māori researchers (Rangahau, n.d.). The four principles that were interwoven into this research were, Tino Rangatiratanga (autonomy), Whakawhanaungatanga (kinship, extended whānau), Whakapapa (genealogy), and He Taonga Tuku Iho (cultural aspiration).

3.6.1 Whakawhanaungatanga and collaboration

Kaupapa Māori research involves collaboration. Collaboration is used in the tikanga (meaning) of whakawhanaungatanga. Whakawhanaungatanga decides the processes of the research. Bishop (1996) describes whakawhanaungatanga as “...establishing relationships and developing research whānau by invoking the processes of whakawhanaungatanga [it] establishes interconnectedness, commitment, and engagement, within culturally constituted research practices” (p.
153). It can be present in hui (meetings), where whānau, iwi and hapū, “address the means of research initiation, to establish the research questions, to facilitate participation in the work of the project, to address issues of representation and accountability, and to legitimate the ownership of knowledge defined and created” (Bishop, 1996, p. 153). Hui also enabled participants to whakawhitī kōrero (converse) their issues without disruption. Each person has a chance to kōrero, clarify meanings, delete and modify what has been discussed and perhaps opinions may vary, but the main objective is to work collaboratively and reach an agreement (Bishop, 1996). Whakawhanaungatanga reforms the traditional practice of the researcher deciding the processes and empowers those who are being researched. Therefore, researchers are accountable to those who are being researched.

3.6.2 Tino Rangatiratanga and empowerment
Traditional forms of research lacked authentic representation of Māori and denied a Māori voice. Kaupapa Māori has enabled Māori to have a voice in research, for the betterment of Māori within their own cultural realms, beliefs and tikanga. It is a Māori-centred research that “has the highest degree of Māori involvement at all levels” (Powick, 2002, p.11). Because of this, Māori have tino rangatiratanga. Tino rangatiratanga empowered Māori and it allowed Māori to have autonomy or control of the research. Therefore, Kaupapa Māori research is participant driven (Bishop, 1996).

3.6.3 Whakapapa
Whakawhanaungatanga also weaved the tikanga (meaning) of whakapapa in Kaupapa Māori research. “The process of whakawhanaungatanga identifies how our identity comes from our whakapapa” (Bishop, 1996, p. 148), which also included the connectedness to whenua (land), iwi, hapū, maunga (mountain), awa (river), and waka. In the research conducted by Kana and Tamatea (2006), they showed their connection with whakawhanaungatanga through their pēpeha/mihimihi. Furthermore, their “tribal affiliations, kura, marae and community involvement allowed them to access the information...” (p.13). Therefore the sharing and knowing of each other’s whakapapa enabled the strengthening of whakawhanaungatanga.
3.6.4 He taonga tuku iho

He taonga tuku iho are the treasures that have been handed down from tūpuna (ancestors). These taonga are tikanga Māori, te reo Māori and Mātauranga Māori and they are described as, “Māori ways of knowing, doing and understanding the world [and] are considered valid in their own right” (Rangahau, n.d.). The handing down of these treasures ensure that they are never to be lost.

3.7 OUTSIDER / INSIDER RESEARCHER

I am a kaiako who has taught te reo Māori for 19 years, where 11 of these years have been in Waitaha. I have known the participants of this research for a number of years. Although we did not work directly together at the same school, we have met and worked together during hui and other gatherings where our ākonga were involved and, it is through these shared experiences that we have developed very good friendships. Therefore, within this research I am classified as an outsider / insider researcher. An insider researcher has spent time and developed a relationship with those who are the research participants. An outsider researcher has no or little connection with the research participants whether it be in a friendship or working capacity. Although I have a relationship with all participants, I do not work within their schools.

Bishop described that insider researchers will “conduct research in a more sensitive and responsive manner than outsiders” (Bishop, 2008, p. 148). Within Kaupapa Māori research, Powick (2002) described insider researchers as researchers who are Māori, collecting and analysing Māori data which will provide knowledge to empower Māori and using Māori approaches throughout the research. Although I am not of Māori descent, my knowledge and background of tikanga and te reo Māori ensured that I have a substantial understanding of adhering to Kaupapa Māori research and Te Ao Māori (The Māori World).

Denzin and Lincoln (2011) described research that was conducted by an insider researcher, where she was concerned that as an insider researcher that she may have influenced her participants with her own story and experiences as she “wrote her own story before collecting tales of other Indian women” (p. 663). This reflection
“acknowledge[d] that researchers cannot be separated from their research, that the researchers’ relationship to those they study as well as their procedures influence their findings and researchers that reflect about their stance offer more trustworthy and honest accounts” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 663). As an insider researcher remaining objective throughout the research, despite my emotional connection, was a reminder of a possible dilemma.

3.8 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

This research was driven by the ethical principles of Kaupapa Māori. This provided a code of conduct for Māori, by Māori. The ethical principles are described as the following:

Aroha ki te tangata. This refers to respecting those who were being researched. It was important that I showed my respect for those who were researched within the entire research.

Kanohi ki te kanohi. This means face to face. Conducting interviews and having hui face to face enabled myself and the research participants to have an open dialogue. Kanohi ki te kanohi allows both the researcher and participants to read each other’s body language. Culturally this is very important.

Titiro, whakarongo, kōrero. Look, listen, speak. This reminded me to first look and listen to the participants to develop understanding, before speaking.

 Manaaki ki te tangata. This encompasses sharing and being generous. It was important that the I showed generosity to those who had taken the time to participate in the study, as they were busy kaiako.

Kia tūpato means be careful. As an insider researcher I needed to ensure that the participants felt culturally safe and continually reflected upon my actions as an insider researcher (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008), so as not to allow my biases to impact on the research.

Kaua e takahi te mana o te tangata. Do not trample on the mana of people. Uphold the status (mana) of those who are being researched and don’t belittle what they know if the researcher already knows it (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008).

Kaua e mahaki. Don’t flaunt your knowledge. I am encouraged to share my knowledge however, it is the knowledge of the research participants that I am seeking. (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008).
An informed consent form was included for participants to sign and provided information about the research, the educational issue being researched and the purpose of it. Informed consent means to completely inform the participants of the research of the rationale and how the research will be conducted, and the possible distribution of the data collected (Mutch, 2005). Informed consent is evidence that is given by a signature by the participants who have indicated that they want to participate in the research (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998). The researcher should also reveal possible risks for the participants (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998).

This is so the safety of the participant (Mutch, 2005) is adhered to. The consent form also included the approximate duration of the research, for example the interview and the stages in which the research project would be managed. Participants will receive a final copy of the research.

The assurance of confidentiality and the protection of identities of the participants, the right to withdraw from the project, the security of storing the data collected, the right to decline to participate in any questions, researcher contact details and a space provided for a signature from the participant signifying consent are also included in the informed consent.

Similar to Jacques (1991) research, participation in this research will be voluntary. Confidentiality will also be assured for participants and their schools of the research. Being an insider researcher can be a disadvantage in maintaining confidentiality and anonymity (Mutch, 2005). Confidentiality of the participant’s interviews and anonymity must be assured. Bogdan and Biklen (1998) expressed that through anonymity the identities of participants must be protected so that it does not harm or embarrass them. Anonymity can often be met by using pseudonyms.

3.9 METHOD

This section described the method of how data was collected.
3.9.1 Initial hui and follow up

This qualitative research was guided by Kaupapa Māori research. An initial hui with some research participants took place in order to meet, kanohi ki te kanohi—face to face (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008). “It is important to meet face to face, especially when introducing the idea of research” (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008, p. 130). During this time, discussions around the research took place. Bishop (1996), described these hui as an opportunity to “address the means of research initiation, to establish the research questions, to facilitate participation in the work of the project, to address issues of representation and accountability, and to legitimise the ownership of knowledge defined and created” (Bishop, 1996, p. 153). The initial hui took place during a Canterbury Māori Secondary Schools Teachers Association, where I introduced the idea of this research with some research participants and other kaiako of te reo Māori. We briefly discussed at the hui what the research could look like, why I wanted to conduct this research, benefits and representation, but as it was close to Manu Kōrero, this topic also took precedence. The other participants who were not present at the initial hui, were followed up with another hui. The follow up hui was conducted individually with all participants, face to face, in order to discuss ideas on the research, questions and accountability. The follow up hui was conducted individually due to the difficulty of finding a time that everyone could be present together.

Within the follow up hui the information sheet (Appendix III) was explained. A copy was kept by the participants. Information that was discussed at the initial hui including possible length of interviews, anonymity and confidentiality, the right to withdraw from this research, security of storing the data collected and information about the stages of the research were also discussed. The consent form (Appendix IV) was also explained and given to the participants. On this form it had the contact details of my supervisor and place for their signature. Some signed at the follow up hui, others signed at the time of their interview. At this time, a date, time and place for each interview was confirmed. It was important to structure the interviews around the dates, times and places that were most suitable to the research
participants. Open ended questions that were first initiated by talking to the participants during this hui was then further developed.

The questions were emailed to the participants separately, in order for them to add further questions, amend or delete questions. Some participants took this opportunity to amend some questions. This method allowed “reciprocal design and sharing of control over the structure of the interview, as a way of reducing researcher imposition” (Tito, 2008, p. 11). It also provided them time before the interviews commenced to think about some possible topics of discussion.

The research questions were used as a guide to find out more information about the teaching history of each kaiako such as, how long they had taught for, where they taught and what subjects they have taught. Information was also asked about their classroom teaching and learning environment and how that sat alongside NCEA internal and external assessments for their ākonga and themselves. Moderation was also a process that each kaiako was involved with and questions regarding what moderation looked like was also shared. Kaiako were also asked to describe their workload as a kaiako of te reo Māori. Finally, the kaiako were questioned about the ideal methodology of assessing te reo Māori for second language learners. The semi-structured questions are in Appendix II.

3.9.2 Participants and Settings
The research participants in this study were four te reo Māori kaiako who taught in English medium secondary schools within the Ōtautahi (Christchurch) / Waitaha (Canterbury) area. It was their voices and experiences that provided a “rich and personal portrayal” (Jacques, 1991, p. 119) of working as te reo Māori kaiako in English medium secondary schools. It was their knowledge and expertise that “make a positive difference for Māori, that incorporates social change or transformation that privileges Māori knowledge and ways of being” (Tuiwiwai Smith, 2008, p. 120).
As a member of the Canterbury Māori Secondary Schools Teachers Association for the past 11 years, I have formed relationships therefore it was easier to gain access to kaiako I knew. This research allowed me “to enter pre-existing relationships; to build, maintain, and nurture relationships; and to strengthen connectivity, [these] are important research skills in the indigenous arena” (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008, p. 129). Kaiako who were experienced te reo Māori kaiako with teaching, learning and assessing provided a historical experience of NCEA assessments for second language learners. Further information about the teaching, learning and assessing experience of each kaiako will be further explained in the Data Stories chapter.

The data were collected in locations that were most suitable for the participants. One interview was conducted within the school of the research participant. Another interview was conducted within my school, as the kaiako preferred to conduct this interview in a place where she was less likely to be interrupted. The other two kaiako had their interviews within their own homes. Collecting data within their own setting can also enhance the understanding of the participants as “qualitative researchers assume that human behaviour is significantly influenced by the setting in which it occurs” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 5). The places where the interviews were held, enabled the interviews to take place without interruption for the duration of the interviews.

3.9.3 Individual interview

It was important that at each interview I brought kai (food) to share. The sharing of kai strengthens whakawhanaungatanga. Research conducted by Vaioleti (2006) stated that “a little gift of light food maybe appropriate…” (p. 30). Vaioleti provided and shared kai with participants. Kai is a representation of whakawhanaungatanga and not payment.

Qualitative semi-structured interviews that were conducted individually was the method of collecting data for this study. These methods helped qualitative researchers find “an in-depth and interpreted understanding of the social world of
research participants by learning about their social and material circumstances, their experiences, perspectives and histories” (Snape & Spencer, 2003, p. 25). This research was guided by Bishop’s (2008) research method of using semi-structured interviews.

### 3.9.4 Tools for data collection

Within the guidance of Kaupapa Māori research, semi-structured in-depth interviews was the tool of data collection for this study. Permission to use a recording device to record interviews was given by all participants and this was used to record data. If kaiako declined the permission of using a recording device, the interview would be recorded by way of written notes conducted by the researcher. In order to write and record information in more detail, areas that were of particular interest would require further questioning to enable time to write the data more comprehensively and to ensure what was written was indeed the true meaning of what the participant shared. Participants may decline the use of a recording device due to the lack of cultural appropriateness of collecting data. Another possible reason was that the participant(s) were concerned with the storing of the recorded data after the interview and perhaps be concerned of the consequences of this being used for other purposes. Nevertheless, the use of using a recording device enabled “a nearly complete record of what has been said and permits easy attention to the course of the interview” (Glesne, 1999, p. 78). Complete accuracy with data collecting was important for the validity of the research and to provide a true representation of the stories that were shared by the participants.

These qualitative interviews were 45 minutes to 90 minutes in length, and in some instances, follow up emails were required to further clarify responses given during the interviews. Follow up emails was due to the school holidays and, for some, little time to meet face to face during school term. After each interview, a written transcript of the entire interview was created, where time intervals were also recorded on the written transcript. Each line typed on the written transcript was also numbered in an ascending order. The time intervals and numbering helped
with the ease of locating information, in the event information was needed to be readdressed or reheard.

3.9.5 Data analysis

Interviews were analysed by using different colour highlighters. Visually, this made it easier to identify key words, phrases and patterns of thinking while analysing all data. This also reduced data to manageable proportions (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996). Analysing data using Grounded theory was also used. Macfarlane (2012) described Grounded theory as “theory that is developed inductively from a body of data that has been gathered… the task of the researcher is to understand what is happening and how the participants manage their roles…” (p.101). Data were continuously and repeatedly explored and once the key words, phrases and patterns of thinking were identified, sub-themes emerged. Sub-themes eventually evolved into themes.

Common themes appeared across all or some interviews. The common themes that were evident were:

- PRESSURES (The pressures of being the kaiako of te reo Māori)
- KŌRERO (More ākonga pursue the Whakarongo and Waihanga Tuhinga internal assessment rather than the Kōrero internal assessment)
- PROFESSIONAL LEARNING DEVELOPMENT
- PREFERRED METHOD OF ASSESSING

These themes and sub-themes are further developed in the Data Stories chapter.

3.9.6 Rigour and trustworthiness

Participants are the co-creators of this research, and it was their stories that embodied this study. It was important to check that accurate and a true representation of their stories were collected. Communication and clarification throughout the data analysis ensured true interpretation of participants meaning. Another method to ensure rigour and trustworthiness is triangulation of data. Triangulation of qualitative data sources means “comparing and cross checking the consistency of information derived at different times and by different means…” (like)
comparing interviews with interviews...checking for the consistency of what people say about the same thing over time” (Patton, 2001, p. 559). However, Patton continued to state that different methods may not lead to a consistent finding; the point of the study is to find out why there are differences. This ensured the validity of the data.

Reliability over time was also considered within this study. Similar to Jacques (1991) research multiple contact time was maintained, including after her research was completed. Contact with research participants in this study was maintained, especially throughout the data analysis. However, as explained this research was sadly suspended for approximately 18 months due to the sudden passing of my beautiful dad and ongoing health issues. I placed this study aside, so that when I did return, I was ready to complete. Contact with the research participants about this study ceased during this time, however, there will be recontact made in order to let them know about the completed research.

In discussion with my supervisor with the concern of the validity of the data due to the time lapse of this research, we concluded that there was little concern that the data would have been outdated, because the themes and sub-themes that are discussed in this research still exist today for te reo Māori kaiako teaching in English medium secondary schools. Furthermore, more recent research was able to be included in the Literature review.

3.10 CONCLUSION

This research was driven by the principles of Kaupapa Māori research, where qualitative semi-structured interviews provided a platform for the data collection. This method of data collecting enabled in-depth conversations to take place where rich stories of the research participants were shared. Semi-structured questions gave guidance to the interview, but also provided the flexibility for conversations to change throughout the interview.

As an outsider / insider researcher there was prior connections with the research participants before the research commenced and it was this connection that enabled data collecting to be more responsive from both the researched and the researcher.
Because of these prior connections, interviews were also conducted in a relaxed setting. Ethical considerations were based on the principles of Kaupapa Māori research. It was important to adhere to these principles due to the relationships that already existed between myself and the research participants.

Interviews were conducted individually. This enabled the kaiako of this research to kōrero about their own lived experiences of being a kaiako of te reo Māori in an English medium secondary school. This method provided their own story, without the opinions and stories of others. The rich stories shared took some time and finding a suitable length of time for the interviews to take place depended on the availability of the researched participants, so as the researcher, flexibility of time was required. Interviews took place where it suited the participants. One participant conducted the interview at my school, another at her school. Two participants were interviewed at their homes.

Once the rich stories were gathered, the oral stories become written transcripts shortly thereafter. Further questions were asked in order to seek clarification and this was conducted through email, due to school holidays and time constraints of teaching. Written transcripts were then analysed. Grounded theory enabled the data to be analysed continuously together in order to find key words and phrases where sub-themes emerged from the data. Different coloured highlighters also aided the analysing of the data. This continual process was ongoing until themes emerged. The themes and sub-themes are further discussed in the Data Stories chapter.
CHAPTER 4: DATA STORIES

4.1 Introduction

He aha te kai ō te rangatira? He kōrero, he kōrero, he kōrero. What is the food of the leader? It is knowledge. It is communication. This whakataukī speaks about knowledge and communication providing sustenance. In this context the researched kaiako who have communicated their stories have provided the sustenance to this research.

This chapter is an analysis of the kōrero shared by four kaiako who taught te reo Māori in four English medium secondary schools in Waitaha. The kaiako who participated in this research will be referred to as, participants, research participants and/or kaiako of this research. Pseudonym’s were used to protect the identity of the kaiako who took part in this research. The first participant to introduce is Anahera.

Anahera was the most experienced kaiako and had taught for 37 years. She had taught in a number of schools from single sex to co-educational, including other schools outside of Waitaha. Anahera taught English before she had her first child and, it was during this time, she began to learn te reo Māori. Upon her return to teaching after maternity leave, she was asked to teach sixth form studies where she taught culture to ākonga. Anahera progressed to teaching te reo Māori and English while teaching at another school. Her experience as a kaiako have seen her teach and assess under School Certificate and NCEA. During her interview, Anahera was teaching in a co-educational school where she was teaching Years 7 to Year 11 te reo Māori.

The next kaiako to introduce is Aroha. At the time of her interview, Aroha had taught for 19 years. All her teaching experience was in Waitaha, mostly in co-educational schools, however she had experience teaching in a single sex school. Aroha had also taught and assessed under School Certificate and NCEA. She has always taught te reo Māori and was teaching Year 9 to Year 13 te reo Māori at the time of the interview.
The next kaiako to introduce is Maia. Maia had 14 years’ experience teaching across co-educational and single sex schools and other schools outside of Waitaha. She had taught Social Studies and Maths up to Year 10 and NCEA Level 2 English. At the time of her interview she was teaching te reo Māori from Year 7 to Year 13 and had only assessed under NCEA.

The last kaiako to introduce is Maria. Maria had 12 years teaching experience. She had teaching experience in co-educational and single sex schools in Waitaha. Maria had taught junior Maths however taught predominantly te reo Māori. She was teaching te reo Māori Year 9 to Year 13 at the time of her interview.

Qualitative questions were created before the interviews commenced initially by the researcher and further developed and amended by some participants. Themes appeared and within each theme there were sub themes and these are highlighted throughout this chapter. The first theme are the pressures of being the kaiako of te reo Māori.

4.2. PRESSURES

Kaiako who were interviewed shared their concerns about the pressures of high kaiako workload including the extra work that was asked of kaiako who had a strong knowledge of cultural competency, and in many situations that was the kaiako of te reo Māori. Another pressure commonly emphasised by the researched participants was multi-year levelled te reo Māori classes, where more than one year level was timetabled at the same time in the same class with the same kaiako. For many kaiako of this research, this was two year levels in one class, for example Year 12 and 13, and for one participant, she taught three year levels in one class. An additional area where pressure was experienced by kaiako were assessments, in particular preparing ākonga to sit external examinations. These one off tests were difficult to prepare due to reduced classroom preparation time that multi-year levelled classrooms created. These areas described the extra workload felt by kaiako.
4.2.1 Extra workload

Increasing workload for kaiako, both primary and secondary has been commonly known across Aotearoa for many years. Increasing workloads looked differently to different kaiako, yet, there was the same outcome of pressure and stress that was felt and shown. The research participants were asked to describe pressures they had as the kaiako of te reo Māori, and one mutual area that was revealed was advising on bi-cultural practices within their schools, such as Pōwhiri, Mihi Whakatau and organising and attending whānau hui. Maria stated that she was expected to, “organise Manu Kōrero and Pōwhiri and ensure that tikanga is being upheld throughout the school being the pillar of all knowledge around things Māori”. Aroha also shared similar thoughts to Maria where she was asked to organise, “Pōwhiri for this, that and everything, there’s just lots, I think that Māori teachers do more, so they are always busy. Running cultural evenings and all sorts of things that other teachers don’t do”. As well as organising and supporting the cultural practices of a school, other cultural activities that many kaiako of this research were involved in was Ngā Manu Kōrero speech competition and Kapa Haka.

Ngā Manu Kōrero speech competition is held annually and the regional Kapa Haka competitions are every second year. These competitions were organised by Te Roopu Kaiako Kura Tuarua ki Waitaha – Canterbury Māori Teachers Secondary Schools Association. As well as community events, many of our kaiako either tutored and/or were the teacher in charge of Kapa Haka, therefore they organised practices, kept in touch with whānau and organised other performances at other cultural events. For some schools, they combined with other schools to make one haka group, and so regularly keeping in contact with other kaiako at other schools in order to have practices at the same time, was important to maintaining these relationships. Maria revealed that the “workload of a te reo Māori teacher is... high because of everything else that surrounds that”. Kapa Haka and Ngā Manu Kōrero Speech competitions are important kaupapa (topics) to te Ao Māori (the Māori world) and both these kaupapa celebrated and embraced te reo Māori. Nevertheless, these curricular activities were not included into the teaching time allowance allocated for our kaiako of te reo Maōri as these areas were considered as extra curricular. Therefore, the extra work required for these roles placed pressure on
time and resourcing for our interviewed kaiako. Another area where time was consumed was assisting with the pastoral support of Māori ākonga.

Pastoral support of all ākonga is fundamental to the whole wellbeing of an ākonga. Some of our interviewed kaiako have been asked to be involved and to provide assistance with pastoral support with Māori ākonga and their whānau. Maria described her high workload was also due to, “… the pastoral needs, needing to be in different meetings, been called on as an advisor...”. Like Maria, Maia had also been asked to take responsibility in pastoral areas of our Māori ākonga at her school. Maia stated, “unfortunately teaching comes secondary to other things that I have had to take responsibility for, even though I am not a Dean, I’m not pastoral. Te Ara Raukura, that’s been given to me, even though it shouldn’t”. Assisting with the pastoral support of Māori ākonga and their whānau by those who were knowledgeable and experienced with cultural engagement, like that of our kaiako of te reo Māori, was positive and, it validated and acknowledged their cultural knowledge and background. However the time used to assist these areas was taken from teaching preparation time because no time allowance or renumeration was given to these kaiako. Furthermore, pastoral support of Māori ākonga go beyond the classroom and school hours. Kaiako in this research, attended after school and weekend activities in order to support our ākonga, like that of Te Ara Raukura leadership programme.

Maia communicated about the leadership and mentoring programme of Te Ara Raukura. Te Ara Raukura was a group made up Māori ākonga who were educated in secondary schools in the eastern area of Christchurch. It was established to develop their leadership skills and was delivered within a kaupapa Māori setting strengthening their culture, language and identity. This programme also strengthened the whakawhanaungatanga between different schools. It was organised and delivered by Ngāi Tūāhuriri, Te Tapuae o Rēhua and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu. This collective group wanted to support Māori ākonga who were affected by the earthquakes, particularly the secondary schools in the eastern area of Christchurch. This initiative was centred around one day and overnight wānanga throughout the year and continued to run over four years. The organisers of Te Ara
Raukura planned and implemented the programme, including the education outside the classroom risk identification, assessment and management (EOTC RAMS) form. This programme also required each school to provide a committed kaiako to support their own ākonga in each session, organise transport and day relief. Overnight and weekend wānanga affected kaiako with whānau. This was a positive initiative that concluded in term one 2019 and it assisted and supported the growth of many Māori rangatahi who were involved. For many of these sessions it was the reo Māori kaiako who gave their time to support to this cultural initiative.

Maria and Maia claimed that the time spent assisting in the cultural areas, affected preparation time on their teaching programmes. Maria expressed, “I think if we were just teachers of te reo Māori and that was our only job was to teach a quality programme of te reo I think the workload would be quite manageable”. Maia also shared, “because of everything, my teaching and learning programme has gone to the way side a bit”. Kaiako of this research were used within important bi-cultural practices within their school and the consequence for them was reduced time to prepare quality lessons for their classroom. Time to prepare quality lessons was needed by kaiako especially for their senior classes, as all kaiako interviewed had at least one multi-year levelled class composition they taught.

4.2.2 Multi-year levelled class composition.

As kaiako, it is important that we know and understand the composition of our class, for example, who our ākonga are, where they are from, who their whānau are, and how they learn best. This knowledge is fundamental in developing positive relationships with ākonga. One common theme amongst the kaiako of this research was teaching in combined senior classes. A combined class in this context was a multi-year levelled class, for example Year 12 and Year 13 ākonga were timetabled at the same time with the same kaiako. This composition was usually seen when ākonga numbers were too small to create a single year levelled class and, it also allowed the subject to continue being taught.

Maia’s senior classes consisted of 22 ākonga who were taught in a Year 11, 12 and 13 combined class. Aroha taught a combined Year 12 and 13 class with 17 ākonga
and one single Year 11 class with eight ākonga. Maria also taught a combined Year 12 and 13 class with usually over 15 ākonga and 10 ākonga in her Year 11 class. Anahera had only one senior class, Year 11, however it was a combination of two schools. Anahera taught Year 11 ākonga from her school and a neighbouring school. Anahera’s ākonga in Years 12 and 13 were taught NCEA Levels 2 and 3 te reo Māori at that neighbouring school by another kaiako, who was also teaching those ākonga in a combined Year 12 and 13 class. Kaiako also indicated that they taught each senior class for 50 to 60 minutes in each period (class time), four times a week. Therefore, the average time of teaching and learning in single year levelled classroom setting was 3.5 to 4 hours per week, whereas each year level in the combined two year levelled class on average had 1.4 to 2 hours per week, which was half the teaching and learning time compared to the single year levelled senior classes. However, the average teaching and learning time for Maia’s ākonga was further reduced to 1.1 to 1.2 hours per week. These reduced teaching and learning times described were difficult for kaiako and most likely for their ākonga. Aroha stated, “yeah, you’ve got all these mixed levels in the class. I think it’s unfair and difficult and not good for their achievement...”. Less teaching and learning time for ākonga could affect their achievement in NCEA. Teaching and learning a year programme in half the time available including preparation for internal and external NCEA assessments was unfair and difficult. Maia shared her difficulties in completing assessments in her combined Year 11, 12 and 13 class.

I have to admit, this year has been difficult, I haven’t done any whakarongo assessments... when I’ve got four hours to teach three curriculum levels, sorry, three NCEA levels, but in reality, I am teaching seven curriculum levels, it’s difficult.

The Whakarongo assessment is an internal assessment standard offered across NCEA Levels 1 to 3 and is completed in the classroom under teacher supervision. Each ākonga who chose to do this standard were required to submit two different whakarongo assessment pieces in their portfolio, therefore kaiako were required to administer at least two whakarongo assessments. For Maia, she was required to administer at least a minimum of six Whakarongo assessments within the year, with
the little teaching time she had. The multi-year levelled classroom described, placed enormous pressure and stress on te reo Māori kaiako and less time for ākonga to be exposed in the language.

The pressure and stress on kaiako have implications for the learning and growth of ākonga who have chosen to learn te reo Māori. Maria said, “overarching in every level, not enough time exposed to te reo is definitely a reason why language is not progressing as it should”. Less time exposed in the language placed limitations on the growth of the learner being able to speak at a proficient level and the growth and strength of te reo Māori to be maintained and sustained, not only in schools, but across Aotearoa also. If ākonga found the reduced amount of time too difficult to learn in, they were likely not to continue with learning te reo Māori. Therefore, the support of senior management is vital and needed in order to support their ākonga and kaiako in their schools teaching and learning te reo Māori.

The classroom settings described by Aroha who had 17 ākonga in her Year 12 and 13 class and Maia who had a combined Year 11, 12 and 13 class question whether school valued and placed importance on te reo Māori, their kaiako and their ākonga. Aroha described, “a lot of combining of different classes and it’s just an indication of whether or not the school values the subject and its students and how much support, financial support they’ll put in it”. Kaiako of this research described how pressured it was to teach multi-year levelled classes, including preparing ākonga for external NCEA examinations.

4.2.3 External examinations
External examinations and one off internal assessments are conducted within a time limit and required ākonga to recall and apply content and skills they had learnt in class and for many of these types of assessments, without class notes. For many ākonga, this method of assessment created pressure and stress. Maria expressed that when ākonga were sitting a one off assessment, ākonga were, “…under pressure for an hour and a half is quite a daunting task for them”. Although stress was felt by many ākonga, preparing ākonga to sit these examinations also created pressure for kaiako. Maria described that preparing ākonga for external
examinations was “probably one of the hardest part of teaching te reo” and teaching and learning in a multi-year levelled senior class did not help either.

Another area of pressure for kaiako, was the unknown possibilities of what the examiners would set in the examinations across all levels of NCEA. Aroha expressed her concerns that, “the assessments are just so unrealistic from NZQA it’s ridiculous. That there is not enough there, not enough guidance for students...it all just so limitless...lack of resources, lack of parameters, lack of guidance”. She further explained that parameters meant, that “there is no end...they [students] can learn 50,000 lists they can still miss the mark because the examiners don’t have a guidance about where they can take their language from, it’s plucked out of their heads”. There was not enough information to guide and support our ākonga to prepare for external examinations. Assessment specifications inform kaiako of what to expect in the external examinations, but it did not provide enough information and guidance.

In the late 2000’s, assessment specifications indicated likely kaupapa that could be examined, which gave guidance around possible kaupapa to teach in the classrooms. Today, assessment specifications on the NZQA website provided the format and parameters for external examinations for Tuhituhi and Pānui for Levels 1, 2 and 3. Level 2 Pānui parameters stipulated that students will answer questions about the “exploratory world with familiar and less familiar themes” (NZQA, n.d.g). Level 3 Pānui and Tuhituhi topics related to “local, national and global themes” (NZQA, n.d.h). This was the reason Aroha said “there is no end” – the parameters of possible assessed topics are limitless, vague and ambiguous for English medium second language learners of te reo Māori. These were unrealistic expectations placed upon ākonga and were unhelpful to ākonga and to kaiako of te reo Māori. Aroha also continued to express,

Again our assessors, NZQA powers that be, are unrealistic I think of what they expect our second language learners as well... examinations [which] do not assess them at all on anything that
they are expected know, based on sound second language learning methodology.

And so, in order to express kaiako thoughts and feedback about external examinations, te reo Māori kaiako are encouraged to provide feedback on external examinations on the NZQA website. This is often available after the NCEA examinations. Aroha encouraged, “…teachers, we need to be more pro-active of giving feedback as well…that [is] something we should all be doing”. This feedback will empower kaiako to have their say about the parameters of the external examinations, in order to be a voice for second language learners learning te reo Māori. Aroha explained that she had sent feedback previously. She expressed, “I have sent letters, but I haven’t done that feedback. I get the feeling that they don’t look at anything else other than the feedback so that’s what they have to look at”. Aroha also explained that she did not get a response from NZQA. It is important that kaiako provide feedback so that our ākonga who are second language learners are fairly assessed, as the idea of changing the Whakarongo internal assessment to an external assessment, similar to other languages such as Japanese and French, have been suggested by other kaiako who teach te reo Māori.

As previously discussed, the Whakarongo assessment was a portfolio internal assessment, which was created and assessed by the te reo Māori kaiako. Changing the Whakarongo internal assessment to an external examination, like Japanese and French, was a possible idea of assisting with workload in the classroom throughout the year and may also increase the number of ākonga completing the Kōrero internal assessment. Maria conveyed, “I don’t believe that the whakarongo should be internal…I just think like with other languages it’s an external…” Similarly to Aroha, where she said, “…it’s the whakarongo that was problematic. I’d almost want it to be put into the exams like other languages…”. There were varying reasons for the idea of changing whakarongo to an external assessment. For Aroha, the whakarongo assessments were very time consuming, from creating the assessment and marking schedule to moderating the assessment and conducting the assessment, marking the assessment and moderating the marking all became time consuming. However for Maria she saw that this would be an opportunity for more
validity and standardisation of this assessment if it became an external exam. Maria felt that the Whakarongo internal assessments she moderated were variable. Despite the thoughts of changing the Whakarongo internal assessment to a high stake assessment, some kaiako disagreed with this, as Aroha described, “...I don’t trust our examiners to be able to do that in a good way”. For some kaiako, there was little trust that the examiners would be able to examine fairly due to experiences with the Pānui and Tuhituhi external examinations. Maia described that whakarongo assessments should be “valuable that they’re able to use, able to develop te reo, the language, and be able to use it”. She also provided some examples of what a whakarongo assessment could look like for example, it could be a kaiako providing tasks where ākonga would produce an item or an object as the end result, for example cooking or baking an item. Nevertheless, NZQA statistics showed that one te reo Māori internal assessment that fewer ākonga opted into and that was the Kōrero internal assessment.

4.3 KŌRERO
Quantative data from NZQA (n.d.f) in 2018 revealed a reduced number of ākonga completing the Kōrero internal assessment in Levels 1, 2 and 3 across the country, compared to the Waihanga Tuhiinga and Whakarongo internal assessments. This data didn’t provide reasons, however kaiako who were interviewed in this research presented some reasons. Some stated that the kōrero internal assessment promoted ākonga to rote learn speeches and conversations, rather than encourage fluency for everyday conversations. Furthermore, some schools have reduced the number of credits offered to ākonga, as ākonga were offered too many credits needed to achieve NCEA Levels 1, 2 and 3. Reduced credits assisted ākonga workload and over assessing. In addition, kaiako also recognised some ākonga lacked confidence speaking the language especially within an assessment setting.

4.3.1 Lack of confidence to speak the language
When delivering a speech in front of an audience, having confidence helps. Some research participants revealed their ākonga lacked confidence when they presented a speech in front of an audience and/or speaking for a period of time without or little assistance of cue cards. Because of this, many of their ākonga did not enter
the Kōrero internal achievement standard. Maria suggested that, “I think a lot of it is confidence in speaking”, and continued to say that, “...they tend to favour the writing more than the speaking”. Maia and Aroha reflected similar feelings where their ākonga were also not confident with speaking te reo Māori. Maia said she “only assess[ed] Whakarongo and Waihanga Tuhinga”. For rangatahi (youth), the pressure of saying something incorrectly in front of their peers or adults was a fear that consumed confidence, and to some extent left ākonga feeling vulnerable. Because of this, some ākonga preferred to work towards achieving the Whakarongo and Waihanga Tuhinga internal assessments, as these assessments required them to interact individually rather than orally interacting in front of peers or adults. However, as kaiako we need to encourage our ākonga to have conversations in te reo Māori, so that their confidence can grow.

Creating a safe and encouraging environment, where ākonga were comfortable to speak te reo Māori to their peers and adults can help grow their confidence. Aroha believed that “you can focus on your kōrero as part of your teaching programme rather than your assessment programme...”, thus removing the stress and pressure of the assessment criteria that the Kōrero assessment prescribed. This could assist with building their confidence to have conversations, no matter what level they are at. Aroha stated,

I do know that it should be achievable and students should be rewarded for the language that they are able to produce— at a conversational level, rather than focusing on the production or reproduction of large chunks of more complex language, which detracts from the aim of studying a language; being developing their ability to converse.

Kaiako who have participated in this study have expressed that they and their ākonga wanted to be able to hold everyday conversations in te reo Māori without the pressure and expectation of whether the language they were using was at the correct curriculum level. Maia conveyed that if she had more teaching and learning time with her ākonga to teach kōrero she would promote, “… incidental
conversations. You know, things, conversations that they have around other things that we don’t prescribe them to have conversations around”. Having the time to be able to help ākonga produce unprescribed conversations was important when learning a language and developing confidence. When ākonga were pressured to produce a kōrero at a prescribed curriculum level, rote learning was more visible.

4.3.2 Kōrero promoted rote learning rather than conversation

The kōrero internal assessment across NCEA Levels 1, 2 and 3 required ākonga to submit two pieces of kōrero evidence while meeting the criteria of the achievement standard. Some examples of evidence could be a speech and a conversation between people. It was claimed that these types of evidence encouraged ākonga to memorise speech and memorise structured conversation rather than naturally conversing in the language. Aroha explained, “...because I figure that it’s just another lot of rote learning it’s just another waihanga tuhinga with the rote learning and memory test, yeah, rather than kōrero”. When learning another language, the goal for most learners and kaiako is for learners to be able to converse and interact with others in the language. NCEA subjects Japanese, French and German assess an internal assessment called the Interact assessment, where ākonga orally interacted with each other within an assessment setting. However, it was seen by some kaiako that some ākonga rote learnt conversations.

The Interact internal assessment prescribed ākonga to collect pieces of evidence by recording interactions with others in the language. Aroha spoke of ākonga rote learning interactions as she said,

The languages department here has an interaction standard that they can do, they have just decided to can it [stop assessing] because what they are finding, the girls are doing is not the spontaneous language that’re supposed to be getting assessed for, they are rote learning.

Rote learning enabled ākonga to focus particularly on form and content of their conversation while they attempted to include complex sentence structures. This
practice ensured ākonga that they were doing their very best to achieve the Interaction internal assessment, and for some ākonga to achieve with a high grade such as Merit or Excellence. This was also the case for ākonga who learnt te reo Māori. Aroha suggested that ākonga who were striving for quality grades, such as Merit or Excellence was another reason ākonga rote learnt conversations and speeches. Achievement standards for internal and external assessments for all subjects use a grade scoring mark of Not Achieved, Achieved, Merit and Excellence. Achieved, Merit and Excellence indicated the quality of a passed grade, whereas the Not Achieved meant that the ākonga did not meet the required standard of the internal and external assessment. For some of Aroha’s ākonga, the quality of the achievement was an important goal of NCEA, as some strived to gain a subject endorsement with Excellence or Merit and, or an overall Excellence and Merit endorsement for Levels 1, 2 and 3. However, some schools have required learning departments to reduce the number of credits offered because of over assessment.

4.3.3 Reduced NCEA credits
Ākonga are required to achieve at least 80 NCEA credits in Level 1, where 10 credits must consist of numeracy and literacy in order to achieve NCEA Level 1. If ākonga reached that criteria successfully in Year 11, ākonga at Years 12 and 13 needed to achieve 60 credits or more in NCEA Levels 2 and 3 to achieve these qualifications. University Entrance (UE) also required ākonga to achieve 10 UE literacy credits, which consisted of, five reading and five writing credits, from Level 2 and/or Level 3 achievement standards where UE literacy was offered. Each internal and external assessment was worth a number of credits. Subjects offered ākonga the opportunity to complete a number of different internal and external assessments, which resulted in too many credits in total being offered to ākonga, and so they were being over assessed.

Over assessment occurred when subjects offered ākonga lots of achievement standards where they had the opportunity to gain many credits. Because of this, some schools have asked each subject department to offer similar reduced number of credits, in order to ease the amount of internal and external assessments and to
protect the preservation and wellbeing of ākonga. Kaiako who were in schools that enforced reduced credits, would decide which internal and external assessments to offer. However it was important to consider who their ākonga were in their classroom and what their learning needs were when deciding what assessments were offered. This indicated where the classroom time would be spent on. Some te reo Māori kaiako were more inclined not to offer the Kōrero internal assessment and offer the Whakarongo and Waihanga Tuhinga. Maia’s school implemented reduced credits, and it was because of this reason she did not offer the Kōrero internal assessment. “[I] do not offer Kōrero at Level 1, 2 and 3 as my school caps credits for each subject. For example, 18 to 20 credits are offered per subject”. Aroha also expressed similar thoughts where her school looked at reducing credits to prevent ākonga being over assessed. Over assessing was also caused by the number of subjects ākonga selected to study. Some schools allowed ākonga to study more subjects in order to provide a wider range of options for their ākonga, or schools were state integrated, otherwise known as a special character schools. Maia explained further that her school offered subjects in order “…to encourage students to take a range of subjects rather than limiting students to a few subjects where many credits could be offered”. Allowing ākonga to take a range of subjects allowed them the opportunity to try new areas for future possibilities.

Alternatively, many special character schools, who were founded by a particular religious faith, taught Religious Education or Religious Studies within their teaching curriculum and for many special character schools was a compulsory subject in secondary education from Year 9 to Year 13. Religious Education or Religious Studies was also a NCEA subject where internal assessments from Levels 1 to 3 were offered. In many cases, this subject was an additive subject on a subject load similar to mainstream schools. However in 2018, the Government commenced engagement with kaiako who assessed with NCEA across Aotearoa, discussing possible changes to NCEA. Despite the possible changes in the feature of NCEA, professional learning support for te reo Māori kaiako continued to be a valuable practice.
4.4 PROFESSIONAL LEARNING DEVELOPMENT

Support was important for kaiako and ākonga. Professional learning development was one form of support that was available to kaiako. For kaiako of te reo Māori support amongst each other was valuable. The kaiako of this research looked upon the support of the kāhui ako (cluster learning). Some also reflected upon the support of University of Canterbury Plus (UC Plus) when an advisory role was established to support te reo Māori kaiako to implement NCEA when it first commenced. NZQA also has a website where all subject resources are found including links to exemplars of internal assessments and past examination papers. Kaiako reflected upon the suitability of the exemplars provided. Nevertheless, kanohi ki te kanohi, face to face support enabled whakawhiti kōrero with other kaiako of te reo Māori.

4.4.1 Other kaiako of te reo Māori support

One most likely support for kaiako of te reo Māori are other kaiako who teach te reo Māori. Te reo Māori kaiako have supported each other with creating and critquing new internal assessments and derived examinations, moderation and teaching activities to help with language learning. Having the time to whakawhiti kōrero and share resources was invaluable.

In 2013 and 2014 a cluster group of kaiako reo Māori was formed to provide professional development to kaiako within the Waitaha (Canterbury) region. Hui took place one or two days a year. At that time, experienced te reo Māori kaiako in Ōtautahi facilitated these professional learning development days, which focused on the needs of kaiako, in particular NCEA internal and external assessments and teaching practices. Funding or part funding was applied for in order to help fund or part fund teacher release days, which was used to pay the respective school for a reliever. This funding was supported by Ako Panuku and was valuable when NCEA aligned to the New Zealand Curriculum.

It was during this time that changes to NCEA took place where achievement standards was aligned to the curriculum achievement objectives of Te Aho Arataki
mō te Ako i Te Reo Māori – Kura Auraki and the New Zealand Curriculum. Change was slow, however the support of this group was very helpful including the funding or part funding to enable schools to release kaiako from their school. Overtime, this group grew in number and smaller cluster groups were formed.

In 2016 the cluster group became cluster groups. Due to the growing number of te reo Māori kaiako in Ōtautahi / Waitaha, smaller cluster groups, with a lead kaiako in each group, were formed and continued the professional development for kaiako like that of the larger group. Leading kaiako continued to apply to Ako Panuku for kaiako funding or part funding. Aroha described the worthiness of these professional development days. “Looking at moderation as a cluster is really good. So many different levels of where you are at”. Anahera also appreciated the benefit of these days. “We have one more meeting this year and this is going to be moderation, which will be very helpful...”. Meaningful and valuable discussions took place around moderation including whakawhiti kōrero around the justification of marks given to ākonga. This time provided the opportunity for kaiako to see different levels of ākonga knowledge and produced work from different schools and it revealed a snap shot of who the second language learners were in te reo Māori classrooms in English medium schools. Moderating internal assessments was a timely and important process.

Internal assessments that were created by kaiako and had not yet been externally moderated by external moderators of NZQA, were required to be critiqued by another kaiako of that subject before it was used as an assessment in the classroom. Once ākonga had completed the internal assessment, kaiako marked the assessment. Once the assessment was marked and graded by the kaiako, another kaiako who has experience and knowledge of that achievement standard for that internal assessment would moderate, in most cases a kaiako who taught the same subject. NZQA (n.d.i) stated,

The verification process is to ensure that the teacher judgements are consistent with the standard...the marker should seek
verification of samples of work around grade boundaries, as well as for any grades that need review, to satisfy themselves that their decisions are consistent with the standard (para. 6).

The moderation process of marking portfolios opened up communication and collaboration amongst kaiako. Kaiako were also able to see different teaching strategies reflected in pieces of ākonga work. The opportunity to converse with other kaiako about different learning strategies was a positive aspect of these cluster hui. Aroha explained that,

It's talking about the strategies... a teacher would bring in [an] amazing piece [of] work from a student but had some really good strategies of how they scaffolded it and how they got there which is just as important to look at and valuable for me.

Different teaching strategies that worked in classroom was valuable information because kaiako were encouraged to continually learn and reflect upon teaching strategies that worked and didn't work for different ākonga. Understanding how our ākonga learn as a second language learner is vital for the growth of their knowledge of the reo, their success in the reo and the growth of the reo.

In order to moderate, most kaiako of te reo Māori would meet after school, in the weekends, or during the school holidays, as it was difficult to meet te reo Māori kaiako during school hours because of little time available during the day and possibly the time and distance to travel between schools. The reason that kaiako needed to travel to other schools was that for many te reo Māori kaiako, they were the only te reo Māori kaiako at their school. Therefore, the cluster days provided kaiako the time during school hours to meet and to moderate assessments. Maia described how she moderated. "I used..... for moderation...with her [personal circumstances] and getting busier being a Dean the time to moderate wasn't really there". Anahera also expressed the difficulty to moderate compared to other
learning subjects who have more than one kaiako who taught that subject within their school. Anahera shared, "...yes it is quite difficult being the only te reo Māori teacher in the school, because if you are teaching English for example you just casually have conversations with other people". The ability to freely meet kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) and converse about assessments and moderation was difficult for te reo Māori kaiako compared to other subjects, such as English, Mathematics and Science. Although contact through email and telephone is a possible method, it would not provide the same wairua as kanohi ki te kanohi. Another example of support that ensured kanohi ki te kanohi was tuakana-teina support.

4.4.2 Tuakana - teina support

A role that existed not long after the commencement of NCEA was a secondary school’s advisor for kaiako of te reo Māori. This paid role was administered by University of Canterbury Plus (UC Plus) and supported experienced and new kaiako with the implementation of NCEA. These relationships demonstrated tuakana-teina, where the expert teacher was the tuakana (older or more expert) who helped and guided teina (younger or less expert) who were new to the profession. Aroha was familiar with this role as she used the support of the advisor. She explained that the role was,

Just about teaching teachers the reason the purpose and how to implement NCEA... it was before the merit and excellences, so it was just a matter of, why do we do this, what does it look like and what are all the bits and pieces the components of it...

Maia also used the help and guidance of the UC Plus advisor during her first te reo Māori teaching position teaching in a secondary school in the early to mid 2000’s. She described how helpful and supportive it was having an advisor. Maia described learning the specifications of NCEA in it’s early stages as learning “through trial and error and [the advisor] guiding and supporting me. If [the advisor] hadn’t been
able to help me, I would have been lost in how to teach NCEA...". The support of another kaiako who was experienced and competent with teaching and assessing enabled our new kaiako to become more confident with teaching and assessing.

As a young kaiako, Maia valued the support of the secondary advisor, especially with NCEA. She has reciprocated the help and support she received, as she was a tuakana to new te reo Māori kaiako supporting them through NCEA te reo Māori. However, this was an unpaid position and it was her kindness and aroha that Maia supported those kaiako. Maia expressed, “I am supporting...because he was in the same position I was 14 years ago...I’ve been where he’s at and I know how hard it is...he’s got a fresh perspective and fresh eyes on...he’s enthusiastic to trial new things”. Maia understood and knew the uncertainty of implementing NCEA as a new kaiako and her years of experience as a kaiako benefited other teina. The relationship of tuakana-teina can also be reciprocated through Ako (reciprocal learning), where the teina also taught the tuakana. New and fresh perspectives with enthusiasm for teaching from teina today are aspects in teaching that tuakana can be reminded of. In addition to tuakana-teina support, NZQA provided a range of support resources for assessment through their website.

4.4.3 NZQA support

Opinions of how useful the NZQA website was to the researched kaiako was variable. Maia explained that the exemplars online were not helpful. She said, “I don’t use anything on TKI”. Aroha also expressed similar sentiments. “The assessments are just so unrealistic from NZQA it’s ridiculous. That there is not enough there...”. These approved exemplars were expected to provide guidance to kaiako when creating their own internal assessment work. The exemplars published on the TKI website rectify this, however there are only few exemplars published when there is a wide variety of topics that ākonga could learn in NCEA Levels 1, 2 and 3. Therefore, another approach to assist with professional development with NCEA is to become an external and/or an internal assessment moderator.
Experienced kaiako could apply to become an external moderator and/or an external examination marker. This opportunity to moderate and mark work from ākonga across the nation would increase confidence with understanding, creating and conducting internal and external assessments. The opportunity could also provide new content and concept ideas of assessing and linking assessments with curriculum objectives. Maia spoke about the benefit of being an external marker.

Until you mark a standard you don’t know. You know there’s also the moderation, internal moderation kahui, there’s I think there’s positions open on those. It would be amazing to be on for a year to see what other people do.

Although this could be considered as another job on the ever increasing workload kaiako have, especially for te reo Māori kaiako, the likely benefits can become advantageous for kaiako in the classroom and to see how other kaiako assess their ākonga. It would also provide the opportunity to see other portfolio assessments, which was one preferred method of assessing by most of the kaiako involved in this research.

4.5 PREFERRED METHOD OF ASSESSING

The alignment of NCEA and NZC in 2011 with Level 1, then the roll out period of Levels 2 and 3 over 2012 and 2013, saw the one off test for each internal achievement standard for te reo Māori for Levels 1, 2 and 3 change to collecting multiple pieces of evidence for a portfolio for the internal assessments for Waihangatuhinga, Whakarongo and Kōrero. Pieces of evidence were different assessment pieces collected by ākonga to create a portfolio. Currently, ākonga submit two pieces of evidence for each internal assessment. Portfolio’s allowed ākonga time to learn new sentence structures, vocabulary, kīwaha (idioms), whakataukī (proverbs) and to use this knowledge learnt within their pieces of assessment evidence. Portfolio’s also enabled ākonga to have the flexibility to edit work over a time period where kaiako provided feedback and feedback and provided a more realistic information of the learning progress of the ākonga.
Portfolios were one of the preferred methods of assessment by most kaiako involved in this research. One reason for this was collating pieces of evidence for a portfolio, across different genres, throughout the academic year, provided more suitable information about what ākonga had learnt and how they applied what they had learnt in different contexts. Maria expressed,

...[students] can gather small pieces of speaking evidence throughout the year and there’s no big one off speech[es] that a lot is hanging on...[portfolios] gives a much more realistic picture of the progress that’s happening for the student. Heading that way is more ideal than one off assessments.

Portfolio assessments provided more realistic information about the progress of the ākonga during the school year, rather than a quick snap shot like that of a one off test. The one off test and, assessments of that same nature, examined what ākonga learnt and retained which resulted in either a pass or fail, and for many ākonga this created stress. Aroha also expressed her preference for portfolio’s,

I actually like the idea behind NCEA and particularly appreciate the opportunity to do the internal assessments [portfolio assessments], because then I am able to assess them on what they know and there is also a lot of learning that occurs as students complete their preparation for these.

Portfolio are assessed by kaiako rather than NZQA. Kaiako assess their ākonga based on what has been taught in the classroom or it allowed ākonga to decide on their pieces of writing. It also allowed ākonga time throughout the year to learn content, process their learning and practice what they had learnt within their pieces of crafted work. Aroha explained that, “portfolios gives them [ākonga] the impetus to look really carefully at grammar and to focus on learning vocabulary, which is beneficial for all areas of their language learning”. Teaching grammar and vocabulary to ākonga and having time for ākonga to process these skills assisted
with language learning. Kaiako encouraged their ākonga to think about how they could use their grammar knowledge and new grammar taught within their pieces of evidence. Maria explained that, “...constant reminding as we’re learning a new concept, or a new structure saying how can this be used in one of your pieces of writing that you are working on”. Maria encouraged her ākonga to think about how new grammar could be applied in the different pieces of work that the ākonga were working on for their Waihanganga Tuhinga or Kōrero. This process also allowed crafting to take place. Portfolios allowed ākonga time to craft their work as the portfolio for Waihanganga Tuhinga required ākonga to show evidence of editing and re-working their work over a period of time. Maria stated that, “they are used to taking their leisurely time writing a piece of writing, you know it gets done over the year and they come back and they re-visit it they might chuck in another sentence here and there”. Most researched kaiako said that their final submission date for portfolios was at the end of term three. This gave many ākonga three terms to complete two pieces of evidence for each internal assessment portfolio. Maria claimed that her “students can work throughout the year, and I always give a submission date at the end of term three”. Once again, this time allowed ākonga to process content taught in class and time to practice using the language. Time was allocated for ākonga to work on their portfolio at school and/or at home.

Classroom time was limited, therefore there was more emphasis on using classroom time for teaching and learning rather than working on Waihanganga Tuhinga and Kōrero portfolios. This was to enable ākonga to have more time practising language grammar with the guidance of their kaiako. Maria said that ākonga had, “the weekend, holidays... not class time to work on their pieces of writing... I do tend to have to allocate class time near due date”. Using homework time to work on portfolio provided more time in the classroom. However, this was dependant on the type of learners kaiako had in their classrooms. For some ākonga, completing homework was difficult for one reason or another, and so this created a barrier to the progression of the portfolio. In these instances, including time to work on portfolios during class time was needed, especially if the Waihanganga Tuhinga portfolio was completed using Google doc.
Ākonga choose to complete their Waihanga Tuhi nga portfolio electronically or pen and paper. For many, Google doc was the preferred option, as it gave the ability to show edited work over a period of time. Maria said,

I would say 90% of the kids use google docs...I think it's quite a transparent way of seeing what's happening. If they go on there and delete the whole lot, you can always get it back it's not a big issue.

To use Google doc, connection to the internet was needed. For many whānau, the cost of having the internet / Wi-Fi at home was not possible and so they were not able to work on their Google doc at home. Hence, for some ākonga, their Waihanga Tuhi nga portfolio was completed with paper and pen. In order to assist ākonga with maintaining evidence of crafted work, a work book, like a 1B5 work book could be used, where drafted and crafted work was maintained in one document. When kaiako checked on the progress of portfolio's, ākonga could take photos of their portfolio and upload electronically at school in order to keep another copy somewhere else. The flexibility of submitting handwritten or electronic Waihanga Tuhi nga for their portfolio allowed ākonga to use tools convenient to them.

Another advantage of portfolios was the ability to be flexible, as it allowed ākonga and kaiako to have open discussions about the types of genre and possible kaupapa (topics) that ākonga wanted to submit within their portfolio for Waihanga Tuhi nga and/or Kōrero. Assessment conversations were likely to take place at the start of the year as Maria described,

It is flexible for each student over the year for the portfolio. As the portfolio start to develop, one student might find that their writing is not very strong, and so they want to put all their focus into their kōrero.
Maria illustrated that portfolio assessment provided flexibility. Ākonga had the flexibility to change, amend and add work throughout the year and allowed different types of learning and assessment conversations to take place between ākonga and kaiako about their portfolio assessments. Maria explained this as,

[We] talk about all the different options, a typical piece of writing in te reo. So, I’d say, okay, an example of a piece of writing could be a letter. So, we might be writing a letter, and we brainstorm all the types of letters… So, some might choose a letter, and then a report for the school magazine and then a narrative. And then others might choose two narratives and you know like, an instructional giving piece or something like that. So, they’ll start that up midway through term one… So, all the class are looking at report writing, we can focus on that genre of writing… And then as the year progresses, we may look at the kaupapa of school history or school rules or something like that. I can help guide them towards including more into their portfolio.

The flexibility of portfolio assessment enabled ākonga to produce work that they could relate to or had an interested in, rather than kaiako directed, thus the assessment was driven by ākonga. This example showed that it was important to empower ākonga to make decisions about their work. Maia said, “I write my assessment based on the class”. Assessments were flexible to be designed to meet the needs and interests of their ākonga rather than the kaiako. Teaching and learning such as kaupapa and grammar were co-constructed between ākonga and kaiako.

It was important that ākonga had a buy into their learning and so giving ākonga the autonomy to decide on kaupapa was discussed by Maria. She stated,

Kaupapa can become a bit dry for them if it’s pre-written and not owned by them. I like to feel like, okay let’s talk about leisure activities, what do you guys do in your weekends and you know…
many of them maybe sporty people, okay so let’s start to talk about sport, how do we describe you know, your Saturday netball game, but then you get a class where hardly any of them are into sport, and so forcing them to write about sport, when they’re actually don’t care about it is quite hard, so, that’s why I tend to have a flexible programme around that.

Maria showed that it was important that ākonga owned their own work and that they wrote or spoke about kaupapa of interest, rather than the interests of the kaiako. This was also followed by co-constructing further content such as vocabulary and sentence structures for their respective kaupapa, which was also a practice Maria explained. “I like all of my lists of, you know, kupu [words] and structures and that are often co-constructed with the students, so going into the next week, you can’t actually say, I’m going to teach this”. Co-constructing grammar and vocabulary required teaching units of learning to be created on the go, therefore kaiako were not able to plan too much ahead like that of planned, prescribed units. Maria said that, “it works for them [ākonga] because they are more interested. It’s quite hard from a teacher’s point of view because you got to become much more flexible and you can’t plan too far ahead”. This enabled ākonga to become more interested in their learning.

Ākonga who were proficient and abled speakers of the language had the ability to easily co-construct grammar structures and vocabulary lists with kaiako. Kaiako of this study were aware that the prior knowledge of language of their ākonga depended on how much the portfolio was driven by them. Ākonga who had the capability and confidence to write or speak on their choice of genre and kaupapa were generally ākonga who had learnt te reo Māori for some time, for example, ākonga who were in Level 2 or Level 3 NCEA or ākonga with a bilingual background. Maria indicated that,

If they’re getting through to Year 12 and 13, Year 13 in particular, they need to be self-discovering language and thinking about
what kind of structures do I know and what do I need to know, those skills are something that can be enhanced and developed over the years.

This also encouraged ākonga to take responsibility for their learning. Ākonga who were in Level 1 NCEA were generally new to portfolio assessment therefore they required more guidance and help from kaiako with writing different genre and kaupapa. It was also suggested by some research participants that ākonga needed to practice collecting pieces of evidence to create a portfolio in order to build their confidence and understanding of these types of assessment. Most Level 1 ākonga, who were new to NCEA, also needed to have knowledge and understanding of the rules and processes of NCEA. Maria suggested that,

If they’re in Year 11 and they’re new to portfolio, we really spend a lot of time at the beginning of the year establishing what that is [be]cause it’s quite a new concept. We do lots of little practice things, which aren’t at all at the correct level for te reo, but just to build up that confidence of yes I can create something, a written or a spoken piece of something, with the language I already have and I can pop it into my portfolio and then just as the year starts to progress and we go on to our teaching and learning programme, which is language focus as opposed to assessment focus.

Maria’s suggestion for her Year 11 class to understand the concept of portfolio assessment was to gather pieces of evidence for their portfolio irrespective of the curriculum and language level which allowed her ākonga to focus on their language learning and knowledge rather than focus learning around assessment. This practice of collecting evidence irrespective of the curriculum and language level would also be beneficial for ākonga in Year 10. This would assist them to understand the concept of portfolio before Year 11.
Another feature of portfolio assessment in NCEA te reo Māori was to provide feedback and feed forward to ākonga. This was when kaiako checked the progress of portfolios and provided feedback to ākonga about an area or areas that they needed to address. Feedforward provided the advice to move forward. For example, if the ākonga had macrons missing from many kupu, the feedback would direct them to macrons missing and the feedforward could be, use macrons as you write your assessment, as it can be difficult going back over the document to find where the missing macrons go. The internal assessment for Waihanga Tuhinga across all levels stated that, “[All] students need to have the opportunity to receive feedback… you can validly make suggestions about areas where further development is needed...” (Te Kete Ipurangi, n.d.b). This reflective tool was valuable for both ākonga and kaiako as kaiako saw area(s) that needed further teaching, especially if kaiako noticed similar areas that needed addressing across ākonga work. It also showed that ākonga had understood language structures that had been taught. Maria described her practice of feedback and feed forward. She indicated that, “I had a look at your portfolio and I just noticed that these kinds of errors were coming up. Let’s look at these together as a class and remind ourselves about how we use this structure”. Discussing similar errors collectively as a class showed transparency and fairness towards all ākonga. Maria continued to explain that she was “…always really transparent with them about when I’m looking at their stuff”. This also enabled the same content to be taught to all ākonga. Although if one ākonga or a small group of ākonga showed that they didn’t quite understand a structure, then kaiako would provide feedback individually or in smaller groups. Maia shared that “any academic feedback and feedforward done is on an individual basis based on where they are at”. Ākonga learn differently, some are quick learners and others need regular revision to maintain learning, therefore individual feedback was relevant in some cases. Providing whole class or individual feedback and feedforward was also conducted at regular intervals for many of the researched kaiako, as it gave a good indication on where ākonga were at and how much they had completed. For some rangatahi, their expertise in procrastination and leaving work to the last minute is very real. The benefit of portfolio assessment is time, and this may appear a luxury to ākonga, therefore, regular checking is encouraged. Some kaiako checked once every two to three weeks and when it became closer to
the due date, feedback and feedforward became more frequent. Regular checking also indicated to kaiako whether their ākonga needed further support with time management with their portfolio. Here kaiako were able to sit one on one with their ākonga to help plan milestones.

4.6 Conclusion

The data collected were conducted through qualitative interviews. The four kaiako who participated in this research were experienced kaiako who had taught te reo Māori in English medium secondary schools in Waitaha. Although qualitative questions were used to direct the interview, the rich conversations had with all kaiako led our discussions to other areas. All interviews were voice recorded and after each interview, their kōrero became written narratives. There were common themes highlighted by kaiako and they are recapitulated below.

Firstly, te reo Māori kaiako felt obliged to assist in areas that required their expertise knowledge and caused pressure due to the extra workload. Many were asked to biculturally advise and organise tikanga Māori within their school such as Pōwhiri, Mihi Whakatau, Manu Kōrero speech competition and Kapa Haka. Some kaiako also advised on pastoral matters that involved ākonga and their whānau who were Māori. Although these kaiako were well qualified in assisting in those areas described, remuneration and/or time allowance, at that time, was not given to kaiako. Because of this, preparing quality lessons for their classroom became secondary at times. The pressure of being a te reo Māori kaiako was also felt teaching within multi-year levelled classes. Weather it was a combined Year 11 and 12 class or Year 12 and 13 class or teaching ākonga from another school, all kaiako had experienced multi-year levelled teaching. Their pressure was felt with the reduced time to teach and to assess their ākonga. This included time to prepare for external examinations, which caused stress to both kaiako and ākonga. The topics that were assessed in external examinations for all year levels were limitless for second language learners and little guidance from NZQA in assisting with preparing for external examinations, made it difficult for kaiako to prepare their ākonga.
Secondly, NZQA’s statistics showed that more students completed the Whakarongo and Waihanga Tuhinga internal assessments rather than the Kōrero internal assessment. Kaiako sensed that their ākonga lacked confidence to speak te reo Māori. For many ākonga, the fear of saying something incorrectly, consequently made ākonga whakamā (shy). Furthermore, the little time spent learning the language, also contributed to this. Kōrero internal assessment also promoted rote learning rather than natural conversation. Conversing in the language is an objective of learning a language, however it was difficult to obtain due to limited teaching and learning time and, ākonga striving to achieve higher grades such as Merit and Excellence. In order to achieve these grades, complex sentences were required, and so ākonga would rote learn in order to increase their chances of obtaining these grades. Furthermore, due to the high number of credits offered to ākonga in all NCEA levels, many schools have reduced the credit amount for each subject. Because of this, kaiako were likely not to offer the Kōrero internal assessment and focus on the Whakarongo and Waihanga Tuhinga internal assessments.

Thirdly, kaiako spoke about how to support each other, because for many English medium schools, there was only one te reo Māori kaiako at their respective school. A cluster group of te reo Māori kaiako was formed with the financial support of Ako Panuku. Ako Panuku funded or partially funded teacher release day(s) in order for kaiako to hui and to converse about teaching programmes, moderate internal assessments, create internal assessments and share resources that had been successful in the classroom. Due to the increased number of te reo Māori kaiako, smaller cluster groups were formed within different areas of Ōtautahi. The time and financial support to hold these hui was valuable support for kaiako, as it provided time during school hours for kaiako to meet. Another form of support kaiako spoke about was the role of te reo Māori secondary school’s advisor, which existed in the early 2000’s when NCEA first commenced. The advisor supported te reo Māori kaiako with implementing NCEA. Kaiako shared the appreciation of this role, as it assisted them when they were new to NCEA. Furthermore, some kaiako still see the need for this type of tuakana-teina role today. Lastly, kaiako spoke of the support the NZQA website provided. NZQA website provided
assessment exemplar resources for all NCEA levels including other areas of support such as the language grammar progression table. However some kaiako felt that the exemplar resources were too limited, and more support was required. It was suggested that kaiako become external markers and moderators as it could assist with understanding internal and external assessments better nevertheless, these roles required time to complete.

Lastly, kaiako expressed their preferred method of assessing. Most kaiako preferred the portfolio internal assessment. Ākonga collected pieces of evidence throughout the year rather than the one off tests and so it provided ākonga time to work on their crafted pieces of work. It also allowed ākonga to select the type of genre that they wanted to work on therefore, it was ākonga driven. Ākonga could also receive feedback and feedforward from their kaiako, such as advice on areas of development and where to next steps were important discussions for ākonga, as it enabled ākonga to further develop their learning of the language. Kaiako also shared that portfolio assessment allowed the co-constructing of work between kaiako and ākonga, which allowed ākonga to have autonomy and ownership of their work.

The rich kōrero that the kaiako of this research shared have contributed to gaining further knowledge. ‘They are the rangatira who have shared their knowledge.’
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Nāu te rourou, nāku te rourou ka ora ai te īwi. With your food basket and my food basket the people will prosper. This whakataukī speaks about the coming together and sharing for the wellbeing of all. The stories shared by the kaiako who participated in this study will come together with a range of research based on the themes, pressure, kōrero, professional learning and preferred method of assessing. These themes have emerged from the kōrero shared by kaiako of this study. The first theme to be discussed is pressures.

5.2 PRESSURES

The increasing workload of all kaiako has been evident for many years. In my first year of teaching in 2001, I had my first introduction to protest and strikes. That year was the renewal of teacher contracts and I found myself for the first time on strike, standing as one with other fellow kaiako protesting to the Government about pay and workload. Fast forward to 2019 and we as kaiako have striked and protested about pay and workload. Nevertheless, being the te reo Māori kaiako in an English medium secondary setting where it is likely that you are the only cultural expert in te reo and tikanga Māori within the school, has seen an increase of demand for their time and cultural knowledge. This is a positive sign for education, however, for the one kaiako who has the expertise in cultural knowledge, the extra demands increase the workload.

5.2.1 Extra workload

Kaiako who shared their stories in this study, of being the kaiako of te reo Māori in an English medium school revealed similar stories when they spoke about the other roles they were asked to help with, which was on top of their normal teaching and learning role. As they were experienced kaiako in te reo and tikanga Māori, they were organisers of Mihi Whakatau, Pōwhiri, whānau hui and cultural activities such
as Kapa Haka and Ngā Manu Kōrero speech competitions. Some kaiako also spoke about assisting in pastoral and mentoring roles of Māori ākonga, however no kaiako was a Dean. Similarly with the mentoring roles or programmes that Māori ākonga were involved with this required the support of kaiako, and because the mentoring programmes were for Māori ākonga, it was generally the kaiako of te reo Māori that supported these programmes. With the extra workload, many of the kaiako of this research found that the time used to complete those extra roles reduced their classroom preparation time. Classroom preparation time enabled kaiako to plan teaching lessons, to create or find resources to use in the lessons and to photocopy work. Although these kaiako were experienced kaiako who had worked in the profession for a number of years, kaiako were teaching multi-year levelled classes, therefore classroom preparation time was especially needed to organise lessons. Further discussion on multi-year levelled classes will be discussed in the next sub-theme.

Kaiako of this research, at the time of the interviews, received no renumeration. It is standard practice within all schools, that kaiako who have extra areas of responsibility, such as a Head of Learning Area or a Dean, were normally renumerated either by a monetary unit or time allowance, or both. With the increased demand of practicing bi-cultural practices, advising and being in charge of ‘all things Māori’, and being that important link of school and home, our kaiako of te reo Māori should have the same mana (status) as those who are being renumerated for their area(s) of extra responsibility.

In 1997, Brian Donnelly stated that Māori kaiako were the only bi-cultural experts working within their respective school and were the link between ākonga and their whānau and school. Torepe and Manning (2018) expressed that the extra cultural areas that were organised and facilitated by Māori kaiako, on top of their normal teaching and learning workload, was described as a ‘cultural taxation’ on Māori kaiako, as kaiako ‘felt obliged’ to perform these different cultural roles in order to support their Māori ākonga, whānau and community. Torepe and Manning (2018)
continued to suggest that the effect of Māori kaiako being the “one-stop-Māori-shop” (p. 117) resulted in the detriment of the well-being of the kaiako and thus Māori kaiako leaving the teaching profession. In 2019, the picture was similar, as Kupenga (2019) expressed that the heavy workload of a te reo Māori kaiako was not a positive enticement to enter this vocation. Education Conversation, otherwise known as Kōrero Mātauranga, publishes education conversations that have taken place around different hui held by the Ministry of Education. Education Conversation (2019) stated that there was a need for more professional development for kaiako (not te reo Māori kaiako) around te reo and tikanga Māori and culturally responsive practices. Professional development such as this, would assist with increasing the number of kaiako being more culturally responsive and knowledgable of cultural practices rather than just the reo Māori kaiako. Torepe et al. (2018) also expressed the need for culturally responsive professional learning development for other kaiako, in order to strengthen cultural responsiveness throughout their school and their classrooms. This could also assist with the organising of cultural practices within their school. However Torepe et al. (2018) also stated that Māori kaiako who facilitated these professional learning development would further add to the workload of Māori kaiako. Thus, an example of a current professional learning development that has been established, in conjunction with the Government, is Te Ahu o te Reo. Te Ahu o te Reo is a professional development programme aimed to increase, to support and to normalise te reo Māori in all education settings by 2025. As discussed, a small amount of funding was available to assist with teacher relief if required. Professional development programmes such as this, including other te reo and tikanga classes that are being taught all over Aotearoa are vital for all levels of education and, it is important that Board of Trustees and Tūmuaki (Principals) encourage as many kaiako to participate in professional development such as Te Ahu o te Reo.

As discussed in this section, the kaiako of this research taught in multi-year levelled classes. According to them, this was also another area of their teaching role where they experienced pressure.
5.2.2 Multi-year levelled composition

Teaching multi-year levelled senior classes was another common description shared by the kaiako of this research that created further pressure for them. Multi-year levelled classes for te reo Māori was due to smaller ākonga numbers opting into the subject, and so as Lloyd (2007) expressed that multi-year levelled classes were established because of financial costs.

Composition of classes looked differently for all kaiako. Combinations of senior classes were either Year 11 and 12 or Year 12 and 13 or Year 11, 12 and 13 in one class. One kaiako had a single Year 11 class with a combination of ākonga from two different schools. Teaching and learning in multi-year levelled classes increased workload for kaiako due to the reduced amount of time teaching and learning with each year level and the organisational skills required to teach in this setting. When kaiako taught sentence structures, they would either teach all ākonga at the same time, or teach to a group of ākonga, while setting work for other ākonga to complete. There could be different ākonga learning activities at one time, where kaiako would move around the classroom in order to see how ākonga were going. Sometimes, kaiako were required to have ‘eyes at the back of their head’ in order to keep ākonga who were working independently focused on their work. Hamilton and Wilkinson (2003) recognised multi-year levelled teaching placed higher demands on teacher capabilities and skills in the classroom. Ākonga learning within this setting would have limited teaching time with the kaiako. Engin and Ege University (2018) spoke about the disadvantages of composite classes as it placed extra workload on the kaiako and limited time teaching and working with individual ākonga in the classroom. Lloyd (2007) also spoke of greater workload for kaiako teaching in composite classes and that burnout was a consequence of this.

Some kaiako of this research also conveyed that reduced teaching and learning time of learning te reo Māori also had consequences on the language development and progression. Kaya and Tasdemieri (2005, as cited in Engin and Ege Univeristy,
2018) also communicated about the consequences of composite teaching on literacy growth and development. They expressed that those consequences described are not as likely to be evident in single year levelled classes. Teaching and learning time also required time for assessments to take place. The Whakarongo internal assessment was an example of the type of assessment that needed to be administered by a kaiako.

Kaiako of this research said that the reduced time of teaching and learning placed pressure on administering the Whakarongo internal assessment. A minimum of two Whakarongo assessments needed to be administered by the kaiako, within an assessment setting, for each NCEA level and the length of this assessment would normally take one class lesson (50 – 60 minutes) or sometimes slightly longer, depending on the length of the assessment. By NCEA Level 3, whakarongo assessments generally became longer, as these assessments required them to listen for sustained amounts of time. Kaiako created the Whakarongo assessment and marking schedule, moderated the task before it is used, administered the assessment, marked the assessment and moderated marking. This process was lengthy, but was a requirement of NCEA. While kaiako administered the assessment, the other year level in the class would no doubt be working quietly on independent work that may have been organised and prepared by kaiako. These were examples that supported the research that Engin and Ege University (2018) published about limited time being a consequence of multi-levelled classes.

Professional development of teaching composite classes, including courses within teaching tertiary providers that assisted with teaching and learning in composite classes was an area that could be further developed, in particular, in secondary schools. Many secondary schools throughout Aotearoa taught singled year levelled classes. Wagemaker (1993) stated, more composite classes are taught in primary schools. Veenman and Raemakers (1995, as cited in Engin & Ege University, 2018), explained that professional development with teaching in composite classes
could assist with being able to teach and learn effectively in a learning environment where barriers easily existed.

As discussed in this section, time constraints with teaching, learning and assessing in multi-year levelled classes created pressure for kaiako. Preparation and sitting external examinations also created pressure for both kaiako and ākonga.

5.2.3 External examinations
Examinations and one off tests were described by some kaiako of this research as stressful and daunting for ākonga. As voiced by Maria, preparing ākonga for external examinations was, “probably one of the hardest part of teaching te reo”, and so external examination preparation was also stressful for kaiako. East and Scott (2011) acknowledged the substantial responsibility placed on kaiako to prepare their ākonga for external examinations. Hamp-Lyons and Condon (2000), expressed that examinations discriminated against second language learners as examinations required ākonga to recall what they had remembered, which was a challenge for many second language learners in our English medium schools because many progressed through six curriculum levels from Year 9 to Year 11 and senior classes were learning in multi-year levelled classes. Many second language learners who learnt te reo Māori at Year 9 were beginners in the language and were working at Level 1 of the curriculum (Te Aho Arataki Marau mō te Ako i Te Reo Māori – Kura Auraki: Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools). When ākonga continued learning te reo Māori through to Year 11, they were expected to work at Level 6 of the curriculum. Therefore the learning and teaching confinements and requirements of kaiako and ākonga enabled examinations to discriminate against them as educators and learners of te reo Māori. Furthermore, Cumming (2002) believed that examinations required ākonga to be performing at their best at the date and time as set by external providers. This was another example of further stipulations placed on ākonga as learners.
Some kaiako articulated their concerns of NZQA and the lack of guidance and parameters that were given to kaiako to prepare ākonga for external examinations. Although there were assessment specifications provided on their website each year, which communicated on what to expect for external examinations for each year level, Aroha felt that there was limited information provided. Furthermore, NCEA examinations were aligned with achievement objectives of the curriculum, however the topics within the curriculum were limitless as there were a lot of topics that could be taught. This curriculum document was created for ākonga learning te reo Māori as a second language in English medium schools. According to H. Douglas Brown (1994, as cited in Ogino, 2011), external examinations should be reliable, practical and valid showing consistency and dependability. The practicality and dependability of external examinations was questionable according to Aroha. She questioned whether the examinations promoted good second language acquisition theories which supported our second language learners with learning in English medium schools.

It is important in respect of reliability, consistency and dependability that external examinations are set by kaiako who teach or who have recently taught te reo Māori in English medium education and who also have a solid understanding of second language acquisition. Furthermore, examiners should originate from both Te Waipounamu (South Island) and Te Ika-a-Māui (North Island).

Kaiako of this research shared mixed thoughts with changing the Whakarongo assessment as an internal assessment to an external assessment. Maria saw this change as an opportunity to improve the standardisation of the Whakarongo assessment, as this standard has been contentious due to the variability. However, some kaiako had wavering confidence with external examinations and to include another achievement standard to be externally assessed may cause more pressure and stress for kaiako and ākonga as described by Chang (2008). Furthermore, if the Whakarongo internal was changed to an external assessment, ākonga would have the option of completing three achievement standards in the examination within the three hours allocated.
Maia suggested that the Whakarongo assessment should use real life examples making it more authentic, such as following oral instructions to cook kai or to bake a cake. Bachman and Palmer (1996, as cited in East & King, 2012) suggested that listening tests should show authenticity where performance is still measured in a formative assessment setting, rather than summative. Furthermore, recorded listening assessment in an examination setting, removed the human interaction of listening authentically to the language.

External examinations and preparing ākonga to complete them does create pressure for kaiako and ākonga. The Kōrero assessment is another internal assessment alongside Whakarongo and Waihanga Tuhinga. However, kaiako of this research expressed that their ākonga were less likely to complete the Kōrero internal assessment, which was reflected in the NCEA national data.

5.3 KŌRERO

Statistics from the 2018 NCEA internal assessment results for te reo Māori showed fewer ākonga chose not to complete the Kōrero internal assessment. This data had a similar trend in previous years, however this study has not published these statistics. Te reo Māori was traditionally known as an oral language, however fewer ākonga did not enter the Kōrero internal assessment. Kaiako of this research expressed likely reasons, for example, the Kōrero internal assessment promoted rote learning. They also spoke about ākonga being offered excessive amounts of credits across all subjects and so schools have limited the amount of credits each subject offered. Another reason suggested by the researched kaiako was young learners lacked confidence with speaking the language.

5.3.1 Lack of confidence to speak the language

Most kaiako in this research did not assess the Kōrero internal assessment due to the limited time teaching, learning and assessing, and many of their ākonga preferred to complete the Waihanga Tuhinga and Whakarongo internal assessments. Some claimed that their ākonga chose not to enter the Kōrero internal
assessment due to lack of confidence to speak the language, particularly in a formal test setting. Confidence to speak at the required level for an assessment and, to recall complex sentence structures correctly can be daunting for second language learners who have not had a considerable amount of time exposed in the language. Lightbown and Spada (2010) also acknowledged the sense of failure learners experienced when they were unable to produce, through speaking, complex sentences and ideas. Lightbown and Spada continued to suggest that ākonga as young learners were more self-aware and mindful of how they would look if they were to make mistakes and so speaking a second language progressed slowly.

Many kaiako of this research proposed that we should be encouraging our second language learners to be confident at conversing naturally without the constraint of whether the ākonga has used enough complex sentences at the correct curriculum and assessment level. Nonetheless, more time teaching and learning in the classroom was an advantage with developing sound conversational skills, however, kaiako illustrated that limited teaching and learning time in the classroom was a barrier.

Levels of immersion were prescribed by the number of hours and minutes a learner was exposed in the language. May et al. (2006) suggested that for effective second language learning, the learner should be exposed to the language for 12.5 to 25 hours per week. Ākonga who were taught by the kaiako of this study were exposed to the language, up to four hours in the week. Erlam and Sakui (2006) reflected similar sentiments as May et al. (2006), and they said that limited time exposed in the language had an adverse outcome for oral assessments in secondary schools. Subsequently, second language learners were more likely to favour the Waihanganga Tuhinga and Whakarongo internal assessments due to lack of confidence speaking the language and time exposed in the language. Furthermore, some kaiako in this study suggested that their ākonga were more likely to rote learn a kōrero in order increase the possibility of achieving a higher quality grade.
5.3.2 Kōrero promoted rote learning rather than conversation

Kaiako of this research who had attempted in the past to assess the Kōrero internal assessment felt that ākonga memorised structured speeches and conversations in order to increase their chance of achieving a higher quality grade, such as Merit or Excellence. Therefore they felt that the Kōrero internal assessment transformed to a memory test. Aroha spoke about her colleague who taught another language within her department and her colleague also noticed that her ākonga were rote learning conversations in order to use more complex sentence structures. Erlam and Sakium (2006) expressed that using correct sentence structures drove ākonga to rote learn speeches, furthermore, Lightbown and Spada (2010) suggested ākonga did this to ensure they would successfully pass the assessment. The focus of passing the assessment obstructed the goal of gaining the ability to converse in the language. Some kaiako expressed that their ākonga were driven to achieve high grades and that was one reason why ākonga were less likely to choose the Kōrero internal assessment, as ākonga believed that they were more likely to achieve a higher grade in Waihanga Tuhiinga and Whakarongo than Kōrero. Kaiako continued to say that those ākonga who were striving to achieve higher grades, were also aiming to achieve NCEA overall endorsement, which required them to achieve 50 or more Merit or Excellence credits in any Achievement Standard assessment of that NCEA level.

As kaiako, we should not dissuade our ākonga for aiming high to achieve grades such as Merit or Excellence, however as a profession we need to be promoting working ‘excellently rather than for excellence’ (K. Frame, personal communication, January 28, 2019).

5.3.3 Reduced NCEA credits

Reducing the number of credits offered to ākonga in all subject areas, across all year levels, was a requirement of some schools. Kaiako who worked in these schools, expressed that ākonga were being over assessed causing ākonga further stress, because they were offered too many NCEA credits. Schools have asked that
each subject offer 18 to 20 credits in order to enhance ākonga wellbeing. This requirement that school have asked of learning departments was supported by Hipkins et al. (2016), who encouraged all learning subjects of NCEA to reduce the amount of credits offered to ākonga. After the NCEA review findings published on Kōrero Mātauranga (2019), the potential that all schools in Aotearoa will follow this practise will become more evident when changes to NCEA are confirmed. One suggested change was to reduce the number of credits offered to ākonga. The effects of reduced credits across all schools in Aotearoa may have further implications for te reo Māori internal and external assessments, in particular the Kōrero internal assessment.

5.4 PROFESSIONAL LEARNING DEVELOPMENT

Professional learning development for te reo Māori kaiako was one approach to gather te reo Māori kaiako in one place at the same time. For many te reo Māori kaiako, they are the only member on their staff who taught te reo Māori. Support provided in professional learning development assisted te reo Māori kaiako with teaching, learning and assessing. One type of professional learning development that supported all of the researched kaiako was the kāhui ako (learning cluster).

5.4.1 Other kaiako of te reo Māori support

Support of kaiako who taught the same subject was significantly helpful, especially if subject kaiako were experienced and used effective teaching and learning strategies in their classrooms. For many te reo Māori kaiako, they were the only kaiako that taught te reo Māori within their school and so collegial support for effective and successful teaching and learning strategies and internal and external assessment support often required kaiako to travel to other kaiako at other schools. Murrow et al. (2007) concluded that time and distance travelled to obtain support with teaching and learning of te reo Māori as a second language was an obstacle. The opportunity to meet with a number of kaiako at the same time at the same place, during school teaching hours assisted with having to find time outside school hours. Most kaiako who were involved in this research was part of a kāhui (cluster) with Ako Panuku where they were given the opportunity to hold professional development time during school hours throughout the year. These kāhui days were
partially funded by Ako Panuku. The funding assisted with covering the cost of a reliever.

Blase and Blase (2006) cited work from DuFour and Eaker (1988) as they highlighted that kaiako have limited time to discuss and mark ākonga work collaboratively therefore, the opportunity to have professional learning development time with kaiako during school hours was valuable for kaiako of this research. Kaiako who were part of a kāhui, found these sessions helpful and effective. Anahera who also taught in another subject learning area at her school, recognised the obstacle of being the only kaiako to teach te reo Māori. She was able to converse more easily and informally about assessments and moderation with other kaiako who were in the other subject learning area and, it did not require her to travel to another school to have these discussions. Another kaiako spoke about how difficult it became to arrange similar days and times to meet and to moderate internal assessments, as the other te reo Māori kaiako was a Dean and her workload increased at that time. Kaiako of this research who attended their kāhui ako would use that time to discuss internal and external assessments and moderation.

During the kāhui ako sessions, kaiako spoke about sharing their internal assessment resources that had been successfully externally moderated. Kaiako said that discussions around moderation enabled them to see what other ākonga had been learning and it provided the opportunity to discuss learning strategies on how ākonga developed their pieces of assessment. Kaiako also found creating internal assessments during the kāhui hui were valuable, because research indicated that kaiako who were the only kaiako who taught their subject, created their own assessments by themselves (Jamentz, 1996). Therefore the kāhui assisted with creating internal assessments, which provided other perspectives from kaiako and shared the workload furthermore, other kaiako were present to moderate assessments.

Collins (1991) recognised that continual funding for days such as Ako Panuku was further needed in order to pay for partial or full teacher funded professional day(s). School budgets are limited, including the relief teacher budget, therefore those who
were in charge of the of the professional development budget were more likely to allow te reo Māori kaiako to attend these days which occur two to three times a year.

Professional learning development not only provided positive outcomes for kaiako, but also benefited their ākonga. Timperley et al. (2007) stated that research evidence has shown that kaiako who participated in meaningful professional development, strengthened teaching and learning knowledge which benefited their ākonga. Another form of professional learning for kaiako was tuakana-teina support, otherwise known as peer mentoring support.

5.4.2 Tuakana - teina support

Tuakana-teina support was discussed by most kaiako in this study, as most had the opportunity to receive support within a tuakana-teina setting. Tuakana-teina was used to support kaiako, who were new to implementing NCEA te reo Māori within their school. Tuakana-teina enabled mentoring to be conducted in a cultural manner (Glynn & Bishop, 1995). It was not long after the inception of NCEA that the tuakana role was established in the Ītāutahi / Waitaha region. Support was needed to implement NCEA in secondary schools, as kaiako were familiarising themselves with achievement standards and unit standards assessments. Kaiako of this research described that there was a paid position filled by an experienced kaiako (tuakana) who worked with a number of kaiako in secondary schools in Waitaha who required support implementing NCEA. This paid position was managed from UC Plus (University of Canterbury Plus), and kaiako who used this service said it was a tremendous help at the time. Kaiako who used this service, were not only new to NCEA, but also new to the teaching profession and said that the support from the tuakana was very useful and supportive. They felt that if this support did not exist, they would have felt lost and undoubtably would have felt incompetent especially being a new kaiako. The experienced kaiako provided valuable help and support which were characteristics of the Māori concept of being a tuakana.

Kaiako who used this service as a teina, are now tuakana to new te reo Māori kaiako in Waitaha, although it is not a paid position like the past. The concept of Ako,
which is reciprocated learning, is exchanged between the tuakana-teina relationship (Glynn & Bishop 1995). Maia described her role as tuakana to teina who were new to teaching. She described that teina were enthusiastic and had fresh ideas of teaching and learning, which as an experienced kaiako was refreshing. However, she did this role unpaid and her time used to help and support teina was time from her teaching and learning preparation time. Barnett and Te Wiata (2017) expressed that tuakana-teina mentoring has successful with resourcing.

5.4.3 NZQA support
Kaiako and ākonga were aware that NZQA provided exemplars of internal and external assessments. As described within the data stories, kaiako had varying opinions on how useful the resources were on the NZQA website. Some kaiako did not use many of the resources online as they did not think they provided enough guidance and support. There were limited internal assessment exemplars online, considering that there was a vast number of topics provided in Te Aho Arataki Marau mō te Ako i Te Reo Māori – Kura Auraki (Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools) that could be assessed at all levels. More internal assessment exemplars that cover a wider range of kaupapa (topics) may be more useful to te reo Māori kaiako in order to have more support and more importantly in order to improve validity and reliability of the Whakarongo internal assessment. It was also important to make exemplars relevant to second language learners from English medium schools, exemplars from these ākonga would be valuable.

5.5 PREFERRED METHOD OF ASSESSING
Kaiako spoke about the current method of assessing internal assessments, which was collecting pieces of evidence to create a portfolio of work. Most kaiako spoke of portfolio assessments for the Waihanga Tuhiinga internal assessment. For many kaiako of this research, portfolios were the preferred method of assessing than the one off test. Ākonga had the flexibility to select the different types of genre that they would present within their assessments. Kaiako said that pieces of evidence provided a more realistic indication of what ākonga had learnt and, more importantly, how they understood what they had learnt, in order to use it within
their pieces of assessment. Portfolio’s also enabled kaiako and ākonga more time to show what they had learnt. Ākonga learnt new sentence structures, concepts and vocabulary and had the opportunity to add these to their pieces of assessments. Kaiako of this research also said that another advantage of portfolio allowed ākonga time to write and edit their work over a period of time, therefore it allowed ākonga to continuously revisit their work.

Lam (2015) shared his research about writing portfolios and conveyed that portfolio assessment allowed ākonga to continuously work on their writing portfolio where they had the opportunity to write and re-write their work allowing ākonga to show development of their writing. Lam (2015) continued to express that portfolio enabled ākonga to self-reflect and take ownership of their learning.

Throughout the portfolio process, kaiako were able to provide feedback and feedforward to ākonga about their work. Mahuika et al. (2011) described the significance of feedback and feedforward in Kotahitanga as it enabled ākonga to develop and strengthen their learning. However research has expressed the importance of providing feedback and feedforward correctly, as kaiako may provide too much assistance when providing feedback and feedforward and, ākonga were more likely to show limited growth with their learning because of this (Cumming, 2002). In order to minimise explicit feedback from kaiako, Mahuika et al. (2011) provided suitable methods of feedback for kaiako. They suggested to encourage ākonga when they have used structures and content correctly, allow ākonga time to process the feedback and regularly give them the opportunity to enact the feedforward, be prepared to have conversations individually or in a group and provide suggestions that enhance scaffolded learning (Mahuika et al., 2011).

Feedback was also a reflective tool for kaiako. Some kaiako noticed that if similar errors were being made with ākonga within their writing portfolio, then kaiako would revisit those sentence structures as a class. Maria spoke about the importance of being transparent during the process of feedback and feedforward and so when revisiting and/or reteaching sentence structures she would do this as a whole class activity rather than individually. However, some kaiako, including Maria, did
express that if only a few ákonga made the same errors then they would revisit/reteach in small groups or individually if needed. Bishop and Berryman (2009, as cited in Bishop 2012) illustrated the Effective Teaching Profile (ETP) in Kotahitanga. They expressed that kaiako needed to be flexible when portfolios showed errors or content where ákonga have not understood. Kaiako should revisit or reteach the content not understood in a different way. They said that this was a method to help Māori achievement.

As Mahuika et al. (2011) previously suggested, feedback and feedforward should be provided regularly throughout the year. Some kaiako said that they checked Waihanga Tuhiinga portfolios every two to three weeks and it became more frequent before the portfolio was due. Regular checks provided kaiako with the information that ákonga understood content taught and more importantly, they were working on their portfolio assessment. Most kaiako of this research indicated that were able to have learning conversations with their ákonga about what they may need to further enhance their learning, which could be used in their portfolio.

Kaiako who participated in this research also spoke about the flexibility of their teaching programme. Some kaiako spoke about co-constructing learning programmes with their ákonga, promoting collaboration, ownership and this strengthened learning conversations between kaiako and ákonga. Kaiako promoted co-constructing learning programmes with their ákonga in order for ákonga to produce work that was of interest to them, as some kaiako suggested that pre-prescribed units of learning from kaiako was boring. Furthermore, pre-prescribed learning programmes that interested some ákonga, may not interest others, for example playing sport on a Saturday, when not all your ákonga play sport on Saturday. Kaiako also co-constructed sentence structures and vocabulary with self-directed learning. This gave ákonga ownership of what they wanted to know and learn. Maria noticed that her ákonga become more interested with what they were learning. Shared decision making and working collaboratively with reciprocal learning conversations, supported Bishop’s (2012), Culturally Responsive Pedagogy of Relations. This provided ákonga the autonomy to self-direct their learning, otherwise known as tino rangatiratanga.
However, some kāiako suggested that self-directed learning was more successful with Level 2 and Level 3 ākonga rather than Level 1 ākonga, as they were new to NCEA. Level 2 and Level 3 ākonga have had longer exposure to the language including complex sentence structures than Level 1. Maria expressed that Year 12 and Year 13 ākonga need to self-discover language more, by enhancing their awareness of different language structures. Level 1 ākonga who were new to NCEA and were new to portfolio assessments required more support and guidance from kāiako in order to build their confidence. At the start of the Year 11 year, some kāiako would practice collecting pieces of evidence for Waihanga Tuhinga, irrespective of the correct curriculum level of sentence structures. This was to support ākonga to understand the requirement of a portfolio. This method can also be practiced in Year 10.

Most kāiako preferred that ākonga worked on their portfolio assessment at home in order to use classroom time on teaching and learning. However this did not work for all ākonga, and time in class had to be allocated for ākonga to work on their portfolio as well as teaching and learning. Some ākonga struggled to complete homework and so it was important to know through whakawhanaungatanga and connectedness who these ākonga were. Some ākonga also chose to use Google doc to work on their writing portfolio. It enabled ākonga to re-produce drafted and crafted work, as Google doc has the ability to show history of work. However, some kāiako said that there were ākonga who still preferred to work with paper and pen, and so establishing a system of keeping their drafted and crafted work was required. Thus, portfolios allowed ākonga flexibility and ownership on how they wanted to present their work (Mahuika et al., 2008) (Lam, 2015).

Kāiako who participated in this research created assessments according to their class and what their interests and needs were. Portfolio assessments allowed time to process learning and time to develop their assessment work, compared to a one off assessment (Yates & Johnston, 2018).
5.6 SUMMARY

This summary provides key findings on the themes that emerged from the rich data shared by the research participants and these are; pressures, kōrero, professional learning development and preferred method of assessing.

5.6.1 Pressures

There were a number of pressures that were identified by the kaiako of this research. Extra workload was added to their teaching and learning workload, such as advising and organising cultural practices of the school and wider community and pastoral care and advice of Māori ākonga. For all participants, time allowance or paid renumeration was not allocated to them for those extra areas and none of the participants were a Dean. Research and government initiatives have continuously stated that the extra workload for te reo Māori kaiako has been an ongoing issue for many years and it continues today.

Most kaiako taught in multi-year levelled classes, and one kaiako taught one year level with two different schools. Research indicated that a consequence of this educational setting was reduced teaching and learning time for ākonga and added extra workload placed on kaiako who taught in these settings. Kaiako of this research indicated the pressure of reduced teaching and learning time also impacted on conducting and preparing for assessment.

External examinations caused pressure for both ākonga and kaiako. Research indicated that examinations did not favour second language learners due to the lack of time exposed in the language. This was also mirrored by the research participants, however some added that the guidance of NZQA also lacked.

5.6.2 Kōrero

Data showed that fewer ākonga opted into the Kōrero internal assessment compared to Waihanga Tuhiinga and Whakarongo. Kaiako of this research suggested that ākonga lacked confidence with speaking the language, especially with speeches. Furthermore, research supported what some kaiako expressed, that some ākonga rote learnt speeches and conversations in order to achieve higher grades and natural
conversations in the language became less evident. Research indicated that rangatahi (teenagers) were self-conscience especially around their peers and didn’t want to make mistakes in front of them. So they were more likely to avoid speeches in a second language.

5.6.3 Professional learning development
Time and funding were important factors to enable professional development of te reo Māori kaiako. Funding or partial funding enabled teacher release days to be paid, in order for te reo Māori kaiako to hui at the same time and the same place. Kaiako of this research were the only te reo Māori kaiako at their school and so, professional support was conducted outside of school hours. Research discussed the importance of financial support of professional learning development days. Researchers continued to say that these days enabled kaiako to learn more about teaching and learning, which in affect would benefit their learners in their classrooms.

5.6.4 Preferred method of assessing
Kaiako of this research discussed the benefits of using portfolios as a method for internal assessment. The method of forming portfolios mirrored the embodying of Kaupapa Māori principles. Portfolios encouraged shared learning conversations between kaiako and ākonga, embracing whakawhanaungatanga within these conversations and ākonga could share the types of work they wanted to present within their portfolios. Research participants also shared that these conversations also involved co-construction of learning, such as co-constructing sentence structures and vocabulary. This process allowed ākonga to have autonomy of their work and shared power between kaiako and ākonga. According to researchers these practices supported and enabled success of Māori achievement and Kaupapa Māori. Feedback and feedforward provided by the kaiako enabled self-reflection for kaiako and ākonga. Research indicated that feedback and feedforward assisted with Māori achievement also.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

This research was to explore the effects NCEA had on te reo Māori as a learning subject within English medium secondary schools. Te reo Māori, one of our national languages, has had a traumatic journey, which commenced not long after the arrival of European to Aotearoa. Since then, education was one of the factors that diminished te reo Māori being spoken by Māori tamariki (children). Generations today remember the punishments they received by their teachers for speaking te reo Māori in school. In the 1970’s, te reo Māori eventually became a subject taught in secondary schools, and ultimately was a learning subject that was assessed under School Certificate, which at that time was the main national qualification framework for secondary schools in Aotearoa. However, according to Hana O’Regan (2011), te reo Māori was considered as a non-academic subject, and was ranked last in the hierarchy scale of subjects. Today, te reo Māori as a learning subject, has progressed since the school certificate era. Te reo Māori as an NCEA subject has two paths of assessment: Te reo Māori for second language learners in English medium secondary schools, or Te reo Rangatira, which cater for ākonga who speak te reo Māori as their first language or they are proficient speakers. Different subjects also have papers available in te reo Māori, where ākonga can answer these respective papers in te reo Māori.

This research had the intention of seeking what a culturally appropriate assessment framework for NCEA te reo Māori would comprise of, how can this be achieved and by whom? However what was omitted from this original research question was from the perspective of second language learners in English medium secondary schools. This perspective is important to include because it was intended to gain this knowledge from kaiako who taught in English medium secondary schools as most of their ākonga were second language learners. This is not to say that this research is not relevant for kaiako and ākonga who are teaching, learning and assessing te reo Māori in Māori medium schools, however, due to the differences in learning environments in Māori medium and English medium, this research was intended for second language learners in English medium schools. It was the rich stories and lived experiences that was collected from these kaiako who taught in
English medium secondary schools, that reminded myself as the researcher to write from the lens of second language learning.

A culturally appropriate assessment framework for NCEA should embody the principles of Kaupapa Māori and the features of portfolio assessment mirrored principles of Kaupapa Māori. NCEA internal assessments for te reo Māori currently use portfolio for Whakarongo, Waihanga Tuhinga and Kōrero achievement standards. The features of portfolio assessment were also a more preferred method of assessing ākonga who were second language learners.

Kaiako who participated in this study spoke about co-constructing learning programmes and assessment design with their ākonga. This encouraged meaningful learning conversations between the kaiako and their ākonga to take place. Kaiako described it as an opportunity to discuss about the kaupapa and genre ākonga were interested in, in order use within their portfolio. During these conversations, ākonga highlighted their needs in order to produce their work, such as vocabulary, sentence structures, kīwaha (idioms) and whakataukī (proverbs). Therefore kaiako and ākonga were co-constructing their learning programme and assessment collectively. This shared decision making process allowed ākonga and kaiako to have reciprocal conversations while working collaboratively. This provided a platform for ākonga to have autonomy over their work as it was self-directed. These characteristics of portfolio assessment are examples of the principles of Kaupapa Māori. Whakawhanaungatanga which was represented in the relationship between the kaiako and ākonga, where it enabled them to have open conversations and shared decision making about the learning of the ākonga. The shared decision making, and reciprocal conversations enhanced Ako, where reciprocal learning between the kaiako and the ākonga was embodied. Furthermore, these conversations were discussed kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face). Kanohi ki te kanohi allowed both the kaiako and ākonga to read body language, so that each were aware that these conversations were respectful. The autonomy ākonga had over their assessment work showed tino rangatiratanga. These principles of Kaupapa Māori were also highlighted in Bishop’s (2012), Culturally Responsive Pedagogy of Relations. Using Kaupapa Māori principles as a driver of conducting assessment was also
discussed in Te Whatu Pōkea, which was an investigation into assessing at Early Childhood level using Kaupapa Māori. Te Whatu Pōkea stated, “assessment based on Kaupapa Māori is a powerful vehicle for the normalisation of success for Māori children and whānau” (Ministry of Education, 2009, p. 47).

Research participants of this study also described that portfolios provided their ākonga time to process and apply their learning within their internal assessments. Portfolios provided ākonga the flexibility to continuously work on their pieces of assessed work by editing and crafting their work over a period of time. Feedback and feedforward provided by kaiako enabled ākonga and kaiako to reflect on teaching and learning.

Kaiako of this research regularly provided ākonga feedback and feedforward on their portfolio assessments, in particular with their Waihanga Tuhinga. Feedback provided a picture to ākonga of their learning, such as reaffirming that ākonga have understood the application of sentence structures or any other areas where ākonga have shown progression. Feedback to ākonga also showed areas that needed to be readdressed. The feedforward provided the advice that ākonga would use to readdress those areas. This process described assisted ākonga to self-reflect on their learning. Mahuika et al. (2011) illustrated the importance of feedback and feedforward in Te Kotahitanga and how it supported learning success for Māori ākonga. However, it is essential that kaiako understand suitable methods of providing feedback and feedforward in order to prevent explicit feedback. Mahuika et al. (2011) research provided methods of providing suitable feedback and feedforward. Feedback and feedforward also enabled kaiako to reflect on their teaching. It provided a picture to kaiako of what ākonga had learnt and what areas may need reteaching. This reflective process also supported the ETP in Kotahitanga. Bishop and Berryman (2009) communicated the importance of kaiako revisiting content taught, however they also encouraged that kaiako should reteach it differently.

However, some kaiako of this research felt that ākonga needed to have some fluency in the language in order to co-construct sentence structures and vocabulary needed
for their pieces of evidence in their portfolio, like that of Year 12 and Year 13. Ākonga in Year 11 needed more support and guidance with their language learning and so, conversations were structured around what they wanted to write about in their writing portfolio and to increase their knowledge on what portfolio’s consisted of, as Year 11 ākonga were new to portfolio assessment.

The Kōrero internal assessment used portfolios to show kōrero development, which was a similar process of the Waihangā Tuhinga assessment. Despite this, what emerged from this research was fewer ākonga opting into the Kōrero internal assessment compared to Whakarongo and Waihangā Tuhinga internal assessment. This research wanted to know some of the possible reasonings for this and to ask what a culturally appropriate framework for NCEA internal assessment for Kōrero would comprise of instead. Kaiako expressed that their ākonga lacked confidence using the language. Research showed that rangatahi (teenagers) were self-conscience and were whakamā (shy) when it came to speeches as they feared making mistakes, especially in front of their peers, thus resulting in ākonga not wanting to do speeches. Some kaiako of this research also expressed that the Kōrero internal assessment encouraged rote learnt speeches and conversations and did not promote conversational kōrero. Kaiako continued to say that for some of their ākonga, the importance of using and memorising complex sentences was in order to increase their chances of achieving higher grades. The quality of the grade was important for ākonga, as they were striving to gain overall endorsement and/or subject endorsement. Another possible reason for fewer number of ākonga opting into the Kōrero internal assessment was the reduced number of credits offered to ākonga. Some kaiako expressed that their school had reduced the number of NCEA credits offered by each subject of all NCEA levels, in order to address over assessing and ākonga workload. As a consequence of this, the Kōrero internal assessment was less likely to be offered or opted into. The NCEA national review has also proposed that schools reduce the number of credits offered to ākonga and this will likely take effect soon. Consequently, some kaiako expressed that the focus of their classroom was to develop the confidence of their ākonga to have conversations in te reo Māori without the measurement of assessment. Encouraging ākonga to kōrero in te reo Māori, no matter what sentence structure they use or what
level of the curriculum they are speaking at, would nurture their development of naturally conversing in te reo Māori. The safe and supported classroom environment, where it is encouraged that it is alright to make mistakes, would support ākonga with using the language orally. Therefore, following the practice of Aroha where kōrero does not need to be assessed, but instead needs to be nurtured and encouraged will assist with ākonga learning to converse in the language.

Kaiako expressed that one off tests such as external examinations caused stress and was daunting for ākonga. The traditional test where ākonga sat separately and were not permitted to converse while they recited what they had learnt, all within a time limit was a traditional framework that has existed for many years in education. Kaiako of this research expressed that it was difficult preparing their ākonga, who were second language learners, for these external examinations. Kaiako expressed that there was not enough guidance and support from NZQA because the possibilities of what ākonga could be assessed on was limitless. The alignment of the Te Aho Arataki Marau mō te Ako i Te Reo Māori (Kura Auraki: Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching and Learning Te Reo Māori in English-medium Schools) to NCEA, provided guidance to kaiako on what was required for ākonga to know at each curriculum level. This document also provided a wide range of kaupapa that could be studied within the classroom and assessed within NCEA. However the number of kaupapa available is limitless. Although many kaupapa in past NCEA examinations were in the context of Te Ao Māori and Kaupapa Māori, it was the traditional method of examinations that wasn’t the best example of a culturally appropriate assessment framework for te reo Māori. Mahuika et al. (2011) expressed that tests, like examinations where ākonga sat and completed with paper and pen, within a prescribed time limit were untrustworthy indicators of Māori ākonga achievement. Furthermore, the construction of NCEA external assessments for second language learners in English medium secondary schools lacked trust amongst kaiako. Kaiako expressed their concerns, of varying nature, of what external examinations looked like for their learners of all year levels. Therefore the current method of generating external examinations for te reo Māori were also not the best examples of assessing second language learners and exhibiting second language acquisition methodology.
Therefore, some kaiako of this research encouraged te reo Māori kaiako to provide feedback to NZQA. After the external examinations have completed, NZQA conduct a kaiako survey, to provide feedback on NCEA external examinations. It was encouraged that kaiako completed this survey, in order to express concerns of the te reo Māori external examinations, in the hope that kaiako receive more guidance in order to support second language learners of te reo Māori in the English medium secondary schools. This could also assist with the heavy workload that te reo Māori kaiako have.

Portfolio assessment allowed Kaupapa Māori principles to be embodied and so, it has the ability to suit the criteria of being a culturally responsive method of assessment. It is encouraged that when the academic year commences, learning conversations between kaiako and ākonga are driven by Kaupapa Māori principles. It is also important to remember to continuously use these principles within the process of portfolio assessments throughout the year.

6.1 LIMITATIONS

As a kaiako of te reo Māori working in an English medium secondary school in Waitaha, this research had a number of limitations.

Firstly, as an insider researcher. Remaining impartial and not biased throughout the study, in order to keep the integrity of the study and to hear the actual voices of the research participants.

Four te reo Māori kaiako were the participants of this study, therefore the sample size was small. All kaiako were female and lacked male voices. At the time of the interviews, kaiako were experienced kaiako and had 14 to 37 years teaching experience and did not represent the voices of newer kaiako to the profession. Two kaiako taught in single-sex settings and two kaiako taught in co-educational settings, however all had experience teaching in both educational settings. Kaiako also taught in a cross section of decile schools. Some information about kaiako was not included in this study, in order to make them less distinguishable in the small community of te reo Māori teachers in Waitaha. Other data that provided more
information about NCEA data was unable to be used in this study due to the data only being available to secondary school teachers through user name and password and the public do not have access. Stories were shared from kaiako but did not include ākonga and whānau voice and opinions about te reo Māori as an assessed subject of NCEA.

Interviews for this study commenced at the end of 2016 and the start 2017. This research was conducted as a part time study course, while working full time as a kaiako in a secondary school. Due to work commitments, health issues and sudden bereavement, time extension of this study had been requested thus, this study has taken longer to complete. Nevertheless, the themes in this research still remain today.

6.2 FURTHER RESEARCH
If further research was to be continued as a result of this study, increased sampling size of interviewed kaiako would be recommended. A cross section of female and male teachers with varying experiences of teaching would better represent the teaching profession today. The opinions of young kaiako who were assessed with NCEA when they were in secondary school and their experiences with teaching and assessing under NCEA would also be recommend. Research could also be conducted in other regions nationally to compare and contrast.
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**APPENDIX I**

**KUPU TAKA**

ākonga  | student/s  
kaiako  | teacher/s  
Waitaha | Canterbury  
Ōtautahi | Christchurch  
whakataukī | proverb  
rangatahi | youth  
whakapapa | genealogy  
tikanga Māori | customary practices / protocols  
taonga | treasure  
tikanga | meaning / protocols  
whakawhiti kōrero | converse  
tupuna | ancestor  
kaupapa | topic  
te Ao Māori | the Māori word  
kāhui ako | cluster learning  
tūmuaki | principal  
mana | status / power  
kīwaha | idioms  
whakataukī | proverbs  
mātauranga Māori | Māori knowledge  
kupu | word/s  
whakamā | shy
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“A Study on the Mana of Te Reo Māori in NCEA — Te Mauri o te Mana Māori”
LIST OF POSSIBLE INTERVIEW TOPICS WITH POSSIBLE QUESTIONS FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

Background experience on teaching career and NCEA.

- How many years have you been teaching?
- How many years have you been involved with NCEA and under what capacity?

Teaching and preparing students for NCEA achievement standards internal and external assessments.

- How many contact hours each week do your students have in your Te reo Māori classroom?
- How many and what achievement standards are offered to your students in Levels 1, 2 and 3?
- Describe how students are prepared to sit NCEA internal and external assessments in your classroom.
- How does NCEA assessments effect teaching programmes and learning in the classroom?

Assessment procedures, managing assessments and workload.

- Describe how assessment portfolios are managed in your classroom.
- Describe the pressures with implementing NCEA in your classroom and how are these pressures dealt with?
- Describe how NCEA assessments conducted in your classroom, internal and external mock examinations are professional judged?

Recommendations and suggestions.

- What support has been available with NCEA assessments? How effective are they?
- How should we be assessing Te reo Māori?
- What ‘go to strategies’ have worked for you in NCEA?
- Any other kōrero to add?
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“A Study on the Mana of Te Reo Māori in NCEA – Te Mauri o te Mana Māori”  
Information Sheet for  
Teachers of Te Reo Māori in English Medium Secondary Schools in Canterbury

Papaki kau ana ngā tai o te mihi ki a koe.

“Ko te reo te mauri o te mana Māori” – Language is the life force of Māori. This whakataukī speaks of the importance of Te reo Māori. I have been a secondary teacher of Te reo Māori for the past 16 years and I have often reflected on how well I have taught the language to my students while ensuring the ‘mauri’ (life force) of the language was being nurtured.

I have also experienced the changes of teaching and assessing Te reo Māori under the National Certificate in Educational Achievement (NCEA) since its birth in 2002 and later its alignment to the New Zealand Curriculum in 2011. Since 2011, the number of evidence required to submit for an internally assessed achievement standards for Te reo Māori has increased. NCEA internal and external results have been mixed and more students are likely to sit internal assessments rather than external. There is also a noticeable drop in the number of students who continue with Te reo Māori from levels one to three. Therefore, one intention of this study is to gain better understanding of methods used to effectively facilitate a cultural NCEA assessment framework for Te reo Māori for the success and betterment of the Māori language’s mauri and the students who learn the language.

This study has also been influenced from the implementation of a number of national strategies from the Ministry of Education. The aims of these strategies is to increase Māori success and Māori language in education. ‘Tau Mai te Reo – The Māori Language Education Strategy 2013 – 2017’, stated that more research of Māori language in English medium education is needed and Te reo Māori teacher workload is still an issue. It is for these reasons that this research is being conducted to complete my Master of Education Degree at the University of Canterbury.

I would like to invite you to participate in this study. If consent is given you would participate in the following:

- Whakawhanaungatanga – an initial hui to meet kanohi kitea (face to face). Discussions will take place around appropriate research questions, benefits, participation, accountability and ownership of this study.

- Hui - A second possible follow up hui could be arranged to suit participants interests and availability. This hui would explore and discuss initial themes that could be used in the semi-structured in-depth interviews. Possible themes likely to be discussed:
  - Background experience on teaching career and NCEA.
Teaching and preparing students for NCEA achievement standards internal and external assessments.

Assessment procedures, managing assessments and workload.

Recommendations and suggestions.

- **Uiui** – Individual semi-structured in-depth interviews, taking approximately 40-60 minutes. Between one and three interviews would take place. Interviews will be taped. Venue and time will be arranged to suit the participant.

- **Tirohanga** – overt observations will be conducted during the Canterbury Teachers of reo Māori Cluster professional development hui. Between one and two professional development hui may take place. Data collected will be recorded by note taking.

Throughout the interview process, you have the right to decline to participate in answering questions without penalty. Rigour and trustworthiness will also be maintained throughout the study. To ensure accurate and true representation of information shared, I will maintain communication and seek clarification of meaning. I will also provide an opportunity to check direct quotes said by you that will be used in the thesis.

Participation in this study is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw at any stage of the study without penalty. If you withdraw, I will do my best to remove any information relating to you, provided this is practically achievable.

All data collected will be stored securely locked at Marian College, where only I have key access to. Refusal to access will be given to unauthorised people. All data will be kept for five years following the study, then destroyed. Information I gather for this study will be kept confidential. I will use pseudonyms to disguise the identity of participants and their respective schools ensuring anonymity. Identity and other participant's identity in this study will be known to each other during the initial hui and possible follow up hui. Within hui, the importance of maintaining anonymity of other participants and confidentiality within this study will also be discussed.

When completed, this master’s thesis will be available via the UC library database. Participants will also receive a copy of the report on the study via email. Please provide email details on the consent form. If you have any questions about this study, please contact me at the details above.

This study has received ethical approval from the University of Canterbury Educational Research Human Ethics Committee. Any issues that arise, you can address or email any complaints to:

The Chair, Educational Research Human Ethics Committee,
University of Canterbury,
Private Bag 4800,
A study on the mana of te reo Māori in NCEA: Te mauri o te mana Māori

Christchurch

Email: human-ethics@canterbury.ac.nz

If you give consent to participate in this study, please complete the consent form and place it in the attached self-stamped envelope and post it to me to Marian College, P O Box 27-064, Shirley, Christchurch 8640 by

Te mutunga kē mai o te mihi ki a koe mō tautoko ki tēnei mahi rangahau.

Nāku noa,

Myra Fidow
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“A Study on the Mana of Te Reo Māori in NCEA – Te Mauri o te Mana Māori”
Consent Form for Teachers

Ngā mihi ki a koe.
This form provides consent to participate in this study.

- A full explanation of this study has been given and you have also had the opportunity to ask questions.
- You understand what you are required to do within this study.
- Participation in this study is voluntary and you can withdraw at any stage of this study without penalty. If you withdraw, I will do my best to remove any information relating to you, provided this is practically achievable.

- All information or opinions that you provide will be kept confidential and that only myself, (the researcher) and my senior supervisor if needed, will have access to data. Anonymity will also be maintained by the use of pseudonyms, protecting your identity and the identity of your school in the thesis. Your identity and other participant’s identity in this study will be known to each other during the initial hui and possible follow up hui. You understand the importance of maintaining anonymity of other participants and confidentiality with what has been shared within this study.
- You understand that semi-structured in-depth interviews could take approximately 40-60 minutes and will be audio-recorded and note taking. Between one to three interviews are possible.
- You understand that observations on conversations about assessment practices will be recorded through note taking during the Canterbury Teachers of reo Māori Cluster professional development hui. Direct comments made in the observations will not be directly used, unless participants would like their direct comments to be used.
- You understand that rigour and trustworthiness will be maintained throughout the study. To ensure accurate and true representation of information shared in the observations collected at the professional development hui and, or the semi-structured in-depth interviews, I will maintain communication and seek clarification of meaning. You will also be given the opportunity to check the transcript and direct quotes said by you that will be used in the thesis.
- You understand that you have the right to decline to participate in answering questions without penalty.
- You understand that all data collected for the study will be kept in locked and secure facilities and/or in password-protected electronic form and will be destroyed after 5 years.
- You understand that this master’s thesis will be available via the UC library database and could be used to support and help teachers of Te reo Māori and other secondary language teachers with NCEA and implementing NCEA assessments within the classroom. You will be sent a copy of the report findings of the study. Please provide email details below.
- You can contact me for further information:
  Email: myraf@mariancollege.school.nz
  Phone: cell 021 1628090  work 3858449
  Or my senior supervisor Missy Morton:
  missy.morton@canterbury.ac.nz
  Phone: work 3458312
- You can contact the Chair, University of Canterbury Educational Research Human Ethics Committee, if you have any complaints.

Your name ____________________________________________
Date

Signature

Email address for copy of report to be sent to:

Once you completed this consent form, please place it in the attached self-stamped envelope and post it to me to Marian College, P O Box 27-064, Shirley, Christchurch 8640. Te mutunga kē mai o te mihi ki a koe.

Nāku noa

Myra Fidow