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Abstract

Since early European settlement of Aotearoa New Zealand Māori children have been constructed as deficient learners in the education system, and this construction continues to undermine their learning at school today (Butchers, 1930; Macfarlane, 2005; Ministry of Education, 1998, 2005). Educational assessment practices have largely contributed to this discourse, because they reflect western ideologies regarding the reasons for testing, who does the testing, what counts as important to test, how results are interpreted and so on (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). Further, the tests used have been developed with monolingual and monocultural European children. Reading acquisition and language development have been implicated as major learning deficits for Māori children (Crooks & Flockton, 2005; Ministry of Education, 2006; Wagemaker, 1992). And a body of research signals that the reading related language skills for phonological awareness and narrative ability are linked to reading acquisition for English (Adams, 1990; Botting, 2002; Rollins, McCabe & Bliss, 2000).

My research is an enquiry into how Māori children respond to reading related language assessments for narratives and phonological awareness, taking into account their lived experiences and cultural practices. My aim is to create possibilities for alternative discourses to the deficit discourse. With support from a local Kaumātua and school whānau I worked as a participant-observer in two classrooms in two schools for one year, following 17 Māori children. Critical theory, socio cultural theory and Kaupapa Māori theory informed my position. The techniques I used to
approach my research practice and analyse my data reflect the influence of these frames as I understand and interpret them.

Throughout the year of field work, I undertook a range of activities, including conversations with parents, children and school personnel, observations of class ‘lessons’ and the teaching strategies used by the teacher, visits to the children’s homes, collection of school records, and administration of assessments related to reading, narrative tasks, and phonological awareness according to a standardized English test, the Preschool and Primary Inventory of Phonological Awareness (PIPA) (Dodd, Crosbie, MacIntosh, Teitzel & Ozanne, 2000) and a specifically designed set of Māori language tasks. I used video and audio recording for some activities, and wrote my observation notes while observing or immediately following an event or session.

My findings showed that the home and school contexts for the children were largely bicultural and bilingual. The children were living their lives in ways vastly different to monolingual and monicultural Pākehā (European) children. Those who had been at school for approximately five years were reading at or above their age, in line with traditional reading norms, despite showing relatively poor phonological awareness skills determined by the ‘standard’ test procedures. The ‘standard’ testing process for both phonological awareness and narrative ability presented most of the children as language deficient and in need of intervention, or at least in need of ongoing monitoring. However, my analyses driven from the theoretical frames mentioned above presented the children with language strengths and difference. These children were clearly able, achieving learners.
My study highlighted the fact that the bilingual and bicultural knowledge and skills of Māori children are not valued in the predominantly monolingual and mono-cultural education system, and this has serious implications for their learning and for perpetuating the cycle of deficiency construction because the children are seen not to meet the requirements of the system and its assessment protocols. Further, regardless of phonological awareness and narrative ‘ability’, by the time Māori children have been at school for a period of time, approximately five years, they are able to read English and understand the written text. This finding questions the relevance of the salience generally attributed to phonological awareness as a crucial building block for bilingual children who are proficient in or exposed to a non-alphabetic language, such as te reo Māori.

I argue that the assessments used in schools are inappropriate for bilingual and bicultural Māori children. When the children’s language skills were analysed using alternative systems to the ‘standard’ methods prevalent in schools, they were able and achieving learners. They were not learners ‘at-risk’ but learners ‘at-promise’, to use Tabachnick and Bloch’s terms (1995).

This study provides empirical evidence that bilingual and bicultural Māori children’s learning needs are not met by the current school system. Continued research in this area will strengthen the necessity for changes to be made in the education system, changes that are sensitive to, and value, linguistic and cultural difference in the classroom. In the areas of pre-service teacher and speech-language therapist education, and ongoing professional development for educationalists, linguistic and cultural differences need to be presented afresh. Educational assessment practices
must change to recognise learning strengths of Māori children and to stop the perpetuation of deficiency constructions. Schools have to be willing to understand more fully the home contexts of their students and to engage in teaching practices that are cognizant of their cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Without such fundamental changes in our view of the cultural and linguistic strengths of Māori children, very little real change can occur despite lofty words and plethora of strategies and policies.
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Introduction

Setting the Scene

Māori are the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand. In this thesis I take a critical stance to challenge the deficit construction of Māori children as learners in the education system of Aotearoa New Zealand. Reading acquisition for English is given prominence in this construction. Further, a large body of western literature claims that progress in learning to read is dependent on a foundation of oral language ability, and in particular the language related literacy skills phonological awareness and narrative ability. Phonological awareness is considered predictive of reading acquisition, particularly for word recognition (Bradley & Bryant, 1983; Fletcher et al., 1994; Gillon, 2004; Lundberg, Olofsson, & Wall, 1980; Stanovich, 1991; Strattman & Hodson, 2005). The ability to tell narratives is also considered a predictor and precursor of literacy development and later academic success (Bishop & Edmundson, 1987; Botting, 2002; Dickinson & McCabe, 1991; Feagans & Applebaum, 1986; Feagans & Short, 1984; McCabe, 1992; McCabe & Rollins, 1994; Paul, 2001; Paul & Smith, 1993; Rollins, McCabe & Bliss, 2000; Roth, Speece, Cooper & De La Paz, 1996; Silliman & Champion, 2002; Snow, 1991; Westby, 1991).

Like most children in Aotearoa New Zealand Māori children are subjected to tests and measurements related to reading development, narrative ability and phonological awareness. The learning of these skills is embedded in a regime of testing at all levels throughout the education system. In classrooms and schools, assessment programmes include such tests as the School Entry Assessment (Ministry of Education, 1997a) or some other alternative, the Six-Year Observational Survey (Clay, 1998) and the Progressive Achievement Test in Reading (Reid, 1991). At a national level the Group Special Education (GSE) service of Speech-Language Therapists, Psychologists, Early Intervention Teachers, Resource Teachers of Learning and Behaviour and Resource Teachers of Literacy, provide testing, diagnosis, and interventions for
children who are deemed to have special learning needs. Further, national monitoring schemes such as the National Education Monitoring Programme (NEMP) assess and report on the achievement of primary school children in all curriculum areas (Crooks & Flockton, 2005). International assessment projects such as the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) Reading Literacy Study (1990-91), the follow up 10-Year Trends Study (2001) and the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS-01), report on how New Zealand children’s learning compares with that of their international peers. The tests and measurements used within this regime are developed according to western frameworks, dictating what is important to test, how it is to be tested, who is qualified to administer the tests, and how the results are to be analysed and interpreted for diagnosis of ‘normal’, ‘delayed’ or ‘disordered’ development.

Such a test and measurement system perpetuates the cycle of deficit thinking applied to many Māori children and provides an education context that ‘chokes’ (Walker, 1996) their potential. Such a context has existed since early colonial settlement of Aotearoa New Zealand and continues today, with a large body of government and educational reports voicing this deficit discourse.

In this thesis this term discourse refers to a social conception, a way of thinking and ‘talking’ in either spoken or written text, about a topic, according to a certain perspective and belief system. When I write about a deficit discourse in relation to Māori children I am writing about the ways of thinking, believing and acting that brand Māori children as unsuccessful and failing within their education. Following Foucault (1980) I would argue that discourses are closely linked to power, and that the deficit discourse applied to Māori children is a reflection of the power and dominance of western culture. Foucault posits that the words and phrases used within a discourse become ‘truths’ and that the boundaries of that discourse constitute a battlefield. In a sense I have entered a battlefield.
My thesis challenges this deficit discourse in relation to Māori children. I worked in two classrooms with sixteen school age Māori children for a year, with a focus on testing and measurement of phonological awareness and narrative ability. Apart from coming to know and develop a relationship with the children, their home and school whānau, and exploring the educational and home contexts in which they lived their learning experiences, I wanted to discover the ways in which the children responded to the testing and measurements for reading, phonological awareness and narrative ability, and to explore alternative ways based on te reo me tikanga Māori. I wanted to delve into the possibilities for alternative discourses to deficit, discourses based on achievement and ‘at-promise’, to use a term from Robert Tabachnick and Marianne Bloch (1995). I was driven by a belief that commonly held assumptions about the universality of laws governing language and reading development are not appropriate. Māori children may present with linguistic and cultural differences in the way they respond to assessment of phonological awareness and narrative ability, differences based on the bicultural and bilingual contexts in which they live their lives. A large body of literature (Cummins, 2000; Genesee & Cenoz, 2001; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders & Christian, 2006; Riches & Genesee, 2006; Saunders & O’Brien, 2006) claims that bilingual children learn language in different ways to monolingual children. This claim is particularly relevant for phonological awareness (Bruck & Genesee, 1995; Bruck, Genesee & Caravolas, 1997; Caravolas & Bruck, 1993; Cutler, Mehler, Norris & Segui, 1986). Another large body of research also claims that narrative ability is culture-specific (Bliss, McCabe & Miranda, 1998; Blum-Kulka, 1993; Champion, Seymour & Camarata, 1995; Fiestas & Pena, 2004; Heath, 1982, 1983, 1986; Lewis, 1992; Michaels, 1981; Minami & McCabe, 1991; Pesco, Crago & McCabe, 1996; Silliman, Diehl, Aurilio, Wilkinson & Hammargren, 1995). I believe that a commonly held assumption about Māori children, whether thought about consciously or not, is that their biculturalism and bilingualism does not play a role in their English language and reading development. This is
because Māori children are administered educational assessments that are developed with monolingual English and monocultural western children.

The following specific questions have guided my research study.

1. What are the prevalent and possible constructions of Māori children as learners in education?

2. What role does bilingualism and biculturalism play in the development of phonological awareness and oral narrative abilities for Māori children?

3. How do Māori children respond to phonological awareness tasks in English and Māori, and how is their performance perceived when analysed using different theoretical perspectives?

4. How can Māori children’s narratives be interpreted when evaluated from different theoretical perspectives?

My Journey

Wiremu is sitting at the table with me. He is 8 years old, and he is grinning and his eyes are shining with fun. I am grinning too. We are playing a game and Wiremu is beating me. Wiremu has walked across from his classroom for his weekly half hour speech therapy session, for help to develop the ‘th’ sound.

I was with Wiremu in Rotorua in 1980. In those days we worked on the ‘th’ sound. I loved seeing Wiremu, but I couldn’t help wonder whether he wanted to learn the ‘th’ sound or not, whether it was really that important. He said he did but you know I wondered, not because I thought he was dishonest, not at all, but because he wanted to please me. His and my worlds seemed so far apart. I was a brand new Speech-Language Therapist wanting to help the world, but from a world that I knew about –
which was not necessarily Wiremu’s world. I wondered what Wiremu’s people
down at the marae wanted for him. And what was I doing?

Then I moved away. I have not forgotten Wiremu and his grinning and his shining
eyes, nor my questioning of what I was doing and what he and his people might have
wanted for him.

It is 27 years later now and another story is beginning, a different story to ‘Wiremu’
but the same story too. It hasn’t started just now. It’s been there for a very long time.
It’s just that I have started to reconnect with it.

I now realize that this was the seed for my questioning of a ‘grand narrative’ that had evolved
with the positioning of Māori as the subordinate peoples within the European colonization of
Aotearoa New Zealand. When I questioned my working relationship with Wiremu, I was
naively confronting this narrative. Here I was in Rotorua, a freshly certificated Speech-
Language Therapist, with a full belief in my training. I had the institutional and professional
knowledge to work with any child that I had diagnosed with a speech or language disorder. I was
fully committed and well-meaning in my role as a Speech-Language Therapist, putting into
practice all that I had learned, in a caring and fun way. I had been invested with the authority to
make decisions about the status of a child’s development as normal, delayed or disordered.

At the same time I had some doubts about my training. I questioned my decision about what
Wiremu needed and whether my role in relationship to him was appropriate. It was not a
question about the value of helping Wiremu develop clear speech. It was a question about the
ways in which I had arrived at a place to work with him. Although I questioned the ethics
underlying the way in which I had diagnosed Wiremu’s speech problem and decided that he
needed help, at the time I did not understand the complexities of meanings underlying my
thinking.
As I have come to understand more about these complexities I can see a clear discord between my institutionally and professionally authorised position as a Pākehā Speech-Language Therapist and Wiremu’s position as a child of Te Arawa. I held assumptions about the universality of working with any child, assumptions I had learned to believe in. My training had provided me with knowledge about children that was steeped in developmentalism. In particular, speech and language development occurred according to age related stages; each stage a prerequisite for the next. I acquired the assessments to evaluate a child’s speech and language development through these stages, for diagnosis of ‘delayed’, ‘disordered’ or ‘normal’ development. I believed that speech-language therapy was essential for children so diagnosed. What I did not understand then was the deficit model underlying speech-language therapy.

In Rotorua I was equipped with my knowledge of standardized and non-standardized assessments, and interventions. I was working with Wiremu, just another child who needed my expert help. The fact that he was Māori did not enter the equation. According to my assumptions then, he belonged to the category of ‘child’. He participated in assessments and interventions. Like many Māori children before and after him, Wiremu was diagnosed as having a deficit or deficiency.

I see how these words, deficit and deficiency, have constructed a discourse about Māori children in our education system. Speech-Language Therapy has, of course, contributed to this discourse. There was a time, in the mid-1980s, when I was conscious of my growing awareness about a language deficit applied to Māori children. A close colleague of mine worked in Whangarei and she often talked about the language difficulties that local Māori children presented with and the programmes being implemented to support their learning needs, for example ‘Parents as First Teachers’ (PAFT) (Royal New Zealand Plunket Society, 1991) introduced in the early 1990s. First, it did not make sense to me that all or most children of a certain ethnic group could be
diagnosed with language difficulties - delayed or disordered. Second, I never felt comfortable about programmes considered to provide the answer to all ‘problems’ because I always felt that the children were expected to fit the programme, not vice versa. I had come across language programmes in my work, for example, The Portage Programme (Weber, 1975), or the Carolina Curriculum (Johnson-Martin, Altermeier & Hacker, 1990). I had an instinctive disregard for the use of these programmes according to the programme specifications, although I did acknowledge that parts could be adapted and used outside the confines of ‘the programme’. I did this. It is just that I believed in a way of working with children that was spontaneous and authentic to who I was, not a programme that instructed me on what to do, what to say and when to say it. This is what I thought about when colleagues talked about programmes.

In the late 1980s I undertook university courses called ‘Māori Culture’ and then another, ‘Cross-Cultural Studies’ which included a Treaty of Waitangi workshop. These courses informed my emerging Frierian ‘conscientisation’ about the subordination of Māori. In particular, I learned about Māori students as low achievers at school with poor literacy abilities, leaving school without qualifications, and becoming unskilled workers or unemployed. I did not understand then about this discourse reflecting a deficit way of thinking. I recall thinking, however, that there was an inequality or injustice within the educational context for Māori students. These courses also stimulated my thinking about my relationship to the Treaty of Waitangi and a transforming of my identity that was to inform this research endeavour.

During this time I was also reconstructing my identity as a Speech-Language Therapist in relation to the Speech-Language Therapy knowledge base and the clinical practices in vogue, particularly in terms of childhood speech and language development. I had moved from a speech-language therapist role at a local school for deaf children to being a lecturer and clinical supervisor of student speech-language therapists at the University of Canterbury. So the 1990s was a time of tremendous change for me in many ways.
At this time I was aware of Ministry of Education reports and the local research related to assessed poor literacy learning and educational underachievement for Māori children, and the policies and programmes initiated to rectify this underachievement. Regardless of the programmes, the reports and research continued to inform us of underachievement for Māori children. The programmes clearly were not working and I recall questioning their rationale. However, I continued to be unaware of the deficit discourse underlying the assessments and the programmes.

I started to question Speech-Language Therapists’ use of language assessments and their diagnosis of language difficulties for Māori children. Wiremu had provoked an ethical awakening in me regarding the assessment and treatment of Māori children within essentialist westernized views, and as I wrote above, I had read about the so-called education ‘problem’ for Māori children. Over time I gradually came to question the assessments and interventions that we Speech-Language Therapists administer to children regardless of ethnicity and culture.

In the late 1990s I was thinking about embarking on a PhD programme. I knew that I wanted to understand more about Māori students’ learning within our education system and one of the questions I was asking was related to the transmission of culture and how this influences how children learn. More specifically though, I was asking myself about how Māori children learn phonological awareness and narrative ability, given that western research evidence considered these skills to be important for reading development, and given that reading acquisition was deemed to be a difficulty that Māori children faced.

The question of ‘how transmission of culture influences learning’ was not a major question, but it was the question that provoked a critical turning point in the initial stages of my thesis. I had started my doctoral study within the Speech-Language Therapy Department (as it was called
then), because people with the knowledge about phonological awareness and narrative ability were in that Department. In the initial stages of my thesis I was floundering around with the notions of culture, phonological awareness, narrative ability and reading acquisition for Māori children. While not clearly obvious to me at the time, the importance of culture that nagged at me meant that I was searching for an epistemological framework that would support my thesis. This was not accessible within the Speech-Language Therapy Department. I clearly needed supervision that would promote the theoretical framework that was essential for my questioning, and moved to the Education Department for this.

Outline

One of the challenges of this thesis has been to situate the many faces of the deficit discourse within the broader contemporary and historical contexts. In Chapter One, The Colonised Context, I trace the early colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand, the British annexation in 1840, and the establishment of native and public schools. I draw on the notions of race and genetics to illustrate ways of thinking that were developing and prevalent at the time; ways that validated scientific explanations, had social and political power, and became entrenched in the education system. This chapter situates the deficit discourse applied to Māori children during colonial settlement.

In Chapter Two, Contemporary Shaping of the Deficit Construction, I write about deficit constructions in contemporary time. For this thesis I define ‘contemporary’ as my life time, from the 1950s to present day. In this chapter I bring together notions of deficit and the application of these notions to cultural and linguistic deprivation and the culture of poverty. I demonstrate how deficiency was embedded in policies of multiculturalism and biculturalism and the ‘at-risk’ discourse that is current today. In addition, I draw on my life stories and the stories told in Witi Ihimaera’s Growing up Māori.
Chapter Three, *Contemporary Challenges to the Construction of Deficiency*, focuses on a number of challenges, that have emerged during my life time, to the construction of deficiency for Māori children in education. These have happened as a result of the action of Māori leaders, contemporary Māori researchers and academics, and western researchers questioning the linguistic and cultural appropriateness of tests and measurements used with Māori children.

In Chapter Four, *Reading and Language are at the Heart of this Research*, I outline the language skills considered important for English reading development: phonological awareness and oral narrative ability. These language skills are explored in relation to how Māori children are living their lives and the educational contexts in which they are learning to read English. I introduce my research whānau in this chapter.

In Chapter Five, *Engaging with the Research Methods*, I write about my research position. I select a number of concepts from a range of theoretical frameworks to create a unique research position that is applicable to this research. In drawing these concepts together I am using a mixed method approach to my work. I outline the range of methods I used to complete my study.

Chapter Six, *Multiple Interpretations with Discussion*, is a laying out of my findings for reading, phonological awareness and oral narratives. It presents the multiple interpretations that can either position Māori children as achieving learners, or as deficient learners.

In Chapter 7, *Conclusions and Implications – Weaving the Threads*, I draw together the major findings of my research and the implications of those findings.
Chapter One

The Colonised Context

Racist ideologies imported by the early missionaries into Aotearoa New Zealand constructed a race pathology (to borrow the term from Shields, Bishop & Mazawi, 2005) in relation to Māori. With ethnocentric belief in their superiority, the colonizers sustained the race pathology during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. A genetically determined inferior status related to the intellect and culture of some races was promoted by scientific and social movements, especially those of the Eugenicists and Social Darwinists. During the 20th century deficiencies related to inferior intelligence, culture and language became deeply entrenched in the belief systems of the dominant western institutions, particularly the education system in which these deficits were formed and played out. This chapter positions the deficit construction of Maori children in our education system in the colonized context of Aotearoa New Zealand. I discuss the missionary importation of a race pathology, Māori response to the missionary agenda, the Treaty of Waitangi, Native and Public schools, and the emergence of tests and measurements.

The Missionary “Mission”

The missionaries came to Aotearoa New Zealand in the early 19th century fully believing in the supremacy of their civilized state, European race and Christian doctrine. Māori were constructed as a deficient race. Their ways of living, acting and believing were pathologized and deemed immoral, heathen, idle, unclean and disorderly (May, 2005). The missionaries were committed to the project they had to do in the servitude of God, to “save (the) souls” (Fitzgerald, 1995, p.3) of the “savages” (May, 2003). They were the “advance guard of modernity” (Walker, 1996a, p.259), the bearers of the Enlightenment project upon which western culture was to develop.

With largely monogenist beliefs about the inferiority of the Māori race and their potential to become civilized, the missionaries set about the task of transforming Māori into ‘Brown Britons’
(Belich, 2001), and the establishment of the mission schools was the vehicle for this change.

Māori children, like Wiremu, were constructed as learners, but deficient based on their race. The missionaries schooled them for salvation and ‘Pākehā-fication’ (my term). Helen May (2003), in her historical account of the early years of mission schooling, says that the missionaries were under instructions to model the “...arts of civilized life...” throughout their daily lives – attending Church on Sundays, working hard, being self-sufficient, and talking to the natives about sin and salvation. The missionaries believed that their form of education resulted in “stability, subordination, and industry” (pp. 23, 24).

As school pupils the missionaries believed Māori children to be capable learners. Thomas Kendall, who set up the first mission station in 1814 at Rangihoua, Bay of Islands, and the first mission school in 1816, wrote about his “vagrant scholars” and “wild little pupils” with “wild habits” who created a teaching challenge (quoted in May, 2003, p. 13). In 1818 he wrote about the children’s learning abilities, that 30 children could read, and that the writing abilities of the boys “show a degree of skill quite equal, if not decidedly superior to that of a School of English Boys under similar circumstances” (quoted in May, 2003, p. 465). Others commented on their pupils as having “intellectual potential” (May, 2005, p.47), having ability to listen and observe, and ability to acquire literacy. According to the Reverend Joseph Matthews at the Waimate Mission:

Now it is just as easy to teach them (the children) the orderly habits of the Infant School, as to teach them the habit of delighting in war. (May, 2005, pp. 511-2)

The missionaries also constructed Māori children as learners according to their beliefs about gender roles embedded within a Christian family life. For example, May (2003) writes about Reverend Henry Williams with his wife Marianne, a teacher, who arrived in Paihia in 1823 to lead the Christian Missionary Society mission. Marianne was instructed to attend to “the education of female children, and in the general improvement of the condition of women in New
Zealand...exhibit to the Natives, the instructive example of a happy Christian family” (Fitzgerald, 1995, p.11). Education of girls was to render them “...useful in washing, ironing, sewing and nursing and being able to write and read with tolerable ease...”, and in their demeanor “...that they become more orderly and obedient, and that their habits are more decorous and less dirty” (quoted by May, 2003, p.16).

**Māori Response to the Missionary “Mission”**

Māori were not always willing or passive in response to the missionary “mission” (Bishop, 1992). Some Māori subverted the missionary project and used Christianity according to their own needs, accepting only those aspects that were of most benefit for them. As King (1997, p. 27) wrote:

Their (the missionaries’) influence at first was minimal. When it did become apparent it was more in the creation of a Māori interest in literacy and the growth of Māori expertise in agriculture than in conversion to a Christian church.

The use of literacy spread widely among Māori (Jackson, 2003). Te reo Māori was an unwritten language prior to 1800 (Biggs, 1968) but by 1830 Māori demand for books and printed matter overwhelmed the missionaries. By 1840 many Māori were literate in their own language (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2001), having learned to read via the Bible and other Christian writings. Literacy was considered the route to European knowledge and belief, and some Māori leaders sent their children to mission schools to gain the knowledge that made European culture successful in economic terms (Walker, 1996a).

Literacy was also “…a means of transmitting information accurately, swiftly and if necessary, privately” (Jackson, 2003, p.38). The arrival of the printing press in the 1830s was eagerly welcomed by Māori who saw it as a great tool for publication of books, circulars, newsletters, and other printed material (Bagnall & Petersen, 1948). The Waikato Māori were keen to use the printing press, in part to support the burgeoning King Movement. In 1861 a press at
Ngaruawahia commenced the publication of Te Hokioi o Nui-Tireni under the editorship of Patara te Tuhi (McLintock, 1966).

However, it was soon clear to Māori that the literacy they were exposed to did not achieve their goals for increasing trade with the settlers, or for accessing European knowledge and technologies (Simon, 1994). Missionary instruction and printed materials were in te reo Māori. This was a deliberate policy by the missionaries to ensure Māori had access only to Christian printed materials, and to prevent them from reading English information from non-Christian European communities. Māori could see that the education their children received did not allow them to participate in the new economic order. This, coupled with their experiences of non-Christians and the Protestant-Catholic friction, led to a rejection of the missionaries.

Kuni Jenkins (1993) argued that the acquisition of literacy also had a negative effect on many Māori. A number of Māori developed a belief in the superiority of the Pākehā knowledge and culture, and the inferiority related to their own. Friere’s work seems relevant here, in terms of his ideas about the oppressed believing in their inferior status (Freire, 1970). Some Māori became embedded in what Freire called the dehumanizing process as their beliefs in the superiority of western culture evolved.

**Treaty of Waitangi 1840 and the Colonial Assault**

The race deficit construction of Māori, imported by the missionaries, was promoted by many state officials and settlers post signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in February 1840. For example, Barrington (1966) quoted Governor Grey as saying, in 1847, that Māori communities were a “demoralising influence” (p.2). Although the formation of a treaty was designed to “protect the native population” (Simon & Smith, L.T., 2001, p. 249; Stocking, 1987), in practice it was far removed from doing so. Māori became the recipients of colonial ideology: the conquest,

Colonial assault dealt its blow. In all spheres of life and in a multiplicity of ways Māori were disempowered, marginalized and relegated to a subordinate position in their indigenous space (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Smith, H.G., 1993; Smith L. T., 1999), their territorial and cultural integrity destroyed (Poata-Smith, 1997a).

Post Treaty of Waitangi the race deficit applied to Māori was endorsed by an official Government policy. Quoted by Barrington and Beaglehole (1974), Governor FitzRoy stated in the preamble to the 1844 Native Trust Ordinance, that this policy was about “assimilating as speedily as possible the habits and usages of the native to those of the European population” (p.40). The objective was for Māori to become monocultural Pākehā, as the missionaries had aimed to achieve (Harker, 1980). Māori endured this colonizing regime and its racist assimilation policy from 1840 to 1960, underpinned by the assumption that the colonialists knew what was important and best for Māori (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). The beliefs of the dominant Pākehā culture have become entrenched as truths in the minds of Pākehā and continued to shape Māori as deficient.
**Native and Public Schools**

The policy of assimilation played a major role in shaping a state school system that, since its inception, constructed Māori children as deficient learners since its inception and was an oppressive vehicle for Māori children’s education (Walker, 1996a).

By the mid-1860s the number of Māori children attending mission schools had significantly decreased. This was due to land disputes and a thriving industry to supply food and other materials to the markets in the Australian gold-fields (Department of Education, 1971). At this time the State took over mission schools and a two school state system was developed. First, the 1867 Native Schools Act created a form of special schooling for rural Māori children, governed by the Native Department and with English as the language of instruction. Second, the 1877 Education Act established public schools that were compulsory, secular and free for the settler children and governed by local Education Boards. In addition, the administrative control of the Native schools moved to the Department of Education. Māori and Pākehā children were entitled to enroll at either school, and from 1909 onwards more Māori children attended the Public schools than the Native (Simon & Smith, L.T., 2001). This system co-existed up to 1969, when the Native Schools were disestablished.

The formation of the two school system occurred at a time when the western world’s pursuit of science challenged traditional Christian doctrines, especially in the ways that man’s existence was thought about in terms of Darwin’s evolution theory. Added to a climate of scientific and theological debate were monogenist and polygenist views related to the hierarchy of human species. Both views were supremacist in their doctrine, placing European races at the pinnacle of civilization and non-European peoples at the bottom. The emergence of the Social Darwinist and Eugenics movements endorsed this supremacist thinking. According to the beliefs of Social Darwinists and Eugenicists, Anglo Saxon or Teutonic people of north and western Europe and
North America were more biologically evolved than any other race (Baker, 2002). They were the stronger, more intelligent, more civilized, socially superior form of mankind, especially the members of the upper and middle classes. Eugenicists advocated racial and national improvement via various policies and programmes, for example, forced sterilization for the ‘mentally insane or defective’ and segregation of the races via immigration laws, to prevent ‘mongrelisation’ of the Anglo-Saxon race (Valencia, 1997). The emergence of genetics gave scientific authority to human stratification, with associated levels of intellect, strength and capabilities, and furthered the Eugenicists’ endeavour to cull out the weaknesses within the lesser races. The Eugenicists believed that intervention could either eliminate the flaws of the lower classes and black peoples, or manage them in ways that were acceptable to the white upper and middle classes.

These ways of thinking were evident in Aotearoa New Zealand. For example, European diseases such as chicken pox, measles, influenza and whooping cough contributed to Māori population decline throughout the 19th century (Olssen & Stenhouse, 1989), a pattern similar to European colonization in other parts of the globe. This decline served to confirm the scientific views that Māori, as indigenous people, would not survive due to an inherent race weakness, and would eventually die out (Smith, L.T., 1999; Stenhouse, 1999). The Social Darwinist slogan ‘survival of the fittest’ underpinned this thinking.

Baker (2002) writes about the influence of western Eugenicist thinking in creating deficit thinking about indigenous children globally. Baker says that the Eugenicists created problem populations classified as abnormal, as opposed to ‘normal’, for the purposes of programmes to correct the ‘imperfections’. The problem populations were thought about in such categories as “the feeble-minded, the degenerate…” and so on (Garton, 2000, p.16).
In Aotearoa New Zealand, Social Darwinist and Eugenicist race ideology was reflected in the ways Māori children were viewed in relation to their perceived biological evolution, as less intelligent and incapable of learning an academic curriculum at school (Adams, 2005; Barrington, 1992; Shields, Bishop & Mazawi, 2005). This was visible in both Native and Public schools, but in different ways (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Butchers, 1930; Shields, Bishop & Mazawi, 2005; Simon & Smith, L.T., 2001). In the Native schools a manual curriculum was developed for Māori children, to meet their perceived learning abilities and needs (Adams, 2005; Barrington, 1992; Butchers, 1930). The Department of Education 1880 Native Schools Code outlined in Butchers (1930), set out a curriculum that taught reading, spelling, writing, English, and arithmetic (see Appendix 2 for details). In addition, the girls and boys were taught manual skills “with a view to their future needs” (p.123). Girls learned domestic duties and needlework, and boys, carpentry and agriculture (Simon & Smith, L.T., 2001).

The Native Schools curriculum cemented a race deficit based on a belief that Māori children were genetically endowed with lower intellectual ability for learning an academic syllabus. Although it is on record that Māori children made better educational progress in the Native Schools with teachers who were more qualified and more committed to maintaining a relationship with the community, when compared with the Public School and its teachers (Butchers, 1930), Māori children were provided with a limited curriculum based on views that positioned them as inferior. Further, at the turn of the 20th century, te reo Māori was banned within all school premises to aid assimilation, and corporal punishment enforced its suppression for a further five decades (Walker, 1996b).

In the Public School system, steeped in this same race deficit belief, the race hierarchy legacies prevailed and Māori children endured racial prejudice from teachers and pupils. Public School teachers did not engage with the Māori community in ways that Native School
teachers did. They were less experienced in teaching Māori children who needed support to learn English. Butchers (1930, p. 511) says, “Consequently they (Māori children) make but little progress, their attendance becomes irregular, and, in the end, they leave the school without having reached a very high standard of attainment.”

While the colony of Aotearoa New Zealand took great pride in a pursuit of egalitarianism, it was a way of thinking that lasted temporarily for Māori (Shuker, 1987). The state school system marginalized Māori, limited their higher education and employment opportunities, and fortified their educational and social inequality (Adams, Clark, Codd, O’Neill, Openshaw & Waitere-Ang, 2000).

**Tests and Measurements**

The scientific advancement of the child study movement, coupled with the emergence of tests and measurements at the turn of the 20th century, added weight to the ‘genetically inferior intellect’ construction of Māori children in our education system (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). The Binet-Simon Intelligence Test had been developed in the early 1900s. It was used to assess the learning needs of children who needed to be ‘rescued’ (a term borrowed from Baker, 1998). Its importation into the United States by pioneers of intelligence quotient (IQ) testing and ardent Eugenicists, people like Terman, Goddard and Yerkes, paved the way for civilian testing (Cronbach, 1975; Shuker, 1987). Tests like the Binet-Simon were widely used throughout the western world (Adams, 2005).

Testing and measurement became a feature of education in Aotearoa New Zealand with the use of the Terman IQ test in the 1920s, the Otis Test of Mental Ability from 1930 to the late 1960s; then the Test of Scholastic Abilities (TOSCA) published in 1981 (Shuker, 1987). From the 1920s a number of schools adopted whole school testing programmes for guidance purposes, streaming
of pupils and preparing them for their place in society (Faulds, 1984; Shuker, 1987). IQ and mental ability tests became the ‘gatekeepers’ to social, economic and educational status in Aotearoa New Zealand society (Shuker, 1987). It was perceived that their use provided scientific evidence for the sorting of people in society according to innate general intelligence. However, the testing “...largely served to reinforce and reproduce the existing structures of inequality” in Aotearoa New Zealand (Adams et al., 2000, p. 187).

Internationally the genetic pathology related to the intelligence deficit model lost favour during the 1930s. The Depression weakened the Eugenicsists’ belief that poverty was due to a limited inherited intelligence and the racial purification programmes and atrocities of Nazi Germany desecrated the reputation of Eugenicists (Blum, 1978). Locally, some researchers challenged the intelligence deficit attributed to Māori children. Educators such as Norman McKenzie conducted surveys in the Taranaki Province in the late 1920s using an assessment battery, which was then used in native schools by D.G. Ball, Inspector of Native Schools. McKenzie (1931, p. 204) concluded, “The whole evidence tends to prove that the Māori is the intellectual equal of the European”. In his discussion McKenzie re-shaped the intelligence deficit to a linguistic limitation, combined with lack of opportunity, “Any apparent disparity is due to the language difficulty and to the Māori’s relative lack of social, educational and vocational opportunities” (p. 204).

The intelligence deficit shifted to one based on cultural attributes. The perceived genetic ‘lack of mental abilities’ continued to shape the non-academic curriculum for Māori children in the Native Schools (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Shuker, 1987), and dominated the curriculum of the first Native District High schools in the 1940s. The Directorate of Education enforced a manual curriculum comprised of handwork, cooking, home management, infant welfare, manual skills, metalwork, decorating and technical instruction (Walker, 1996b). In the mid 1940s Māori
voiced their concern regarding the limited high school curriculum for their children, stating their desire for School Certificate subjects to be taught in their schools as for other secondary schools (Walker, 1996b). However, the limited curriculum continued (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). In a context steeped in deficit thinking, the school system produced oppression and cultural conflict for Māori. From 1900 to 1960 spoken use of te reo Māori among Māori school children plummeted from 95% to 25% (Biggs, 1968). As Walker (1996b, p. 164) lamented: “The high schools were a choke-point that allowed only a thin trickle of Māori into tertiary education”. It is with this history of limited access to learning within an education system that either prepared them for unskilled work, trades and agriculture, or ignored their needs altogether, that Māori children endured their schooling.

Above, I borrowed the term ‘rescue’ from Baker (1998). Her portrayal of childhood-as-rescue is a discourse about children in need of saving, a notion that reinvents an underlying deficit way of thinking in relation to indigenous children. Using Baker’s terms, Māori children needed to be saved. From early European settlement the missionaries wanted to save Māori children’s souls. Māori children were to be ‘rescued’ from their race, their savageness and heathen-ness via schooling and Christianity, from their Māori-ness via assimilation, and from a genetic intellectual inferiority via a school curriculum that apparently suited their station in life. To an extent intelligence testing has been a Eugenicist pursuit to ‘rescue’ Pākehā children from Māori children, and to manage Māori children by excluding them from access to certain vocations.

To conclude this chapter I ask the question, “What has changed”? The comments made by Butchers (1930) about Māori children not progressing in education, not attending school, and leaving school without qualifications echo throughout the Ministry of Education Annual Reports related to education for Māori students in more recent years (Ministry of Education, 1997,
Chapter Two

Contemporary Shaping of the Deficit Construction

Notions of Deficit

The construct of deficit has been framed in a number of ways (Pearl, 1997). The Collins Concise Dictionary, fourth edition (1999) gives the meaning of deficit as, “the state or quality of being deficient”, and deficient as, “lacking some essential; incomplete; defective”. As I understand it, this is what deficiency in education draws on, the perceived lacking of some essential element, the incompleteness or defectiveness of ability, achievement or performance. This is the underlying thread within the notions of deficit I will outline here.

Race and genetic pathologies proliferated in the western world and were embedded in its worldwide colonial conquests as discussed in Chapter One in relation to Aotearoa New Zealand. I draw on the notion of ‘pathology’ in line with Shields, Bishop and Mazawi (2005), and Bishop and Glynn (1999), who use the word as a metaphor to frame the impact of dominant group power over subordinate, less powerful groups, in this case the dominance of the colonialists over the indigenous peoples. In the context of my thesis, pathologising is the shaping of Māori children as deficient learners in the education system, by the dominant Pākehā culture. Palmer (2000) clarifies pathology as “phenomena that are reconceptualised as a product of a power relationship in which the views of a less powerful patient are defined as abnormal” (p. 661).

Race and genetic pathologies lost favour as explanations for education deficiencies during the middle of the 20th century, as stated in Chapter One. With the rise of liberal ideas during this time, the conservative race and genetic notions of deficit became ‘politically incorrect’ and relatively liberal notions were advanced (Pearl, 1997). If the reasons for school underachievement for children from low socioeconomic backgrounds and indigenous groups
were not genetic, they were either due to an environmental deficit or persistent unequal treatment. The former cause was adopted, and the cultural notion of deficit emerged and gained prominence during the 1940s to 1960s. The ‘culture of poverty’ advanced by Lewis (1965) blamed the victim’s life circumstances, and maintained that the way of life of the poor prolonged their impoverished state. Cultural and accumulated environmental deprivation notions grew from this model, and “singled out the family unit as the transmitter of deficiencies” (Pearl, 1997, p. 133). It was perceived that parents did not value, or participate in their child’s education, and the child was labeled with deficits related to apparent intellectual and linguistic impairments linked to inadequate socialization processes of the home environment. Cultural deprivation notions of deficit were expanded with the development of policies and programmes to educate the deprived child. For example, compensatory programmes such as ‘Head Start’ in 1960s United States made its mark, and language programmes were created to facilitate the language development of poor black children (Bereiter & Engelmann, 1966). Pearl (1997) argues that these remedial interventions have only served to reinforce deficit thinking.

During the 1960s and 1970s the cultural and environmental deficit notions were challenged, with people such as Labov (1970) and Baratz and Baratz (1970) insisting that deficit was in fact, difference, and that difference was not inferior to the ‘standard’ form. Writing in the 1960s Bernstein (1959) differentiated between restricted and elaborated language codes, with the former used mainly by working classes and the latter by upper classes. The elaborated code was considered to be used in relatively formal, educated situations, involving a range of linguistic alternatives, and characterized by a high proportion of subordinate clauses, adjectives, the pronoun ‘I’ and passives. In contrast, the restricted code was thought to be used in informal situations, highly predictable linguistically, characterized by a high number of pronouns, tag questions, and use of gestures and intonation to express meaning. Bernstein’s work was appropriated by a number of academics to strengthen notions of linguistic deficiency for children
from working classes. However, Bernstein (1970) was intent on distancing himself from those who interpreted the restricted language code as representing “linguistic deprivation, linguistic deficiency or being nonverbal” (p. 26). Bernstein placed his work in the difference camp, not the deficit. However, both terms continue and co-exist in today’s discourses about the educational underachievement of children from indigenous and working class groups (Pearl, 1997).

In recent times culture has reemerged as a major focus in the notion of diversity, and the shaping of multicultural/bicultural education, with deficit seen as difference. Initially, education acknowledged difference but continued to apply the policy of assimilation to children of diverse cultures. Schools were moved, reluctantly in some quarters, to modify the curriculum and accommodate multicultural diversity in the classroom (Pearl, 1997). However, in the western world multicultural education has not gained the high status of monocultural education. The limited and fringe changes in the curriculum stimulated a backlash (D’Souza, 1991), and did not enhance the conditions of the poor (Pearl, 1997).

Valencia and Solorzano (1997) maintain that contemporary deficit thinking is an assortment of genetic pathology, culture of poverty and cultural and accumulated environmental deficit models, interacting in ways that make it difficult to clearly define any one particular deficit thinking at any given time. These notions of deficit have been visible in Aotearoa New Zealand throughout contemporary time, as outlined below. Contemporary time for this thesis is defined as my life time, from the 1950s, when many Māori migrated from their rural lands to the cities.

**Moving to the Cities – Contemporary Constructions**

I was born in 1957, the fourth of five children. I grew up in a working class neighbourhood in Auckland with the seven of us living in a small state house. My Dad was a socialist, an artist, a sailor. He worked first as an engineering draughtsman for the then Ministry of Works, later as a technical officer for the Geology Department, Auckland University. My Mum was a teacher, primary and
secondary. Her passions were art history, history, English literature, crime fiction, and later in life dog breeding.

Pākehā and Māori families lived side by side in our neighbourhood. Mr and Mrs G, an elderly couple, lived next door and their grandson lived with them, but Billy was not allowed outside to play with all of us kids. We wondered why sometimes. Their front garden had this huge pohutukawa tree in the front corner that overhung our front garden, and there were rose bushes; and the back yard was all vegetable garden and fruit trees. There was a large family round the corner who used to have parties in the weekends. Waiata and guitars wafted from their house. Always loads of people at their house.

These memories about Pākehā and Māori families, through my eyes as a child, are innocent of the histories of relationships between Pākehā and Māori, or that the 1950s was a time when Māori migration from rural communities to the cities was in full momentum. Mason Durie (2003) writes of this massive post World War II relocation of Māori who were in search of work due to the incapacity for their farming whānau to provide incomes. Now, as I think about Mr and Mrs G, Billy and the family around the corner, I wonder what it must have been like for them to move away from their ancestral land, their ‘nurturing kāinga’, their whānau and hapū, and all that was familiar in their tikanga and reo. How was it for Māori to become dispersed and move to a place of Pākehā invention? I wonder if they thought that they had found the improved living conditions by way of employment, higher wages, trade training, housing, education and greater social mobility that Shuker (1987) and Durie (2003) write of. And what of those who stayed behind?

While I cannot speak for Mr and Mrs G, Billy or the whānau round the corner, Māori researchers like Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) write of the frustrations urbanization created for Māori, the challenges they experienced within education, health, housing development, government policy and with non-Māori people in general. As Shuker (1987) informs us, the 1950s was a time of economic boom throughout the western world, including Aotearoa New Zealand. The population movement from rural and small town settlements to expanding urban centres was
partly driven by an urbanized, service based economy in which the manufacturing industry and government services became major employers. These new industries required labour and Māori filled the space, largely as labourers and unskilled workers. Increasing numbers of low paid workers became tenants of the State’s new housing suburbs. As Durie (2003) writes, tensions brewed between Māori and Pākehā within these urbanized sites. He goes on to assert that urban migration for Māori had not eradicated memories of ancestral land and people, had not helped to develop “strong and vibrant communities” (p.91), but instead created a growing discontent related to the State’s dominance over Māoridom and a deep longing for ancestral homes.

During this time Māori could see that their culture and identity as Māori, historically undermined, was being further eroded, and their Māoritanga threatened by a need to compete with Pākehā, in a Pākehā world and on Pākehā terms. Māori responded. The Māori Women’s Welfare League, the Tribal Committee system, and Young Māori Leaders’ Conferences urged greater recognition of Māori culture in schools and the teaching of te reo Māori for Māori children (Walker, 1996a). The Department of Education established National Advisory Committees on Maori Education (1955) and the Teaching of Maori Language (1958).

Enrolments in the Māori Schools continued to decline (Native Schools had become Māori Schools in 1947), a number of Māori Schools became Public Schools controlled by the local Education Board, and Public Schools increased (Metge, 1990; Simon & Smith, L.T., 2001). After a decade of reports on Māori education, recommending one unified system of state schooling for Pākehā and Māori (Department of Education, 1962; Hunn, 1961; National Advisory Committee on Māori Education, 1955, 1966), the Māori Schools were disestablished in 1969. Apparently, the government race policy of assimilation was coming to an end, a policy that played an official role in the colonization of Aotearoa New Zealand since 1844. Bishop and
Glynn (1999) and Gerritsen (1998) state that as a policy, assimilation reflected the racist assumption that the colonialists knew what was important and best for Māori. However, I believe this racist assumption has continued within the contemporary mix of deficit thinking related to cultural and accumulated environment deficit models, and a culture of poverty, discussed previously.

**Cultural Deficit – Intelligence and Language**

Māori migration to the cities during the 1950s and 1960s coincided with researchers’ construction of cultural deficits related to intelligence and language (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). Aotearoa New Zealand research related to intelligence reflected the educational research fashionable at the time in the United States, with its focus on cultural deficiencies (Ausubel, 1961; Calvert, 1950; McClew, 1958; Walters, 1958). Calvert (1950) and McClew (1958) interpreted the lower intelligence and reading test scores, attained by Māori students, when compared with their European peers on tests such as the Otis, as due to language deficiency, ‘low’ cultural backgrounds, detrimental home conditions such as overcrowding, or poor motivation for school achievement. On non-verbal testing Walters (1958) concluded that the higher overall achievement of European children compared with Māori children challenged the efficacy of using non-verbal tests with culturally handicapped children. While I applaud Walters for challenging the use of what he identified as an inappropriate assessment, he continued the deficit discourse by seeking the explanation of different scores in terms of a ‘cultural handicap’.

Based on data collected in 1957 and 1958, Ausubel (1961) concluded that Māori students were “…undoubtedly handicapped in academic achievement by a lower average of intellectual functioning than is characteristic of comparable pakeha (sic) groups” (p.90). He went on to discuss how “retardation in language and intellectual development among Māori children” is manifested in “markedly inferior levels of attainment in the basic school subjects when they enter post-primary school” (p.91). Further, Ausubel attributed the causes of “intellectual
retardation” of Māori children to an underprivileged and rural, lower class minority status, and “disabilities associated with problems of acculturation” (p.91).

Not all research promoted an intelligence deficit for Māori children. For instance, Leonie Smith (1957) asserted that urban Māori and European children were equally capable of learning at school, based on similar performances in verbal intelligence tests and reading ability. While research like Smith’s appeared to dispel notions of an intelligence deficit discourse, a ‘culture of poverty’ explanation was reflected in the Hunn Report in 1961, and a cultural and accumulated environment deficit model has continued to shape the cultural and linguistic deprivation deficit discourse and construct Māori children as underachieving learners well beyond the 1950s.

Culture of Poverty: The Hunn Report 1961

The rate of Māori migration to urban centres over the three decades from 1940 gave rise to concern, with the second Labour Government wanting a ‘stocktaking’ of the social, cultural and economic situation for Māori. Jack Hunn and a research team were commissioned to take “…a new look at Māori affairs from every angle and invite study of the pace as well as the nature of what is being done for Māoris…” (Shuker, 1987, p.13). As Bishop and Glynn (1999) assert, the research group for this study was organized by and for the dominant Pākehā culture. Of the eighteen researchers involved in the study, one was Māori. The process established for this research was embedded in the hegemonic practices of Pākehā culture. The Hunn Report reflected white cultural supremacy that harked back to colonialist thinking.

In 1961 the ‘Report on the Department of Maori Affairs’ was released documenting the statistics on the ‘Māori situation’ within a number of indices – education, health, employment, housing, population, land settlement, land titles, legal differentiation and crime (Hunn, 1961; McMurphy-Pilkington, 2001). According to Durie (2003, p. 91) the Hunn Report presented a “…new class
of urban dwellers – poor, unhealthy, housed in sub-standard homes, more likely to offend, less likely to succeed at school, and Māori”.

Hunn and his colleagues discussed “the Māori education problem” (p.23); specified the need to train teachers to “cope with the special needs of the Māori pupils in their classes” (p.24); and reported the ‘parental apathy’ amongst some Māori for their children to attend school. They concluded that the low demand for education, ‘not its quality’ was of concern. Walker (1996b, p. 164) records that at this time, “Over 85 percent of [Māori] students left secondary school with no educational qualification”.

Hunn and his team further noted that very few Māori students went on to university, stating that this would only change when Māori indifference to secondary and university of education was ‘overcome’. They wrote about education being the pathway to ‘improvement’ for Māori children, the way of rescue (to use Baker’s (1998) terminology) from a culture of poverty. For example; “Better education promotes better employment, which promotes better housing, which promotes better health and social standing, which promotes better education…” (Hunn, 1961, p.28).

In their report however, Hunn and his colleagues (1961, p. 23) acknowledged the capability of Māori to “absorb education” at all levels and indicated; “It seems that illiteracy is now virtually non-existent among Māoris”. Further, Hunn’s team appeared to dismiss deficits related to an ‘intelligence pathology’ caused by cultural deprivation theories that Ausubel, Calvert, and McClew deemed to be evident. While Hunn and his team acknowledged the findings of intelligence testing, they expressed a fault with the test as a reason for different scores between Māori and non-Māori. They reported teachers’ comments that “the distribution of intelligence is
the same among Māoris as among Europeans” (p.23), and in response stated that this was perhaps not borne out by intelligence tests administered to all pupils enrolling in Form III at post-primary schools, but that is probably due to the fact that the literary element of the tests relates to English, not Māori, language and thought. (p.23)

As I read it, the Hunn Report constructs Māori children as able learners, able readers, and able to “absorb education”, but suffering a culture of poverty according to location and behavioural factors such as the “falling away of Māori… patronage of post-primary schools” (p. 24); leaving school without qualifications; few enrolments at tertiary level; rising unemployment rates; high infant mortality rates; no or substandard housing (in terms of no bath/shower, piped water, hot water, flush toilet, refrigerator, washing machine); house overcrowding; and increasing crime rates amongst adolescents. I believe that the content and tone of such expressions as “parental apathy” and “overcoming indifference” to education suggests they were in relationship to Māori not taking “advantage of a good education” (p.22). The quality of the education system was not considered to be in need of attention, instead Māori indifference towards education was perceived as the problem.

The Hunn Report (1961) heralded in the government policy of integration, replacing the assimilationist objectives that had existed for the preceding 120 years. Defined in the Hunn Report integration is, “To combine (not fuse) the Māori and Pākehā elements to form one nation wherein Māori culture remains distinct” (p. 15). However, as a policy, integration was superseded by policies of multiculturalism and biculturalism in the 1970s and 1980s, to be discussed.

**Cultural and Accumulated Environmental Deficit**

Following the Hunn Report a range of educational research reports contributed to a cultural and accumulated environment deficit applied to Māori children, with the work of Barham (1965),
Clay (1970), Committee on Education, Training and Research (1962), Lovegrove (1966), The Department of Education (1962), The Māori Education Foundation (1966) and others. International research added to the local literature, with people such as Basil Bernstein (whom I discussed previously) and American psychologist Frank Reissman whose work with disadvantaged black children promoted the deficit model and influenced the application of linguistic and cultural deficiency for Māori children (Metge, 1990).

The nature of the cultural and accumulated environment deficit model is that the victims are blamed and those reporting the perceived deficiencies of Māori considered Māori as responsible (Gerritsen, 1998). Parental responsibility came in the shape of homes that were “…less visually and verbally complex [than European], and less consciously organized to provide a variety of experiences which [would] broaden and enrich the intellectual understandings of their children” (Lovegrove, 1966, p.34). “Reasons for Māori retardation (in education) are more probably attributable to the generally deprived nature of the Māori home conditions than to inherent intellectual inferiority” (Lovegrove, 1966, p. 31).

Māori parents did not give their children books, did not talk or read to their children, and did not reward verbal sophistication as Pākehā parents did (Metge, 1990). The comparative research by Marie Clay (1970, 1976) related to oral language and other reading related skills, for Pākehā, Māori and Samoan children, concluded that the lower scores gained by Māori children could be because; “The Māori child may suffer emotionally from the impact of school …for some reason hidden in child-rearing practices” (1970, p. 162). In 1976 Clay commented on the lower scores as possibly due to a lack of books and printed materials in the children’s homes coupled with lack of ‘reading’ experiences. It was simpler to blame Māori families than the government for Māori under participation in education (Jenkins, 1994).
Many Māori took responsibility for the reported educational underachievement of Māori children during the 1960s (McMurchy-Pilkington, 2001). Some Māori leaders cooperated with the state to develop ways to rectify it (Walker, 1996b). For example, in 1962 John Waititi launched a major fundraising campaign and established the Māori Education Foundation to seek ways for solving the ‘problems’. Additional strategies such as the introduction of Māori language and culture into the curriculum, establishment of homework centres, formulation of Māori education committees, and adoption of the play centre for preschool education, were all attempts to overcome problems within Māori education (Walker, 1996b). This reflected international trends, such as the Headstart programme in the United States, to implement policies and compensatory education programmes to educate the deprived child, to intervene early enough so that “the child can recover from the lack of intellectual stimulation at home and the dearth of language…” (Pearl, 1991, p. 285).

Nominally, Māori culture was part of the curriculum when I was at primary school in the 1960s. I remember learning about ‘Māori culture’ each year in the standards (years 3 – 6, aged eight to ten).

When I was about eight years old I got to know Ruby. We were the same age as Wiremu, when I got to know him. Ruby lived down the road and we were in the same class at school. She and I walked to school together and sometimes we played together. I did not know where Ruby’s ancestral land was.

I recall in the Standards our teacher telling us we were going to “do the Māoris”. I recall images of us decorating rolled up newspapers for stick games, trips to Auckland Museum to see ‘the’ Māori village, singing Pokarekare Ana a thousand times, the image of Māori concerts in Rotorua, looking in souvenir shops and the endless plastic tiki for sale.

Now, I wonder what Ruby thought about us ‘doing the Māoris’. On the one hand an element of Maori culture was included in the curriculum, but on the other hand the inclusion was in the form of “doing the Māoris” as if ‘they’ were out there, ‘the other’ (Meredith, 1998). As with
Wiremu, Mr and Mrs G, Billy and the neighbouring whānau, I cannot say what Ruby thought and felt.

Some of the stories written in *Growing up Maori* edited by Witi Ihimaera (1998) offer me insight into what some Māori children might have thought and felt at school. Patricia Grace recalls her time at school. “It was when I started school that I learned that I was ‘different’ and this was a shock to me” (p. 49). Being different meant that “…you could be blamed...” for stealing, swearing or graffitti, and that the teachers had low expectations of you. Grace talks about the constant need to prove herself to her teachers. The stories Ngāhuia Te Awekotuku tells of her schooling echo those of Patricia Grace. For example, being Māori meant you were blamed for shoplifting. Deirdre Nehua (p. 91) says:

> If anything went wrong at school it was always the Māori students who were singled out. If anything was stolen or broken we were always lined up for interrogation. The Pākehā kids in the school thought all Māori were thieves. This was reinforced by the attitudes of the teachers towards us. The irony was that it was never the Māori students who were guilty.

Ripeka Evans tells about the time she achieved top place in her third form (year 9, age 13) English exam, the criteria for receiving the English prize – yet it was the second placed student, a Pākehā, who won the prize.

At school Patricia Grace recalls the other kids bullying with comments about Māori being dirty and needing a good scrub. Te Awekotuku was called a “black abomination” by one of her teachers for not doing her homework. J.C. Sturm was called a “nigger” and learned to be afraid.

Donna Awatere Huata was hospitalized at the age of eight due to rheumatic fever and left school for four years, either being in hospital or convalescing. She missed out on primary school education and writes: “I believe that was a good thing. Unlike my sisters I never learned that I couldn’t do things” (p.147).
Snapshots of Andrew Vercoe’s schooling reveal it was a foreign place for him,

The school was like some sort of tragic wilderness…Māoritanga was non-existent and French and German were given considerable status as the preferred alternative languages…a parochial mentality that Māori stuff was only for Māori people. (p.243)

Vercoe recalls that Te Wai Pounamu, where his parents taught, became a cultural shelter for him, a place where he learned and developed a sense of self worth, that “being Māori was something one should aspire to” (p. 243).

Ruby may have felt school was a tragic wilderness just as Andrew Vercoe did, a place where Māoritanga was not included (even though we ‘did the Māoris’ each year, Māoritanga was not integrated into the daily curriculum practices), a place where she learned she couldn’t do things as Donna Awatere Huata’s sisters did, a place where she may have been called a thief, or derogatory terms related to her ethnicity. Ruby may not have experienced school in any of these ways. She may have had some of these experiences and different ones. Some of Growing up Māori contributors also talked favourably about their schooling, the subjects they loved, some of the teachers who nurtured them and the friends they made. So Ruby may have had positive schooling experiences.

In the early 1970s in Aotearoa New Zealand, a handbook for teachers, Māori Children and the Teacher (Department of Education, 1971) was published and circulated. It perpetuated notions of deficit, deprivation, a restricted language code, and provided an outline of Māori culture that was grossly uninformed. The decade followed with staff development in-service courses for the provision of language enrichment programmes for Māori children (Simon & Smith, L.T., 2001). For example, a book entitled Language Programmes for Maori Children (Department of Education, 1972) provided guidelines to teachers about enhancing language development and ways to compensate for language ‘difficulties’. Metge (1990) states that although there was an acceptance that Māori children came to school with different rather than limited experience, the
compensatory language programmes aimed to remediate language according to the world of Pākehā.

Metge (1990) states that compensatory programmes have continually emerged to ‘fix’ Māori children, to bring them ‘up to standard’ so that they could cope with the ‘normal culture’ of the school.

**Multiculturalism and Biculturalism**

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s policies of multiculturalism and biculturalism gradually surpassed the integrationist policy of the 1960s. This was because reasons for Māori educational underachievement came to be seen as related to the effects of monocultural education practices (Walker, 1990). In the 1970s multicultural education was a way of addressing cultural difference. However, although children were taught about cultural diversity, the teaching practices used and values taught were not necessarily applicable to Māori students. Bishop and Glynn (1999, p. 40) wrote: “Contemporary Māori culture remained invisible in the majority of mainstream classrooms”.

In addition the majority of teachers were part of the dominant Pākehā culture. They did not perceive themselves as having a culture, and promoted a non-culture phenomenon (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). Pākehādom continued to be the reference point for comparison, the ‘yardstick’ (Alton-Lee, Nuthall & Patrick, 1987). Māori children continued to compare themselves with Pākehā culture and sometimes defined themselves as culturally inferior. This reinforced the notion of ‘other’ (Bishop & Glynn, 1999).

Deficit thinking was not alleviated by this ‘multicultural’ stance. The Department of Education responded to pressure by Māori to address the Māori-Pākehā relationship, before attending to a
multicultural environment, and to implement a policy of biculturalism (Bishop & Glynn, 1999, p. 41).

Such arguments (for a bicultural policy) were based on the need to recognize the Treaty of Waitangi as a founding document of New Zealand. Māori people were seeking a visible language and cultural identity in their own country and inclusion in the mainstream education system on equal terms. The argument by Māori people was that the relationship between Māori and Pākehā needs to be addressed in such a way as to remove the dominant-subordinate pattern in order to develop the potential of partnership as envisaged in the Treaty of Waitangi. Relationships with other peoples could then be developed from this bicultural basis.

The 1975 state-initiated Taha Māori programme was embedded in bicultural policies (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; McMurchy-Pilkinson, 2001). However, at the chalkface, while Taha Māori was integrated into the timetable, it was taught in English and taught by non-Māori teachers who received some support from Resource Teachers of Māori. It is little wonder that the initiative failed to create bicultural New Zealanders, fulfill Māori aspirations for cultural and language revival, increase participation in education, or change the power relationship between Māori and non-Māori (Jenkins, 1994; McMurchy-Pilkinson, 2001; Smith, 1997). Taha Māori mainly served the needs of Pākehādom, and endeavoured to acculturate Māori (Jones, McCulloch, Marshall, Smith & Smith, 1990; Smith, G.H., 1986). Biculturalism was a disguise for assimilation, a policy that survives today (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). Deficiency has become named as ‘at risk’ (Valencia & Solorzano, 1997).

**At-Risk**

The notion of ‘at-risk’ emerged in the western world during the early 1980s, within a critique of ‘excellence’ in education. The ‘excellence’ movement promoted the belief that education achievement or failure depended only on individual effort (Margonis, 1992). This notion was challenged, with arguments that education failure was due to systemic causes, not individual effort (Valencia & Solorzano, 1997). The term ‘at-risk’ was initially used with ‘tongue-in-cheek’ to demonstrate the shortfalls of the ‘excellence’ project. Standardized curricula and testing in combination with large teacher workloads created an impersonal school environment,
thus placing the students at risk. The ‘excellence’ proponents grabbed the term, and Margonis (1992, p. 344) says: “Educational goals embodied in the ideas of excellence became the standard, and students who could not reach these goals came to be at-risk”.

Numerous authors in Swadener and Lubeck (1995) argue that ‘at-risk’ is a form of deficit thinking, a synonymous term for the popular 1960s terms ‘cultural deprivation’ and ‘culturally disadvantaged’, that places the blame on victims, and fails to recognize the strengths and ‘promise’ of children. ‘At-risk’ is a word that has become visible in some of our texts about Māori children. For example, Tunmer and Chapman (2005) devoted a section called ‘At-risk Children’ to their discussion about reading difficulties. This section is wholly about the ‘gap’ between Māori and Pākehā children in reading ability and providing Māori children with “explicit and systematic instruction in alphabetic coding” (p. 262) to enhance their future skills in learning to read English.

Ngā Haeata Mātauranga. The Annual Report on Māori Education (Ministry of Education, 1998) refers to Schooling Improvement Initiatives for ‘at-risk’ students, and the implementation of programmes “where there are identified gaps” (p.24). For example, the “Achievement in Multicultural High Schools” (AIMHI) project which started in 1995 to help Māori and Pacific Islands students to reach their potential; “Māori Tau: Hei Āwhina Mātua”, a whānau based project involving parents, teachers and whānau to overcome students’ behavioural and learning difficulties; Mangere and Otara Project aimed to improve ‘educational outcomes’; and programmes for families ‘at-risk’ such as the “Strengthening Māori Families” project.

Twentieth century deficit terminology continues to undermine Māori students in this new millenium with words such as ‘disparity’ (Crooks & Flockton, 2004; Ministry of Education, 2006), ‘underachievement’ (Education Review Office, 2004), ‘gap’, (Phillips, McNaughton &
MacDonald, 2002; Tunmer & Chapman, 2005), ‘at-risk’ (Tunmer & Chapman, 2005) and phrases such as “Māori candidates were less likely than their non-Māori peers…” (Ministry of Education, 2001a; Wang, Harkess & Perkin, 2006), often marshaled to lament Māori schooling performance. These words and phrases linger in our current discourses and perpetuate the deficit ways of thinking about Māori children.

In addition Government reports continue to place responsibility for underachievement with Māori. For example, the Education Review Office (ERO), the school auditing section of the Ministry of Education, has reported annually about Māori in primary and secondary English immersion education since 2001 (ERO, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004). ERO has reported on the wide range of educational initiatives implemented in schools, “…aimed at reducing the disparities …” (2003, p.11). Although the 2002 report recorded school innovations to counter barriers for learning, it stated:

The reasons for Māori underachievement are complex, and differ according to the community the students come from and their individual personal circumstances. The remedies are also complex and need to take these differences into account. (p.21)

The need to address diversity is positive, but the continued blame for “underachievement” lies with the Māori student. In other words the assumption remains that either the culture of poverty and/or cultural/accumulated environment causes are at work here. The talk about ‘remedies’ insinuates remediation of an ailment, a construction of deficiency in Māori children or Māori way of life.

Although present well before 2000, one of the common themes winding its way throughout the current literature on education for Māori students is that of “improving Māori students’ educational achievement” (Shields, Bishop & Mazawi, 2005, p. 72) or words to that effect (Alton-Lee, 2003; Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson, 2003;
The need to improve the educational outcomes for Māori children is not new, and makes a mockery of the education system programmes upon programmes that have been implemented over the past decades to enhance educational progress for Māori children. The words ‘gap’, ‘disparity’, ‘underachievement’ and “at-risk” fester away seemingly without thought of their consequences. These words and educational intentions for Māori children have moved from the 20th to the 21st century.

The notions of deficit I have discussed in this chapter, have influenced the ways in which Māori children have continually been described as having learning deficits throughout contemporary time. A cultural and accumulated environment deficit explained intellectual and language deficiencies throughout the 1950s and 60s. A culture of poverty was the perceived cause of educational, housing, employment, health and crime deficiencies in the Hunn Report (1961). Throughout the decades following, Māori children endured the flaws of educational policies for multicultural and bicultural education, and then more terms to describe their constructed deficits - ‘underachievement’, ‘disparity’, ‘gap’ and ‘at risk’. These terms are used today in the literature and only serve to perpetuate the barriers to learning for Māori children.

There have been times, however, when voices of protest have ‘spoken’, and these are presented in Chapter Three.
Chapter Three

Contemporary Challenges to the Construction of Deficiency

In the last Chapter I recounted some examples of Māori internalizing their victim status. However, that was not the only or even predominant response from Māori. A range of ‘voices’ has emerged to forcefully and repeatedly challenge the systems that construct deficit thinking. These ‘voices’ have come from Māori leaders, Māori academics and researchers; from educational, social and political activists in Māoridom; from academics who denounce the inappropriate use of tests and measurements with children from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds; and from international and national western academics who have regard for diverse ethnic cultures.

Deficit Thinking Undergoes Scrutiny

As far back as the late 1960s and 1970s, validity of the deficit model was under attack on the international and national scene. Western scholars who respected ethnic cultural tradition protested against the culture of poverty and the cultural/accumulated environment deficit models, and challenged “the images of a dysfunctional, negative culture of the poor” (Foley, 1997, p. 118). Sociolinguists such as Cazden, John and Hymes (1972) and Labov, Cohen, Robins and Lewis (1968) assailed the idea that the poor spoke Bernstein’s restricted language code, with a less abstract and simpler language form and cognitive reasoning style. They and others, for example, Kochman (1972), showed that so-called language deficiencies were language differences, and the so-called ‘non-standard’ form of English was demolished. Researchers like Heath (1983) challenged the belief that lack of parental involvement and interest in education coupled with the deprived linguistic environment, created educational underachievement for black American children. Heath demonstrated that these children came from communities with complex oral communication patterns, rich in literacy practices. It was linguistic difference, not
deficit that helped explain poor school performance for black American children. School failure shifted from deficiency related to the child and his/her background, to failure of the schools to provide appropriate teaching practices and curriculum programmes.

Within Aotearoa New Zealand Watson (1967, 1972) wrote about the unrecognized intellectual and social strengths of Māori children, and acknowledged that the educational underachievement of Māori children related in some part to the education system and its measurement system. The New Zealand Educational Institute (1969) acknowledged that Māori were culturally different, not deprived, and placed the responsibility of Māori achievement on the school system. In 1970 the National Advisory Committee on Māori Education suggested that the education system needed to fit to Māori children, stressing the need for Pākehā teachers to understand and accept Māori language and cultural values. At this time also, an academic challenge to intelligence testing was on the rise.

**Tests and Measurements**

Academics have voiced their protest about intelligence testing throughout the western world (Cole & Cole, 2001; Gee, 1996; Gould, 1981; Owen 1985), and in Aotearoa New Zealand the Otis Test of Mental Ability received much criticism during the 1960s (Shuker, 1987). Its use was seen by some as legitimating and perpetuating Māori educational underachievement. Intelligence as defined by standard test scores evaluated in tests such as the Otis, was culturally and class biased, favouring children from white middle and upper class backgrounds (Shuker, 1987). Cole and Cole (2001) reiterate that assessments such as intelligence tests derive their validity from correlation with school achievement precisely because they are “rooted in the schooled society in which they are developed and bound to the graphic systems of representation that are central to all schooling” (p.534). Cole and Cole (2001) and Gee (1996) state that all tests of intelligence [and tests of language competence also] are culture-specific. Intelligence tests are culture-
dependent and conclusions drawn from their use with culturally and linguistically diverse students must be disregarded because as Gee (1996, p.59) says:

Very often the members of a given social group make up tests germane to the social practices of that group, pretend that these tests test mental ‘skills’ not tied to any given social practice, and then give them to members of other groups to ‘prove’ they are underskilled, less intelligent, or ‘illiterate’. This is how mainstream, middle-class people in our society use IQ tests and SAT (college entrance) tests to privilege themselves.

In Aotearoa New Zealand test results from assessments like the Otis were used from 1930 to the late 1960s, to stream children into perceived academic ability classes, which became closely related to future occupational pathways (Vellekoop, 1969). It was found that Māori children tended to achieve lower scores than Pākehā, a difference that was called the ‘ten point gap’ (Lovegrove, 1966). Māori children tended to be streamed in the ‘manual’ stream, where they learned such skills as woodwork and cooking (Shuker, 1987). Testing served to confine Māori children’s learning opportunities. In 1971 Munro commented in the New Zealand Herald (p.8): “It is complete nonsense to use a middle-class test devised in Britain (sic) in Polynesian children. All the proverbial and conceptual background of such tests is alien to them”.

The MOTIS (Maori Otis) Test was developed as a serious tongue-in-cheek protest against such tests as the Otis (Archer, Oppenheim, Karetu, & St George, 1971). A 10 item test related to Māori culture was administered to Māori and Pākehā students. Results were such that Māori students obtained a mean I.Q. of 102.94 and Pākehā students 67.26. Archer and his team wrote satirical comments about these results illuminating the flaws in tests like the Otis.

These findings are, of course, rather distressing. They show the Pākehā child to be further behind his Māori classmate than even the authors had expected. More important, the findings justify the immediate implementation of corrective programmes to assist the handicapped Pākehā child to catch up.

…In other words, the Pākehā child may be thought of as “culturally disadvantaged”. This means that the Pākehā child has simply not grown up in a home as rich in cultural opportunities as the home of a Māori child. Of course, the authors feel that it would be wrong to shame the Pākehā child by telling him that his parents haven’t
given him the advantages given a Māori child. After all, the Pākehā’s inferior intelligence is simply not his fault. (p. 259)

If we recall, Hunn (1961) and his colleagues acknowledged the inappropriateness of tests like the Otis as one reason for different scores between Māori and non-Māori in intelligence testing.

In other words there had been enough evidence for a ‘wake up’ call about the ways Māori children were assessed and tested in the education system. However, evidence to the contrary notwithstanding, the Otis test was replaced by the Test of Scholastic Abilities (TOSCA) published by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) in 1981. Codd (1984, p.1) said:

…the case against TOSCA should be interpreted in terms of a more pervasive political and moral concern to reduce structural inequalities and cultural domination that remains deeply embedded in our educational system.

On the one hand Peter Fraser, Prime Minister of the Labour Government as early as 1938, promoted equality of opportunity through our education system and this refrain echoes throughout the system. On the other hand, the use of intelligence tests to stream students only reinforces and perpetuates inequality of opportunity (Shuker, 1987). Educational testing and measurement for intelligence, oral and written language and reading tests, developed as standardized tests, like the Otis and TOSCA, have continued to be administered to children in the education system of Aotearoa New Zealand. The Eugenicist thinking of old continues to shape the ways schooling sorts, classifies and divides students for quality control of populations, via the use of these tests and measurements (Baker, 2002).

The use of assessments with Māori children in Aotearoa New Zealand continues to define them as deficient learners. Researchers, such as Mere Berryman (2004), have written about the cultural and linguistic inappropriateness of these tests and measurement procedures in the English medium schools for Māori children.
The large majority of Māori students are in English medium classrooms, where many Māori students face serious underachievement. For these students it is equally important for educators to affirm and validate the language and cultural identity that they bring with them to the classroom. Developing assessment processes that respond to the culture of the child and at the same time contain visible culturally appropriate messages and images will help to ensure that all Māori children can begin to be assessed from within their own cultural reality and begin to experience more successful outcomes. (Berryman, 2004, p. 13)

More recently, Graham Nuthall (2007) has written about the myths of educational assessment practices in Aotearoa New Zealand, especially those tests that assign an individual student a raw score translated into a percentile (a percentile is a score out of 100, and represents the number of people achieving higher than this score, for example, a percentile of 45 means that out of 100 people 55 people will achieve a higher score). Although Nuthall supports assessment practices that provide teachers with information related to what children have learned and how they have learned, such as the Running Record developed by Clay (2000), he is critical of much of today’s school-wide and national measurements. Nuthall points out that much educational assessment is outdated and based on the 19th century approach to teaching and learning which required the student to learn and know pieces of knowledge, read and write words, and recall arithmetical facts. Scoring by raw scores and percentiles provides no information about what a child has learned, and how they have gone about learning. “Instead, tests reflect students’ motivation and test-taking skills” (Nuthall, 2007, p.41).

The accumulation of deficit constructions about Māori children, legitimated by tests and measurements, provided a backdrop to the emergence of Māori protest in the 1970s.

**Māori Protest**

An intensifying of political and social consciousness by Māori during the 1970s and 1980s reflected the international movements of the time, and had a profound effect on Aotearoa New
Zealand (Poata-Smith, 1997b). The upsurge gained momentum in the anti-racist movement, particularly played out in opposition to the New Zealand Rugby Football Union’s relationship with the apartheid doctrines of their South African counterpart, the women’s liberation movement, and the trade union movement. Poata-Smith talks about the anti-racist struggle with the formation of Ngā Tamatoa and their goal for tino rangatiratanga, and for Māori to define their own goals and develop their own separate organizations. Political activism also took form in the Land Rights movement and the 1975 Land March on Parliament, the occupation of Bastion Point and Raglan and regular protests at Waitangi. The combined force of the Waitangi Action Committee, Māori People’s Liberation Movement of Aotearoa and the Black Women Movement added to the momentum of activism (Te Ahu Poata-Smith, 1997).

In the milieu of the 1970s political and social activism, educational protest was gaining momentum about the imminent death of te reo Māori, the unequal power relations between Māori and Pākehā in a society where Pākehā dominated, and the “education gap between Māori and Pākehā, as measured by School Certificate passes” (Walker, 1996b, p. 165). Māori took control of the education of their own children and the birth of Te Kōhanga Reo (the language nests) movement in the early 1980s was one of the most successful actions for tino rangatiratanga (Kaai-Oldman, 1988). It was one of the most dynamic, innovative and dramatic education programmes for Māori children within recent times (Smith, G.H., 2000), a transformative agenda for Māori to save te reo Māori from a slow decline and looming death (Benton, 1979; Biggs, 1968; Kaai-Oldman, 1988).

In 1979 at the first Hui Whakatauira of Māori leaders, a commitment to te reo Māori survival was undertaken (Irwin, 1990). Following hui shaped the birth of Te Kōhanga Reo movement in 1981 and 1982 (Irwin, 1990), conceptualised as a total immersion programme for preschool children, in partnership with the Māori Affairs Department (not Department of Education).
Kōhanga Reo were transformative in their aims to revitalize Māori language, to give Māori control over decision making for themselves and their communities, and to achieve control over Māori resources (Kaai-Oldman, 1988). As the Kōhanga children grew up, there was a need for Māori immersion education to expand its horizons and Aotearoa New Zealand witnessed the establishment of Kaupapa Māori education: the Kura Kaupapa (primary school), Whare Kura (secondary school), and Wānanga (university) in the 1980s and 1990s.

Smith, G.H. (2000) writes about the Kōhanga Reo movement as a ‘resistance initiative’ (p.72), a term adopted from Giroux (1983), developed not only as a proactive stance for the revitalization of Māori language, knowledge and culture, but also as a reactive stance to disillusionment of Māori for Pākehā dominated state schooling. He writes about the growing “critical consciousness” (p.58) within Māoridom towards the state policy of assimilation and the educational underachievement crisis for Māori students, a deepening discontentment that underpinned the development of Kaupapa Māori education. ‘Critical consciousness’ is what Freire (1995) expresses as important for the oppressed to resist and transform their context.

Freire’s clear articulation of the lived reality for oppressed peoples resonated with Māori (Smith, G.H., 1997). Freire (1970, p.29) spoke of the oppressed

...who must, from their stifled humanity, wage for both (the oppressed and oppressor) the struggle for a fuller humanity; the oppressor, who is himself dehumanized because he dehumanizes others, is unable to lead this struggle.

As oppressed people, Māori had been fully engaged in their own struggle of transformative praxis long before Freire. However, Freire’s analysis according to Smith, G.H. (1999, p.36) gave Māori the “intellectual space and structures to illuminate the critical issues confronting (them)...”, and the “…support, direction, validity and confirmation of what they were already doing”. Further, Smith, G.H. (1999) adapted Friere’s linear process of conscientisation,
resistance and transformative praxis into a cyclic process. In Smith’s terms, there is no entry or exit point in this cycle because individuals are engaged in it intentionally or unintentionally. There is no stepping in or stepping out, and it is this cycle that has created a context for contemporary Māori to survive culturally.

In tandem with Te Kōhanga Reo movement, the 1980s witnessed the emerging revolutionary and transformative praxis of Kaupapa Māori theory. This was a turning point for Māori self-determination, a consolidating momentum for Māori cultural aspirations and practices (Benseman, 1992; Bishop, 1996a; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; McCarthy, 1996; Mead, 1996; Smith, G.H., 1991; Walker, 1991). Smith, L.T. (1999, p. 185) thinks of Kaupapa Māori theory as a “local approach to critical theory”, especially according to notions of critique, resistance, struggle; notions of liberation from oppression, marginalization and the silencing of Māori. Pihama (1993) also regarded Kaupapa Māori theory as aligned to critical theory, in its potential to illuminate the underlying assumptions that mask power relations and societal inequalities created by dominant groups. It is an emancipatory theory that offers resistance to the overriding hegemony of the dominant culture and the revolutionary potential for changing oppressive structures in society (Pipi, Cram, Hawke, Hawke, Huriwai, Matakī, Milne, Morgan, Tuhaka, & Tuuta, 2004).

Kaupapa Māori theory has given Māoridom, its researchers and academics, a strong ‘voice’. According to Cram (2001, p.40), “Kaupapa Māori is an attempt to retrieve space for Māori voices and perspectives”. This ‘voice’ has made mātauranga Māori and te reo Māori visible within the bicultural partnership promised in the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi. The Treaty affirms the right for Kaupapa Māori theory to exist. Bishop (1990, p.12) agreed with Ranginui Walker when he wrote that a Kaupapa Māori theory approach:
...asserts that two people created this nation. The Treaty is seen as a charter for power sharing in the decision-making processes of this country and for Māori self-determination of their own destiny as the indigenous people of New Zealand.

Kaupapa Māori theory has established its own integrity, reflecting an indigenous ideology and “an evolving field of enquiry” (Barnes, 2004, p.50) - a theory that can transform prevailing dominant views about Māori children in education (Berryman & Atvars, 1999; Bishop, Berryman, Richardson, & Tiakiwai, 2002; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Durie, 2001; Glynn, Berryman, Atvars & Harawira, 1997; Shields, Bishop & Mazawi, 2005; Smith, G.H., 1992, 1999, 2000; Smith, L.T., 1999; Waitere-Ang, 2005).

The development of Kaupapa Māori theory reflected the concerns of intertribal leaders, who asserted their right to consider and develop a framework for educational advancement (Durie, 2003). The establishment of Hui Taumata Mātauranga (Māori Educational Advancement) has been a strong platform for Māori to plan for a more effective education system.

With regard to the first Hui Taumata Mātauranga in 2001, Mason Durie (2001, p. 266) wrote:

During the twenty-five years 1975-2000, the focus for Māori shifted from assimilation and state dependency towards greater self sufficiency, a celebration of being Māori, and higher levels of autonomy. The message was tino rangatiratanga and positive development; the agenda moved away from domination by others to Māori control of Māori resources.

As a result of this Hui a framework for considering Māori educational advancement was formed (Durie, 2003). Broad goals for Māori were decided: to live as Māori, to participate as citizens of the world, and to enjoy good health and a high standard of living. Principles, pathways and capacity were determined as ways for implementing these broad goals, as Durie (2003, p. 211) outlines:
Within the broader discussion of this framework was a strong commitment to a zero tolerance of educational failure. This commitment has been adopted by some Māori academics and researchers, and has been a way of addressing the deficit construction of Māori children in education (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson, 2003; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; McFarlane, 2005; Shields, Bishop & Mazawi, 2005). Bishop et al. (2003, p. 2) state:

The deficit theorizing by teachers is the major impediment to Māori students’ educational achievement for it results in teachers having low expectations of Māori students. This in turn creates a downward spiraling, self-fulfilling prophecy of Māori student achievement and failure.

Teachers, as agents of the dominant culture, have been trained in the systemic construction of Māori children as deficient. Their position has had the inadvertent power to perpetuate it. In relation to the position of power Foucault (1980) wrote that it is from a privileged position of domination and power that the controlling culture enforces its beliefs and ways of being over the subjugated culture, just as Pākehā culture has voiced authority over knowledge and ways of being for all people in Aotearoa New Zealand, and has shaped the deficit discourse about Māori children in education (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson, 2003; Durie, 1998; 2001). For extensive discussion see Shields, Bishop and Mazawi (2005) and their book entitled *Pathologising Practices: The Impact of Deficit Thinking on Education*.

More recently research has taken place with regards to teachers’ roles within the context of Māori children’s learning (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai & Richardson, 2003). As a consequence of this Bishop and his colleagues implemented Te Kotahitanga, a professional development
programme for teachers to critically reflect on their teaching practice and what guides them, and how these might have an impact on Māori students’ educational achievement. Strategies to enhance classroom interactions were also provided. As a result of this programme Bishop et al. (2003, p. 2) state that when changes in teacher-student relationships and interaction patterns occur, “Māori students’ on-task engagement increases, their absenteeism reduces, their work completion increases, the cognitive levels of the classroom lessons are able to increase, and their short-term achievements increase”.

Māori have been actively engaged in their protest about Māori children being labeled deficient learners in the education system. While Māori protests have come in different forms they continue to ‘speak’ for Maori children to be constructed as capable and able learners.

This chapter has outlined voices of protest about the way Māori children have been shaped as learners unable to learn. Over the contemporary time period the protest has come in different forms. Western academics have protested about the cultural deficiency model with its inbuilt intelligence and language deficits caused by impoverished homes. They challenged the cultural and linguistic appropriateness of administering such tests as the Otis, with Māori children. The growth of Kaupapa Māori education, initiated during the 1970s and 1980s, occurred at a time of immense political activism by Māori that in many ways set the scene for them to take control of education for their own children. The seeding of Kaupapa Māori theory created space for Māori to be Māori. Māori leaders, academics and researchers have promoted Māori children as able learners who are ‘at-promise’. The initiative of intertribal leaders to establish the Hui Taumata Mātauranga for Māori educational advancement has set the scene further for zero tolerance of educational ‘failure’.
From here I move to Chapter Four to discuss the specific reading and related language ‘deficits’ that have positioned Māori children as failing learners for many years, and which led me to ask the questions that I did for this thesis.
Chapter Four

Reading and Language are at the Heart of this Research

In this thesis reading relates to reading English. As mentioned earlier reading development in English has been singled out as a major ‘problem’ for Māori children. Statements about Māori children with reading deficits, achieving significantly lower levels in reading compared with non-Māori children, and making relatively less progress in reading, are commonplace (McNaughton, 2002). In this chapter I will expand on the so called reading ‘plight’ for Māori children, and then narrow this discussion further to the reading related language skills of phonological awareness and narrative ability. I will describe these language skills, relating them to competing models of reading development, and then introduce bilingualism and reading into the frame. This will lead me on to present my research questions.

Reading ‘Deficit’ Constant

Poor levels of English reading progress for Māori children, in comparison with non-Māori children, are constantly reported in our research literature and government documents (Crooks & Flockton, 2005; Education and Science Committee, 2001; Flockton & Crooks, 1997, 2001; Limbrick, 2001; McNaughton, Phillips & MacDonald, 2003; Ministry of Education, 2006; New Zealand Education Institute (NZEI), 2003; Phillips, McNaughton & MacDonald, 2002; Pitches, Thompson & Watson, 2002; Wagemaker, 1992; Westerveld & Gillon, 1999-2000).

International studies have staked a claim in this ‘deficit’ discourse (Limbrick, 2001). The 1991 International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) survey indicated that while a number of students in Aotearoa New Zealand had very high reading achievement levels, a number also had very low levels. Moreover Aotearoa New Zealand had the largest spread of scores of any of the 32 participating countries, and Māori children were
overrepresented in the low achievement levels (Wagemaker, 1992). Similarly, results from the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study 2001 (PIRLS-01) (2003) indicated that Aotearoa New Zealand’s 10 year-old students scored significantly higher than the international mean in reading achievement scores out of 35 participating countries. However, the spread of scores between those achieving high and low levels of reading was again larger than most other countries, and Māori students were implicated in the low levels. The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (2000) reported that the critical ‘gap’ between Aotearoa New Zealand’s top and bottom 25% of 15 year-old achievers in reading was the second largest in 32 countries. And 5% of Aotearoa New Zealand’s 15 year-olds achieved below the lowest fixed international benchmark for reading. Overall, conclusions remain consistent, that reading performance in New Zealand is very good for those achieving at the top end but very poor for those at the bottom. The Innocenti Report Card Issue Number 4 (2002) documented that in terms of basic reading, up to 72% of Māori and Pasifika students functioned at the two lowest reading levels over three measures in the 1996 International Adult Literacy Survey (IALS). These reports indicate that the major ‘gap’ in reading achievement is not only associated with ethnicity, but also the type of school in terms of decile rating (Reading Task Force, 1999; PIRLS-01, 2003). High numbers of students in low decile schools, schools representing lower socioeconomic status communities (Ministry of Education website, 2006), remain in the lower levels of reading development. According to Te Puni Kokiri (2001) the majority of Māori children tend to be enrolled in the low decile schools.

The Report of the Education and Science Committee (2001) stated that the low levels of, and slow progress in, reading performance puts Māori children ‘at risk’ for school and beyond school failure, with dire social and economic consequences for themselves and the nation. In Aotearoa New Zealand people in the lowest two levels of the IALS reading scale are considered to be four
times as likely to be unemployed compared to those with higher reading levels (*Reading for Change: Performance and Engagement across countries, results from PISA, 2000*).

In summary, reading deficit related to Māori students permeates the education system of Aotearoa New Zealand. Within such a milieu of deficiency the Government has initiated new reading policies and projects, a major initiative being the establishment of the Reading Taskforce in 1998, which was to advise the Government on how to reach the goal that all nine year old children will be able to read, write and do maths for ‘success’ by 2005 (Reading Taskforce, 1999). The Taskforce endorsed a large range of best practice principles for reading instruction, including language programmes that link oral, written and visual language, and activities to enhance phonological awareness. Oral language, in particular oral narrative ability, and phonological awareness are two language skills believed to be important for English reading development, and it is these skills that are the focus of my dissertation.

**Phonological Awareness**

*Phonological Awareness Defined*

Phonological awareness refers to knowledge of speech sounds and their placement in spoken words, represented by an alphabetic orthography, and the ability to segment, delete, blend and purposefully manipulate these sounds (Blachman, 1994; Swank, 1994). As a multilevel phenomenon, phonological awareness requires the ability to break words down into smaller units – moving from one level to another, from segmenting the word sound structure into syllables, the syllable into onset-rime structures and then this structure into individual phonemes (or speech sounds) (Hoiien, Lundberg, Stanovich, & Bjaalid, 1995; Muter, Hulme, Snowling, & Taylor, 1997). I have presented definitions for syllable awareness, onset-rime knowledge and phoneme awareness in Figure 1 below. I have also listed the types of tasks generally used in extant research to determine a child’s ability to perform skills at each level, in Appendix 3.
**Phoneme or Phonemic Awareness**

- An understanding that a phoneme, or speech sound, is the smallest unit of sound within a word.
- An example: the word *cat* has three phonemes, or speech sounds, *c-a-t*. The word *truck* has four phonemes, or speech sounds, *t-r-u-c-k* (the *ck* equals one sound, *k*).
- Each phoneme in the word contributes meaning to that word.
- An example: if the *c* in *cat* is changed to *b*, *bat* is produced and a new meaning. If the *t* in *cat* is changed to *n*, *can* is produced, and if the *a* in *cat* is changed to *o*, *cot* is produced.
- Phonemes provide significant meaning to each word.

- Body-coda knowledge develops prior to onset-rime and incorporates: the body consisting of the initial consonant and following vowel, and the coda, the final consonant.
- Examples: The body of the word *soup* = *sou* and coda = *p*, the body of *storm* = *stor* and the coda = *m*, the body of *most* = *mo* and the coda = *st*.

---

**Figure 1.** Ph onological Awareness Levels from the basic syllable segmentation level to intrasyllabic awareness to the more sophisticated phoneme awareness.
In line with the traditional linear view of child development, research has established a linear theory of phonological awareness learning, which asserts that according to levels of complexity, awareness of the syllable occurs before onset-rime awareness, which emerges prior to phoneme awareness (Bryant, MacLean, Bradley & Crossland, 1990; Fox & Routh, 1975; Liberman, Shankweiler, Fischer & Carter; 1974; Lonigan et al., 1998; Treiman, 1992). Cassady and Smith (2004) maintain that their research confirms a “continuous and progressive developmental process” for phonological awareness (p.261). However, this linear developmental theory has come under fire from some researchers. For example, Duncan and Johnston (1999) found that older ‘poor’ readers can manipulate phonemes but not complete rhyming tasks. Bradley and Bryant (1983) and Stuart-Hamilton (1986) found that children can learn to read well without, or with low levels of, phonemic awareness. Campbell and Butterworth (1985) concluded that some adults who are excellent readers complete phonemic awareness tasks poorly. This serves as a clear reminder that not all ‘good’ readers of English have or need phonemic awareness.

**Phonological Awareness and Reading Acquisition**

A vast body of western research has determined the importance of phonological awareness ability to word recognition and spelling for reading development of an alphabetic language (Adams, 1990; Anthony & Lonigan, 2004; Blachman, 1989; Bradley & Bryant, 1983; Catts and Kamhi, 1999; Ehri, 2000; Juel, Griffith & Gough, 1986; Mody, 2003; Rozin & Gleitman, 1977; Stanovich, 2000; Tunmer & Fletcher, 1981; Wagner & Torgesen, 1987; Wagner, Torgesen & Rashotte, 1994; Yopp & Yopp, 2000). Development of phonological awareness abilities is considered a significant precursor to the acquisition of reading skills (Adams, 1990; Ehri et al., 2001; Goswami, 2001; Wagner & Torgesen, 1987) and a strong predictor of reading performance (Gillon, 2004). Catts, Fey, Zhang and Tomblin (2001) go further, stating that phoneme segmentation skill is the best predictor of reading achievement, in particular phoneme tasks requiring elision or deletion. In terms of intervention a number of studies have shown that
phonological sensitivity programmes enhance the rate of reading development (Brady, Fowler, Stone & Winbury, 1994; Byrne & Fielding-Barnsley, 1995).

Phonological awareness is linked to reading acquisition through an alphabetic orthography that “maps speech to print at the level of the phoneme” (Yopp & Yopp, 2000, p.131). The child learning to read and write must discover that running speech is a sequence of individual sounds that can be constructed as a sequence of letters put into print. Considered an important skill for word recognition, phonological awareness is embedded in theories of word recognition - dual-route model, modified dual-route models, analogy model and connectionist models. Gillon (2004) provides a thorough overview of these models.

As a skill set for decoding and encoding words, phonological awareness is taught according to a word-based, code-emphasis, bottom-up, linear, systematic and explicit phonics approach to reading acquisition (Nicholson, 2000; Tunmer, Chapman & Prochnow, 2004). This contrasts with the whole-language, contextual, text-based syntactic, semantic and phonics cues, top-down approach that has dominated in Aotearoa New Zealand classrooms for the past several decades. Researchers, such as Tunmer, Chapman and Prochnow, argue for the bottom-up approach with the inclusion of specific phonological awareness programmes in classroom practices. They place responsibility for the large reading achievement ‘gap’, found in the international surveys discussed above, on the ‘whole-language’ approach (Tunmer, Chapman, & Prochnow, 2004).

This whole-language versus phonics approach to teaching reading acquisition debate has been in existence since the turn of the 20th century (Chall, 1967), continues today throughout the western world, and is no less apparent in Aotearoa New Zealand. For the whole-language approach proponents see the work of Ken Goodman (1989), John Smith (1975, 1976) with Warwick Elley (1994), Marie Clay (1998) Stuart McNaughton (2002) and his colleagues Gwenneth Phillips and

*Phonological Awareness in Aotearoa New Zealand*

As already mentioned, the New Zealand Government established a Reading Taskforce and Experts Group to advise it on achieving the goal that every nine year old would be able to read, write and do maths by 2005 (Reading Taskforce, 1999). One of the first recommendations in their report was that “greater attention needs to be focused on the development of word-level skills and strategies in beginning reading instruction, including the development of phonological awareness” (Smith, J., 2000, p. 141).

One result of the Reading Taskforce Report (1999) was the Government’s establishment of a Reading and Numeracy Strategy. This was to provide direction for a range of policies and programmes aimed at raising reading achievement at all levels. The Ministry of Education established a fund (the Reading, Writing and Mathematics Proposals Pool - RWMP) for primary schools to trial learning projects. Consequently, independent schools and school clusters have documented case study reports in the Reading and Numeracy section of the Te Kete Ipurangi (TKI) (2001), Ministry of Education website (www.tki.org.nz).

Of the eighteen schools undertaking these trials, eleven of them included some or all of the following in their reading projects: phonological awareness in combination with story telling activities in Hei Awhiawhi Tamariki ki te Panui Pukapuka (HPP); the Pause, Prompt and Praise (PPP) programme; oral language enhancement activities; and development of strong community links to involve parents and volunteer adults as tutor-readers. The remaining seven schools,
which also reported high numbers of Māori students on their rolls, did not include phonological awareness training. All eighteen schools reported positive gains in reading levels.

More recent documents indicate that the Ministry of Education’s emphasis on systematic phonological awareness teaching in the reading curriculum is on an increase (Ministry of Education, 2003c). Similarly, academic researchers in reading have shown an increasing emphasis on phonological awareness (Berryman, Boasa-Dean, & Glynn, 2002; Gillon & Schwarz, 1999; McNaughton, 2002; McNaughton, Phillips & MacDonald, 2003; Openshaw, 2000). Phonological awareness assessment is administered to children to diagnose ‘normal’ or ‘disordered’ ability, determine research participant eligibility, and measure experiment progress (for example, see the work of Gillon, 2000a, 2000b, 2002, 2004). None of the assessment tools used in this research have been developed with Aotearoa New Zealand children. Those that are used have been constructed with monocultural, monolingual English speaking children in Australia, Britain and the United States - for example, the Queensland University Inventory of Literacy (QUIL) (Dodd, Holm, Oerlemans & McCormick, 1996), the Preschool and Primary Assessment of Phonological Awareness (PIPA) (Dodd, Crosbie, MacIntosh, Teitzel & Ozanne, 2000) and the Lindamood Auditory Conceptualisation Test (LAC) (Lindamood & Lindamood, 1979).

This academic research repeatedly documents the difference in phonological awareness scores between Māori and non-Māori children, in favour of the latter group (Gillon & Schwarz, 1999; Tunmer, Chapman and Prochnow, 2004). Gillon and Schwarz (1999) concluded that Māori children’s performance on the phonological awareness skills - phoneme blending, phoneme segmentation, phoneme identification and rhyme tasks - was inferior to Pākehā. This difference is being reiterated again and again. Tunmer, Chapman and Prochnow (2004) discussed the “significant differences favouring Pākehā” in phonological awareness scores of school age
children (p.132). Tunmer and Chapman (2005) specifically devoted a section to a discussion about reading difficulties for Māori children, titled ‘At-risk Children’. They reported their concern about the ‘gap’ between Māori and Pākehā children in reading ability and advocated the need for “explicit and systematic instruction in alphabetic coding” (p. 262), to enhance these children’s skills in learning to read English. Tunmer and Chapman are talking about phonological awareness.

As a ‘scientific’ and specific skill phonological awareness is assessed by educationalists such as classroom teachers, Speech-Language Therapists and Resource Teachers of Learning and Behaviour. Teachers test the grapheme-phoneme relationship in the Letter Identification subtest of the Observation Survey (6 Year Net) (Clay, 1993). Children are shown a letter and asked to name it, say its sound, and to give a word that starts with that letter. This is a nationwide assessment, administered to children after one year of schooling, at six years of age. Results of this assessment battery are used for summative purposes providing schools with information related to children’s reading progress. Based on a child’s ‘slow’ reading progress and their ‘poor’ 6 Year Net performance, school personnel determine a child’s eligibility for inclusion in the national reading recovery programme, for the following year. Speech-Language Therapists and Resource Teachers of Learning and Behaviour use assessments in line with those used in research, outlined above.

Based on the congruence of Government policy and funded research, independent research and educational practices, a ‘phonological awareness deficit’ discourse related to Māori children is taking shape. From my viewpoint, I see such a discourse easily aligned with the historical deficit discourse already discussed. This discourse is assisted by widespread unquestioned belief in the scientific relationship between phonological awareness and reading acquisition, at Government, academic and classroom levels.
Of major concern is that the centrality ascribed to phonological awareness is driven according to monolingual knowledge. As previously stated, the tests have been developed with monocultural and monolingual English speaking children. The history of labeling Māori children as deficient learners has been perpetuated via the use of these tests. Despite occasional challenges from a number of researchers questioning educational testing with culturally and linguistically diverse learners (for example, Archer, Oppenheim, Karetu & St George, 1971; Cole & Cole, 2001; Hunn, 1961; New Zealand Education Institute, 1967; Shuker, 1987; Watson, 1967, 1972) they continue to be used. Uncritical acceptance of their value demonstrates the ease with which the hegemony of the historical deficit discourse for Māori children continues.

Given that most Māori speakers identify as bilingual in English and te reo Māori, according to the 2001 New Zealand Census (Statistics New Zealand, 2002), it is essential to understand the implications of bilingualism in learning to read English, for Māori children.

*Phonological Awareness and Bilingualism*

The definition of bilingualism in the 2001 New Zealand Census (Statistics New Zealand, 2002) context relates to languages one can use in a daily conversation about events (Starks, Harlow & Bell, 2005). I draw on this definition for my thesis, although it is narrow accounting only for interpersonal communication, which is usually contextualized and occurs in everyday social interactions (Riches & Genesee, 2006). This definition does not take account of the language skills needed for complex cognitive or academic purposes, language skills that are usually decontextualised and often associated with written text.

The Developmental Interdependence Hypothesis related to bilingual and biliteracy development includes both language ability for conversation competence and an underlying “academic
language proficiency” consisting of knowledge and abilities considered necessary for school success (Cummins, 1981, 1991, 2000). This hypothesis postulates that when “academic language proficiency” is learned in one language it is potentially available for development of another (Lanauze & Snow, 1989; Royer & Carlo, 1991). While the interpersonal daily conversational use of a second language can be learned relatively quickly, research suggests that more time is needed to learn proficiency in the second language for academic and decontextualised uses, and when English is the second language this can take approximately five years (Cummins, 1981, 1992; Lindholm & Aclan, 1991). For other models of bilingualism, for example, the Threshold Hypothesis, the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis and Interlanguage Theory, see Riches and Genesee (2006).

Languages can differ widely in structure with orthographies that are syllabic, alphabetic, a combination of these, and so on (Rogers, 2005). The orthographies of alphabetic languages tend to be described as regular, transparent, systematic and consistent (eg. Spanish, Portuguese, Italian) or irregular, unsystematic and inconsistent (eg. English) (McBride-Chang, 2004). The syllable structures in languages differ also (Cutler et al., 1986). Some have syllable structures that are uniform with only CV sequences, and others have greater variation - from a V only to combinations of (C)(C)(C)V(C)(C)(C) sequences. Further, languages can be described as syllable- or stress- timed in which the clarity of syllable boundaries differs (Cutler et al., 1986). The boundaries in syllable-timed languages, such as French or Spanish, tend to have clarity and are heard more clearly compared to those in stress-timed languages, such as English (Roach, 1998).

Phonological awareness research has documented that bilingual children and children learning alphabetic languages, develop phonological awareness skills that reflect the salient structural characteristics and orthographies of the languages to which they were exposed (Bruck &
Genesee, 1995; Bruck, Genesee, & Caravolas, 1997; Caravolas & Bruck, 1993; Cossu, Shankweiler, Liberman, Leonard & Tola, 1988; Cutler, Mahler, Norris & Segui, 1986; Read, Zhang, Nie, & Ding, 1986; Rubin & Turner, 1989). Further, bilingual children whose first language is alphabetic and orthographically regular (e.g. Urdu, Portuguese, Italian) and their second, alphabetic and irregular (e.g. English), tend to transfer phonological awareness knowledge of their first language to their second (D’Angiulli, Siegel & Serra, 2001; Da Fontoura & Siegel, 1995; Mumtaz & Humphreys, 2001). Strong transferability of phonological awareness skills from one alphabetic language to another may be the case, however this is not evident when the first language orthography is syllabic and the second, alphabetic or syllabic. Research with bilingual children and adults, whose first language orthography is syllabic, has found that phonological awareness is not evident or crucial to successful reading (Bialystok, Majumder & Martin, 2003; Karanth, 2002). This supports the theoretical position that phonological awareness is more crucial for alphabetic script languages, such as English.

The two languages that most Māori are exposed to are English and Māori (Statistics New Zealand, 2002). These two languages have vastly different syllable structures. Māori is a syllable-timed syllabic language with a regular and transparent orthography, compared to the stress-timed and irregular alphabetic orthography of English, and they have different phonemic systems. These differences are outlined in Appendices 4 and 5, and in accordance with the phonological awareness research outlined above, they may influence the learning of language-specific phonological awareness skills for Māori children, skills related to English and te reo Māori. Should this be the case, the standardized monolingual English phonological awareness tests administered to Māori children are linguistically inappropriate.
Oral Narratives (Story telling)

Oral narratives are the stories we tell and retell during our daily conversations. In the Aotearoa New Zealand education system the way Māori children retell stories has been constructed as deficient (Crooks & Flockton, 2005; Flockton & Crooks, 1997, 2001; Gilmore, 1998; McNaughton, Phillips & MacDonald, 2003). In this section I will focus on oral narratives including theoretical notions, reading development, measurement of a ‘good’ narrative and their place in the education system of Aotearoa New Zealand.

Theoretical Notions about Oral Narratives

Oral narratives have been variously conceptualized as universal modes of thought and communication (Bruner, 1986, 1990; Champion, 1998; Minami, 2000; Silliman, Diehl, Aurilio, Wilkinson and Hammargren, 1995), a culturally universal way of knowing (Bruner, 1990), a “part of every culture’s oral tradition” (Champion, 1998, p.252). The theoretical perspective that individuals or groups of people hold about the ‘truth’ of narratives defines what they are and how to judge their quality, whether that perspective is based on a cognitive, interactionist, constructivist, or socio-cultural paradigm, any combination of these, or other views.

From a cognitive view, oral narratives are the organization of content and production of a coherent structure, as a product of the human mind (Bamberg, 1997a). Children develop oral narrative competence according to a narrative schema mapped out from early to late childhood, and valued in quantitative terms. The narratives are a temporally sequenced, linear account of events with a definite beginning, middle and end, and the work of Peterson and McCabe (1983) has produced a chronological age sequence for the development of increasingly complex oral narratives. The cognitive view assumes that oral narrative competence develops in parallel with
other cognitive abilities, such as memory, language and reasoning abilities, and is assigned to
the individual without cognizance of other people within the environment. In relation to this
way of thinking about oral narratives, Quasthoff (1997, p. 54) says that “productive and
receptive processing are necessarily bound to the mental domain and, thus, to an individual”.

According to the interactionist viewpoint, story telling is an interactive speech event or process
between the teller and those listening, involving their comments and interjections (Bamberg,
1997a; Corston, 1993). Oral narrative is therefore co-constructed between the teller and the
listeners as equal co-participants. The co-constructed narrative is the unit of analysis. This
contrasts with the traditional cognitive view of narratives seen as monologic texts, and the unit of
analysis as the spoken product from the individual. Labov’s (1972) definition of narrative,
emanating from the cognitive perspective, as “…one method of recapitulating past experience by
matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which actually occurred”
(p.359-360) and then his recording of narratives as a continuous set of clauses with no seeming
interjections, has, according to Corston (1993) tended to create a view of narrative as monologic.
Hence a number of researchers have recreated what Corston called “Labovian narratives” (p.69).

Story telling from a constructivist angle relates to the active engagement of the individual to
construct his or her own life through narration (Bamberg, 1997b). Narratives are opportunities
to build meaning from experiences, using the linguistic practices of the community. The
relevance of language used to create the story is central in this view.

The sociocultural approach places culture at the very core of oral narratives. Language
(including story telling) is a cultural tool for communicating from one generation to another the
cultural attitudes, values, beliefs and practices shared by a community of people (Minami, 2000).
For Minami, culture works as a filter, so that when narrating or interpreting events we make
sense of them in a certain way from a certain viewpoint. According to Minami, “…how to tell and interpret stories should be regarded as a culturally deep-rooted activity” (p.76) and “…narrative models, devices, and strategies are socioculturally embedded” (p.79). Oral narratives are fundamental to who we are, because they constantly happen throughout daily talk, within the lives of all peoples from all sociocultural groups (Heath, 1986).

In yet another way, oral narratives can be thought of within a mix of paradigms. In her work with European North American children and cross-cultural studies, McCabe (1997a) embraces a range of aspects relating to the cognitive, interactionist, constructivist and sociocultural paradigms. Her meaning of narrative is a paradigmatic conglomerate in which “narrative is a linguistic crossroads of culture, cognition, and emotion and serves the dual functions of sense making and self-presentation” (p.137).

McCabe’s view resonates with my thinking about oral narratives. Regardless of theoretical perspective, I have a high regard for the work of academics who maintain that the influence of cultural context on the ways children learn to tell oral narratives is undeniable (Gee, 1985; Heath, 1982; Hicks, 1994; Michaels, 1991; Silliman & Champion, 2002). The next two quotes embrace the importance of cultural context in the learning of oral story telling for me.

And just as the common core of human language is expressed differently in different languages, so the common core of human narrative is expressed differently in different cultures. (Gee, 1985, p.11)

Ways in which we might organize and transform a series of events into ‘a story’ are dependent upon the cultural paradigms of possibility available to use; they are dependent upon the social understandings accessible at specific historical moments. (Gilbert, 1993, p. 214)

A body of research has demonstrated that story telling is culture-specific (Blum-Kulka, 1993; Champion, Seymour & Camarata, 1995; Fiestas & Pena, 2004; Heath, 1982, 1983, 1986; Lewis, 1992; Michaels, 1981; Minami & McCabe, 1991; Pesco, Crago & McCabe, 1996; Silliman,
Diehl, Aurilio, Wilkinson & Hammargren, 1995). Further, McCabe (1995, 1996a) says that there are not only variations in storytelling across cultures, but also within cultures. For example, research with African American children has demonstrated a range of oral narrative styles (Champion, Seymour & Camarata, 1995; Hyon & Sulzby, 1994). Similarly, Hester (1996) found that African American children told ‘oral topic-associated high context’ and ‘literate topic-centred low context’ narratives but the oral style predominated.

These two narrative styles, ‘oral topic-associated high-context’ and ‘literate topic-centred low context’, reflect the two main traditions in which cultural differences in storytelling have been defined (Gee, 1985; Hester, 1996; Mainess, Champion & McCabe, 2002; Michaels, 1981, 1986; Michaels & Collins, 1984; Paul, 2001; Westby, 1991, 1994). According to the oral and literate traditions ‘topic-associated high-context’ stories reflect an oral culture in which people tend to share similar background knowledge and patterns of oral performance. These narratives are anecdotal. They include shifts in time, people and place as well as a number of thematically related experiences within the one story. The theme or point of the story is implicit and relationships are inferred by the listener. Story segments are “…linked implicitly to an event or theme but with no explicit statements of an overall theme or point” (Westby, 1994, p.203). To a Eurocentric listener stories may seem as if they have no beginning, middle or end, or main point.

On the other hand, ‘topic-centred low context’ stories reflect a literate culture in which stories explicitly express the temporal and causal links between segments, and consider a style of telling associated with school language and books. The stories have a linear progression. An initiating event or problem prompts a character to carry out a plan. The problem is resolved in some way, and an external evaluation is placed on the resolution. A listener inexperienced in this way of story telling may think there is too much unnecessary information, and the story telling is tedious.
However these traditions have been critiqued by researchers such as McCabe (1995, 1996b) and Gee (1996) who argue against labeling children’s stories according to a dualism. For example, McCabe argues that:

...any kind of oral language can be made literate by the simple act of writing it down,...that the smoothness of transition from oral language in preschool years to reading in the primary school years depends just as much on the kind of literate language to which the child is exposed as it does on the kind of oral language the child brings to the task, and ...that understanding the literature of any culture not one’s own is greatly facilitated by understanding the oral discourse style that participants in the culture value; without such background knowledge, a reader is likely to be severely constrained in comprehension. (McCabe, 1996b, p.26)

Gee (1996) talks of ‘the new reading studies’ emerging from the deconstruction of the oral-literate culture contrast. Gee’s argument is that reading cannot be essentialised into oral or literate, described as a single element, but is in fact a “plural set of social practices” (p. 49). The important ingredient that researchers such as Gee and McCabe highlight is that children come to school with prior experience, and a range of oral language and story telling ways that reflect their community customs. Children participate in the cultural and linguistic practices of the context they are situated in and this may differ from the cultural and linguistic practices of the school system. Heath (1986, p. 84) says:

In formal schooling…most judgments of students’ performance depend on their oral production of certain kinds of narratives. Yet neither testers nor teachers give much thought to the fact that definitions of narratives and their roles in children’s early language socialization vary greatly across sociocultural groups.

**Oral Narratives and Reading**

Many researchers have repeatedly documented that the ability to tell narratives is essential for socialization and a predictor and precursor of English reading development and later academic success (Bishop & Edmundson, 1987; Botting, 2002; De Hirsch, Jansky & Langford, 1966; Dickinson & McCabe, 1991; Feagans & Applebaum, 1986; Feagans & Short, 1984; McCabe, 1992, 1996c; McCabe & Rollins, 1994; Paul, 2001; Paul & Smith, 1993; Rollins, McCabe & Bliss, 2000; Roth, Speece, Cooper & De La Paz, 1996; Silliman & Champion, 2002; Snow,
1991; Westby, 1991). The link with reading is through comprehension. Story knowledge aids comprehension of the written text and poor knowledge of oral narrative is likely to be a cause of poor reading comprehension (Cain & Oakhill, 1996).

However, this relationship of oral narrative knowledge and reading comprehension of English text is built on the premise that children tell stories that are culture-specific to the North European and North European American ways for story telling, ways that are considered necessary for schooling, namely those embodied in the cognitive perspective described above. Paul (2001) highlights the school learning difficulties for children from communities who use language and tell stories in different ways to that of the North European and North European American model.

Assessment of Narratives - Measuring a ‘good’ story

There are myriad ways of assessing and analysing oral narrative ability. The particular assessment is selected according to the theoretical paradigm within which the tester views narrative ability, what is important to assess and how it should be assessed. Silliman, Diehl, Aurilio, Wilkinson and Hammargren (1995) believe that the methods of narrative analysis are based on assumptions about how people organize and interpret experiences in their story telling. These beliefs then “function as a filter that sifts our judgements about children’s competence” (p. 31). I will now outline some of the features of analysis systems based on the theoretical perspectives previously discussed.

1. Macro and Micro Structure Analysis

As mentioned above, the ‘standard’ story telling form valued in the western education system is based on the cognitive perspective stemming from European and North American customs, and assumes that narratives are formed according to a linear organisation (McCabe, 1996a). The
way school children tell stories is measured against this model. Hughes, McGillivray and Schmidek (1997) provide a thorough account of oral narrative assessment according to the cognitive perspective. Macro analysis relating to the overall narrative form, including description of each sentence spoken, is discussed according to: Applebee’s Levels (Applebee, 1978); Episodic Analysis (Glenn & Stein, 1980; Hedberg & Westby, 1993) and High Point Analysis (Hudson & Shapiro, 1991; Labov, 1972; Labov & Waletsky, 1966). High Point analysis has been a prevalent method of analysis in research over the past three decades. Lexical diversity analysis of Westby, van Dongan and Maggart (1989) and Paul (1995) provides micro analysis, which is the analysis of smaller story parts such as conjunctions, or adverbs, or pronouns and so on.

1 a. Macrostructure using High Point Analysis

As noted above, high point analysis has its origins in the work of Labov and Waletzky (1966) who coded the narratives of black and white speakers in urban and rural environments in the United States. They coded the narratives according to five components: orientation, complicating action, evaluation, resolution and coda. Hudson and Shapiro (1991) added a sixth component, introducer and/or abstract. These are defined in Table 1 (p.72).

Further to this Peterson and McCabe (1983) used high point analysis to categorize the structural patterns of personal stories told by children four to nine years of age: leapfrog, end-at-high-point, classic, chronological, impoverished, disoriented and miscellaneous. McCabe and Rollins (1994) added an eighth pattern, two-event narrative, after collecting stories from three and a half year old children. This work has resulted in a chronological age sequence for story telling development (McCabe & Rollins, 1994; Peterson & McCabe, 1983). These structural patterns and the ages at which they typically develop are outlined in Table 2 (p.73).
Table 1. High point analysis – personal narrative components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Introducer and/or Abstract</strong></th>
<th>Occurs at the beginning; an abstract is an overview or summary of the event; an introducer gains the listener’s attention.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Provides background and setting. It sets the scene, gives information related to characters, time, place and story situation. It tells the where, who, when and why of the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complicating Action</strong></td>
<td>Gives actions leading up to and including the high point. It tells what happened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Gives evaluative or emotional comments about the high point. It gives the reason for why the story was worth telling, conveys the point of the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution</strong></td>
<td>Caps the event and resolves any complications. States how the story ended, finished up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td>Closes the story, wraps it up, and bridges the end of the story to the present context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Hudson and Shapiro (1991); Labov and Waletzky (1966)
Table 2. Structural patterns analysed by high point analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Structural Pattern</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>Two-event</td>
<td>The narrative is a combination of only two events (e.g., complication and evaluation; orientation and complication).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Leapfrog</td>
<td>The narrative jumps from one event to another within an integrated experience, leaving out major events that must be inferred by the listener; the narrator’s sequence of events does not match a logically occurring order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>End-at-High Point</td>
<td>The narrative builds up to a high point (i.e., the narrator concentrates on the complication and evaluative comments, then ends, without resolution).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Classic High-Point</td>
<td>The narrative builds up to a high point, the narrator evaluatively dwells on it, then resolves it; this is the typical form of adult narratives found by Labov and Waletzky (1966).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>Chronological</td>
<td>The narrative consists of undeveloped stories that are unevaluated lists of actions or simple description of successive events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No typical age</td>
<td>Impoverished</td>
<td>The narrative consists of too few sentences for any high point pattern to be recognized, or it reiterates and evaluates only two events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No typical age</td>
<td>Disoriented</td>
<td>The narrative is too confused or disoriented for understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>The narrative does not fit into one of the above categories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: McCabe and Rollins (1994); Peterson and McCabe (1983)
1b. Micro Analysis using Lexical Diversity

Lexical diversity is considered important for ‘good’ narratives and includes four word or word class categories.

i. Conjunctions, not including and and then.

ii. Elaborated noun phrases i.e. containing more than two modifiers preceding the noun, and nouns followed by prepositional phrases or relative clauses.

iii. Mental and linguistic verbs, such as think, wish, say, promise, exclaim, etc.

iv. Adverbs, especially those that express tone, attitude, and manner such as, angrily, cheerfully (Westby, Van Dongen & Maggart, 1989).

Hughes, McGillivray and Schmidek (1997) state that if any of these four word class categories are missing or rare, they could be goals for intervention to improve narrative language style. This implies that absence of these features equals a language ‘deficit’. They are features believed to be essential for literate language and academic achievement. However, Westby (1991) points out that stories told in a non linear fashion present with characteristics that do not necessarily ‘fit’ with literate language notions.

2. Underlying Structure Analysis

The underlying structure analysis approach stems from the early work of Gee (1985, 1986, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1996). Wilkinson, Silliman, Nitzberg and Aurilio (1993) named Gee’s analysis as an underlying structure perspective system because for them it partly represents a way for deciphering a structure that supports and shapes narrative production. It is a way of exposing culturally bound story telling patterns, because this approach assumes that culture-specific
devices are used by the narrator to make interpersonal links with the listener, and that narratives are not linear in the organization of events (Wilkinson et al., 1993).

Gee’s system focuses on rhythm and pattern within narratives. This is illuminated when the stories are recorded in lines and stanzas. Gee applies five subsystems, which interact to establish the “sensefulness of a text” (Gee, 1990, p.104): prosody, cohesion, discourse organisation, contextualisation signals, and thematic organisation. Text refers to spoken or written language. Prosody refers to the pitch, volume, stress, length of syllables and pauses. Cohesion is the way in which lines and stanzas are linked together within the story using a range of devices: conjunctions, pronouns, demonstratives, ellipsis, adverbs and repeated words or phrases. Discourse organisation is the grouping of text in stanzas and lines, and the language patterns across these. Contextualisation signals relate to what the speaker signals to the hearer to establish the context that they want to convey, and how the speaker wants the listener to construct that context in their minds. Thematic organization refers to the way in which themes emerge and develop through the text.

3. Discourse Analysis
Analysis of the discourses within the narratives allows for a different reading of storytelling. It makes possible the illumination of the many meanings, and in this sense reflects the constructivist notion that individuals construct their lives through narration (Burr, 1995). It also highlights the storytelling practices that reflect the lived experiences within the sociocultural context of children’s realities (Gilbert, 1993). This analysis is based on the premise that in principle any text can be deconstructed to expose the discourses operating through it (Burr, 1995). Identification of discourses is largely an intuitive and interpretive process. There are no set rules governing what to search for. One individual’s ‘reading’ of stories is one of many possible ‘readings’, and is equally valid to other different ‘readings’.
Assessment of oral narrative is included in the evaluation of language skills for children, especially language assessments of children with learning disabilities and language impairments (Botting, 2002; Champion, Seymour & Camarata, 1995; Hadley, 1998; Paul, 2001). Nicola Botting (2002) believes that assessment of narrative ability is an ecologically valid way to measure communicative competence for children in both the ‘normal’ and clinical populations. She considers that there is ample normative data related to narrative developmental trends which can be used for comparison between groups, narrative ability has been linked to reading development, and narrative measurement can describe specific communication difficulties.

Some academics and researchers, (such as Bliss, McCabe & Miranda, 1998; Paul, 2001) caution Speech-Language Therapists about the use of any narrative analysis with children whose culture is not ‘mainstream’ (ie. European and North American), due to cultural differences in story telling practices. They warn Speech-Language Therapists to avoid diagnosis of a discourse deficit when in fact a cultural difference has shaped the child’s story telling abilities. Gutierrez-Clellan, Pena and Quinn (1995) also argue for the need for assessment approaches that address unexpected variations in narrative performance. No one form of narrative analysis works well for all cultures (McCabe, 1997b). In addition, story retelling as a school task has limitations in that it is primarily a memory activity where recall accuracy tends to be rated more highly than imaginative reproduction (John-Steiner, Panofsky & Smith, 1994). And inferences children make about the status and knowledge of the listener has a major impact on the strategies used to organize and tell story content (Peterson, 1993).

*Oral Narratives in Aotearoa New Zealand*

The standard oral narrative valued in the Aotearoa New Zealand education system is based on the European and North American model of linear, temporally sequenced stories that contain a
clear beginning, middle and end (Ministry of Education, 1997). This is a model embedded in
the cognitive perspective which promotes story telling as the organization of content and
production of a coherent structure as a product of the human mind. Story telling ability is
assigned to an individual without regard for the environment. Further, the narrative schema
mapped out from childhood to adulthood, and the chronological age sequence for the
development of increasingly complex stories reflects a developmentalist perspective.

This ‘standard’ is evident in the school and nation-wide educational assessments. For example,
the School Entry Assessment (SEA) (Ministry of Education, 1997) is administered to a number
of five year old children within the first six weeks of school enrolment, to determine the child’s
knowledge of numeracy, concepts about print and story retelling. The story retelling task can be
administered in English or Māori, however analysis is guided by the ‘standard’ outlined above.
The analysis system for the SEA evaluates the following ‘reduced’ parts, and echoes episodic
and high point analysis systems.

1. Sentence structure (grammatical complexity)
2. Vocabulary
3. Organisation (sequencing of events)
4. Description/expression (including details of who, what, where, when, how and meaning)
5. Content (including main events/actions, underlying story problem, the episodes with characters involved, resolution or ending, main point, theme, or moral).

This way of story telling is clearly valued because there is only one way provided for eliciting
the story and only one analysis system. The assessment instructs the teacher in what to do.
There is no choice. At this point in time, in 2007, there are no alternative assessment methods
and analysis systems provided for teachers that reflect cultural and linguistic diversity in
storytelling.
Even within the cognitive perspective for assessing oral narratives, which I challenge as inappropriate for at least some Māori children, the protocol is inappropriate. The SEA procedure provides the child with one exposure to the story before retelling it. However research has indicated that the child should be exposed to the story at least twice before retelling it, for a more informative language sample to be achieved (for example, Gummersall & Strong, 1999).

As indicated at the beginning of this oral narrative section, Māori children have been constructed as deficient in story telling. Gilmore (1998) compiled the SEA results for its first year in operation, July 1997 – July 1998. In profiling mean scores for 6541 summary sheets submitted to the Ministry of Education, and presented according to the ethnic groups Pākehā, Māori, Asian, Pasifika and other non-European, Gilmore reported that there were significant differences between ethnic groups for all three subtests, with Pākehā performing higher than the other groups. Māori children performed significantly worse than Pākehā children on the story retelling task of the SEA (Gilmore, 1998). In their research with 346 children between 5.0 and 6.0 years with the majority being Māori and Pasifika children, McNaughton, Phillips and MacDonald (2003) reported that a high proportion of retell scores from the SEA were in the lower band and stated these results supported Gilmore’s finding.

The National Education Monitoring Project (NEMP), established in 1993 to evaluate and report on the educational achievement of Aotearoa New Zealand’s Years 4 (age eight years) and 8 (age twelve years) primary school students, across all curriculum areas, includes a variety of oral story telling tasks within the ‘Oral Description’ and ‘Oral Presentation’ sections of the “Reading and Speaking” curriculum area (Crooks & Flockton, 2005; Flockton & Crooks, 1997, 2001). The analysis features used for these tasks reflect the cognitive perspective for what counts as a ‘good’ story, such as completeness, continuity in covering the main thread of the story and
embellishing it with detailed description, accuracy, organization and sequencing of events, clarity of comments and ideas, vocabulary conveying information, using well constructed, rich and descriptive language, and achieving story closure. In their 2000 report, Flockton and Crooks (2001) compared the performance of Māori and non-Māori students. For both year groups, story telling tasks were performed at a higher level by non-Māori children.

My argument is that these statements above about the narratives of Māori children are based on a linear analysis perspective that may provide inaccurate information about their storytelling abilities. This discourse has the harmful potential for labeling Māori children as deficient in language, when the analysis perspective itself might be deficient. As stated earlier, Silliman, Diehl, Aurilio, Wilkinson and Hammargren (1995) reported that the methods of narrative analysis are based on assumptions about how people organize and interpret experiences in their story telling. These beliefs “function as a filter that sifts our judgements about children’s competence” (p. 31). Interpretations made about Māori children’s story telling abilities from the SEA and NEMP demonstrate the value placed on the cognitive form of oral narrative, which serves to filter our judgement about Māori children. Michaels (1991) warns against mistaking cultural difference in narrative structure for narrative deficit, as often happens. Speech-Language Therapists in Aotearoa New Zealand use linear analysis systems for oral narratives told by children, reflecting international Speech-Language Therapy narrative analysis methods (Gillam, McFadden and Van Kleeck, 1995). Although Westerveld and Gillon (1999-2000) acknowledge the need for research regarding oral narratives told by culturally diverse children in Aotearoa New Zealand, they do not broach the subject of who qualifies as culturally diverse nor do they state the nature of assessment for such narratives.

In terms of cultural diversity or difference, Jane McRae (2004) wrote about te ao Māori and how it is richly engraved in oral tradition of waiata, kōrero, whakapapa and whakatauāki, an oral
literature in which people read the performance, the sound of texts spoken, and their subjectivity. Traditionally, narratives were rhetorical, with each telling a chance to preserve moral or historical knowledge. And even though there was a high degree of similarity in narrative structure, phraseology and subject matter, each rendering was unique. The narrators worked within a well defined tradition that assisted memory and performance. They spoke within conventions of structure, beginnings and endings, dialogue, type scenes and recurring themes or motifs. They used concision, poetic devices with rhythm and repetition, formulaic usage, allusion, and rhetoric. Brevity was achieved through lack of detail and a focus on a significant event involving one or two named characters.

These characteristics of storytelling may be traditional and may have been prevalent in pre-European Māori communities, but I contend that at least some Māori children hear these ways of telling oral narratives today, particularly since the revival of te reo Māori in the 1980s. This challenges an assumption that Māori children are embedded in a Pākehā only culture, and therefore enter school with linguistic and cultural ways that are only Pākehā. I believe that Māori children are situated in the culturally diverse populations of Aotearoa New Zealand, that Māori children enter school with storytelling ways that reflect their lived experiences and participation in their whānau, which is often comprised of Māori and Pākehā worlds, and that their storytelling ways may differ to those of the linear standard exclusively valued by the school system.

Sociolinguist Janet Holmes (1998) studied the conversational oral narratives of Māori and Pākehā adults and concluded that there were similarities and differences in the ways narratives were told across ethnic groups. This suggested that there are cultural and linguistic specific ways for telling narratives. Although I do not necessarily adopt the idea that there is a Māori way or a Pākehā way for telling stories, I find Holmes’s research of interest in signaling that diversity
in telling oral narratives is a matter of fact and might be significant for the ways Māori children tell stories.

In summary, I have presented the theoretical perspectives from which oral narratives are viewed, with a focus on the cognitive perspective defining the ‘standard’ form valued in western education systems, including Aotearoa New Zealand, the educational testing of oral narratives that have shaped Māori children as deficient in story retelling tasks, the work of Janet Holmes indicating differences and similarities in oral narratives of Māori and Pākehā adults, oral narrative from a Māori perspective, and above all, the need to acknowledge that some Māori children come to school with cultural patterns of story telling that may well differ from the ‘standard’ expected in our education system.

I will finish this section with the comment that narrativisation of experience occurs in culturally specific social contexts that govern the content and delivery of children’s narratives (Gutierrez-Clellen & Quinn, 1993). The expanding multi-cultural mix within New Zealand society today has resulted in an increase in non-western cultural and linguistic diversity. And at the heart of this diversity are Māori people, the indigenous peoples of New Zealand.

**Research Focus and Questions**

A number of Māori children are bilingual and bicultural. However, in Aotearoa New Zealand the education system and research programmes prioritize phonological awareness assessments that have been developed and standardized with monocultural, monolingual English speaking children, and then used with Māori children. The ways that oral narratives are assessed for Māori children are defined by the European and North American traditions. There is little regard for the cultural and linguistic contexts in which Māori children live their lives. The assumption is
that they can be tested and measured in ways determined by an institutional authority based on western standards.

It is highly likely that Māori children will learn phonological awareness skills that pertain to both languages, and in keeping with bilingual research, that the children will learn phonological awareness skills that are salient features of each language. It is highly likely that Māori children learn to tell and retell stories in culturally different ways to those expected in the education system. The assessments that are administered to them may well be linguistically and culturally inappropriate for Māori children because they are developed with monolingual and monocultural English children. Māori children’s performance can easily count as a ‘deficit’ in such a system.

My research is a result of coming to understand the wider picture of the deficit construction shaping Māori children as learners in our education system – in historical and contemporary time frames - and the voices of protest that have and continue to ‘speak’ about this shaping. In this chapter I have presented the reading deficit ideas applied to Māori children, with a focus on the two language skills deemed important for learning to read English.

In my research, I set out to explore alternative discourses for Māori children. I was keen to discover the ways in which Māori children learn language and reading in their school and home environments, the ways they respond to phonological awareness assessments and how they tell their narratives, with a view to constructing alternative discourses to deficit. I wanted to explore the possibilities of constructing Māori children in Aotearoa New Zealand’s education system as achieving learners who are ‘at-promise’ (Tabachnick & Bloch, 1995).
I repeat my research questions.

1. What are the prevalent and possible constructions of Māori children as learners in education?

2. What role does bilingualism and biculturalism play in the development of phonological awareness and oral narrative abilities for Māori children?

3. How do Māori children respond to phonological awareness tasks in English and Māori, and how is their performance perceived when analysed using different theoretical perspectives?

4. How can Māori children’s narratives be interpreted when evaluated from different theoretical perspectives?

Enter my Research Whānau

At this point I will introduce the research whānau, and then in Chapter Five I will write about the fieldwork I did to learn about the children and adults. I have replaced names with pseudonyms chosen by the whānau or myself. In accordance with the University of Canterbury Ethics Committee and the research whānau wishes, confidentiality and anonymity of the people involved has been maintained.

Talking with a Local Kaumātua

It was a winter day, clear blue sky, but icy cold. There had been a frost and the morning air was crisp and made me shiver.

I went to Uncle Rewi’s house and I greeted him with the little te reo I knew, and I gave him the cake that I had brought for morning tea. Inside I saw many photos of Uncle Rewi’s boy in his rugby teams, all over the wall. And I knew he was proud of his son. He had photos of others in his family too, old and recent photos, ones of his daughter and son-in-law, and when Uncle Rewi talked about his wife there was sadness. I knew she had died and he lived in this house alone.

So I sat at the kitchen table. Uncle Rewi left the door wide open, so the cold air
came in. He had a gas heater over the other side of the room but it was not on.
I said nothing about the cold, and we were sitting down at the table. But I left my
jacket on. It wasn’t that great at keeping me warm. Uncle Rewi had his t-shirt on and
track pants, and slippers.

Then I waited for Uncle Rewi. It didn’t matter that I was cold. We talked about
Uncle Rewi’s work, where he came from. He is Ngāti Porou, and came to
Christchurch 30 years ago, lived here ever since. Uncle Rewi told be about his
relationship with Kai Tahu, how their ancestors were related in marriage. We spent a
long time talking about Uncle Rewi’s work in Christchurch, as a Kaumātua and as a
leader in the Church.

After a time Uncle Rewi turned to me and asked me what I wanted to talk with him
about. I just talked about this idea of finding out about language development and
reading development for Māori children. Uncle Rewi’s eyes glistened. I talked
about how I came to be interested in this work. He listened and he thought and after
a long time he told me he would support this.

Uncle Rewi suggested time for a cuppa. And it was. He got up and made me a cup
of tea. While the jug was boiling he went over to the heater. He brought it up close
to me and turned it on. I was happy to have it on. I knew how he feels about this
work. I learned to respect him at that visit.

(Researcher Journal Entry, 6 May 2001)

My meeting with Uncle Rewi happened because when I started out with the idea of my study I
knew I needed to present it to a local Kaumātua. I needed to find out if the study was important
to Māori, needed more thinking, discussion and changing, and if I had permission to carry it out.

A Ngāti Porou colleague gave me two names. I phoned the first person, Uncle Rewi.

After this first meeting with Uncle Rewi six months went by before I went back to see him with
a more developed plan in writing. At this visit we talked more about the work, and Uncle Rewi
recommended a school for me to work in. He was the Kaumātua for this school, led a weekly
Church service for the children, and taught the students weekly te reo Māori lessons.

Uncle Rewi, whose first language was Māori and second, English, was the central person for me
to contact throughout my research project. He listened to my concerns and advised me,
answered my questions, took part in whichever way he could, and supported the work within
the research whānau. He was an incredibly busy person being a local Kaumātua for a large part
of Christchurch, a Kaumātua for a number of schools, a Church leader fully involved in the
Christian calendar, a Kaumātua for a local prison, a highly respected judge of the annual te reo
Māori high school speech competitions, a leader from his home area up north, and a granddad to
mokopuna who came to him for te reo Māori, and of whom he was very proud. Since my
research started Uncle Rewi has been ill on a number of occasions with heart problems and
various other health concerns that were a long time healing. He has been hospitalized on a
number of occasions and yet finds it difficult to deny people help when asked. Through it all
Uncle Rewi has made time to guide my work.

At my second meeting with him, Uncle Rewi proposed that I talk to Whāea Kath, the teacher of
the school he suggested to me.

*My Meeting with Whāea Kath*

It was the last day of the school year 2001. The tamariki had left for their Christmas
and summer holiday break. It would be another seven weeks before they returned to
school for a new year. I greeted Whāea Kath. We went outside and sat on a stool
beside the whare hui. It was a hot day.

Whāea Kath knew I had talked with Uncle Rewi. She asked me to tell her about my
ideas, and she talked about her teaching experience in Christchurch over many years.
She had become a Deputy Principal in a local English immersion school, but had a
dream to establish a bilingual whānau class kura with a Christian focus, and she was
fulfilling that dream in her present position.

Whāea Kath is Ngāti Porou. She talked about her daughter and sons. One son in
particular she was proud of because of his goal to become a Church leader, just as
Whāea Kath’s father had been.

Whāea Kath asked me when I would like to start my work. We talked about this and
about coming to the school for three days in the week because I was planning to go
to another school for the other two days, that this might vary at times but I would
always talk with her about it. We talked about the Kura parents knowing about my
work and their approval for their tamariki to be involved. I could talk with each
parent as they brought their tamariki to school.

(Researcher Journal Entry, 23 December 2001)
I would see Whāea Kath and her Kura students on day one of the 2002 school year. I will call this school, the Kura. From the time we first met, and while I was in the Kura, I talked about the study with Uncle Rewi and Whāea Kath. I talked with them about how I was doing, if everything was working from their point of view and I talked with them about any changes needed. Changes were needed and some of these will be discussed throughout the thesis.

*Searching for a School Whānau*

During the year that went by between my first meeting with Uncle Rewi and going back to him, the time he suggested the Kura for me to work in, I had started contacting three local English immersion schools, closest to where I live, with as large a percentage Māori population as possible, as determined by the Christchurch City Council (1999). I wanted to work with approximately ten year 1 (five years old) Māori children in schools near to the community that I lived and moved in. If this was possible the study would be more meaningful for those taking part and for me because we would be part of the same geographical community.

I met with Boards of Trustees, and attended two hui organized by one school where the Principal was searching for ways to involve the local Māori community in the school. This school was part of a cluster group of schools, which had received Ministry of Education funding to implement reading enhancement programmes. However as it turned out these three schools had very few Māori children intending to enrol for the Year 1 class in 2002, the year I was keen to carry out my fieldwork. I expressed my appreciation to these schools for their time and willingness to consider my research involvement in their schools, but I could not carry out my work due to small numbers of Māori children.

I approached another English immersion school, meeting first with the Principal, who then suggested I come to the next Board of Trustees meeting in November (2001) to talk about it.
The meeting was at night time, in the Staffroom, with a cup of tea and biscuits. The Board included Pākehā and one Māori. We sat around low tables in a circle, and I was asked to talk about my research first. There was a lot of business on the agenda and I could leave once I had presented the proposed study. I gave each Board member a handout explaining the work, and talked to this. They asked me how often I would be in the School, two days per week. The Principal believed that the teacher Julie would agree to my involvement in the classroom, and that he would talk with her about it. The Board approved of my involvement in the School for the following year provided that there would be the numbers of Māori children enrolling and that their parents would agree. So I have to wait until Term 1 2002.

(Researcher Journal Entry, 28 November 2001)

In Term 1 2002 there were five Māori children enrolled in the Year 1 class. I decided to work there and I will call this school, the School.

The Kura and the School

Table 3 (p.88) outlines the main characteristics of both schools, based on Education Review Office Reports and School Charters.

The initial goal for my study was to work with Māori children (as determined by parents on their school enrolment cards) between the ages of five to six years. I intended to do this at the Kura, as well as the School. However within a few weeks of being at the Kura I decided to work with all the children because the class was based on a whānau concept and it made sense to work with all the children. This was one of the changes that I made very early in my fieldwork, in consultation with Whāea Kath and Uncle Rewi. I presented my research at the next monthly Whānau meeting and gave parents approval forms for signing. The information sheet given to the parents about the research, and the form they signed are placed in Apendices 6 and 7. Similar information sheets and forms were given to the Boards of Trustees and the teachers. All parents were in agreement for me to work in the Kura with their children.
Table 3: The Main Characteristics of the Kura and School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Kura</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Church/State (Integrated)</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>Non-whānau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Bilingual (Māori/English)</td>
<td>Monolingual (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Roll (highest number for the year)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Staff</td>
<td>Kaumātua</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal/Kaikako</td>
<td>Deputy Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Whānau Komiti</td>
<td>Associate Deputy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent help</td>
<td>Office Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Teachers of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning and Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Aides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Facilities</td>
<td>Phone, photocopier,</td>
<td>Phone, photocopier,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kitchen in Church office</td>
<td>computer, staff workroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Composition</td>
<td>17 children Māori</td>
<td>58% Pākehā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 child Pākehā</td>
<td>28% Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7% Samoan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2% Tongan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Levels</td>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Multi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Children</td>
<td>4.5 – 11 years</td>
<td>5 – 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities on Site</td>
<td>Whare hui</td>
<td>Staffroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen in Church Office</td>
<td>Special Education Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kohanga Reo</td>
<td>School Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church Office</td>
<td>School Hall and Kitchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hall and Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sleeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the year the roll fluctuated at the Kura with the highest number reaching 18. Eleven of these children (between the ages of four and a half and 12 years) became my study children and they are the children I have written about (from the oldest): Rapata, Roxy, Rata, Mary, Tama, Pere, Ana, Ariel, Big JL, Hone, and Huriana. Even though I worked with all 18 children and collected information for them, the eleven children I have written about here were either enrolled for the whole school year, or had arrived during the year and were still enrolled at the end. I did not include the six children who left during the year, and I did not include the Pākehā girl in this thesis, except that she is embedded in some of the children’s oral narratives.

At the School I worked with five Māori children between the ages of five to six years: Kylie, Ella, Cathy, Jasmine and Nate. As per the Principal’s recommendations I gave information sheets about my work and approval forms for signing to Julie, the teacher, who placed them in the children’s bags to take home. All five children’s parents approved of my work in the classroom with their children. I did work with others in that classroom too, to eliminate any individual concerns that they were being excluded, but I did not gather information for these children.

Thus, this enquiry is about eleven children, in a whānau class at the Kura and five children in a Year 1 class at the School. My inquiry involved intensive participation in the two schools for one school year, being present at the Kura all day for three days a week, usually Monday, Wednesday and Thursday, and at the School all day on Tuesday and Friday. During the second year I followed up the children with visits to their teachers and sometimes to their homes.
The children are on the mat. The older children are on some of the chairs around the edge of the mat. Whāea holds up a book, reads the title, “Sneezy Snatcher and Sammy Small”, and says “About a giant”. She asks the children, “Who can tell me some words about a giant?” She looks at the children, and the answers come, “big ears” says Big JL and Whāea repeats “big ears”, “big feet” says Ariel and Whāea repeats “big feet”, “hairy” says Tama and Whāea repeats “hairy” (Whāea repeats all the words in this way.), “scary” from Rata, “mean” from Roxy, “wide” from Big JL, “huge” says Mary, “big body” says Huriana, and “unhappy” says Big JL again. Pere says “sneezy” and moves his spot on the mat, craning his neck to look at the book. Whāea is reading the book and comes to the word ‘shortsighted’. “What does that mean?” The children are silent. Big JL calls out “I don’t know”. Whāea explains the word and she asks, “When someone looks foolish they look what?” She then says “s”. “Silly” call out some of the children – Rata, Rapata and Mary. Big JL and Huriana repeat what the older children call out. “And why do you think her husband called her dummy?” asks Whāea.

(The Kura, Classroom Observation, 22 August 2002).

These shared reading times were a typical daily learning activity in the Kura classroom. I included this observation here to demonstrate that the children were keen and able learners. They participated in listening, answering Whāea’s questions, and thinking about words. They were co-constructors in their learning, with Whāea and the other children. This observation is also representative of Whāea’s emphasis on teaching words, their meanings and being able to put them together for expression. According to Metge (1990) the fostering of words and how to combine them is given a central place in teaching by Māori teachers. In addition, Whāea’s cue “s” was a common practice of hers, as a way to scaffold the children’s learning.

I arrive at the Kura carpark. Ariel is on the trampoline. She calls out “Kia ora Whāea Fleur” and comes over to meet me. I say to her, “Kei te pēhea koe” (How are you?) and she answers, “Ka pai” (Good). She asks me, “Kei te pēhea koe Whāea?”

I answer and Ariel is looking in my car boot asking “Where is Kākā?” I pull Kākā from the bag and say “Here he is”. I place him on my hand. “Kia ora Kākā”, says Ariel smiling, and she takes him, puts him on her hand and skips off making a ‘caw’ type sound, dancing Kākā on her hand. On seeing Tama walking in to the driveway with his father, Ariel calls out, “Hey Tama I’ve got Kākā”. “Hey, Kākā. Can I hold him?” Tama asks Ariel.

(Interaction with Ariel, 17 July 2002)
Kākā is featured in Appendix 8. I placed this observation here for three reasons. First, Ariel’s enjoyment of the parrot puppet that I included in the study was typical of the younger children. I used Kākā in all the activities I had with the younger children and I gave him a life out of the Kura. At times he did not come because he was sick or visiting whānau. Second, the younger Kura children were fully engaged in the imaginative existence of Kākā’s life. “What is wrong with Kākā?” asked Ana one day curious to know, when I told her he was sick. Ana’s question was typical of the way in which the children had a relationship with Kākā in the world of pretend, presenting these children as able creative thinkers. Third, our brief conversation in te reo Māori and English was indicative of the bilingual context of the Kura.

The Kura Charter spelled out the school’s special character as a “strong spiritual bi-lingual education. It is an integral part of the programme to help children develop a high level of fluency in Māori” (Kura Charter, 1995, p. 3). Whāea Kath told me that she would place the level of Māori immersion in the Kura at 4, 0-33% Māori spoken, as per the Ministry of Education (1998b) levels of immersion. Whāea Kath enlisted the help and support of Uncle Rewi for weekly Church services and weekly reo Māori lessons. On these occasions Uncle Rewi spoke te reo Māori. Whāea Kath spoke Māori for karakia, greetings and instructions, daily waiata, and during shared class book reading with reo Māori text, followed by comprehension questions in English, two to three times a week. English was spoken at other times. Reo Māori written tasks were completed by the children as a specific lesson, and in combination with English words during other lessons, as in Figure 2. The children copied this diagram in their books at the end of the lesson.
Figure 2. An example of a lesson combining reo Māori and English words.

The little girls are in the classroom when I walk in the door. They are singing to the tune of “Head, shoulders, knees and toes, knees and toes”.
“Nose, mouth, windpipe, lungs and brain, lungs and brain. Oxygen, carbon dioxide, lungs and brain, lungs and brain”.
They are standing in front of each other clapping their hands together. Sometimes they miss and laugh, but they keep going.

(Classroom Observation, 23 March 2002)

This chant that the girls were singing was one that Whāea Kath and the children had created when learning about the respiratory system (23 March 2002). In her lesson Whāea had talked about the respiratory system and how it worked. As the discussion progressed
she wrote words on the whiteboard and I have mentioned Whāea’s focus on teaching words. Then together the class made a chart using the words on the whiteboard (see Figure 3) and a chant with actions.

![Chart on Respiratory System](image)

Figure 3. The chart about the respiratory system, written by Whāea when teaching the children.

Teaching that promotes the learning of concepts in relation to a physical dimension such as a word chart or actions, and the technique of verbal rhythms to establish a sequence are typically used in a Māori educational context (Metge, 1990).

“I’ve got to get back to that”, says Whāea.

(Conversation with Whāea Kath about the Respiratory System Chart, 5 June 2002)

This comment by Whāea demonstrated her cyclic way of teaching using a repetitive format. For her, going over the work reinforced ideas.
Pere walks into the classroom with a newspaper article about the Crusaders winning the Super 12 competition (a rugby competition of 12 teams from Aotearoa New Zealand, Australia and South Africa – now called the Super 14, with 14 teams). He shows some of the other boys who gather around him. Ana wants to have a look, but Pere shows the boys first.

(Classroom Observation, 29 May 2002)

This observation of Pere was characteristic of the way the boys were together. They were ‘mates’ and although they did interact with the girls, the boys were more inclined to sit and work together during class activities and be together during recess and lunch, especially on the trampoline. I have placed this observation of Pere to show how the boys stuck together but also to introduce the next observation.

Whāea Kath is sitting on her chair and the children are on the mat. Pere speaks up and says, “Whāea Kath, the Crusaders won the Super 12”. “Åe, wasn’t that awesome”, responds Whāea. Pere holds up the newspaper article showing Whāea, and she asks Pere if she can show the class. He gives Whāea the article and she holds it up for everyone to see. She asks the children questions, “Why do you think the Crusaders won the Super 12? What makes them such an awesome team?” The children call out their answers. Whāea hears an answer, repeats it, and writes the word on the whiteboard, then reads the word. Sometimes she says the first sound of the word and asks the children the letter that goes with the sound she made.

(Classroom Observation, 29 May 2002)

This lesson was like many lessons in the Kura. On this occasion Whāea moved from the Crusaders being great rugby players to team work, to caring about each other, to enjoying the game, and being prepared physically and mentally, and working hard. Then there was discussion about ethnicities of players, were there any Māori players in the team? Whāea changed the lesson then, to talking about where the name Crusaders came from, and the Crusades. This lesson illustrated Whāea Kath’s holistic approach in the classroom, especially in the way she linked a range of topics together and created connections between them. The children fully participated in the discussion presenting them as active and interested learners. Whāea’s focus on teaching vocabulary was visible again in this lesson. She wrote words on the whiteboard and repeated them as she wrote, just as she used a repetitive cycle for learning the respiratory system.
Whāea’s focus on developing knowledge of words for language sometimes incorporated teaching of the letter-sound correspondence for spelling. This was always incidental in lessons. There were never any set lessons timetabled to teach letter-sound correspondence. I talked with Whāea Kath about this Crusaders lesson (29 May 2002). She told me how she liked lessons like this because there was so much to bring into a discussion, such as relationships, history, health issues and so on.

Rata is at the front holding up the waiata chart. The children are standing on the mat. “This one”, says Rata. “Tahi, rua”(one, two). The children sing and Rata points to the words as they do so, “A e i o u. A ha ka ma….”. They sing.

(Classroom Observation, 13 May 2002)

Waiata was a daily part of the Kura timetable, (see Appendix 9 for the waiata in this observation). At least three points emerge from this class image. First according to Metge (1990) daily singing together is a way for Māori to be a group. “Frequent use of group recitation, singing and dancing reinforces the value of togetherness and group support” (Metge, 1990, p.62). Second, this waiata ‘A Ha Ka Ma’ was sung on a daily basis, as one of a range of songs in te reo Māori. It made visible a Māori-specific CV linguistic unit for the children, because the lyrics are the consonant-vowel segments for every consonant and each of the five vowels (a), (i), (e), (o), and (u). The CV structure is repetitive and portrays the Māori alphabet as consonant-vowel configurations. This song can be found in Te Reo Kori resource kit (Naden, 1991). Third, this observation portrayed the way in which the older students were involved in helping Whāea with teaching. In this way they shifted their role from learner to teacher, a practice commonly used in Māori contexts (Pere, 1994; Tangaere, 1996). The older children were often involved in working with the younger children, in keeping with the tuakana/teina practice, where the older person helps the younger. Rose Pere (1994) writes about the tuakana/teina relationship as bound in whanaungatanga, practices that “bond and strengthen the kinship ties of a whānau” (p. 26), and ako, teaching as well as learning.
I came to know the Kura whānau more than the School whānau because I was with them for longer, shared more experiences and got to know their home whānau. The Kura children’s parents were visible at school in various ways, visiting to talk to Whāea Kath, driving the waka for the children to and from school, helping out with Church related hui preparation, for example, in the kitchen, being present at hui, and cleaning the premises. I got to talk with them more than the School children’s parents.

…it (school) teaches them how to speak properly and to understand both cultures, not just Māori culture as well, to understand the Pākehā culture too and that’s the way I was brought up, to learn both sides of the culture…I think if they can learn to accept both cultures they’ll handle it (life), find it easier.

(Conversation with Dan, 16 October 2002).

This conversation with Dan represented the Kura parents’ desire for their children to be bilingual and bicultural, to be able to walk in both Pākehā and Māori worlds. In every home at least one parent or grandparent spoke te reo Māori, as well as both speaking English. Some of the children had been to Kōhanga Reo before enrolling at the Kura, for example Mary, Ariel, Ana, Huriana, Pere, and Big JL. Most of the parents said that English was their first language, te reo Māori their second, but Māori their mother tongue. They viewed Māori as the indigenous language and therefore their mother tongue. English was an introduced language and might have been the first language they learned, but it was not their native tongue. Tikanga Māori was visible in the homes of the children. Parents talked about saying karakia daily and attending hui on the marae regularly. They socialized with other Māori in their homes, were employed with other Māori or for Māori organizations, such as the Māori Wardens, belonged to clubs or organisations that were Māori based or involved large numbers of Māori for example, the Māori Women’s Welfare League, the local sports club, and ate traditional kai, such as Māori bread and pork bones.

They (the previous school) wouldn’t let her (Rata) in the culture group, and I thought no. They told her that she was too young and she wouldn’t be able to
understand…and she’d just cry because they wouldn’t let her be part of it…I went down there (to the school) and I saw this woman…and I said oh no she’s not too young. I said you never tell a parent who has a Māori child that their Māori child is too young to do their own culture. I said that’s absolute bull…I said you go to any kōhanga, and I said how old are the kids in those kōhanga that can speak Māori, that can be part of their kapahaka groups and that. I said don’t be giving me that.

(Conversation with Rona, 20 October 2002).

Learning te reo Māori is important for my kids…They learn a skill so they can get a job.

(Conversation with Cheryl, 2 August 2002).

These conversations illustrated that access to Māori culture and the reo was of high value to the parents. Cheryl’s comment also indicated that she saw reo Māori as a way for future employment for Big JL.

Oh I’d like for her to do more art history, because that’s what she wants to do…be a wee artist…to paint…she (Mary) has this thing about painting.

(Conversation with Dana, 12 October 2002).

I mean her happiness is basically what worries me. All I want for her is…that she’s going to be happy with what she’s doing and will learn.

(Conversation with Rebecca, 20 May 2002).

These conversations were indicative of the dreams that parents and grandparents had for their children. Regardless of what the children did with their lives in terms of employment, the parents wanted them to follow their own dreams, to be happy in themselves, and to be able to leave school with opportunities for employment.

In all homes the Kura Whānau showed a determined desire for their children to walk comfortably in both Pākehā and Māori worlds, to speak te reo Māori and English, to become adults who could gain employment, and to be happy with their lives.
The School Children

“I can read. I’m at level 9”, says Jasmine. She is smiling.
I say, “That is great Jasmine”.
“Can I read you my book Fleur?” asks Ella.
“Look at my book instead”, says Katie putting her book on top of Ella’s.
“Okay. I can listen to all of you read. Let’s read one book at a time”, I reply.
We are sitting in the book corner of the classroom. Julie is working with the “Bugs” reading group for guided reading. The other reading groups are involved in different activities that Julie set up earlier.

(Classroom Interaction, 4 November 2002)

I put this observation here because it was typical of how the children were eager to learn and to read. Some of them too, such as this group of children, were keen to show me how well they had learned and were jostling for me to listen to them read first. Reading had a central place in this classroom and the children placed importance on being able to read.

Well it teaches the letter sounds first, so that’s important, I mean for children to just go abcddefgh whatever, is meaningless…just singing rote, like 12345, and they don’t know what the number is or the quantity of the number…so it (Jolly Phonics) teaches those sounds and it uses their listening, you know they have to listen, and they can do the actions.

(Conversation with Julie, 28 August 2002)

I placed this conversation with Julie here to demonstrate her belief in the Jolly Phonics programme (Lloyd, 1998) implemented on a daily basis, sometimes twice a day, and timetabled as a specific subject. Placement of the Jolly Phonics in the timetable and specific teaching of the letter-sound relationship illustrated a western way for “fragmentation of the field of knowledge by specialization and timetabling” (Metge, 1990, p. 56). As a junior school programme, endorsed by the Principal, teachers were expected to implement Jolly Phonics regardless of their thoughts about its value.

I always believed in the importance of phonics…you know it’s obviously a mechanical side of reading and it’s only part of the process…however when the whole-language philosophy came in, rather than embracing whole-language inclusive of phonics, it was obvious phonics became a bit of a dirty word in teaching scenarios.
(Conversation with Rob, the School Principal, 24 October 2002).
Julie is sitting in her chair beside the small whiteboard. She places a book back to front on the ledge. The children are sitting on the mat.

“Where’s the front of the book Neil?” Neil stands up, moves to the front where Julie has placed the book. He picks up the book and shows Julie.

“Oh well done”.

“Who can help me find the title?”

Some children call out, “I can” and some are pointing towards the title. Some children are sitting, watching.

“Oh what’s our rules? Who can put their hands up?”

Some children raise their hands.

“Who is sitting quietly? Jasmine, can you point to the title?”

Jasmine stands, goes to the front, points to the title and looks at Julie. “Good thinking Jasmine.” Jasmine smiles. “You can sit down now.”

“Where is the first word?”

Ben is talking to his neighbour.

“Sh Ben, can you please stop. It’s very rude to interrupt. Where is the first word? Who can help me?”

Some children call out.

“Oh again, what are our rules”? Neil’s hand is up. Julie chooses him.

“Put up your hands”, says Neil.

“Yes Neil, you know what to do. Who else knows what to do”? The children are quiet and some put up their hands.

“Katie can you show me the first word?”

Katie stands, goes to the board and is looking at the title. Some children call out the answer. “Sh, sh, don’t tell Katie the answer. She’s just learning”.

(Classroom Observation of shared reading “Coming Round the Mountain”, 5 June 2002)

I placed my observation of this teaching situation here for a number of reasons. First, it shows the way the children were engaged in participating as able thinking learners and wanting to interact by answering questions. Some of the children did not put up their hands but they watched and listened. Second, it showed the way in which Julie singled out children to answer questions. Julie also asked questions to the whole class and the rule was that they were to put up their hands for her to select a child. Third, it showed the importance placed on teaching concepts about print, which is a major focus of learning for emergent readers in the education system. Fourth, the centrality of the rules in this classroom emerged several times in this observation, and was typical of the way in which Julie spent time going over the rules, explaining the reasons for the rules, and keeping to them. Fifth, at the end of the observation Julie wanted Katie to give the answer and when she paused some of the other children called out the answer, which Julie told
them not to do. This indicated to me that Julie sometimes considered that the teaching-learning relationship was between her and each individual child, that the other children were not part of the co-construction of learning. Sixth, Julie constantly praised individual children for doing what she wanted them to do, and she told them when they were not following the rules.

“E tū”, says Julie.
The children stand. “You can go out to play now”.

(Classroom Observation, 5 June 2002)

There were times when Julie used this instruction and “E noho” (sit) in the classroom. Apart from these two instructions and weekly lessons during one school term (10 weeks) to teach Māori words related to certain topics such as counting, colours, animals and so on, te reo Māori was not visible in the School classroom.

“Very important”.

This was the answer that all parents of the children gave me when I asked them,

“How important is it to you that _____ learns to read”?

Like the Kura parents, the School parents viewed reading as an important tool for their children’s future employment. The School children’s parents dreamed that their children would get through the education system well and to be able to follow their chosen pathway.

I would like her to do something that she would love. I do want her to go far. I want her to have a good education, but if she doesn’t want to go through school then I would put her into Polytech…I do want her to do really well but whatever she wants to do I’ll back her up.

(Conversation with Ani, Jasmine’s Mother, 2 September 2002).

Like I always said to them, “I don’t care if you end up picking up rubbish so long as you enjoy what you’re doing”. And so long as you’ve got the qualifications to do something else if you need to or want to.

(Conversation with Rick, Kylie’s Father, 3 April 2003).
Although English was the main language spoken at home for all the School children, Nate’s family spoke te reo Māori at times, particularly his grandfather. Nate’s home life was more akin to those of the Kura children, in terms of bilingualism and biculturalism.

Oh I really enjoy being with Māori people. I think I’ve gone really right back to my culture…which is really good.

(Conversation with Sharon, Nate’s Mother, 5 September 2002).

We say prayers before a meal and before Jasmine goes to school, but not in te reo Māori.

(Conversation with Ani, 5 September 2002)

The comment by Sharon indicated her desire to become more bicultural and bilingual, and Ani’s response to my question about whether they said karakia during the day demonstrated that for her karakia was prayer said in Māori, not English. Ani and Lauren (Ella’s mother) talked with me about wanting to become more bilingual and bicultural. I got to know Sharon and Ani more than the other parents of the School children because they came to and from School with their children each day and we would talk. Ani was also mother-help in the School one day a week, making lunches that children had ordered in the morning, and was involved in class trips.

The people in my research whānau gave it a richness that illuminated ways that children are taught and what they learn. Although my research is not a comparative study, the School classroom and home environments were less steeped in bilingual and bicultural practices than the Kura classroom and homes. The parents’ dreams for their children to learn at school, to be able to read and write, to get through the education system, to be happy with who they were as people, and to be able to gain employment in their chosen pathway was similar in both school contexts.
I have introduced my research whānau. I was a participant also, which I will discuss in Chapter Five, as well as provide an outline of my research position and methods I used.
Chapter Five

Engaging with the Research: Methods

My research position for this thesis has been informed by a number of theories including Kaupapa Māori, Critical, Sociocultural, Phenomenological and Hermeneutic theory. I selected some theoretical concepts from this fusion to create a unique research position that was specific to my study. In effect my research design incorporated a mixed method approach. My initial discussion here will outline the concepts I have borrowed to sculpt my researcher form, and following this I will present the methods I used.

My Research Position

From the inception of this study I was aware of Kaupapa Māori theory, and aware too that Māori have been researched by non-Māori (particularly Europeans) who have controlled the study using non-Māori methodologies, and methods (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). Māori have been objectified as the ‘other’ and compared with a stated universal, objective set of Pākehā norms (Cram, 2001). This has positioned Māori as in need of change (Cram, 2001; Valencia, 1997).

Māori have grown weary and wary of western research methods/methodologies, disregarding Māori history, society and culture, and reinforcing past conclusions that perpetuate a cycle of deficiency and marginalisation of Māori. In 1968 Dewes wrote about being ‘sick and tired’ of hearing that Māori were to blame for their educational and social under-achievements because of their bilingualism and biculturalism. In 1999 Russell Bishop and Ted Glynn wrote:

Such imposition is no longer acceptable to indigenous people such as the Māori of Aotearoa/New Zealand, who have been the focus of much research into their lives. Māori people strongly reject the continuance of researcher hegemony over Māori people’s lives through the methods, methodologies and the very projects being controlled by the researcher. (p.103)
The emergence of Kaupapa Māori theory as a contemporary challenge to western research approaches provided an alternative framework for research with indigenous groups (Barnes, 2004; Bevan-Brown, 1998; Bishop, 1996a; Irwin, 1994; Smith, G.H., 1990). This approach to research is Māori centred, culture safe, reflects Māori goals and aspirations, and is embedded in a Māori research methodology.

Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1996, 1999) maps out principles of Kaupapa Māori research, and these have been evolutionary in the defining of guidelines for Māori. The principles include: aroha ki te tangata (a respect for people), kanohi kitea (face to face, the seen face), titiiro-whakarongo-kōrero (look and listen, and then speak), manaaki ki te tangata (share and host people), kia tūpato (be cautious), kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata (do not trample over the dignity of people), and kaua e māhaki (don’t flaunt your knowledge). Smith, L.T. (1999, p. 173) asks the questions:

Who defined the research problem?
For whom is this study worthy and relevant? Who says so?
What knowledge will the community gain from this study?
What knowledge will the researcher gain from this study?
What are some of the likely positive outcomes from this study?
What are some of the possible negative outcomes?
How can the negative outcomes be eliminated?
To whom is the researcher accountable?
What processes are in place to support the research, the researched and the researcher?

The importance of Kaupapa Māori theory challenged my position as a Pākehā researcher working with Māori. It has been essential for me to ask questions regarding my appropriateness for this research and for the community’s right to turn to me and ask those questions. I was also aware that underlying my questioning of my appropriateness for the research was the encounter I had 27 years ago with Wiremu and my concerns about Māori children in the education system, (see Introduction about Wiremu, p. 4). This inquiry has taken up that story. I have not been convinced of research that perpetuated the victimization and marginalisation of Māori. I wanted to explore alternative discourses. In this sense my position has embraced Kaupapa Māori as it
“presupposes a commitment to a critical analysis of the existing unequal power relations within our society” (Bishop, 1996). Such an analysis is within the realms of Bhabha’s (1994, 1996) hybrid or third space which confronts the colonialist/colonized binary and attacks the hegemonic colonial narrative, a position that resonates with me.

In this research I draw on Kaupapa Māori theory. I am aware that Cram (2001) supports the involvement of non-Māori researching in Māori communities following a Māori kaupapa. My view is that research with Māori must be in accordance with Māori methodology and methods, with the Māori community involved. As a researcher, I position myself as a Pākehā in what Bhabha (1994, 1996) calls a hybrid or third space, an ‘in-between’ space for translating and negotiation. I think of this space in relation to the Treaty of Waitangi. It is in this Treaty of Waitangi ‘space’ that I see myself as a researcher, respecting Kaupapa Māori theory, negotiating a pathway that attempts to regard the principles of researching within a Māori community, outlined by Smith, L.T. (1996, 1999), promoting equal partnership between Māori and Pākehā, and being accountable to both partners. In my research I referred to the questions posed by Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) above, for translating and negotiating with my research community.

Although guided by the core principles of Kaupapa Māori theory, the application of Kaupapa Māori research varies (Barnes, 2004; Pipi et al., 2004). I thought deeply about my research position and action, and could not claim to be carrying out Kaupapa Māori research. However, I could claim to be following a Māori kaupapa, as suggested by Cram (2001). The driving force for my work was whanaungatanga, the importance of establishing relationships within the community I was in. I focused on my commitment to do this for the safety of all people involved.
My thesis is grounded in a challenge to the colonial narrative in which a distorted view of Māori children has been deeply entrenched. I engage with critical theory to confront this distortion, a theory that is a process of critique (Carr & Kemis, 1986), and a theory that some align with Kaupapa Māori theory (for example, Pihama, 1997). Critical theory contrives to transform consciousness and emancipate unequal power relations, to liberate those who are disempowered by some form of domination. According to Pihama (1997) Kaupapa Māori theory takes on a similar goal.

Intrinsic to Kaupapa Māori theory is an analysis of existing power structures and societal inequalities. Kaupapa Māori theory aligns with critical theory in the act of exposing underlying assumptions that serve to conceal the power relations that exist within society and the ways in which dominant groups construct concepts of ‘common sense’ and ‘facts’ to provide ad hoc justification for the maintenance of inequalities and the continued oppression of Māori people. (pp. 284-285)

Paolo Freire (1972), an influential critical theorist, confronted the super- and sub-ordinate positioning of peoples. His view that “we are not only ‘in’ the world, but also ‘with’ the world, that is, essentially related to it” (p.51) is a foundation principle from which humans have a responsibility to transform themselves and their world for the better. For Freire the mere fact of being human means that humans create their world. Following Freire’s thinking I am seeking alternative discourses to the dysfunctional deficit constructions that have shaped Māori children, searching for constructions of achievement. My critical stance is an attempt to transform educational thinking and action related to language assessments.

Interwoven into my Māori research agenda and critical theory research stance is a sociocultural perspective. Sociocultural theory posits the notion that learning is mutually constructed through the interdependence of the individual and his or her social and cultural contexts (Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky’s work has provided the foundation for development of many sociocultural theory constructs. For Vygotsky the process of learning occurs first between people in a social
setting (intermental), and then at a psychological level (intramental) within the individual. This resonates with my inquiry into understanding the interdependent nature of language learning for Māori children within the context of their lived realities. I want to understand the social and cultural contexts in which children learn language, and then the language learning that is occurring intramentally. A quote from Palinscar (1998, p. 354) illustrates the relationships within sociocultural theory.

    It is with the use of genetic analysis (Vygotsky’s term related to change over time) that the complex interplay of mediational tools, the individual, and the social world is explored to understand learning and development and the transformation of tools, practices, and institutions.

Phenomenology accords importance to the meaning making that people construct in their lives and the way meaning directs their actions (McPhail, 1995). A phenomenological inquiry then seeks to find the meanings created by the research participants in relation to certain phenomena. In my research I am searching out the meanings that the research whanau have constructed about a range of phenomena, such as learning and reading. Simultaneously I am making meaning about their meaning-making, from my observations, conversations, interactions and thinking. I am too a participant who is learning in a social setting at an intermental level, and then at an intramental level, making meaning about the phenomena I have experienced.

This is where my position as a researcher and participant merge, because I am engaged in being in a community with all that has gone on in my life before that time. How I made meaning of this community and how I tell my story about the children in their worlds has to do with who I am, my cultural background, personal beliefs, assumptions, experience, personal qualities and all that is me. It is with myself as a participant that I interpret that which has been shared with me and present a story that is as much about who I am as it is about who the community is. How I went about the work has to do as much with the community I was working in as with me. It was
about developing relationships, and here I come back to Kaupapa Māori research that places importance on the relationships developed, whanaungatanga.

I have briefly discussed some selected theoretical concepts from a mix of theories, notions that have made sense to my Kaupapa Māori stance within a Treaty of Waitangi position. I have written this thesis as a result of interpreting the texts (spoken and written), studying them to construct meaning, re-looking at my meaning, and re-looking at the text. This is hermeneutic engagement (Crotty, 1998).

Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s (1999) first question is “Who defined the research problem”? This research focus started from my critical engagement with the existing structures in the education system for Māori children. When I took the work to Uncle Rewi I was very clear about the need for it to be a community aspiration. I was also mindful of the community’s involvement in the potential reshaping of the research, to meet their wishes. Uncle Rewi and others in the research whānau have contributed to defining the form this research took. This happened in different ways, for example, Uncle Rewi read my research questions and after discussion he agreed with them. I discussed my ideas about language with Whāea Kath and she approved of the work in her Kura. At different times throughout the year I asked Uncle Rewi, Whāea Kath and Julie if my work was appropriate from their point of view. On one occasion, Julie asked me not to video record class lessons, and I respected this request. I met with the Kura whānau twice during the year to consult with them and provide feedback about my work. I gave transcripts and audiotapes of conversations with whānau members and assured them that if there was any information they wanted to delete or add they could do so.

The format of my work was dynamic. For example, both school teachers gave suggestions about when to work with the children on certain tasks, where to work, when not to work with the
children and so on. I followed their routines. I became involved in the Kura in ways that helped Whāea Kath maintain the daily Kura activities, for example, transporting Uncle Rewi to and from the Kura.

The ongoing contact I had with Uncle Rewi and others in the community ensured my accountability to the research whānau.

**Fieldwork Procedures**

*Participant-Observer*

My major research role was that of participant-observer, engaged in the activities of the situation, taking part with the children in their day-to-day class tasks, observing and writing my notes as soon as possible after the events. Prior to my fieldwork I had read about the participant-observer role compared with that of the nonparticipant observer, the advantages and disadvantages of each (Gay & Airasian, 1996; Neuman, 2000). I became convinced that the participant-observer gains insights that nonparticipant observers do not, and the advantage of this is a deeper understanding of the people in the research community. A disadvantage of this role can be the loss of objectivity. However, I argue that even as a nonparticipant observer, observation can never be value-free, irrespective of the logical positivists’ argument to the contrary (Clark, 2000). Further, although writing notes after the fact can be problematic in terms of recall, simultaneous observation and writing notes also has drawbacks by limiting interactions that are taking place at the time.

As it was I believe that being a nonparticipant observer was not appropriate for my research situation. I wanted to gain as deep an understanding of the community and their context as possible. I was drawing from Kaupapa Māori research principles meaning that I was a
participant in the research. It would have been counter-productive to those principles for me to be on the outside while being present. In a sense I do not think I could have. I experienced the advantages and disadvantages that I had read about. The participant-observer role allowed me to be a participant within the study, and I came to understand more about the people I was with, as well as about myself as a researcher. And yet, I was uncertain at times about my place within the community and the need to stand back.

Overall I wanted to immerse myself within the classroom communities as much as possible, to learn about the children, their teachers, families and broader school contexts. I wanted to gain understandings about the contexts in which the children learned literacy, phonological awareness knowledge and the ways they told narratives. In my role as participant-observer I was involved in a multiplicity of activities, for instance, taking part in the day-to-day class tasks with the children, observing, writing my notes as soon as possible after interactions and events, talking with parents and school personnel, providing adult help on class outings, being ‘Witch of the North’ at Halloween, being Kākā the parrot and thinking quickly about answers to questions like, ‘Why is Kākā sick?’ and so on. One of the roles I adopted in the Kura was to pick up Uncle Rewi to bring him to school, and take him home. These times were invaluable because I was able to talk with him about the day’s work, check out ideas with him and ensure that my work had his ongoing support.

I was in the Kura three days a week for the entire 2002 school year, and in the School two days a week from Term 2 on, for the rest of the 2002 school year.

Journal

I wrote in a journal for a number of reasons. Mainly, I wrote reflections about: my work as a researcher and as a Speech-Language Therapist; conversations I had with my supervisors,
particularly related to my assumptions; conversations I had with the children and adults in my research whānau; and how the children responded to the variety of tasks we did during the year. At times I wrote in this journal on consecutive days for a week, and at other times I wrote in it sporadically. It depended on the availability of time, and it occurred especially after times of reflection on a certain interaction or event that had happened in the fieldwork.

Observations in the Kura and the School

Some classroom lessons were video recorded to understand the ways teachers taught the children. I recorded six classroom lessons (10 hours) in the Kura. These took place on 4 March, 24 June, 13 July, 5 August, and 7 November 2002. Three lessons totaling 3 hours were recorded at the School (29 May and 5 June). The School teacher, Julie, felt uncomfortable about being video recorded and after the 5 June recordings she asked me not to video record again. She agreed that I could use the videos I had recorded up to that point. This was a change in my work and I respected Julie’s request. I watched these lessons several times, observing the methods of instruction that the teacher used: structured or unstructured, individual or group, in terms of literacy – whole-language or phonics based, and the ways the teachers interacted with the children: how they asked questions, how they responded to children’s answers or comments, how they presented information, and how they engaged children who were not attending, from their view point. In addition to the video recordings I wrote down observations about teaching techniques and interactions, as soon as possible afterwards.

In addition to the video recordings of class lessons, I wrote observations of classroom interactions for each of my school visits. At times I did so as they were happening, provided it was appropriate for me to sit on the edge of the class activities. However, if the situation required me to participate in the situation, I did, and wrote later. I wrote observations of the
ways the children engaged in learning activities in the classroom and how they interacted with materials, with each other, and the teacher. There were times when Whāea and I could sit together, observe the children, and discuss ideas related to her classroom planning or my fieldwork. For example, the Kura children went to a community sports centre for gym every week. At this Centre the gym instructors worked with the class, and did not involve Whāea Kath. So she and I would sit on the sideline watching the children, and this provided us with a good opportunity to talk. This was also a time when I was able to observe how the children interacted and were engaged in the tasks.

Reading Measures
I carried out reading measures with the children who were older than six years of age: Running Records in English, for word recognition in text and reading comprehension (Clay, 1998) and the BURT Word Reading Test (NZ Revision) (Gilmore, Croft & Reid, 1981). I carried out these assessments and interpreted the results according to procedures outlined in their manuals. These assessments were not used by Julie with children in Year 1 until they had progressed past the emergent reading stage (Conversation with Julie, 5 June 2002), so I did not administer these at the School nor for the Kura children younger than 6 years of age. I sourced from Julie the Six Year Observational Survey (Clay, 1998) results for each of the School children.

I utilized these measures because they are among the most frequently used by teachers in the education system in Aotearoa New Zealand (Croft, Strafford, & Mapa, 2000). The Running Records I used were given to me as a Running Records Set that had been compiled by a Literacy Lecturer and Advisor at the Christchurch College of Education. This ‘Set’ included running record forms for books from the Ready to Read series (School Publications Branch, Department

Conversations

I arranged with every parent to talk with them about their lived experiences, beliefs and ways of thinking about their children. I went back to all the parents for further discussion. This involved 28 hours of conversation. I audiotaped these conversations, and transcribed them verbatim for later exploration of themes. I also arranged times to talk with the teachers and other school personnel such as the Principal, the Senior Teacher of Junior Classes, and Church staff, and again at times I needed to go back for further discussions. This involved 10 hours of conversation, which was then transcribed verbatim for later exploration of themes. I wanted to find out about who these people were, how they got to be doing what they were doing and their thinking about learning and teaching. When I talked with the parents and teachers on a second occasion, I checked with them about the information they had given me during the previous conversation. There were some alterations made at these times. The audiotapes and transcribed conversations were given to each of the adults I had talked with. I asked them to check for any information they might want to change. None of them altered any details. I was also able to audiotape some of the children’s conversations with me. Coupled with these formal interactions, I had several conversations with parents, school personnel and the children that happened spontaneously throughout the day. These were written about as soon as possible afterwards.

I had numerous conversations with Uncle Rewi, some were audiotaped (10 hours) and many were not. The audiotaped conversations were transcribed verbatim, and I wrote about many of the other conversations as soon as possible afterwards. Both sets of conversations were analysed for later thematic exploration.
Documentation

I gathered as much documentation as possible related to the children’s achievements over the 2002 school year: portfolios, mid and final year school reports, hearing and vision testing results. I also gathered documents related to the school such as the School Charter, Education Review Office Reports, Annual Reports by the Senior Teacher of the Junior Syndicate and classroom teacher, and classroom and school newsletters. These were all photocopied as sources of information that could add to my understanding about the children in my study.

Phonological Awareness Assessment for English

Children’s phonological awareness abilities for English were evaluated using the Preschool and Primary Inventory of Phonological Awareness (PIPA) (Dodd, Crosbie, McIntosh, Teitzel & Ozanne, 2000). The PIPA was developed and standardised with Australian and English children and contains six subtests: syllable segmentation, rhyme awareness, alliteration awareness, phoneme isolation, phoneme segmentation and letter knowledge. This test was administered to the children three times in the year, at three monthly intervals, by a qualified independent Speech-Language Therapist, Katie, according to the test procedures outlined in the manual. This involved 42 hours of assessment time. Each administration was audiotaped for later checking by myself, and this checking totalled 42 hours.

However, after the first set of administrations by Katie, I had to find another Speech-Language Therapist because Katie won a clinical position in Canada and left. The second Therapist, Lisa, completed the next two administrations. Both were qualified Speech-Language Therapists, completing their Masters in Speech-Language Therapy, employed as clinical supervisors for phonological awareness intervention groups at the University of Canterbury Speech-Language Therapy Department Clinic, and experienced with administration of the PIPA.
My rationale for involving these Speech-Language Therapists was to replicate typical clinical assessment situations. Usually the Speech-Language Therapist is not known to the child, enters an education setting, establishes rapport, administers the assessment and leaves. I had been with the children for three months, so my involvement would not have replicated the usual assessment context. I used the PIPA for a number of reasons.

a. There is no standardised test developed with children in this country. The PIPA was developed with Australian and English children, with test vocabulary generally considered more appropriate for New Zealand children.

b. The standardisation procedures had been completed with children three to seven years old, the age range of my study children when I started my fieldwork.

c. The PIPA appeared to be more user-friendly than other tests, with clear, bright coloured pictures.

d. This test is one of a number used by Speech-Language Therapists in practice and research, in Aotearoa New Zealand.

My major goal in the assessment was to find out how the children went about completing the phonological awareness tasks. I also took note of the norms for children under seven years. When I included all the Kura children in my study I was confronted with a challenge. The children’s age range was four and a half to twelve years, and the PIPA was standardised for children up to seven years. I decided to administer the PIPA to all children and did not use the norms for the older children. However, children above seven years would be expected to reach ceiling levels for the subtests.
Phonological Awareness Assessment for te Reo Māori

There is no existing phonological awareness test for te reo Māori so I needed to construct one. A fluent speaker of te reo Māori and English, who was a post-graduate student in the Māori Department, University of Canterbury at that time and a teacher of te reo Māori, helped me to develop a set of tasks based on the linguistic features of te reo Māori. Activities were developed to parallel the tasks in the PIPA – syllable segmentation, phoneme isolation, phoneme segmentation, letter knowledge and alliteration awareness, (see Appendices 11 to 15). The syllable structure of te reo Māori does not allow for an equivalent English type rhyme activity. Instead, we devised a listening task that included English consonant-vowel-consonant words to check out how the children would hear CV-C and C-VC distinctions in CVC words. This task is outlined in Appendix 16. Te reo Māori phonological awareness tasks were created to find out how the children completed them. I carried out administration of these tasks twice, between the PIPA administrations, and this involved about 58 hours in all. As part of my explanation of the tasks I told the children that I was interested in what they did, and that their answers would always be right, never wrong. Further, the tasks were embedded in play situations involving Kākā the parrot. The intention was to make the task unobtrusive within the interactions, to make the ‘work’ a natural feature of the situation as far as possible.

Phonological Awareness Assessment Analysis

On completion of the PIPA administrations I listened to the audiotaped sessions and rechecked the scoring as per the standard procedure to decide the correct/incorrect responses. If I had any questions related to the scoring I contacted Barbara Dodd, the main author of the test. I then analysed the PIPA information in two ways. First I analysed and interpreted the children’s scores according to the PIPA guidelines. The raw scores for each subtest were turned into
percentiles and standard scores. Percentiles between 16 (standard score 7) and 84 (standard score 13) were indicative of “normal phonological awareness skills” (Dodd et al., 2000, p.19). Percentiles 9 (standard score 6) and below indicated phonological awareness disorders. Second, I studied the children’s responses to find patterns that emerged from how they completed the tasks. These became themes for discussion. I analysed the reo Māori tasks in this second way also.

**Oral Narratives**

During the year three types of narratives were told to me by the children - those told spontaneously during conversation, those prompted by me with a question, or my own story followed by my invitation for them to tell me a similar event, and the last type, a retell of a story they had heard told by an adult. The first two types of narratives called accounts and recounts by Heath (1983, 1986), are grouped together for this study because they occurred during conversational interaction without setting up a procedure with the children. I will call them accounts/recounts. I was able to audiotape seventeen of these narratives throughout the year, told by five Kura children between the ages of five to nine years. They were transcribed verbatim for analysis. For the last type of narrative, the retell, I collected eleven retells from six of the younger Kura children, between the ages of five and nine years, according to a specific procedure that evolved as the first term unfolded.

To summarize, the children told:

1. Accounts/recounts – spontaneously told narratives about personal events/as for accounts, but prompted by a listener.
2. Retells – a retell of a narrative told by someone else.
1. Accounts/Recounts

   i. Elicitation

   As stated, elicitations of accounts and recounts occurred naturally within conversation and these narratives were ‘captured’ on audio or video tape during activities that were not necessarily focused on story telling. I was constantly aware of the possibilities for children to tell narratives and when an opportunity arose I encouraged them. There were times when I used the ‘Conversation Map’ (McCabe & Rollins, 1994; Peterson & McCabe, 1983) technique to elicit recounts. In this technique the adult tells his/her own account, asks the child if he/she had a similar experience, and invites them to tell about it.

   Every attempt was made to use prompts that were natural and neutral as recommended for narrative elicitations and assessment purposes (Rollins, McCabe and Bliss, 2000). Prompts that fall into this category include: repetition of the child’s exact words when he/she paused, saying “uh-uh” or “tell me more”, and asking “then what happened?” There were times, however, when my responses were not neutral and were directly related to the story content. This interaction has proven important in itself because it tells more about the story telling event and my role as the listener within the context of the story telling. It also highlights that storytelling is an interactive event within the context of a conversation, harking back to the interactionist narrative perspective (Corston, 1993). The listener plays an important role in shaping the story told, irrespective of the manner in which they are involved.

   ii. Analysis

   These were analysed according to three contrasting perspectives: an analysis of macrostructure using high point analysis (Hudson & Shapiro, 1991; Labov, 1972) and for microstructure, lexical diversity (Westby, Van Dongen, & Maggart, 1989); underlying structure analysis (Wilkinson,
These systems are discussed later in this chapter. High point analysis is in line with the ‘standard’ procedures for narrative assessment used by Speech-Language Therapists in Aotearoa New Zealand.

After carrying out high point analysis of the stories myself, I randomly selected ten for an experienced Linguist at the University of Canterbury to undertake the same analysis independently, in order to ascertain inter-coder reliability. We had perfect agreement on seven of the stories and the differences on the remaining, we resolved through discussion.

2. Retell Narratives
   i. Elicitation

In term one, in view of my observations that the children were embedded in bicultural contexts at home and Kura, and I wondered if retells might add another dimension to the accounts/recounts I had already begun gathering. I started out with a trial story retell. I told a story to Ariel and Ana together. I decided to support their involvement in the procedure, following Vygotskian notions of scaffolding, and over two months I told them two stories. Before I started my first ‘Soccer’ story, I talked with Ana and Ariel about what we were going to do.

   You girls are going to listen to a story. I will tell you a story, so my job is to be the story teller and your job is to be a listener. I will video record this story. Then tomorrow you two can be together to watch me telling you the story again, on video. You will still be the listeners. Then the day after that Ariel will watch the video again and listen to the story. Then Ariel will be the story teller to someone else, and Ariel, you can choose who you want to tell the story to. But it cannot be Ana because she will know the story. And Ana you are going to do the same and be the story teller to someone of your choice. It can be anyone who does not know the story.

   (Conversation with Ana and Ariel, 2 May 2002)
I also told the girls that they could retell my story by saying, drawing, or acting it. I told my story as the story teller, and Ana and Ariel were both listeners. The next day I went over the procedure with the girls again, reiterating their listener roles, and they watched the video recording of me telling the “Soccer” story. Then on the third day Ana and Ariel watched the video separately. Each girl was reminded of the procedure. Both girls decided to say their retell as story tellers, on this occasion. Ana asked if she could retell her story to Kākā.

I then wondered how it would be if a Māori and Pākehā person told stories to the children in the way I have just outlined. How would they tell their stories? I invited Uncle Rewi and Vera, both elders in the Kura Whānau. I have already introduced Uncle Rewi. Vera was a foster grandmother of Susie, the Pākehā student, and had been a foster mother to eight children. Vera was also the Treasurer of the Whānau Komiti. Both people were well known to the Kura children, with Uncle Rewi’s involvement in the Kura, and Vera’s frequent visits in her Treasurer role. Both Uncle Rewi and Vera were willing to be story tellers. Uncle Rewi told two stories over three months, ‘Kuia-Mokopuna Story’ and ‘Early Days Story’. Vera told one story, ‘Bonfire Story’. The procedure that I had evolved with Ana and Ariel remained the same for Uncle Rewi and Vera’s story teller involvement.

ii. Analysis of the Retell Narratives

All children decided to retell the stories through drawing rather than telling it to Kākā, like the pilot. I analysed the children’s drawings according to high point and underlying structure analysis to the extent possible.
Rationale for Using Diverse Analysis Methods

The rationale for using diverse systems to study these narratives is, as I have mentioned previously, that to a large extent the theoretical perspective in which narratives are studied determines judgments about the narrative competence of children (Wilkinson, Silliman, Nitzberg & Aurilio, 1993). Utilisation of different systems may present us with different understandings of how Māori children tell stories. They may reveal different ways of telling narratives. It has been found that themes and cultural patterns of storytelling become apparent when stories are analysed using Gee’s stanza and refrain analysis (Gillam, McFadden & Van Kleeck, 1995; Silliman, Diehl, Aurilio, Wilkinson & Hammargren, 1995; Wilkinson, Silliman, Nitzberg & Aurilio, 1993). Stories that appear to be deficient from a linear perspective may actually be structurally sophisticated story tellings based on a stanza and refrain analysis method (Silliman, Aurilio & Nitzberg, 1992). Underlying structure and discourse analyses of narratives have not been utilized by researchers for the stories told by Māori children. While the cognitive analysis perspective can show that the stories told by Māori children have deficiencies, the underlying structure and analysis of discourse methods have the potential to illuminate the narratives as linguistically strong.

Macro (high point) and Micro (lexical diversity) Structure Analysis (Cognitive Perspective)

The narratives were segmented according to communication units (CUs) (Hughes, McGillivray & Schmidek, 1997; Loban, 1976). A communication unit is “each independent clause with its modifiers” (Loban, 1976, p.9). I then analysed each narrative at a macro level using high point analysis. I read the stories and marked each communication unit according to abstract/introducer, orientation, complicating action, resolution and coda (refer to Chapter Four for definitions). On completion of this I categorised each narrative as two event, leapfrog, end-at-high point, classic high-point, or chronological. I then determined whether the narratives told presented the child as developing this language skill at their chronological age or not, as per the
norms established by McCabe and Rollins (1994) and Peterson and McCabe (1983). There were no impoverished, disoriented or miscellaneous narratives.

My rationale for using high point analysis is that it is: considered most appropriate for accounts/recounts (Hughes, McGillivray & Schmidek, 1997), although it can be used for fictional narratives (Gillam, McFadden & van Kleek, 1995); a system that has been used in the literature for evaluation of narratives over the last 20 years (McCabe, 1996a, b, c; McCabe & Rollins, 1994; Peterson & McCabe, 1983; Rollins, McCabe and Bliss, 2000; Sleight & Prinz, 1985); and a system used by Holmes (1998) in her comparison of adult Māori and Pākehā personal narratives. My use of high point analysis would allow for comparisons with Holmes’s study, although I did not wish to rely exclusively on high point analysis as the way to assess story telling. Further, high point analysis has been recommended as appropriate in the assessment of narratives across cultures (Rollins, McCabe & Bliss, 2000). According to Paul and Smith (1993) cultures studied to date have included all the components of high point analysis. This is interesting given that it reflects a linear organization of storytelling and has been found to be inappropriate for narratives of different cultures that are organized in a different manner and nonlinear in form (Silliman, Diehl, Aurilio, Wilkinson & Hammargren, 1995).

For micro analysis using lexical diversity, I read the narratives, highlighting any of the categories according to the Westby, Van Dongen & Maggart (1989) model: conjunctions, elaborated noun phrases, mental and linguistic verbs and adverbs (refer to Chapter Four). I then went through the narratives, writing every example of each category into a table. I interpreted lexical diversity according to how the children performed as a group. This demonstrated patterns of lexical use.
My rationale for using lexical diversity analysis, as discussed in Chapter Four, was that it is believed to be important for ‘good’ narratives. Hughes, McGillivray and Schmidek (1997) state that if any of these four word class categories are missing or rare, they could be goals for intervention to improve narrative language style. They are features considered essential for literate language and academic achievement.

**Underlying Structure Analysis (Constructivist, Interactionist, Sociocultural Perspectives)**

I analysed the children’s narratives according to Gee’s subsystems: cohesion, discourse organisation, and contextualisation signals. Cohesion relates to the way in which lines and stanzas are linked together within the story. A range of devices are used to create cohesion: conjunctions, pronouns, demonstratives, ellipsis (omission of parts of a word or sentence), adverbs and repeated words or phrases (Gee, 1996).

Discourse organization is the way text is placed in stanzas and lines, and the language patterns across these (Gee, 1996). I wrote the narratives in stanzas and lines (Gee, 1986). According to Gee (1986) lines are the basic structural unit, relatively short, start with ‘and’ or some other conjunction, terminate using a pitch glide and a hesitation, syllable lengthening or short pause, contain simple clauses and display syntactic and semantic parallelism with adjacent lines. Stanzas are groups of lines that sound as if they go together because: they are said with little hesitation and at the same rate; are often four lines long, sometimes two, and occasionally one; and they have intricate structure and patterning (Gee, 1986). Contextualisation signals relate to what the speaker signals to the hearer to establish the context they want to convey, and how the speaker wants the listener to construct that context in their minds (Gee, 1996). I then interpreted the stories collectively according to patterns linked to cohesion, discourse organization and contextualization signals (see Chapter Four).
Analysis of Discourses (Constructivist and Sociocultural Perspectives)

The stories were deconstructed to reveal the discourses present, particularly those that serve to create self-identity. My initial step was to read the text slowly and re-read several times searching for recurrent themes, words that appeared to be loaded with meaning and dichotomies (Burr, 1995). I underlined words or phrases and listed these on a separate sheet, which allowed for easier scanning and understanding of particular discourses that emerged. Refer to Chapter Four, page 75 for discussion related to discourse analysis.

The Short Stories by Patricia Grace and Ngāhuia Te Awekotuku

After I had completed analysis of the accounts/recounts using high point and underlying structure analyses, I interpreted them using the lens that each analysis brings with it. From the ‘standard’ high point analysis lens I could see that the children would be diagnosed as having language difficulties in telling narratives. From the underlying structure lens the children’s narratives showed a different picture. They presented their stories in a complex cyclic form. I was drawn into the way in which two different analyses could present the children’s narratives in such contrasting ways. I decided to explore the ways in which two contemporary Māori writers, Patricia Grace and Ngāhuia Te Awekotuku, wrote their short stories, to study their narrative form for patterns that may explain the ways my study children told their narratives. I read some of the stories in Grace’s Collected Stories (1994) and Te Awekotuku’s Tahuri (1987), and noted the structural forms that they used.

In conclusion, my research involvement in the Kura and the School included observations of classroom teaching, observations of the children working in the classroom and interacting, conversations with a range of people involved with the children at school and home, the
phonological awareness and oral narrative assessments, the reading measures taken, the sourcing of documents relevant to the schools and the reading of short stories written by Patricia Grace and Ngāhuia Te Awekotuku.
Chapter Six

Multiple Interpretations with Discussion

In this Chapter I write about the Kura children as the Older Kura and Younger Kura children. There were five Older Kura children ranging in age from nine to twelve years: Rapata, Roxy, Rata, Mary and Tama. I grouped these children in this way because of their chronological age and their position as the elder of another sibling in the class. The Younger Kura children were four and a half to eight years of age, and included: Pere, Ana, Ariel, Big JL, Hone and Huriana. The School children formed another group and were all aged between five and six years: Kylie, Ella, Cathy, Jasmine and Nate.

Reading

The Kura Children

The children in the Kura are sitting on the mat. Whāea is holding up a book. “This story is called Maui and the Sun, retold by June Melser” says Whāea. Some of the older children join in saying the title. Big JL is edging forward to make sure he sees the picture on the cover. Whāea is turning the page and says the title again, showing the children that the title appears twice, on the cover and then on the first page in the book. The children are looking at the book and listening to Whāea. She turns the page.

It was dark.
The sun had gone down.\nMaui couldn’t see to eat his food.\nAue, that sun!, said Maui.\nHe goes too fast – far too fast.\nMaui called his brothers.\nThey came to him out of the darkness.

“What do you think he’s going to do?” Whaea asks. Some of the children call out their answers “Catch the sun”, “Make the day go slower”. The others are listening. Whāea repeats back the answers that the children call out, turns the page and reads, “The days are too ______” and again some children call out “short”. Some of the children repeat what the others have said. Whāea Kath repeats, “The days are too short”.\n
You must help me.
We’re going to make that sun go more ______
“Slowly” say some of the children.
“We’re going to make that sun go more slowly”, says Whāea.

(The Kura, Classroom Observation, 15 April 2002)

I placed this observation here to illustrate Whāea Kath’s technique of repetition, her use of questions to scaffold comprehension of language, and her focus on expanding the children’s vocabulary, all common practices in Whāea’s teaching. She asked the children questions related to anticipating the next part of the story (for example, “What do you think he’s going to do?”), sentence completion (such as, “The days are too ______?”), and about the meanings of words. Metge (1990) writes about these teaching techniques as embedded in a taha Māori approach to teaching.

In this classroom context shared reading provided opportunities for the children to engage with books and to practise their knowledge of the written word. It was a time for those children who could read the words to read along and check out their reading with Whāea’s. It was an opportunity for those children who were learning to read, to hear and see the words being read by Whāea and some of the other students. It was a chance for them to hear the story, to learn that the written word can be ‘translated’ into oral language, that the older children have learned how to read the words and that they will learn to read like them too. And for children like Big JL who sat with a book at any chance he got, looking at the pictures, turning the pages and saying out loud the story he saw in the pictures, it was another opportunity for his engagement in the world of books. But it was a moment when all the children engaged with the shared reading. For the very young children, Hone and Huriana it was a time also to hear the story, to learn about the way a story is read, about the title and other concepts about print.

The children are on the mat. Whāea Kath is sitting on her chair beside the small whiteboard. She holds the book up reading the title, “I haere ahau ki te Tātahi”. Some of the children repeat the title as Whāea reads. “What’s this word?” pointing
to ‘haere’. Mary calls out “go”. Whāea repeats, “go, āe”. Whāea writes on the board, saying the sentences as she writes,

I haere au.
Ka haere au.
Kua haere au.
Kei te haere au.

She says, “Au is the same as ahau. One of these is ‘I am going’. Which one do you reckon is ‘I am going’? Go is haere”. Rata calls, “Kei te haere au”. Whāea says “Āe. Kei te haere au”.

(The Kura, Classroom observation, 18 March 2002)

The classroom shared reading activities included books written in te reo Māori as well as English, and reflected the bilingual reading programme. Whāea Kath used these books to scaffold the children’s learning of spoken and written Māori.

Whāea asks Hone and Huriana, “What’s the cover of the book?” and shows the children.“Where’s the name of the story?” Huriana points to the title. “Where’s the first word?” and Whāea points to it. While pointing out each word she says the title. She turns the page. “Where’s your pointy finger?” and shows the children by holding up her index finger. Hone and Huriana are watching Whāea and hold up their fingers too. Whāea reads the first word by pointing to it and saying it. Hone does this too. They work together on each word like this until the end of the sentence. “Now read all of it”, says Whāea. Hone reads all of it, but not using his ‘pointy finger’. Whāea holds Hone’s finger and points it to each word while Hone reads. She works with Huriana, and Hone watches. When Huriana reads the sentence she uses her ‘pointy’ finger.

(The Kura, Classroom observation, 21 October 2002)

Here Whāea’s teaching illustrates the guided reading approach for the emergent readers. It also shows Whāea teaching the children concepts about print and the use of pointing to establish the one-to-one relationship between the written and spoken word. Whāea’s teaching technique of demonstration allows the children to watch and listen.

The class is on the mat. Whāea speaks in Māori telling the class that the day is cold and cloudy. She looks at her small whiteboard and says, “I want you to read this”.
Te Maramataka. (The Calendar.)
Ko Mane. (It is Monday.)
Ko Ngāhuru tō wa o te tau. (It is the season autumn.)

Whāea and the class read together while Whāea points to each word. Rata, Roxy and Mary read out loud and the other children join in at different times, saying some of the words in unison with Whāea and the older children, and some just after Whāea. Whāea talks in English, telling the children it is autumn. How do we know it is autumn? Rata calls out “cold”. Whāea repeats Rata’s answer, writes the word on the board, and reads it. She looks at the class. “Leaves fall off the trees”, says Mary. Whāea repeats Mary’s answer, and writes her answer on the board, reads it and looks again to the class. Whāea does this with all the answers. Pere calls out “yellow leaves” and Big JL says, “red leaves”.

(The Kura, Classroom observation, 15 April 2002)

Sometimes the younger children wait for the older ones to give answers before they do so, an environment that supports learning through demonstration and observation. The whānau class concept allows the older children to scaffold the younger children’s learning. This lesson was another example when the children participated fully in the activity, listening and giving their answers. As a follow up task, the children wrote a poem together, using the words they had said in the above interaction, created on a day that I was not present.

Ngāhuru

Autumn.
Is colder.
Trees sleep.
Trees are bare, clothless.
Leaves drop.
Leaves fall.
All colours.
Red, yellow, brown.
Some stay green.
Evergreen.

This poem is a combination of te reo Māori with the title, and English text. I included it here because it is rich in vocabulary and metaphor, the tree sleeping and clothed. The use of metaphor in taha Māori is strong (Metge, 1990). I interpreted Whāea’s teaching practices as providing an active bicultural and bilingual environment for the children to learn to speak and read in two languages. I interpreted the children’s interactions in the classroom with Whāea, as portraying
them as active and achieving learners. They shared their ideas, offered words to explain or describe the particular topic being discussed, and used observation as a way of learning.

However, when I explored the children’s reading using assessments such as Running Records and the Burt Word Reading Test, assessments that Whāea Kath used in the classroom to check children’s reading progress, the ‘standard’ presented the children’s reading abilities in other ways. The results of these measurements are outlined in Appendices 17 and 18. The Running Records show that the older Kura children, except Tama, were reading at their age level or above for word recognition of connected text and comprehension. The Burt scores indicated that Rapata, Rata and Mary were reading individual words at their age levels, but not Roxy and Tama. However Roxy was reading continual text above her age level when assessed with the Running Records. The younger Kura children were not at their age levels for Running Records nor the Burt word recognition. With these results the ‘standard’ lens indicated that Rapata, Rata, Roxy and Mary were able readers, and Tama, Pere, Ana, Ariel and Big JL were deficient. At this point Hone and Huriana were new entrant children learning at the emergent reading level.

The School Children

The children are sitting on the mat. Julie writes ‘y’ on the whiteboard with a thick felt marker. She asks, “What letter is that?” Children’s hands go up. Julie praises, “Oh well done for putting up your hands. No one called out”. Julie chooses Jasmine, “y” (names the letter). Julie writes ‘y y y’ beside the other ‘y’. “Who can remember the rhyme? Julie starts and all the children follow her lead, doing actions as they go.

Yummy yummy yoghurt.
Y Y Y
Yummy yummy yoghurt.
Y Y Y.
y is the sound that ‘y’ makes.

Julie tells the children, “Hold up your pretend pens in the air and let’s pretend to write a ‘y’ letter”, and as Julie does so all the children do too. Julie says the directions as they write the letter, “Start here. Go down, around and up. Now go down again, keep going and around to make a tail. Who has a ‘y’ letter in their
name?” Cathy calls out, “Me”. Julie says, “Cathy no calling out”. Julie writes “Cathy” on the whiteboard to show where the ‘y’ is in her name

(The School, Classroom Observation, 4 November 2002)

This is a typical daily lesson in the School classroom and is based on the Jolly Phonics programme, which formed a major part of the reading curriculum. This observation illustrates the Jolly Phonics programme structure followed by Julie. After this interaction Julie handed out the activity sheet for the letter ‘y’, which the children completed at their tables, and glued in their special Jolly Phonics exercise books. The children were active learners in saying the rhyme, doing the actions, practising the letter formation, and taking part in answering questions. This interaction demonstrates Julie’s constant reminding about classroom rules, which is very obvious in my next observation.

Julie places the book on the ledge for the children to see. “Time to listen now. When we listen what are our rules?” The children put up their hands for Julie to choose.


Sheamus replies, “A train”. “Good boy, and this story’s called ‘Coming Round the Mountain’. Julie points to each word as she reads. “Ooh who can put their hands sensibly?” All the children fold their arms. “Let’s read again on the inside cover”. Julie turns the cover to the title page. Julie points to the first word and this time all the children read as Julie points. “Oh good listening Jasmine. Sticker for you”. Julie gives a sticker to Jasmine who stands and places it on her chart on the wall. Sheamus starts chanting the ‘ou’ jingle from the Jolly Phonics programme. Julie asks Sheamus to find the ‘ou’ in the title. He stands and points to the word ‘round’. Julie points to the ‘ou’ in ‘mountain’. Nate is twirling an object in his hands. Julie sees this, “Nate put that thing away”. He puts it in his pocket and sits looking at the front. Julie turns the page of the book and starts to read the first page. Nate gets the object out again and twirls it. Julie sees this, “Nate come up here and stand beside me. You are not listening”. Nate does as Julie asks.

(The School, Classroom observation 5 June 2002)
There is an overlapping of events happening in this observation that I want to highlight. Julie spent a lot of time reminding the children of the class rules, managing the children according to her expectations. The interaction taking place above was common throughout the day. Julie’s shared reading time focused on teaching the children concepts about print, and they participated in this. They were engaged in listening to the story. Julie picked up on what Sheamus did to integrate the Jolly Phonics learning into the shared reading. She constantly singled children out for praise and punishment. Nate was one of a small group of children who were often singled out and ‘told-off’ in front of the class. Metge (1990) says that within a taha Māori teaching environment the children would be praised or reprimanded as a group. Individuals are not singled out.

The ‘Bugs’ reading group are sitting in a circle on the floor with Julie, each with the same book in front of them ‘In the Teacup’. Nate and Kylie are in this group. Julie asks, “What is the title of this story? Put your finger on the first word?” Julie does this and the children too. “What do you think that word is?” Kylie says, “I” and Julie responds, “Yes that’s the first letter. It’s not the word. Look, what is the next letter?” There is a pause. “N. Let’s do the Jolly Phonics rhyme for the ‘n’ letter”, and they all do this.

(The School, Classroom Observation, 2 May 2002)

The guided reading component of the reading curriculum was a daily learning activity. The children were grouped according to reading progress and levels. Julie spent time with each group going over two books which they took home for reading. In this observation above Kylie participated in answering Julie’s question. However she was not correct. No one attempted answering Julie’s next question, so she answered it. Nate did not take part in this activity as Kylie did. In my interpretation Nate was reprimanded by Julie regularly and as a result he became disengaged from various classroom learning tasks, particularly those that required him to be singled out. Nate was engaged in class group activities as in the first observation above and in this 2 May observation when the group performed the Jolly Phonics action. This showed me that Nate wanted to be involved in learning, and that he was an active learner, but that if he was
singed out or if he sensed the possibility of being singled out, he tended to withdraw. I understand this to be a result of the way Julie established her relationship with Nate.

The ‘Dragonballz’ reading group are sitting on the floor with their book, “Sally’s New Shoes”. Julie asks each child to read a page and all of them do so. The text is repetitive with each action that Sally is doing in her new shoes, walking, dancing, hopping and so on. At each page, after the child has read the text, Julie asks, “How do you know? The sound of the first letter is ‘d’ (dance) and the picture helps too”. Julie repeats this.

(The School, Classroom observation, 2 May 2002)

The children took part in their guided reading time. All the children in the School classroom were involved in learning to read, were able learners and wanted to learn.

When I examined the ‘standard’ results from the Six Year Net assessments (see Appendix 19) administered by Julie, Jasmine, Cathy and Ella (Running Record) were making progress in reading, at age appropriate levels, and were therefore able readers. Nate and Kylie were deficient readers. Julie told me that she was concerned about their reading levels going in to Year 2.

In summary, the reading programmes in both educational settings required the children to be active participants and they were. The bicultural and bilingual environment of the Kura set up a reading programme that scaffolded the learning to read in two languages. Whāea Kath used teaching methods that were in keeping with ‘whānau-preferred’ teaching and learning practices (Metge, 1990; Pere, 1994; Tangaere, 1996). These included - repetition of ideas within her interactions and repetition of lessons at times throughout the year, a focus on words, their meanings and how to put them together (which it can be argued, are universal effective methods of teaching), the use of metaphor, the strength of group learning that a whānau concept fosters, the inclusion of tuakana/teina practice (the older person scaffolds the younger person) for ako (teaching and learning), daily waiata for whānau strength and unity, a holistic approach to some lessons, karakia; and so on. There were other teaching practices too that reflected taha Pākehā -
for example, the segmentation of the timetable for some lessons. The monocultural and monolingual context of the School classroom created another environment for learning to read English. Julie used the Jolly Phonics programme which reflects the reduction of learning into components. She also used the guided reading techniques to teach concepts about print, just as Whāea did with the youngest two Kura children. In contrast to Whāea, Julie used questioning techniques that singled out individual children and expected that those individual children would answer, as opposed to a group involvement. In this way she considered the strength of learning lay with each individual child, not the group.

The children in my study wanted to learn to read and their whānau wanted them to also, as discussed in Chapter Four. They were capable of learning to read as demonstrated by the ways they took part. When the children’s reading was evaluated according to the ‘standard’ measures, the Older Kura children were reading at or above their age levels, but Tama and the Younger children were not. Three of School children were reading according to plan, and two were not. In line with the research related to bilingualism outlined in Chapter Four, bilingual children take several years to learn to read, and this was clearly evident with the Kura children. The Older group were adept readers of English, and the Younger children and Tama were in the process of learning to read proficiently. It is reasonable to expect that these younger children would develop reading skill with more bilingual and bicultural educational experience, just as the older children had. There was not a large age difference between Tama and the oldest child in the younger group. It is highly likely that Tama was learning in similar ways to those children a year or two ago. At the School, Nate’s home environment was more akin to the Kura children’s, and like the Younger Kura children his learning to read English reflected his developing bilingual status. An exploration into phonological awareness and oral narrative abilities for these children will expand on our understanding of their learning to read English, and the contexts in which they were doing so.
“Cause you miss out the a” – Phonological Awareness

Interpretations based on ‘non-standard’ practices for assessment.

I am in the Kura classroom, sitting with Rata and checking her spelling work. I ask her, “Can I check something out with you? It’s to do with sounds in words”. Rata says, “Yes”. I ask, “If I was to break up the word bat into two parts I could do it like this: ba – t, or b – at. What sounds better to you, ba – t or b – at?”
Rata replies, “ba – t.”
I ask, “Why does ba – t sound better?”
Rata, “ba and the t sound better.”
And I ask, “Why?”
“Cause you miss out the a.”

(Conversation with Rata, Kura, 15 May 2002)

There were many unexpected moments during my research when I was surprised, excited or deeply moved (or all three at once) by a sentence uttered, a picture drawn, or a way of thinking expressed, that challenged anything I had learned before. This was one of those moments. Rata’s response was not what I had expected. I was asking Rata about her understanding of onset-rime knowledge and her response did not conform to onset-rime ‘rules’. Rata’s answer indicated that the way she thought about words in terms of onset-rime was not to break them up according to onset and then rime, but to break them up according to the first consonant-vowel (CV) combination, then the final consonant (C), the body-coda form. She told me that this sounded better to her, because the vowel would be missed out if you did not.

I needed to check some more words with Rata, because this may have been just a one off comment or Rata may have just answered the first choice I gave her. So I asked about some more words, and I alternated the presentation of the separated words, C-VC or CV-C, then CV-C or C-VC and so on to make sure she was not answering the first or second option only: cat, sat, mat and fat. In all words Rata thought the CV-C separation sounded best to her.

I decided to ask Roxy the same question I had asked Rata about how she would break up the words: bat, mat, sat, cat and fat.
I ask, “What sounds better to you b – at or ba – t?”
She replies, “b – at”.
This was interesting. Was Roxy’s way of separating out the words going to be according to the conventional onset-rime structure, C-VC?
I ask the other words, and each time Roxy replies with the CV-C construction sounding better to her: ma – t, sa – t, ca – t, fa - t.
I ask, “Why does fa – t sound better than f – at?”
“Because you can hear the fa better than the f – a”.

(Conversation with Roxy, Kura, 30 May 2002)

I was intrigued by these interactions with the girls because their answers did not ‘fit’ the assumptions I had about onset-rime awareness. In fact, the children’s ways of responding to most of the phonological awareness tasks challenged my assumptions about phonological awareness as will be evident throughout this chapter.

In my interpretation of the ways the children completed the subtests syllable segmentation, rhyme awareness and phoneme segmentation in the PIPA test and the corresponding reo Māori tasks, I teased out a number of thematic patterns which are in line with the research by Bruck and Genesee (1995), that phonological awareness abilities of bilingual children reflect the salient features of the two languages. These themes contest the ‘standard’ test regulations of the PIPA and the cognitive monolingual ways of thinking about phonological awareness, for the children I worked with. On the contrary, these themes demonstrate linguistic strengths that the children have developed as participants in bilingual environments. These analyses are outlined in Appendices 20 to 36.

1. Syllable Segmentation Linguistically Strong

“The next word is ‘agility’”, says Katie.
Ariel says, “a – gi – li – ty”.
“What about “magnitude”?"
Ariel, “mag – ni - tude”.
“Well done Ariel, you did those words really well”.

(Tape recording of Katie and Ariel completing the PIPA syllable segmentation task, Kura, 14 April 2002)
“Listen to this sentence Hone. It goes with this picture. I haere a Patariki a Tahi ki te toa” (Patrick and Tahi are going to the shop.) How can you break up the word ‘haere’?”

Hone says, “hae – re”.
“Okay, what about ‘Patariki’?”
Hone, “Pa – ta – ri – ki.”
“What about ‘Tahi’?”
Hone, “Ta – hi”.

(Interaction with Hone completing a syllable segmentation task in te reo Māori, Kura, 21 October 2002)

Interactions such as these above demonstrated that syllable segmentation was a task the children did for both English and Māori. For the children in my study syllable segmentation was their strongest phonological awareness skill in terms of completing the tasks according to the ‘standard’ imposed by the PIPA test expectations. Further, as far as the PIPA norms are concerned, all the children would be considered as developing ‘normally’ for syllable segmentation skills in English except for Tama, Ana and Kylie. The PIPA phoneme segmentation subtest contained four two syllable words: okay, inside, rabbit and lady (with syllable structures V-CV, VC-CVC, CV-CVC and CV-CV respectively), and eight monosyllable words. All the children consistently segmented most of the four two syllable words syllabically, not phonemically. Clearly the syllable is foremost as a linguistic unit. However, according to the phonological awareness theorists it is not as high a skill as phoneme segmentation (see Figure 1, Chapter Four).

2. CVC English-Specific

“Okay Rata. What about ‘abyss’?”
“a – byss”, replies Rata.
“Magnitude”.

(Tape recording of Katie and Rata completing the PIPA syllable segmentation task, Kura, 14 August 2002)

Rata’s responses were typical of the children. The CVC syllable structure was a salient English-specific language unit for my study group. The children achieved segmentation of CVC syllables
in the PIPA test more so than the CV syllables. As a structure found in English and not Māori (Bauer, 1993), CVC has consonant boundaries that highlight its language-specific nature. In the process of learning the phonology for English, awareness of the CVC syllable boundary may well be influenced by the salience of these consonant boundaries. The English-specific nature of CVC was evident also when some of the younger children (for example, Tama, Big JL, Kylie, Ella and Nate) overused it for segmentation of CV syllables. For example: Big JL, Tama and Nate segmented ‘elaboration’ as “e – lab – o – ra – tion” (17 April, 10 October, 9 May 2002 respectively); Kylie said ‘panorama’ as “pan – o – rama” (4 December 2002); for ‘agility’ Nate and Ella said “a - gig – i – ty” (9 May 2005).

CVC was not used to segment te reo Māori words by any of the Kura children revealing their well developed language-specific knowledge for this component. However some of the School children did so, for example: Ella, Kylie and Nate segmented ‘homai’ as “hom – ai” (18 July, 28 November, 2 December 2002 respectively) and ‘taniwha’ as “tan – i – wha” (Ella, 18 July 2002). The School children were occasionally linguistically unclear about the CVC and CV distinction for both languages.

3. CV reo Māori-Specific

If CVC was a strong English syllable segmentation pattern, the CV was a strong pattern in te reo Māori, as shown in my interaction with Hone, above in (1). The children consistently chunked Māori words into CV patterns when asked to segment words into syllables. At times the younger children segmented words according to CVCV patterns as one segment, displaying emerging knowledge of the CV chunking skill. For example, Ariel and Pere segmented ‘Ūenuku’ as “Ūe – nuku” (VV-CVCV) (26 July and 18 November 2002 respectively), and for ‘aperikota’ Big JL said “a – peri – kota” (V-CVCV-CVCV) (21 November 2002). In addition, when asked to
segment Māori words into phonemes there was a vigorous tendency for the children to do so according to syllables of CV formations.

My interpretation of the CV as a strong linguistic pattern specific to Māori is based on how the children went about segmenting Māori words, and is also supported by the fact that te reo Māori is a syllabic language, as opposed to English, an alphabetic language. A high number of CV units form the syllabic structure of Māori words. For example, there is a large range of single CV syllable high frequency words in te reo Māori, such as te, kā, me, kē, kō, ko, ngō, mā, ki, ngā and so on.

“So do the word ‘panorama’”
Big JL says, “I can do that. Pan – a – ra – ma”.

“What about the word ‘periodical’?”
Ana says, “Pe – ri – odi – cal”.

(Tape recordings of Katie with Big JL and Ana, completing the PIPA syllable segmentation task, Kura, 7 August and 27 November 2002 respectively)

While CV syllables were segmented as such in te reo Māori, the CV syllables in the PIPA English words were not so well segmented, as portrayed in the testing situations above with Big JL and Ana. This was a pattern that was more pronounced with the Younger Kura and School children. The Older Kura children tended to segment CV syllables in both languages. An explanation for this is that the older children had ‘sorted out’ the syllabic structures for both languages due to their longer bilingual experience. As I discussed in Chapter Four, bilingual competence takes time to develop (Cummins, 1981, 1992; Lindholm & Aclan, 1991). This was well displayed by the difference in the ways the Older and Younger Kura/School children segmented CV syllables in ngā reo Māori and English.
4. CV Overall Linguistic Strength

The conversations I mentioned earlier, with Rata and Roxy, signalled that the CV unit was a strong linguistic structure for my study children. Although the children syllabically chunked CVC syllables in English and CV in Māori, the CV unit stood out as an overall linguistic strength. Conversations with the other children supported the way Roxy and Rata thought about the CVC words.

I ask the children to break up a set of CVC words into two parts.
“If you were to break up the word ‘bat’ (‘sat’, ‘cat’) into two parts, how would you do it?”
Ariel says, “Po – op, mo – op, to – op”
(Conversation, Kura, 13 May 2002)

“If you were to break up the word ‘bat’ (‘sat’, ‘cat’) into two parts, how would you do it?”
Ana says, “Ba – at, sa – at, ca – at.”
(Conversation, Kura, 15 May 2002)

Pere says, “Ma – mat, ba – bat, sa – sat”
(Conversation, Kura, 10 June 2002)

Of the children to whom I put this question, six divided the word with these patterns. They retained the vowel in both divisions, either in the CV unit followed by the whole word, such as Pere did, or attached the vowel to each consonant, such as Ariel and Ana did. Of the other children, four broke the words up into CV-C segments, two repeated the whole words and two said that they could not do it. However, none of the children separated the words into C-VC segments. These ways of dividing CVC words by the children illustrated clearly that the consonant and the vowel were thought about as a ‘whole’ production. They support the strength of the CV as an overall significant linguistic structure.

Further, in the ‘onset-rime’ type task designed as part of the reo Māori set, I asked the children the same question with a number of different CVC words, as I did when talking with Roxy and Rata, that is, “What sounds better to you, ca-t or c-at? “ (see Appendix 23). This appendix presents my analysis of the children’s responses to this task. Although the children did say that
the C-VC separation was better than the CV-C, most of the time the segmentation was the CV-C. It was as if the consonant and vowel were inseparable, a way of thinking about phonology that has been influenced by te reo Māori. As I discussed in Chapter Four, bilingual children learn phonological awareness skills that reflect the structural characteristics and orthographies of the languages they are exposed to (Bruck & Genesee, 1995; Bruck, Genesee, & Caravolas, 1997; Caravolas & Bruck, 1993; Cossu, Shankweiler, Liberman, Leonard & Tola, 1988; Cutler, Mahler, Norris & Segui, 1986; Read, Yun-Fei, Hong-Yin & Bao-Qing, 1986; Rubin & Turner, 1989). I told Whāea Kath about this.

Whāea tells me, “They do that (keep the CV chunk together) all the time in Māori. If you isolate the consonant its more difficult for them. They feel more relaxed with the vowel there too – because culturally our language is very much vowel sounds”.

(Conversation with Whāea Kath, Kura, 27 June 2002)

Further, during phoneme segmentation of te reo Māori words some of the children would rehearse their response. They would say the first CV syllable of the word out loud and then try to phonemically segment it, and then the next CV and so on. This may well have been an essential process for working out the phonemic pattern. It is a process however that demonstrates the linguistic importance of CV as a basis from which to think about language. The children did not say the whole word out loud, and then attempt phonemic segmentation. They had already chunked the word into CV syllables and started from this point.

I am talking with Ariel about her reading. She is reading out loud to me and she stops at a word ‘tarapeke’. I ask her, “What is the first sound?” “ta”.
“The next sound?” “ra”.
“The next?” “pe”
“And the next?” “ke. Tarapeke”.

(Conversation with Ariel, Kura, 22 November 2002)
The ‘sound’ was always the CV syllable. I then asked Ariel to tell me how she worked out this word she had stopped at. She said, while pointing to the CV syllable segments in the word,

“Like…them two together, them two together, then the other two together, and them two together, then I get the whole lot together”.

Ariel told me she used this way of working out words when reading English as well as Māori. Rata talked about the same process, “I put some of it together”, in groups of sounds, and work it out in that way, for both Maori and English (25 November 2002). Rata said that she never worked out a word by breaking it up into single sounds.

Roxy said, “I went ma–ta–ku and then I said it together” (25 November 2002). When I asked her about reading words by looking at the single letters, she replied, “I look at them together”. Roxy clearly uses the CV unit for deciphering Māori words. I asked her if she does so when reading English, “Not really”, but Roxy could not say how she worked out English words. It is of note that when Roxy was six years old her teacher at a prior school had written on her Six Year Net survey,

“Interesting way of looking into words. Chunking”.
(Six Year Net Scoresheet, 18 August 1998)

If Rapata did not know a word he would,

“Split it up in two, ta – ma – ri – ki”.
He tells me the Māori alphabet,
“Like a, i, e, o, u, pa, pe, pi, po, pu, ka, ki, ke, ko, ku”. (25 November 2002)

This is the waiata the Kura class have learned when they sing “A Ha Ka Ma” (see Appendix 9). And then further on Rapata demonstrates the CV or syllable chunking when working out the English word ‘stagnant’.

“s, t, a is sta, and g, n, is stag, and a, n, t is ant, stagnant. And this word si, and there’s a lo at the end, silo”.

I interpret these ways of working out written unknown Māori and English words as reinforcing my argument that the CV structure is an important overall linguistic unit for these children. If the
children draw from the CV unit to read English, it begs the question about the relevance of phonological awareness or aspects of phonological awareness for bilingual Māori children.

I refer back to the research about phonological awareness, reading acquisition and bilingualism in Chapter Four. I stated in that Chapter, that research has found phonological awareness knowledge to be important for learning an alphabetic language, not a syllabic one (see p.57). Further, for bilingual children and adults, whose first language orthography is syllabic, phonological awareness is not evident or crucial to successful reading (Bialystok, Majumder & Martin, 2003; Karanth, 2002). My study children were learning two languages simultaneously, te reo Māori which is a syllabic language, and English, an alphabetic one. In this study I found that the children’s linguistic strength of te reo Māori based CV unit, stood out as a major tool for learning to read both languages. The CV structure was central to reading for my study children, not the commonly held belief that phonemic awareness is.

5. Vowel Salience – reo Māori Based.

Apart from the conversation that I had with Whāea Kath outlined in (4) above, the linguistic centrality of the vowel was evident in a number of ways and I put forward the notion that this is reo Māori based, despite its evidence in English tasks as well as Māori. When I asked some of the children to break CVC words into two parts, six of them retained the vowel in each segment, evident in the examples discussed in the ‘CV Overall Linguistic Strength’ theme (for example, Ariel said, “po-op” for pop, “mo-op” for mop, and so on).

I am asking Pere to break the word ‘hand’ up into sounds. He replies, “ha – and”. (17 April 2002)

I am asking Big JL to break the word ‘stand’ up into sounds. He says, “sta – a - and”. (7 August 2002)

I am asking Tama to break the word ‘rabbit’ up into sounds. He says, “ra – a – bit”. (22 November 2002)
These ways of responding were typical of the Kura children. They did not separate out the CV as two phonemes. They were so attuned to this unit that the consonant was not a sound unless it was attached to the V, and then the V could be separated. In another way, during phoneme segmentation of two phoneme words, the vowel was repeated and overused. For example, Big JL segmented ‘car’ as “c-ar-ar-ar”, Ariel and Pere segmented ‘eat’ as “ea-ea-ea-t”. Roxy, Mary and Rata repeated the vowels like this also.

I am asking Pere and Tama to break Maori words up into phonemes. 
I say, “rangī”. Pere responds with, “ra-a-ngi”.
“Kawhe”. Tama and Pere say, “ka-a-whe” (20 November, 15 July 2002 respectively)

These examples highlight the vowel salience again. The CV is sounded, and then the V, just as this happened for some English words. I argue that the vowel prominence is a base building block learned from te reo Māori. The School children did not present with the same vowel focus. Te reo Māori was less pronounced as a daily language in their lives compared with the Kura children, which would influence the ways they thought about the phonological awareness tasks in this study. Further, the vowel is a prominent sound in te reo Māori. The five vowel sounds are in the seven most frequently used phonemes in conversational speech (Bauer, 1993). There are a larger number of vowel combinations compared with English (see Appendices 4 and 5), and te reo Māori is a syllable-timed language where every vowel is long (Bauer, 1993) and more acoustically available (Roach, 1998).

6. Consonant Salience – an English-Specific Marker

In contrast to the reo Māori based vowel salience, the consonant may well be a prominent English language-specific marker for the children in my study. They clearly segmented CVC
syllables, not the CV syllables, in the PIPA syllable subtest. The consonant has a linguistic significance for English because it provides an acoustic boundary in CVC syllables.

There are several reasons for pursuing this line of inquiry. First, in English, five of the seven most frequent phonemes spoken during conversational speech are consonant sounds (Weiss, Gordon & Lillywhite, 1987), (see Appendix 5). This means that consonants predominate acoustically. Second, there are more consonants in English than Māori, (see Appendices 4 and 5). Third, the vowels in English can be unstressed and transformed into the schwa /ə/ (sounds like the ‘i’ sound in ‘sit’), one of the highest seven phonemes spoken in conversational English. Because English is a stress-timed language there are many syllables containing the schwa vowel. As I discussed in Chapter Four, clarity of syllable boundaries differs within stress- or syllable-timed languages (Cutler et al., 1986). The syllable boundaries in stress-timed languages, such as English, can be perceived to lack clarity, while those in syllable-timed languages (which is more akin to reo Māori) tend to be heard more clearly (Roach, 1998). Prominence of the consonant in CVC structures may well have aided the children’s ability to identify these syllables compared to the CV syllables in the English words.

Further, ability to segment vowel only syllables in English provides more evidence for the consonant prominence in English. There were a possible seven vowel syllables to segment in the PIPA syllable segmentation subtest, positioned in initial, medial and final parts of words, and within two, four and five syllable words. The older Kura children, except for Tama, segmented these correctly across the three test administrations. The other children increased their raw scores with each administration. For these children the vowels tended to be segmented most for initial word position for the two syllable words ‘abyss’ and ‘ego’, then the four and five syllable words ‘agility’ and ‘elaboration’, and word final position, such as ‘bacteria’. Medial vowel syllables were not segmented as per test requirements, such as those in ‘periodical’, ‘joviality’.
The children tended to attach medial vowel syllables to other syllables, for example, Tama segmented periodical’ as “peri – odi – cal” (10 October 2002). My interpretation is that this happened because the consonant prominence within syllable structures created salience barriers to deciphering the medial vowel syllable, as a syllable. The word initial and final vowel syllables could be heard as distinct units, and easier to distinguish regardless of word syllable length. For example, the ‘e’ in elaboration tended to be segmented more than the ‘o’ in periodical. The word initial and final vowels were not confined by adjacent consonants.

In conclusion, there were six major themes that emerged from the children’s responses to the phonological awareness tasks. These themes count as linguistic strengths that have been influenced by the children’s bilingual learning of ngā reo Maori and English. At this point I will change my interpretative stance from searching thematic patterns to that of the ‘standard’ set by the regulations of the PIPA test.

*Interpretations based on the ‘Standard’ PIPA Test Regulations*

1. The Subtest ‘Pass’ Status

The ‘pass’ status for each subtest is outlined for all children in Appendix 33. Three School children, Jasmine, Ella and Cathy, would be considered as ‘normal’ in their phonological awareness development. For all eleven Kura children and two School children, Kylie and Nate, the scores would be interpreted as indicative of poor phonological awareness development. Each of the children would be diagnosed with phonological awareness difficulties or disorder and would be considered in need of further assessment and intervention, or at the minimum ongoing monitoring.
2. The Older Kura Children

The raw scores for each subtest are presented in Appendix 34. Six main points can be drawn from the scores of this group. First, the children completed syllable segmentation according to the test requirements for each administration, except Tama. Second, the children completed rhyme awareness in the second and third testing sessions with scores nearly at, or at, ceiling levels: 10, 11, or 12. Third, alliteration awareness, like syllable segmentation, was increasingly completed with high scores throughout, except for Tama. Fourth, the scores for phoneme isolation varied over the administrations, again except for Tama, and were not completed according to test expectations. Fifth, the children did not complete phoneme segmentation as per test regulations, which I find of interest given that phoneme segmentation is considered predictive of reading development. And last, letter knowledge scores indicated that the children do not use phoneme-grapheme correspondence at a level expected of them.

To summarise, this group of children, with the exception of Tama, presented with phonological awareness skills for syllable segmentation, alliteration awareness and over time, rhyme awareness. The children’s responses to the test did not conform to test requirements for phoneme segmentation, so they would be considered as having phonological awareness difficulties with this skill as well as phoneme isolation and grapheme-letter correspondence. Tama would be considered as having phonological awareness difficulties generally across the board, with rhyme awareness acknowledged as his main strength. In relation to these assessments, all children would be thought about as having a phonological awareness disorder and ‘at risk’ for poor reading acquisition. It is highly likely that they would receive further assessments, if not remediation.

3. The Younger Kura Children

Appendix 35 provides the raw scores and percentiles for the younger Kura children for each subtest. Taking on the ‘standard’ analysis I have highlighted in red those scores that did not
conform to test standards. Syllable segmentation was completed as per test requirements for all administrations by all children, except for Ana. Rhyme awareness, alliteration awareness and phoneme isolation scores tended to change over time with increasing scores and varied combinations of children completing or not completing the tasks as per the test standards. The children in this group gained a raw score of 0 or 1 for phoneme segmentation throughout the three test times. For Pere, Ana and Ariel their scores would indicate phoneme segmentation difficulties. However, for the three youngest children, Big JL, Hone, and Huriana, the 0 or 1 scores would be considered ‘normal’ for their age. Big JL’s third administration 0 score would be translated into phoneme segmentation difficulties, and for letter knowledge Ariel and Huriana gained scores for one administration that would be interpreted as ‘normal’ development.

In summary the patterns of phonological awareness skills of this younger group tended to mirror that of the older group – good skills for syllable segmentation and increasing skills for rhyme awareness and alliteration awareness. Like the older children this younger group did not segment words phonemically, a performance that would be diagnosed as showing phonological awareness difficulties, as well as poor grapheme–phoneme correspondence in letter knowledge. According to the test standards these younger tamariki (children), just like the older group, would be thought about as ‘at-risk’ for poor reading acquisition and in need of further assessment, if not intervention.

4. The School Children
Appendix 36 illustrates the raw scores and percentiles for the School children. Like all the Kura children the School children completed syllable segmentation according to test requirements, except for Kylie’s last test. There was a ‘glitch’ with Jasmine on the first administration. My later conversation with the tester Katie (10 May 2002) revealed her belief that Jasmine was uncertain about test expectations for this subtest and that her score did not reflect her ability.
Certainly her score stands out in relation to the other subtest scores and the additional administrations. Rhyme awareness was completed by Jasmine, but not by the other four children. Alliteration awareness was completed by all children in at least two administrations. At the last testing Kylie and Nate did not complete this subtest as per test regulations. Phoneme isolation scores indicated ‘normal’ development for all children but for Nate. Unlike the Kura children, scores for phoneme segmentation were according to test requirements for all children, and letter knowledge completed by three children, not Kylie or Nate.

In summary the ‘standard’ interpretation would identify Ella, Cathy and Jasmine as developing phonological awareness skills appropriate to their age, and not ‘at-risk’ for poor reading progress. However, Kylie and Nate would be diagnosed as disordered for phonological awareness development, with difficulties completing syllable and phoneme segmentation for Kylie, rhyme awareness, alliteration awareness, phoneme isolation for Nate, and letter knowledge for them both. These two children would be considered a concern for reading progress. In fact at the end of their school year their teacher singled them out as ‘at-risk’ for reading problems. It is of interest that their phoneme segmentation scores were ‘age appropriate’, the skill considered most predictive for reading development, yet Julie had referred them both for special reading help in Year 2.

To summarize, the conversations I had with Rata, Roxy and many of the children in my study portrayed how rich their linguistic learning was according to Māori and English. When I studied the children’s responses to the tasks, I found that they completed phonological awareness activities in a range of ways that reflected their bilingual knowledge and metalinguistic awareness. These ways were consonant with the research that has found bilingual children learn phonological awareness skills that reflect the salient features of both languages. The children presented with a solid knowledge of syllable segmentation, with CVC segmentation specific to
English and CV segmentation specific to Māori. Their understanding of CV structures stood out as a major linguistic feature that was utilized for working out unknown words during reading. In addition the children demonstrated in different ways that the vowel phoneme was a salient feature based on te reo Māori and the consonant an English-specific salience. My study children demonstrated too that bilingualism is a complex set of developing skills that take time to master. The ways the older Kura children completed tasks were more established when compared to the younger Kura children, who were less experienced as bilingual learners. Two of the School children, Nate and Kylie, completed tasks in similar ways to the younger Kura children. The other three responded in ways more akin to monolingual English speaking children.

When the children’s phonological awareness responses were interpreted according to the monocultural and monolingual ‘standard’ of the PIPA, all eleven Kura children and the School children, Kylie and Nate, would be be diagnosed with phonological awareness difficulties or disorder, and would be administered further assessment and intervention, or at the minimum ongoing monitoring. The scores for only three School children, Cathy, Ella and Jasmine, would be awarded ‘pass’ warranting an interpretation of ‘normal’ phonological awareness development.

These are the ways that my study children have the potential to be thought about – capable linguists in terms of their bilingual status, or bilinguals who are deficient according to a monolingual English test for phonological awareness proficiency. A study of the ways in which the children told narratives revealed more about how my study children were learning.

“Can I tell you a story now?” The Children as Oral Narrators

*Accounts/Recounts: Interpretations Based on ‘Sociocultural Practices’ for Assessment.*

Using the underlying structure analysis derived from Gee’s (1989, 1996) stanza analysis, I found that the children told their accounts and recounts in alternative ways to the cognitive linear
‘standard’ model. The children used a number of linguistic tools to create complex and sophisticated oral stories, and I will discuss these according to cohesion, discourse organization and contextualization signals, with the stories written in lines and stanzas, following Gee (1989, 1996).

1. Cohesion

_Ariel, Broken Fingers (Conversation, 29 April 2002)_

1. I broke those four fingers.
   And I cried.

2. And then my Mum and Dad have to take me in the bathroom,
   and hold it up.

3. And then I started sitting down to get better
   and then I had a shower,
   had tea,
   and then went to bed.

4. Then I thought that I wouldn’t work tomorrow
   but I might work after this day.

Ariel’s account is representative of the children’s narratives, in which the conjunctions ‘and’ and ‘and then’ are used to stitch parts of the story together. Ariel starts telling about breaking her fingers and the next line is linked to this with ‘and’. Stanza 2 follows a similar pattern. Three of the lines in stanza 3 start with ‘and then’. Ariel finishes her story in the last stanza with ‘then’, which signals the end of the story because no other line begins with ‘then’. The cohesion is complete with Ariel’s use of ‘and’ in stanza 1 and the ‘then’ in stanza 4, creating linguistic boundaries for the repetitive pattern of ‘and then’ throughout stanzas 2 and 3.

The first stanza of _Pere’s Head Cut story (Conversation, 1 August 2002)_ highlights the use of the ‘and’ as a way of keeping the story alive. The story finishes when ‘and’ is dropped and replaced with the conjunction ‘so’.

1. There was this Māori thing at this school.
   And I didn’t know it was there.
And I ran into it.
And I fell over.

After this stanza, as the listener I asked questions using ‘and’ replacing Pere’s need to use this linguistic tool.

And what happened?

2 Heaps of blood was coming out of it.
Okay,
and then what happened?

3 My Mum took me to the hospital.
Mm and.

Then they just glued it up.
Did they?

Yeah,
and they said “You gotta have a shower in the morning”.
To get it out.
So I had one.

Mm. Is there any more to tell me about it?

I had to sleep on this side and not that side.

The use of ‘and’ continues as a pattern in Pere’s story through my involvement as the listener. This is a good example of how the listener aids in the construction of the story. At the point in stanza 3 when I say “Did they?”, not using the ‘and’ conjunction, Pere then uses it, “Yeah, and they said…”. The conjunction ‘so’ in “So I had one” marks the last line of his story. Pere tells me more because I ask him.

Tama, Fat Cat (Conversation, 2 October 2002)

1 Oh I had one pet
   What he died
   That he died

2. Oh um, it grew old
   And um, it was eating too much
And then it got real fat.

3. And then um, then it died.
   And we buried it.

4. And that’s all.

I included Tama’s narrative here because it demonstrates his use of pronouns to glue a story together. Tama basically told his story in stanza 1, about ‘one pet’ and ‘he’ died. The pet is referred to as ‘it’ in stanzas 2 and 3 when Tama retells the story he told in stanza 1. The use of ‘it’ links the 2nd and 3rd stanzas, expanding the first telling in stanza 1. In addition Tama’s story interweaves use of ‘and’ and ‘and then’ to hold it together, just as Ariel and Pere had done in their stories above. The ‘and that’s all’ completes the story.

Ana, Party and Jade Stadium (Conversation, 27 May 2002)

You said “I went to Jade Stadium and”

1 Then after Jade Stadium yesterday.
   After Jade Stadium yesterday
   I went to the party.

   Oh a party. Tell me about it.

2. Cause I got paint on my head.

Ana’s narrative is a good example of how some children used repetition as a cohesive device. The repetition links to information about going to a party. Ana used this technique in another story, the Nan and Party story (Conversation, 27 May 2002).

1 I went with my Nan.
   Aunty Teri.
   Yeah

2 We got pulled up when we were going back to Aunty Ra’s.
   Pulled up when we were going back to Aunty Ra’s with my Nana,
   dropping me and my Mum off.

3 We got pulled up by police.

Ana repeats the phrase “We got pulled up” to begin and link stanzas 2 and 3. She also repeated “pulled up when we were going back to Aunty Ra’s” within stanza 2, with more information
added, just as she did in her *Party and Jade Stadium story*. Information was also added to “We got pulled up” in stanza 3, “by police”, and this ends the story. In her *Kittens story (Conversation, 22 November 2002)* Mary also repeats a line adding more information.

> We found some kittens.
> We found some kittens at home.

And in his *Fat Cat* story Tama said ‘he died’ in stanza 1 and then ‘it died’ in stanza 3 – a way to link the first and second telling of the story together. This way of repeating phrases and adding more information on the second and third repeat is a technique that stands out as a way of aiding the listener’s understanding or recall ability.

2. Discourse Organisation

*Mary, Mira Sick (Conversation, 22 November 2002)*

1 Mira kept on spewing up  
and so we took her to the doctors.  
But the doctor said that she was alright,  
but she really wasn’t.

2 So Mum took her to the doctor’s  
and um um they were staying there for a whole lot of, um, long time.

3 And when Mum came back, back  
she was crying.

4 So she had to take tests and that.

5 And she wasn’t alright.

I place Mary’s story here because it is representative of a number of the narratives told in which the organisation involved stories within stories, with a cyclic pattern and theme repetition. This story is an intricate composition of a theme told and retold, with more information being added with each retelling. This is very much like Ana’s *Nan and Party* story above, when she repeats phrases and adds more information to each repetition.
There are two cycles of the story in Mary’s narrative above. In stanza 1 Mary summarizes her story, that Mira was spewing up, taking her to the doctor’s, and that she wasn’t alright. Then in cycle 1, stanzas 2 and 3, Mary retells the story adding more information. Cycle 2 is stanza 4 where Mary talks more about the doctor’s visit. In stanza 5 Mary ends her story by repeating the last idea in stanza 1. This repetition creates a linguistic border to the story.

This cyclic organisation is apparent again in *Mary’s Weekend story* (*Conversation, 25 July 2002*).

1
   *I just stayed home*
   and played my sega
   and watched TV
   and asked if I could go to Hana’s house.

2
   *Cause she lives across the road from my house.*
   No.
   *I wasn’t allowed to.*
   Cause I had to stay and watch TV with Mum.

3
   *And then I went to the corner*
   out at ( )
   went to the shop.
   I buyed some new leotards.

4
   *And on Saturday night*
   me and Mum, um were watching the um Crusaders
   and the Crusaders won.

5
   *And we were having chips and dip*
   And popcorn.

6
   *And Mira was making a big mess*
   In the bed
   In Mum’s bed.

In this narrative Mary repeats a story theme about watching television. She summarizes her story in stanza 1 stating her entire weekend. Then in stanza 2 Mary picks up on the TV theme for cycle 1 retell of the story outline in stanza 1, but she has emphasized the main feature of the weekend. This was the reason for not going to Hana’s house. In stanza 3 Mary introduces information about going shopping, almost as if she had forgotten about that in stanza 1. And then in stanza 4 she reintroduces the TV theme creating cycle 2, adding information about the Crusaders game.
In stanzas 5 and 6 Mary embellishes cycle 2 with more of the story. It is as if the story gains momentum with each cycle of the TV theme.

Some stories involved telling one cycle. When Ariel tells about breaking her fingers (p. 150) the first and last stanzas encompass the story as one cycle. They could exist as the story, minus stanzas 2 and 3. The cyclic organisation of themes illustrated how complex and elaborate the children’s narratives were. The children in my study were very capable story tellers.

3. Contextualisation Signals

*Pere, Pushed Over (Conversation, 10 June 2002)*

1  She just pushed me over like that.

2  She was kicking me
   And then she just pushed me over.

Pere used the adverb “just” as a signpost for the listener to construct a certain meaning, a typical word used as a contextual signal. In Pere’s story the word ‘just’ signals to the listener an unfairness in the girl’s action, as if her act happened without any warning, and certainly without provocation. There is an underlying meaning related to unfairness. Pere repeats this word in the phrase, “she just pushed me over” as a signpost in his desire for the listener to construct a context in which Pere has been treated badly. This in turn requires the listener to give Pere sympathy and support. Contextualisation signals for sympathy and support are also embedded in Pere’s other two narratives.

*Pere, Bonfire Story (Conversation, 24 July 2002)*

1  Me and my sister and her boyfriend
   and Ra, um, Ra, Ra, Rata
   had a bonfire there.

2  And, and um this lady came over.
   And she said “Can you put out the bonfire?”

3  And then this man started screaming at us.
Pere has allowed the listener to know there was a family group having a bonfire, spent two lines
telling us about the lady and indicated a politeness in the way she asked them to put out the fire.
Up to this point there is a calm situation. Pere changes this with his last line, starting “and then”
to highlight the next event and to signal a change in the situation. His use of the verb
“screaming” conveys that the man was out of order, maybe crazy. Pere wants the listener to feel
some sympathy with him, to think that the man screaming at them was unjustified, especially in
contrast to the way the lady asked in a polite manner.

Pere’s use of the conjunction “and then” is a signpost that something is about to happen, and it
does. Tama uses the same conjunction in his Radio story, (Conversation, 2 December 2002) to
signal a change of events.

1  But my brother, he likes those um, radios.
   Radios?
2  Yeah.
   Cause we, we were cleaning up the classroom.
3  He ah, he turn
4  Where we were over there,
   They were working
5  And then we, we heard it.
   What?
   It was real loud
   the radio.

“And then” introduces Tama’s build up as a mystery, giving clues along the way, using the
words “heard” and “it”, not specifying what “it” is, and “real” to let the listener know just how
loud. He finishes his story stating what the listener is hanging on to know, “the radio”.


Ariel expresses a repetitive pattern of “and then” in her Broken Fingers story, but for a different effect than Pere and Tamas’ signal regarding the suddenness of what was about to happen next. Ariel has placed a chronological sequence of events into her narrative with a repetitive pattern of “and then”, setting a context for the listener to place Ariel’s experience as a major event because of all that she had to do - go to the bathroom, hold up her hand, sit down to make it better, have a shower, have tea and go to bed. Just as Pere wants the listener to have sympathy for him in his stories, Ariel wants the listener to have sympathy for her.

In the Holidays 2 story (Conversation, 17 July 2002) Mary uses the same repetitive pattern for the listener to know how busy her week had been and the range of activities she had done. She repeated “And on …” (Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday).

1 Oh I got another story.
2 And on the first week
   um I went on a holiday programme.
3 And on Monday there were two groups
   And my group, our group, that group that I was in went to iceskating
   And the other group went swimming.
4 And on Tuesday um our group went golfing
   And the other group went to Quail Island.
5 And on Wednesday our group went swimming
   And the other group went iceskating
   And we watched a movie.
6 I went on the speed one at iceskating.
7 Are we up to Thursday?
   And on Thursday we went to Quail Island
   And they went to, they went golfing.
8 And on Friday,
   I forgot what we done on Friday.
9 Everyone was picking on me
   So I went into the girl’s toilet to cry.
Mary wants the listener to be impressed with all that she had done. However in stanza 9 she changes the “and on” format to signpost a contrasting context, a situation that she wants the listener to think of as unpleasant and unfair. Mary achieves this with her use of the word “everyone”, as a way to indicate the enormity of the unfair treatment. She draws the listener into feeling sympathy for her situation with her last line “So I went into the girl’s toilet to cry”. Mary is showing how upset she was about the teasing, and then crying alone so that the others do not see her upset. Mary’s contrast between the week’s events and then the last stanza creates a shock for the listener.

To complete this discussion about contextualization signals, Mary uses a linguistic device to invite the listener to ask her to tell the narrative, a mystery technique. In her Fight story Mary expresses an evaluation first, which creates a mystery that the listener wants to know about. She says:

*It’s a shame that we can’t go to gymnastics today.*

This then leaves the unknowing listener to ask what happened, which I did. And again in her Weekend story:

*I just stayed home and played my sega and watched TV and asked if I could go to Hana’s house.*

The listener is placed in the mystery situation where they need to ask about going to Hana’s house. Mary wants the listener to know about not being allowed to go to her friend’s house and having to stay at home. Such contextualization is accentuated by Mary’s use of the adverb “just”, as Pere did. However Mary wants the listener to hear a slightly different meaning to Pere’s, although like Pere she wants the listener to feel sympathy for her situation. Mary’s use of ‘just’ signals that her weekend was not that great because she could not go to Hana’s house. The mystery technique that Mary uses is also present in Tama’s telling of the Radio (p.156), where he builds up the story until the last line when all is revealed.
My presentation of the underlying structure analysis does not exhaust the possibilities. Three main cohesive linguistic markers were used in the children’s narratives: conjunctions ‘and’, ‘then’ and ‘and then’; pronouns; and repetition of words and phrases. The organization of many of the narratives involved stories within stories involving a cyclic pattern and theme repetition. The children used particular words, such as adverbs and conjunctions, and repetition of words or phrases to express contextualization signals. This analysis presented the children’s story telling practices as very different to the standard cognitive linear pattern using High Point analysis.

*Accounts/Recounts: Interpretations based on the ‘Standard’ Macro-High Point and Micro-Lexical Diversity Analyses*

Macro-High Point Analysis

In the ‘standard’ analyst role I would place the narratives as in Table 4, according to the high point analysis model. Interpretation would indicate that five of the stories were classic high point and two prompted classic high point (my questioning meant the children added components to create a classic high point story), nine were two event, leapfrog, and end-at-high-point narratives, and one chronological. With reference to the chronological age at which these typically develop, the children would be considered as clearly developing story telling towards the classic high point stage, which is apparent by 6 years of age. However given that most of the children’s stories are at stages below the classic high point, the children would be considered as having narrative language difficulties that would be enhanced with a remedial programme.

Using the high point analysis ‘lens’, only four of the seventeen stories would be described as ‘fully-formed’ narratives (Labov, 1999, p.227) using all components: abstract/introducer, orientation, complicating action, resolution and coda. Although all of the stories would be recognised as a narrative according to Labov’s (1999) minimum component requirement, complicating action, the omitted components in thirteen stories would be considered as remedial goals (see Table 4, p.161 for omitted components).
As an analysis system based on the North European and American tradition, high point analysis is reductionist in nature and hones in on the presence and omission of narrative components. Omission of narrative components according to this analysis can influence the ways in which the listener makes meaning. Holmes (1998) says that for Pākehā listeners the omission of an abstract/introducer gives the impression that the story just comes ‘out of the blue’ without any warning. Omission of the abstract/introducer is evident in Pere’s Bonfire story. It starts with an orientation, then two complicating actions, and ends on an evaluation.

Me and my sister and her boyfriend and Ra, um, Ra, Ra, Rata had a bonfire there. And, and um this lady came over, and she said “Can you put out the bonfire?” And then this man started screaming at us.

Omission of an abstract/introducer was also apparent in Ariel’s Broken Fingers story.

I broke those four fingers. And I cried. And then my Mum and Dad have to take me in the bathroom, and hold it up. And then I started sitting down to get better, and then I had a shower, had tea, and then went to bed. Then I thought that I wouldn’t work tomorrow but I might work after this day.

These narratives happen and do not conform to the need for the narrator to prepare the listener for a story about to be told. In this story of Ariel’s an orientation was also omitted. The orientation informs the listener about the specifics of who, what, when, how, and why. After Ariel told her narrative I wanted to know when this event occurred, so I asked her.

When did you break your fingers? Before yesterday. Oh I see. Did they hurt? Yes. That’s no good. Nods head no.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern and Age typically developed (Hughes, McGillivray &amp; Schmidek, 1997; McCabe &amp; Rollins, 1994; Peterson &amp; McCabe, 1983)</th>
<th>Children, Chronological Age, Stories and date of telling</th>
<th>Components Omitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two Event 3-4 years</td>
<td>Ana (6y8m) Party and Jade Stadium (27/05/02) Pere (6y10m) Pushed Over (10/06/02)</td>
<td>Evaluation Resolution Coda Orientation Resolution Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leapfrog 4 years</td>
<td>Ana (6y8m) Nan and Party (27/05/02) (included four two event narratives)</td>
<td>Evaluation Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-at-High-Point 5 years</td>
<td>Mary (9y1m) Weekend (27/05/02) Mary (9y2m) Holidays 2 (17/07/02) Mary (9y6m) Stayover (11/11/02) Mary (9y7m) Mira Sick (27/11/02) Pere (6y11m) Bonfire (24/07/02)</td>
<td>Resolution Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classic High Point 6 years</td>
<td>Mary (9y6m) Kicked out of Bed (11/11/02) Mary (9y7m)* Fight Story (20/11/02) Mary (9y7m) Kittens (22/11/02) Ariel (6y7m) Broken Fingers (29/04/02) Pere (7y)* Head Cut (1/08/02) Ana (6y7m) Car Fire (6/05/02) Tama (8y) Fat Cat (2/10/02)</td>
<td>Coda Introduction Orientation Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Prompted Classic High Point</td>
<td>Mary (9y6m) Kicked out of Bed (11/11/02) Mary (9y7m)* Fight Story (20/11/02) Mary (9y7m) Kittens (22/11/02) Ariel (6y7m) Broken Fingers (29/04/02) Pere (7y)* Head Cut (1/08/02) Ana (6y7m) Car Fire (6/05/02) Tama (8y) Fat Cat (2/10/02)</td>
<td>Coda Introduction Orientation Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronological All ages</td>
<td>Mary (9y2m) Holidays 1(17/07/02)</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. High Point Analysis of Accounts and Recounts
The need for me to ask Ariel this question draws from the narrative form that I know, in which
details related to when this event happened were important for my understanding of the content.
Ariel told this story to me with fluency and a knowing about what happened to her. She was the
agent of her own telling. The time of the event was clearly not important, otherwise she would
have said it.

Omission of the resolution and coda components was common in the children’s oral narratives.
Nine of the seventeen stories ended without both of these and a further four stories ended
without a resolution or coda. A resolution informs the listener how everything ends up and a
coda brings the teller and listener back to the present. Mary’s *Mira Sick* story omits both the
resolution and coda.

*Mira kept on spewing up and so we took her to the doctor’s.*

(Abstract/Orientation)

*But the doctor said that she, she was alright,*

(Action)

*but she really wasn’t.*

(Evaluation)

*So Mum took her to the doctor’s*

(Action)

*and um, um they were staying there for a whole lot of, um long time.*

(Action)

*And when Mum came back, back she was crying.*

(Action)

*So she had to take tests and that.*

(Action)

*And she wasn’t alright.*

(Evaluation)

In Tama’s *Radio* story, the resolution and coda are omitted.

*But my brother, he likes those um, radios.*

(Orientation)

Radios?

*Yeah. Cause we, we were cleaning up the classroom.*

(Orientation)

*He ah, he turn*

(Action)

*Where we were over there,*

(Orientation)

*They were working*

(Orientation/Action)

*And then we, we heard it.*

(Action)

What?
It was real loud, the radio. (Evaluation)

And again in Pere’s Pushed Over story resolution and coda are not included.

What happened there?

She just pushed me over like that (holding hand with fingers outstretched over his face). (Action/Evaluation)

Yeah. What was happening?

I don’t know.
She was kicking me. (Action)
And then she just pushed me over. (Action/Evaluation)

Just as the omission of an abstract/introducer gives the impression of a story being told ‘out of nowhere’, the omission of the resolution and coda gives the impression of stories being unfinished, according to Holmes (1998). Janet Holmes says that the Pākehā listener considers the story is not over, as if it is left in mid-air.

As I discussed in Chapter 4, the School Entry Assessment (SEA) (Ministry of Education, 1997) used in Aotearoa New Zealand is partly scored on the inclusion of orientation details such as who, what, where, when and how, and resolution or ending. The NEMP assessment practices include storytelling abilities with scoring also related to detailed description and achieving story closure (Flockton & Crooks, 1997, 2001, 2005). Māori students’ storytelling language abilities according to both forms of assessment have been documented as less achieving than Pākehā students, which only serves to recycle the deficiency discourse. However my data demonstrates that the ways some Māori students tell stories differs to the SEA and NEMP storytelling expectations related to orientation details and a resolution.

Using high point analysis as the ‘standard’ lens, Janet Holmes (1998) found some differences in the ways Māori and Pākehā adults told stories within conversation. Pākehā adults tended to
include resolution and coda elements more often than Māori adults. Pākehā tended to be more explicit in their language while Māori adults tended to listen to the narrator without questions for more detail. Pākehā used more overt verbal feedback to the story teller. Keeping with the ‘standard’, Holmes’s findings resonate with the features of storytelling that my study children demonstrated. They did not include resolution and coda, as Holmes found with Māori adults, and there were instances when the children were not as explicit in their content as expected in the SEA and NEMP scoring systems, such as absence of orientation. Even when orientation was included, they did not necessarily tell the what, when, who, how and why.

Whāea Kath (Conversation, 22 August 2002) believed that Māori people often do not want to know about specifics. They listen for the general idea, the heart of the story. According to Whāea, Pākehā put in all the specifics, what Māori would consider to be too much information.

As agents of their own narration the children selected the content they considered important. For example, Ana tells her Nan and Party story which includes two event narratives. She starts her leapfrog story with orientation statements related to who, and then adds the context of when, not related to time, but related to who Ana was with and what they were doing.

_I went with my Nan._ (Orientation)

Oh.
_Aunty Teri._ (Orientation)

Aunty Teri.

_Yeah we got pulled up when we were going back to Aunty Ra’s._ (Action/Orientation)

You got?

_Pulled up when we were going back to Aunty Ra’s with my Nana, dropping me and my Mum off._ (Action/Orientation)

Oh.

_We got pulled up by police._ (Action)
Ana has not included all of the orientation type information that is expected of high point analysis, SEA or NEMP, for example, the full extent of the what, the how, the why and the when. We learn more as the story unfolds. Ana may have learned to tell orientation type information in this way, telling only what was important for her.

The standard high point analysis presented the children’s narratives as delayed in development as per the age and stage developmental pattern. A number of the stories were classic high point, the uppermost stage, but most of them were not. Many of the stories omitted components such as introducer/abstract, orientation or orientation type information, resolution and coda, as Holmes (1998) had found with Māori adults.

Micro-Analysis
In terms of micro-analysis, I have placed examples of the children’s lexical diversity in Table 5, according to the model developed by Westby, Van Dongen and Maggart, (1989). I have listed all conjunctions, mental and linguistic verbs, and adverbs of degree, manner and frequency expressed throughout the stories. I have not listed all examples of noun phrases followed by prepositional phrases or relative clauses, nor adverbs of place and time, because there were many instances of these. There were no elaborated noun phrases involving more than two modifiers in any of the stories.
Table 5. Lexical Diversity within the Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Conjunctions (not including and, then)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cause/Because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Elaborated Noun Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than two modifiers (for example, determiners such as the, a, an, and adjectives)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun followed by a prepositional phrase or relative clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...paint on my head.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...Aunty Ra’s with my Nana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...stickers from the McDonald’s lady.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...car with one wheel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the road from Tama’s house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...that I wouldn’t work tomorrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...me in the bathroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...her in the toilet too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...it over to Roxy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the road from my house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...TV with Mum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...the group that I was in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Mental and Linguistic Verbs (for example, think, wish, say, promise, exclam, etc).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scream</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adverbs (especially expression of tone, attitude, manner – for example, angrily, cheerfully, sadly etc).

Adverbs of place: there, at this school, to the hospital, at us, over, on my head, down O Street, where I live, across the road, to gymnastics, in the same bed.

Adverbs of time: in the morning, yesterday, after the party, to Nana’s house, here, to Aunty Ra’s, today, tomorrow, after this day, on the next night, at night time.

Adverbs of degree: just, too much, real/really, all, only, even.

Adverbs of manner: with my Nan.

Adverb of frequency: four times.

As mentioned previously, Hughes, McGillivray and Schmidek (1997) state that if any of these four word class categories are missing or rare, they could be goals for intervention to improve narrative language style. With this in mind the children’s lexical use would be considered as developing for: mental and linguistic verbs; adverbs of place, time and degree; prepositional phrases following nouns; and relative clauses. However the range of conjunctions was limited, as were the adverbs of manner and frequency, and there were no noun phrases with more than two modifiers. The absence or limited use of these lexical features would be thought of as delayed, a deficit in terms of vocabulary use and in need of remediation. As features considered essential for literate language and academic achievement (Westby, 1991), the children in this study would be thought of as “at risk” for school achievement.

Accounts/Recounts: Interpretations Based on Analysis of Discourses

In my analysis of discourses throughout the children’s narratives I selected elements of Burr’s (1995) work, reading and re-reading the texts for features such as recurrent themes, words loaded with meaning and dichotomies (refer to p.75).

1. Recurrent Themes

Two major recurring themes emerged throughout the children’s stories: whānau and events related to being hurt. Whānau had a strong presence in many of the narratives, whānau either sharing experiences together or involved in helping the narrator in a crisis situation. Ana’s stories told about her Mum, Nan, aunts, and sister going out together; Pere talked about his Mum taking him to the hospital and his sisters sharing the bonfire; Ariel about her Mum and Dad helping her when she ‘broke’ her fingers; Tama his brother having a loud radio; and Mary about her Mum and younger sister Mira watching the TV and Mira being sick. Events related to being hurt or having an accident were talked about in some of the narratives, for example, Ariel hurting her fingers, Pere cutting his head, being pushed over, Mary talking about being teased, and the
girls fighting with Susie who cried when she was locked in the toilet. Another minor theme in
the stories was related to animals, with Tama telling about his cat getting fat and old and dying,
and Mary talking about finding some kittens. Friendship was a major theme of Mary’s stories,
about her friends coming to stay, sharing experiences together, not being allowed to go to a
friend’s house and her story about the fight. Friendship was not talked about in any of the other
children’s stories.

2. Words Loaded with Meaning

A number of words spoken by the children were loaded with meaning. One word that stands out
as used more than other words was ‘just’. Although this word was used to provide a context for
the listener to think in unison with the narrator, it was used to denote a range of meanings. For
example, Pere said “Then they just glued it up” (Head Cut), meaning there was no major deal
about the cut; “She just pushed me over like that” (Pushed Over) meaning that the action
happened suddenly without any provocation on Pere’s part; Mary said “Well they just took her
hair tie” (Fight) which meant the same as Pere’s use, related to an action happening suddenly
without being provoked; “I just stayed home …” (Mary’s Weekend story) meaning not a lot
happened and what did happen was not that exciting; and “I just got up on the bed” (Mary’s
“Susie Stayover” story) meaning that there was no other alternative except to do that.

The phrase “and then” was used to convey different meanings. It was used within a sequence of
events to illuminate the enormity of the event being told (for example in Ariel’s Broken Fingers
narrative). Its use generated a surprise to a sudden change of events, (such as Tama’s Radio and
Fat Cat stories). This latter use was a linguistic device to contrast what had been happening in
the story to the next event.

Other words were used once, but stood out because they were words that were not necessary for
the events of the story, but necessary for the intended meanings. These include: “Māori thing”
and “heaps of blood” (Pere, Head Cut); “everyone” (Mary, Holidays 2); “really cute” (Mary, Kittens); “real loud” and “real fat” (Tama, Radio and Fat Cat respectively); ‘freezing cold’ (Mary, Kicked out of Bed); “heaps of things” (Mary, Susie Stayover); “we won” and “I won” (Mary, Weekend and Holidays 1 respectively). These words accentuate the situation the children are talking about. They make an idea seem bigger or more important, giving the event they are talking about an emphasis that would not be there otherwise.

3. Dichotomies

A range of dichotomies stood out throughout the stories. First, Pere talked about ‘a Māori thing’ engaging a dichotomy between Māori and Pākehā. It is interesting that ‘Pākehā’ objects are not distinguished as such, but ‘Māori’ objects are. The fact that Pere did talk about the object as ‘Māori’ illuminates his understanding that there is a difference in Māori/Pākehā, but that he does not specify ‘Pākehā’ objects as ‘Pākehā’ is of interest.

Second, in their stories Mary and Ana presented the dichotomies of belonging/isolated and group/individual. Mary’s story, Holidays 2 showed her belonging with a group of children being involved in events, but at the end she shows her isolation as an individual in the toilet crying. The Weekend story is about Mary’s belonging in the whānau group, although she did want to be an individual and step outside the whānau to go to her friend’s house. Again in Mary’s Fight story, Susie is isolated from the group and locked in the toilet. In Ana’s stories she is with whānau, always belonging to a group.

Third, Pere’s narratives speak of fairness/unfairness, child (no authority)/adult (authority), and responsibility/no responsibility dichotomies. In his Pushed Over story he was treated unfairly by the girl and she was responsible, not him. When Pere ran into the ‘Māori thing’ he did not know it was there, and the message for the reader is that if he knew, he would have not run into it. He was not responsible for the ‘thing’ being there. Pere and his sister were not responsible for the
man screaming at them. In his *Head Cut* story, Pere accepts the authority of the hospital people telling him he’s “gotta have a shower in the morning”.

Fourth, the authority/no authority dichotomy was illuminated also in the stories by Mary, Ana, and Ariel. Mary’s *Mira Sick* narrative told about the authority of the hospital/doctor. Mary repeatedly said that Mira was not alright, even though the doctor (who has the apparent authority to know) said that she was. There is a distinction here between the authority of the doctor and the lack of authority of the patient. Ana also speaks of authority in terms of the police, how the police had the authority to pull them over, in her *Nan and Party* story. Ariel’s parents had the authority to know what to do when she “broke” her fingers, as well as the responsibility to help her.

Retell Narratives

Three major themes emerged from the retell stories. First, the ways Uncle Rewi told his narratives differed to how Vera and I told stories. Second, the children tended to select the drawing option for retelling a story in combination with saying it. Third, the children retold narratives as story tellers, fully involved in the act of retelling. The children were adept story tellers.

Uncle Rewi told his *Kuia and Mokopuna* and *Early Days* stories in ways that were cyclical, using a repetition of themes and returning to the theme throughout the story. For the *Kuia and Mokopuna* story he told about how the Kuia would look after their mokopuna in the old days, and his repeated theme was “That was how it was for the Kuia and her mokopuna. She looked after them” (29 April 2002). Uncle Rewi kept returning to this idea throughout his telling. Likewise in his *Early Days* story he talked about his life as a young boy within his whānau, and kept returning to the idea that during the winter it was very cold, but they managed to survive the
cold. In combination with repetition of ideas Uncle Rewi introduced a range of topics that were linked. For example, when he told about *The Early Days* he talked about having to get up early to milk the cows, walking a long way to school, not having any shoes because of the Depression, bunking school one day and being caught, having fights with his brothers and cousins – and yet coming back and linking what he had told, to how cold it was in winter. His story telling was cyclical.

The ways in which Vera and I told our stories however were very different. We talked in a linear fashion, about this, then this, then this and so on. We also talked about one event exclusively, for example in Vera’s story she told about her family having a bonfire together. I talked about a car crash in *Richard’s Car Crash* story and about a soccer game in another story. The contrast in the ways Uncle Rewi and Vera and I told stories was obvious.

When the children came to retell the stories they chose to draw them, which then had implications for how I was to analyse them. I found the use of high point analysis difficult. I will discuss Ana’s retell with *Richard’s Car Crash* story to illustrate this point.

I told Ana an account, about being ready to go out with my daughter one evening. A friend, Richard, arrived to tell us some good news. After this my daughter and I got into the car to reverse out, and I backed into Richard’s car leaving a large dent in his car door. I became very upset. I have told this story here in a few lines, in a linear way and added a few specifics. I took longer to tell the story to Ana and Ariel, but I did so adding more specifics like the time of day, who Richard was and so on. When Ana came to retell the story she chose to draw it. She was quiet while drawing and very focused. She drew a house.
She attached a garage to it, placing squiggly lines on the garage door to show it was a garage.

She then drew a driveway from a road up to the garage, a parked car in the driveway and a car in the garage.
Ana asked me the colour of Richard’s car and coloured it green, and then asked me the colour of my car, and coloured it blue. I had not included this information in my original story.

Ana then added tow bars to the two cars. This was not part of my story telling, but tow bars were talked about later when Ana asked me if my car had been damaged. It had not because of the tow bar.
At this point Ana stopped and turned looking at me. I asked her, “What happened”? She added the arrow.

Ana retold this story with such attention to being a story teller. She was very adept at retelling, highlighting only the parts of the story that were important, i.e. the garage and colouring the cars with tow bars. When I asked Ana what happened she very depicted the crash with an arrow. I have discussed her retell here because it was typical of how the children retold narratives.

In response to the ways I examined the children’s accounts/recounts and retells, with the finding that they told narratives in a variety of ways, cyclical and linear in form, I was intrigued to find out how some Māori authors wrote their stories.
Short Stories told by Eminent Māori Writers

I studied short stories written by Patricia Grace, *Collected Stories* (1975) and Ngāhuia Te Awekotuku, *Tahuri* (1989). I chose short stories because they were quicker to read and I considered were more accessible for illumination of narrative patterns. Both authors ‘told’ their stories in formations that were linear, for example, Grace’s *A Way of Talking*, *The Dream*, and Te Awekotuku’s *Auntie Marleen*, *Three for Kui* and *Koura*. They also narrated their stories in cyclic patterns that varied in form. Sometimes the story was written in a single cycle moving through a present-past-present rotation, such as Te Awekotuku’s *After the Game*. Some of the one cycle stories repeated an idea at the beginning and end, encapsulating the story as a whole entity, as in Grace’s *Toki* and *Holiday* and Te Awekotuku’s *Uncle Ted in the Big Truck* and *Watching the Big Girls*. There were times when the present-past-present form was repeated in a number of cycles, such as Te Awekotuku’s *Red Jersey*. And a number of the stories repeated themes with each cycle, for example, Grace’s stories *The Hills*, *At the River*, *Holiday*, *Transition* and Te Awekotuku’s *The Basketball Girls* and *Paretipua*. When the narratives embodied a number of cycles, these varied in form, such that some cycles moved along in a horizontal pattern engaging with repeated visual images and certain themes, for example, *The Hills* by Grace, or cycles moving inwards and then outwards in the form of cone shaped movement, for example, *Red Jersey* by Te Awekotuku. There were occasions also that these authors engaged in linear structures within a cycle.

This exploration into the stories by Patricia Grace and Ngāhuia Te Awekotuku provided another one of those times when I was deeply moved. These writers do not have language deficits related to story telling, yet the ways they sometimes wrote their stories did not conform to the linear standard that our education system expects from children.
To summarize, there were times when the children told their stories through the linear form and the classic high point level of high point analysis. However, if using the high point and lexical diversity analysis lens, many of the children’s stories would be considered deficient. In consonance with the developmental ages that have been determined for the narrative forms, the children in my study would be categorised as having language difficulties in telling stories, and needing remediation. Further, in their expression of lexicon the children presented with ‘good’ development of mental and linguistic verbs, nouns followed by prepositional phrases and relative clauses, and adverbs of place, time and degree. However, their limited use of a range of conjunctions, adverbs of manner and frequency, plus no expression of more than two modifiers in noun phrases, would be viewed as delayed language and in need of intervention. As discussed previously in Chapter 4, according to the ‘standard’ model of analysis, lexical diversity is considered important for ‘good’ narratives and includes the above word categories (Westby, Van Dongen & Maggart, 1989). Hughes, McGillivray and Schmidek (1997) state that if any of these categories are missing or rare, they could be goals for intervention to improve expression of narratives.

In contrast however, when I used the sociocultural ways to examine the children’s stories I found that many of them were cyclical in form, the same as many Māori published stories and Māori adult conversation stories. The children used a range of effective and sophisticated linguistic devices not considered or valued by the standard assessment system. In terms of the underlying structure analysis, the children were agents of their own story telling using linguistic tools that illuminated the strength they had in this language form. They used a range of devices that present them as able and capable story tellers who were adept with oral narratives.

Discourse analysis highlighted the recurrence of themes about whānau and events related to being hurt. Mary talked also about friendships in a number of her stories. The children
expressed words that were loaded with meaning, and in particular the word “just” was used on a number of occasions. A range of dichotomies stood out throughout the stories: Māori/Pākehā, belonging/isolated, group/individual, fairness/unfairness, child/adult, authority/no authority and responsible/irresponsible.

When I studied some of the short stories by Patricia Grace and Ngāhuia Te Awekotuku, I found that their stories did not always conform to the linear structure expected by high point analysis. Some of their stories were linear, but many of them cyclic in pattern encompassing a range of cyclic type forms.

In conclusion, this Chapter has presented the reading, phonological awareness and oral narrative abilities of my study children. When using the standard assessment lens to ‘look’ at the children, they presented as deficient, but when using an alternative lens multiple interpretations emerged. The children presented as capable and able bilingual and bicultural learners. This challenges the deficit construction of Māori children in the education system, and strongly re-constructs them as achieving learners. This leads me into my concluding comments and implications.
Chapter Seven
Conclusions and Implications – Weaving the Threads

My study set out to challenge the deficit discourse that prevails in Aotearoa New Zealand. At a macro-level I have outlined the historical construction of Māori children as deficient learners in the education system since colonization, illustrated how this discourse has been perpetuated and voiced my concern that it continues today. At a micro-level, I explored the learning environments for a group of Māori children and the ways they responded to literacy related language assessments, developed with monolingual, monocultural children. I found that my study children were living their lives as bilingual Māori-English and bicultural Māori-Pākehā citizens within their homes and communities, and that this has implications for their learning. They responded to the language assessments in ways that, because they fell outside the expected ‘standard’, positioned them as deficient learners. I will discuss this, but before doing so I want to signal that this thesis has opened up the space between these macro and micro levels. There is a relationship between the two. At the micro-level, the ways that we, as educationalists with authority to make decisions about children, go about our daily practices perpetuates the macro-level deficit thinking about Māori children. The problem lies with a lack of knowledge and understanding about how we do this. However, knowledge and understanding is not sufficient to change this ongoing deficit recycling. We need to have the opportunity to reflect on our practices using a range of theoretical frames that allow us to be critical and open to transformation.

Paolo Freire (1970) created the process of conscientisation, resistance and transformative praxis in relation to emancipation of oppressed peoples. And Graham Hingangaroa Smith (1999) modified this into a cyclic process, in which Māori were positioned at differing points, in their struggle for cultural survival and emancipation. As I see it this is an appropriate process for Pākehā. However I do not believe that evolving conscientisation will be achieved until we have
the opportunity to learn about the macro history and reflect on our micro practices. From my viewpoint, the space will then open up for dialogue, to promote conscientisation, resistance and transformation. My thesis has gnawed at this space, opened it and created the potential for more dialogue.

My micro-level findings place my study children as capable and achieving learners who are bilingual and bicultural. However as I noted above, when the children responded to the literacy-related language assessments in ways that deviated from the ‘standard’, this ‘standard’ positioned them as deficient learners, promoting the perpetuation of deficiency construction. These assessments however, had been developed according to monolingual, monocultural knowledge, and were examples of the ‘standard’ valued in the education system of Aotearoa New Zealand. As stated in Chapter four, being bilingual and bicultural has implications for school learning. It is obvious that the ‘standard’ tests are inappropriate for bilingual, bicultural children, because these children bring a different set of language strengths to the classroom.

My study children demonstrated linguistic strengths in phonological awareness that were in line with the research related to phonological awareness development for bilingual children. They used the CV syllable as a base linguistic unit for reading ngā reo Māori and English. Their knowledge of the CV structure and vowel was strongly aligned with te reo Māori, and the CVC syllable and consonant English-specific. This supports the notion that phonological awareness for bilinguals reflects the salient structural characteristics of the languages they are exposed to. Further, regardless of how well or poorly the children performed in the PIPA phonological awareness tasks, especially for phonemic awareness which is considered essential for learning to read English, my study children were proficient bilinguals and the older children also proficient readers of English. The importance of phonological awareness ability for a number of Māori children is therefore questionable, given these findings, and the research indicating that
phonological awareness for syllabic languages (such as Māori) is not crucial for reading development.

The children told narratives that showed a variety and complexity in form and content. At times they told stories utilizing the linear structure, and at times they told in cyclical ways, in keeping with Patricia Grace and Ngāhuia Te Awekotuku, and Uncle Rewi who told stories in cycles. As for phonological awareness, the narrative form valued in the education system is narrow and lacks accountability for evaluating children’s knowledge based on bilingual and bicultural practices.

The children in my study were proficient bilingual speakers, and the older children were proficient readers of English. It is clear from my research that a number of Māori children use alternative routes to reading proficiency, routes available for bilingual and bicultural learners. This means that the ‘standard’ language assessments used in the education system are linguistically and culturally inappropriate. Their use only serves to compare Māori children with monolingual and monocultural Pākehā children, to the detriment of Māori. Yet Māori children are more advanced in their linguistic skills in comparison to Pākehā, because they are bilingual.

**Implications**

New Zealanders, in particular educationalists, need to know and understand the macro-level historical construction of Māori children as deficient learners. In addition they need to know at a micro-level how their day to day practices in classrooms perpetuate this construction. For transformation to take place educationalists also need time to reflect on their practices and be provided with opportunities to enter into a space for dialogue. As I stated earlier, it is not until we get to this point that conscientisation can begin.
Transformation in thinking needs to happen at all levels of education - Ministry of Education, academics and researchers, teachers, pre-service teachers, and educational personnel such as Speech-Language Therapists, Resource Teachers of Learning and Behaviour, Resource Teachers of Literacy and so on. The literacy related language assessments we currently use are linguistically and culturally inappropriate for a number of Māori children, and must not be used. Assessments that are linguistically and culturally appropriate need to be developed, so that Māori children are safe from being ‘choked’ at school.

The children in my study demonstrated that Māori children must be re-constructed as able and capable learners, who are ‘at-promise’.
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Appendix 1

Glossary of Māori Terms

āe yes
ao world; day; dawn; cloud; excellent
Aotearoa New Zealand
aperikota apricot
hapū sub-tribe
hoata new moon
hōmai give me
hui meeting
kai food
kaiako teacher
kāinga home, village
kapahaka a Māori song and dance group
karakia prayer-chant
kaumātua elder, old man
kaupapa rule; basic idea; topic; plan
kāwhe calf
kē already; different
ketē basket, kit
ki to; into; against; at; with; by means of
kō digging stick; chip; over there!; birdsong
ko used before definite article
koe you
komiti committee
kōrero speak; news; converse; quotation
kuia old lady
kura school
mā white; clean; for; by; by way of; and; and others
mataku afraid
me and (used between nouns); if; with; please
mokopuna grandchild
ngā the (plural)
ngō to grunt; cry
Pākehā  not Māori, European
pānui  announcement
rangihia  sky; weather; tune; day
reo  language
taniwha  water monster
taha  side	
							
tamariki  children
te  the (singular)

tere o Māori  the Māori language
tikanga  custom, rule	
							
tino rangatiratanga  self-determination
tuna  eel

 Ūenuku  Chief of Hawaiki
waiata  song

whāea  mother, aunt

whakapapa  genealogical table; cultural identity

whakatauāki  proverb

whānau  the wider family, but can also refer to a community group of people such as a research group

whare hui  meeting house

Appendix 2  The Department of Education 1880 Native Schools Code 1889.

NEW ZEALAND.

EDUCATION: NATIVE SCHOOLS.

Presented to both Houses of the General Assembly by command of His Excellency.

THE NATIVE SCHOOLS CODE.

A code of Rules and Regulations is published for the guidance of Native School Teachers, and of others concerned in the education of the Maori race.

I.—THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW SCHOOLS.

1. If at least ten Maoris, actually residing in any locality, petition the Minister for Education for a Native School, and if they, or any of them, offer to give at least two acres of land suitable for a school site, and promise further, to make such contribution in money or in kind towards the cost of school buildings as the Minister may require, the Government may establish a school in that locality; provided that (1) the Organising Inspector of Native Schools report favourably on the site offered; (2) that the Natives give the Government a power to purchase the site; and (3) that they satisfy the Government that the district will keep up an average attendance of thirty at the school.

2. When the preliminaries have been satisfactorily settled, the Government will provide a schoolhouse and a teachers' residence suited to the wants of the district. The whole of the land will be properly fenced in, and a plot of ground about one quarter of an acre in extent will be enclosed with a neat picket fence for a garden. The teacher will be expected to keep this constantly in good order, and to make it, if possible, the modelisation of the village.

II.—TEACHERS.

1. Suitable persons will be selected to take charge of the schools. As a rule the Government will appoint a married couple, the husband to act as master of the school, and the wife as sewing mistress. The master will be expected to teach the native children to read and write the English language, and to speak it. He will further, induct them in the rudiments of arithmetic and of geography, and generally endeavour to give them such culture as may fit them to become good citizens.

2. It is not intended that the duties of the teacher should be confined to the mere school instruction of the Maori children. On the contrary, it is expected that the teachers will by their kindness, their diligence, and their probity, exercise a beneficial influence on all the natives in their district. (A circular dealing more fully with this matter than it can be dealt with in a code of regulations has been sent to all the teachers of Native Schools.)

3. It is not necessary that teachers should, at the time of their appointment, be acquainted with the Maori tongue. In all cases English is to be used by the teacher when he is instructing the senior classes. In the junior classes the Maori language may be used for the purpose of making the children acquainted with the meaning of English words and sentences. The aim of the teacher however, should be to dispense with the use of Maori as soon as possible.

(4.) In all cases teachers will be expected to live in the houses provided for them, unless their residing elsewhere has been sanctioned by the Department.

III.—CONDUCT OF THE SCHOOL.

1. In every Native School there shall be a time table used. This document is to be hung up in a conspicuous position in the school-room, and its directions are to be always strictly followed. Every item of school work shall begin and end exactly at the time indicated in the time table. If the teacher finds that he cannot work by the table, he shall alter it, and continue to do so until the precepts of the document and the actual work done are in thorough accord.

2. The master shall keep the school register correctly, and shall post his quarterly returns within fourteen days after the end of each quarter. Any infringement of this rule will be very strictly dealt with. No salary will be paid to any teacher if and so long as his returns are more than one month in arrear.

3. Teachers will be required to instruct the children in the subjects mentioned in the Standards set forth in the 6th section of this code. Teachers should endeavour to make the instruction as thorough as possible. Quality rather than quantity is the thing required. Especially while giving their English lessons the teachers should bear this in mind. No reading lesson should be looked upon as finally disposed of until all the children thoroughly know the meaning of every sentence and word in it, and, in the case of senior classes, are able to reproduce the substance of the entire lesson. The children should be able, too, to pronounce every word accurately, and to spell it, or write it from dictation.

IV.—NATIVE SCHOOL STANDARDS OF EDUCATION.

STANDARD I.

Reading.—To read English sentences made up of easy words of one syllable.

Spelling.—To spell easy words of one syllable.

Writing.—To copy on slates easy words from the black-board, to transcribe from the wall-cards, and to form figures neatly.

English.—To know the English names of all the animals, to know the English names of the parts of the body, to know the English names of the clothes, and to be able to name these when asked for them in any two or three (e.g. one eye, two eyes; one man, two men: one child, two children, three children.)

Arithmetic.—To know the addition tables, to count up to 100, and to read, from the black-board, numbers up to 999.

Sewing.—Girls to thread needles and to hem.

STANDARD II.

Reading.—To read sentences made up of words of one syllable, and very easy words of two syllables.

Spelling.—To spell the words in the reading lesson.

Writing.—To transcribe from the Primer neatly (on slates), and to write neatly in an elementary copy-book.

English.—To translate Maori words such as eho, te, ma, into English, and to know the meaning of very easy English sentences, such as, "He laughs," "I see you." Also, to know the names of things represented in the wall-pictures, and of the parts of these things. (In the case of the picture of a fish, for instance, the children should know the names of the head, the tail, the fins, and the gills.)

Arithmetic.—To know the subtraction tables, and the multiplication table up to six times seven, and to carry out simple addition and subtraction tables in multiplication.

Geography.—To know the names of the cardinal and the four intermediate points, both on the map and on the horizon.

Sewing.—Girls to sew, and to stitch a hem.
STANDARD III.

Reading.—To read and understand the “Second Royal Reader,” and to give in English the meanings of the words and the sentences.

Spelling.—To write correctly from dictation sentences taken from the Primer.

Writing.—To write small-hand neatly in a copy-book.

English.—To be able to describe familiar objects or actions. (For example, the examiner holds up a little piece of pencil and asks what it is. The pupil should be able to say “That is a short pencil.” The examiner raises his hand and asks what he has done. The pupil replies “You raised your hand, sir.” Also, to understand clearly the difference between such expressions as “This boy,” “That boy,” “These boys,” “Those boys.”

Composition.—To translate sentences into English from “Yo se A-mai a Wila.”

Arithmetic.—Subtraction, long multiplication, short division, long division.

Mental Arithmetic.—The first four rules and the money tables.

Geography.—To know the map of New Zealand, and to answer very easy questions on the physical and political geography of the Colony. The pupil should be able to answer such questions as these:—

“This is the largest of the towns in the Bay of Plenty?” “Why do so many of the New Zealand steamers go to Russell, although it is but a very small town?” “Why is the climate of Hokianga warmer than that of Stewart Island?” “Why are the rivers on the East Coast of the South Island longer than those on the West Coast?”

Sewing.—Girls to stitch, to sew on strings, and to be learning to fix all work up to this stage.

STANDARD IV.

Reading.—To read the “Third Royal Reader” with proper expression, and to thoroughly comprehend the meaning of what is read.

Spelling.—To write from dictation a short paragraph from the “Second Royal Reader.”

Writing.—To write a good, plain round hand.

English.—To speak and to understand English fairly well, and to clearly understand the difference between such expressions as I see, I saw, I shall see, I had seen, I may see, &c.

Composition.—To reproduce the substance of a short fable or story, or to write a letter on some familiar subject.

Arithmetic.—To know the compound rules and reduction, and to work problems involving the use of these and the more elementary rules.

Geography.—To know the map of the world, and to answer easy questions on political and on physical geography. The pupil should be able to answer such questions as these: — “What sea does the Dardanelles form?” “Why do white people living in India require to have all work done for them by the Natives?” “If a ship came to Auckland from Mauritius, what would her cargo probably be?” “If this vessel sailed from Auckland for England, what would she take with her?” “When the wind is blowing strongly from the S.W. it is generally cold; why is that?”

Sewing.—To fi all work required for Standard III, to do button-holing, to sew on buttons, to darn stockings, and to be learning to knit stockings.

EXTRA SUBJECTS.

All the classes will be examined in singing and drill, and the two upper classes in elementary drawing.

V.—SCHOLARSHIPS, PRIZES, &c.

(1.) The Government has in contemplation the drawing up of a scheme under which Maori children may receive scholarships to enable them to prosecute their studies after leaving the village schools. Whatever plan may be finally adopted, one of its chief features will be, that the scholarships will be given to the most proficient of the children who have regularly passed all the Native School Standards.

(2.) Prizes for regular attendance shall be given to the children belonging to Native Schools. The allowance shall be at the rate of 3s. per child (on the strict average attendance for the year). The prizes shall consist of useful articles of clothing. No child that has been absent from school for more than one-tenth of the whole school term shall be entitled to a prize.

(3.) Every child passing the examination for the Third or for the Fourth Standard shall receive from the Inspector a certificate of his having passed. This certificate shall be passed on the inside of the cover of a strongly bound book of tales or fables such as are likely to be interesting to young Maoris. The book shall be called a "Reward Book," and shall be the property of the child.

(4.) The Government will give a subsidy of £1 for £1 to a reasonable amount, for the purpose of providing the material for such games as cricket, quoits, foot-ball, croquet, and lawn-tennis. This material is to be used by the scholars only. The master will be expected to take charge of it and to see that it is not lost.

(5.) Books and material that are no longer fit for use in school may be condemned in the presence of some Government officer. They may then be stamped, and distributed among the children for use at home.

(6.) It is desirable that Maori children should learn singing and acquire a taste for music generally. The Government will therefore grant a subsidy of £1 for £1 to districts in which the Maoris subscribe money for the purchase of an harmonium.

VI.—MATERIAL FOR SEWING.

(1.) The Government will send to every sewing mistress a stock of material, such as calico, prints, wincey, flannel, and durganze, and of implements such as needles, thimbles, scissors, &c. This material shall be made up into useful articles of dress by the girls at their sewing lessons. These articles shall then be sold to the Maoris, for cash, at the cost price of the materials. The sewing mistress of each school will be required to keep a Dr. and Cr. account of materials received and articles sold. At the end of the year this account must be closed, and the value of the balance of materials on hand must be carried forward to the next year's account.

VII.—GIRLS MAY BOARD WITH TEACHERS.

(1.) Married teachers may receive into their houses, one by one, the girls belonging to their schools, if the Department is satisfied that proper arrangements are made for their reception. Girls so received into a teacher's house shall learn to do the work of the house, but shall attend school regularly, and shall be treated as boarders and not as servants. They shall remain in the house for three months each, and the teacher will receive from the Department an allowance of £2 for the board and lodging of a girl for that period. In special cases the time may be extended to six months, and the allowance to £4.

VIII.—PERIODICALS SUPPLIED.

(1.) The Department will be prepared to supply to any Native School the "Illustrated London News," the "Graphic," or "Harper's Weekly." The papers are to be kept at the school for one month for the use of the children. They are then to be handed over to the Chief of the district in order that the Maoris in the settlement may have an opportunity of seeing them. The Chief will return them before receiving a fresh supply. These periodicals will be forwarded regularly to the Masters that send in applications for them. The papers must be cut and stripped as soon as they arrive at the school.

IX.—CLASSIFICATION OF TEACHERS.

(1.) The Teachers of Native Schools shall be divided into five classes, viz.:—Uncertified Teachers; Fourth Class, Third Class, Second Class, and First Class Certified Teachers.

(2.) Teachers already employed by the Department will be classified according to their efficiency as gauged by their past success. Any such teacher objecting to the classification offered him may undergo an examination and try to gain a higher position. In the event of his being unsuccessful, he will in no case lose the position already assigned to him.

(3.) Teachers wishing to be examined may at any time give notice to the Department to that effect. Arrangements will be made for holding the examination within six months after the date of such notice.

(4.) The subjects of examination with the marks assigned to each subject are the following—
Reading.—To read a passage from an English author with proper emphasis and expression, and to give the meaning of the words and sentences therein contained. MARKS. 200

Writing, Spelling, and Composition.—To write a neat legible hand, to spell correctly from dictation, and to write a short essay on a familiar subject. 200

Arithmetic.—The Simple and the Compound Rules, and Reduction: Fractions, vulgar and decimal; Practice, Interest, and Proportion, with easy problems founded on those rules. 200

Geography.—To know the Map of the World and the Map of New Zealand, to have a fair general knowledge of political and physical geography, and to be able to draw from memory a sketch map of New Zealand. 200

Maori.—To know Williams's "First Lessons in Maori," to translate a passage from the Maori Bible, and to translate into Maori sentences from "To be X out a WH". Parts I and II. 400

New Zealand History, etc.—The history of the discovery of New Zealand; Maori traditions; indigenous productions, and their uses: Maori customs: physical peculiarities of New Zealand; the history of the New Zealand war.

The following works are referred to as indicating the lines which the examination in this subject will take—Sir G. Grey's Maori books, "3d New Zealand Cylinder," Suller's "Forty Years in New Zealand," Gudgeon's "History of the War," "Wells's History of Tararua," "Cook's Voyages," Taylor's "The Maori Maori." Much useful knowledge may be gained from papers in the Transactions of the New Zealand Institute.

The Art of Teaching.—Questions will be set on the subject generally, and on the practical management of Maori Schools.

Total 2000

(3.) In order to pass in any class candidates will have to satisfy the examiner in reading, writing, spelling, composition, and arithmetic.

In order to pass in the 2nd or the 1st Class candidates must satisfy the examiner in New Zealand history, and in the Art of Teaching.

(4.) Candidates who gain 1000 marks will rank as 4th Class Teachers.

600 = 3rd
500 = 2nd
400 = 1st
300 = Nil

(5.) Teachers will be further classified with reference to the length of time they have been engaged in teaching in Native Schools. A Master that has served less than two years will be a "Probationer"; one that has served more than two and less than five years will be a "Junior," a Master that has served more than five years will be a "Senior," provided that his school has received favourable reports during the whole of that time. Thus, a Junior Third Class Native School Teacher would be a Master that had obtained 600 marks at the examination, and had been master of a Native School for more than two years and less than five.

X.—SALARIES OF TEACHERS.

(1.) The head teacher in every Native School shall receive a fixed salary of £80 per annum and be provided with a freehouse. In addition to this he shall receive increment to his salary as follows:—

(a.) For holding rank as Senior Teacher .... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... £3 10s. per annum.
Junior Teacher .... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... £1 10s. per annum.
Probationer .... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... Nil.

(b.) For an average attendance of 20 but not more than 30 the teacher shall receive £10

= 30 = 40 = 50 = 60 = 70 = 80

These increments will be given for the working average. Ordinarily, the allowance for average attendance will be calculated on the basis of the attendance during the preceding calendar year, but will be subject to revision in case of any marked change during the year for which the allowance is made.

(c.) If three-fourths of the children on the roll that have attended school for two years, have passed Standard I, the teacher shall receive £10
If one-third of the children on the roll, that have attended school for two years, have passed Standard II, .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... ... £10
If one-fifth of the children on the roll, that have attended school for two years, have passed Standard III, .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... ... £10
If one-eighth of the children on the roll, that have attended school for two years, have passed Standard IV, .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... .... ... £10

Whenever the number of children who have passed any standard happens to be lower than two consecutive numbers, of which the higher would have given more than the number of passers required to secure an increment to the teacher, the Inspector shall decide whether the teacher ought to receive the increment or not. (For example,—Twenty-one children are qualified to be sent up for examination in Standard III. If four of these children pass and the others fail, the teacher is not entitled to any increment. If, however, the children that have failed to pass have answered fairly, the Inspector may, at his discretion, recommend that the teacher receive the increment.)

In schools that have been in operation less than two years, only half the number of passers will be required, but all the children will be counted. Thus, in a new school of twenty-eight children, five second Standard passers would give the teacher the allowance for that Standard.

At least two children must pass in any Standard to entitle the teacher to receive the increment for passes in that Standard.

(6.) If the Teacher holds a 3rd Class Certificate he shall receive the sum of £10

= 3rd = 2nd = 1st

= 10 = 20 = 40

(6.) It will be seen that the salary will range from £80 to £225. Thus, the master of a school of 35 children, holding a 3rd Class Certificate, having served four years, and passing his school in Standards I and III, would be entitled to a salary of £119 per annum.

(7.) When such an arrangement can be made, the wife or daughter of the teacher shall be sewing mistress of the school at an annual salary of £20. She shall devote two hours three times a week to the work of teaching the girls sewing and knitting.

(8.) If the average attendance at a school is more than 30, the sewing mistress may be appointed must be appointed on the recommendation of the Inspector. In that case it will be her duty to attend school every afternoon, and, should occasion arise, at other times also, and to assist the master with the literary work of the school as well as to take charge of the sewing. Her salary shall then be at the rate of £35 per annum.

(9.) When the average attendance at a school is more than 50, and the sewing mistress is unable or unwilling to undertake literary work in the school, a female assistant may be appointed at a salary negotiated with the Inspector for various duties.

(10.) No pupil teachers shall in future be appointed in Maori schools.

XI.—SCHOOL REGISTER.

(1.) The attendance of the scholars in each school shall be registered every morning and every afternoon, at a convenient time within the school hours, in a form which shall be furnished by the Education Department.

(2.) The average daily attendance shall be ascertained by dividing the total number of morning and afternoon attendances taken together, by the total number of times, (mornings and afternoons reckoned separately), that the school has been open during the period for which the computation is made. The school shall be held to be open if any child be present before the first half-hour of the school time has passed, but in order that the increment to teachers' salaries for average attendance may not be unduly affected by bad weather, epidemics, or any unusual occurrence, a second computation of average shall be made, by throwing out of account the mornings and the afternoons on which the attendance was less than one-half of the number of children than belonging to the school.
XII.—THE USE OF THE SCHOOL ROOM.

1. The school-room is to be used as a school-room only. The teacher shall not allow it to be put to any other purpose whatever. If the people in the district wish religious services to be held in it, they must make application to the Minister for Education and obtain his sanction. In cases in which this has been obtained and service has been held in the school, the room must always be properly cleaned and set in order for the school work of the following day, at the cost of the persons who have had the use of the school.

XIII.—TEXT BOOKS AND MATERIAL.

1. Books, apiances, and material other than those enumerated in the following list are not to be used without the express permission of the Department:

- Royal Reader Wall Cards.
- Royal Reader Primers.
- Royal Readers, I to III.
- All the Sequels to these books.
- Vere Foster's Copy Books.
- Plain ruled Exercise books.
- Hand small Arithmetic.
- Betts Portable Globe.
- Map of New Zealand.
- Map of the Pacific Ocean.
- Black boards.
- Easels.
- Wilkie's First English Book, parts I and II.
- Petrie's Table Books.
- Harris's Drawing Books, parts I and II.
- Mouladius.
- Calfskin.
- Primers.
- Flannel.
- Dungarees.
- Cotton.
- Trousers.
- Hooks and Eyes.
- Buttons.
- Needles.

2. The following books will be supplied for the use of teachers:

- New Zealand Dictionary.
- Child's Larger Geography.
- Petrie's New Zealand Geography.
- Lake's Object Lessons.
- Graham's School Method.

3. The following articles for school cleaning will be supplied to every school:

- American Brooms.
- Gahamined Iron Buckets.
- Hand Scrubbing Brushes.
- House Flannel.
- Dusters.

4. Requisites for books and materials are to be carefully prepared by the teacher and given to the Organizing Inspector at his second visit in each year.

XIV.—HOLIDAYS.

1. (1) The following books will be observed as holidays in all Native Schools. 1st Saturdays and Sundays, Good Friday, Easter Monday, the 14th of May, the 1st of November, the week following the last Sunday in June, and the weeks following the 15th of December. On all other days of the year the schools shall be opened, and the masters shall be present at their duty. In the case of the illness of the master, the sewing mistress shall, if possible, take his place temporarily.

2. (1) It shall be the duty of the master to make a record in a book (to be called the "Log Book") of every instance in which this rule is transgressed, and to state the reason for the transgression.

3. Under certain circumstances, the absence may be granted by the master. This can be obtained only with the direct sanction of the Department.

XV.—SCHOOL HOURS.

The net time devoted to school work shall be four hours daily, viz., from 10 to 12 and from 1 to 3. There are to be no "intervals" either at morning or afternoo school.

XVI.—SCHOOL COMMITTEES.

1. Every district shall have a committee of five persons, elected annually by the parents of the children in the district. The committee shall all be Maoris or half-castes, unless it is otherwise allowed by the Governor-in-Council.

2. The principal duty of the committee is to see that a proper average attendance is maintained at the school.

3. The members of the committee shall assemble once a month for the purpose of deliberating as to the best means of keeping up the attendance at the school.

4. The committee shall see that there is a proper supply of firewood for the use of the school, and shall arrange matters so that the schoolroom may be cleaned every night, and scrubbed out at least once a month.

5. The school committee may, on the recommendation of the Superintendent any complaint they may have with regard to the school. The District Superintendent will transmit the complaint to the Department, if the matter complained of be of sufficient moment. It is the duty of the committee to interfere with the teacher personally in any way. That officer has the sole charge of the schoolhouse, the residence, and the grounds, and is responsible to the Department and to the Department of General Education.

XVII.—FALLING OFF IN THE ATTENDANCE.

1. (1) If the attendance at a school should from any cause suddenly decrease considerably, or if after vacation the children should not at once assemble, the master shall at once report the fact to the District Superintendent, who will endeavor to ascertain the cause of the falling off in order that he may report the same to the Department.

2. (2) When the attendance at a school of a high-class master shall fall off, it is found that such decrease has not taken place through the fault of the teacher, he will be removed to a better school as soon as possible, and his place taken by a teacher of lower rank.

3. (3) On the average attendance at any school fall below 15, the Government may at its discretion close the school.

XVIII.—NATIVE SCHOOLS MAY BECOME BOARD SCHOOLS.

As soon as the Organizing Inspector shall report that all the children in a native school district have made sufficient progress in English to enable them to work for the "Standards of Education" with advantage, the Native School in that district may be transferred to the Board of the Education District in which the school is situated.
XIX.—EUROPEAN CHILDREN AT NATIVE SCHOOLS.

(1.) Where the parents desire it, there is no objection to the children of Europeans attending a Native School. In such cases, however, the master will bear in mind that the object for which his school has been established is the instruction of Maori children. He will let nothing interfere injuriously with this his proper work.

(2.) In a mixed school the records of the attendances of Maoris and Europeans are to be kept separate.

XX.—FENCING.

The Department will entertain favourably all proposals for the complete fencing-in of Native School sites, if the titles have been secured to the Government.

XXI.—INSPECTOR.

The Organizing Inspector shall visit every native school twice yearly—once to examine the school and report upon it, and once for the purpose of organizing and improving it. In cases in which the school is difficult of access, the second visit may immediately follow the inspection. At least four weeks notice of an approaching visit of inspection shall be given.

XXII.—DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT.

(1.) A District Superintendent may be appointed to exercise supervision over several schools. The District Superintendent will visit each school twice yearly. At these visits he will take note of the attendance at the school, and of the repairs and additions that the buildings may require. He shall be at liberty to give the Inspector information of anything connected with the schools that it may appear to be desirable for him to know.

(2.) The committee and teacher of every school will be informed of the name of the Superintendent of the District to which the school is situated.

(3.) The correspondence between any school and the Education Department shall pass through the hands of the District Superintendent.

(4.) If in any district there be no District Superintendent, the committee and teachers will be instructed as to the channel through which correspondence is to be carried on.

XXIII.—WHO ARE TO BE CONSIDERED “NAIVES?”

The word “Naives” in this code shall be taken to mean Maoris and half-castes.

XXIV.—CODE COMES INTO FORCE.

This code shall come into operation on the 1st August, 1880, but the regulations affecting the salaries of teachers shall not be in force until 1st April, 1881.

WM. ROBERTSON.

DIRECTIONS FOR TEACHERS OF NATIVE SCHOOLS.

Circular Memorandum for Teachers of Native Schools.

I am directed by the Minister for Education to send you the circular referred to in Section II subsection 2 of the Native Schools Code. Information gathered from various sources enables the Department to say that the more closely you conform to the directions here given as to the relations that should subsist between the teacher and the Maori, the greater will be your success as a Master of a Native School.

Besides giving due attention to the school instruction of the children, teachers will be expected to exercise a beneficial influence on the Natives, old and young, to show by their own conduct that it is possible to live a useful and blameless life, and in smaller matters, by their dress, in their houses, and by their manners and habits at home and abroad, to set the Maoris an example that they may advantageously imitate.

The Department would especially call your attention to the fact that it is extremely advisable that teachers should always keep their houses and gardens neat and tidy. In this matter the natives are, as a rule, very careless. It is highly necessary that teachers should be on their guard against allowing their own habits to degenerate under the influence of surrounding negligence. They ought rather to exert a steady influence tending to the elevation of the people among whom they live.

You are particularly cautioned against entering into close personal alliance with any clique or party of the Natives. Still less should you ever permit yourself to assume a hostile attitude towards any individual or party in the district in which your work lies.

The Government will not allow teachers to trade with the Natives, or in any way to endeavour to gain pecuniary advantage from them.

The discipline in a Maori School should be mild and firm. Maori children when in school are so easily managed that you should hardly ever have much difficulty in dealing with them. You should, if possible, avoid inflicting corporal punishment. If you should ever have to resort to it, you will record the fact in your Log Book.

In not a few districts teachers have found themselves able to fulfill all those requirements, positive and negative. It is the wish of the Government that all Native School teachers should at any rate strive to reach the standard here set before them.

John Holroyd,
Secretary.

Education Department, Wellington, 4th June, 1880.

By Authority: GEORGE DIXON, Government Printer, Wellington.—1880.
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Evaluation Tasks for Syllable, Onset-Rime and Phoneme Awareness

Syllable Awareness
a. Syllable segmentation, for example, “How many parts (syllables) in the word table?” (Dodd, Holm, Oerlemans, & McCormick, 1996).
b. Syllable completion, for example, “Here is a picture of a rabbit. I’ll say the first part of the word. Can you finish the word ra____?” (Muter, Hulme, & Snowling, 1997).
c. Syllable identity, for example, “Which part of racket and locket sound the same?” (Dodd et al., 1996).
d. Syllable deletion, for example, “Say finish. Now say it again without the fin” (Rosner, 1999).

Onset-Rime Awareness
a. Spoken rhyme recognition, for example, “Do these words rhyme? jar / tar?” (Dodd et al., 1996)
b. Spoken rhyme detection or rhyme oddity, for example, “Which one doesn’t belong. rake – snake – cake – corn?” (Dodd, Crosbie, McIntosh, Teitzel, & Ozanne, 2000).
c. Spoken rhyme generation, for example, “Tell me words that rhyme with bell” (Muter et al., 1997).
d. Onset-rime blending (Wagner, Torgesen, Laughon, Simmons, & Rashotte, 1993).

Phoneme Awareness
a. Alliteration awareness (also called phoneme detection and sound/phoneme categorisation, for example, “Let’s look at the pictures in this book. Three of the words start with the same sound. One doesn’t. See if you can work out which one doesn’t belong. duck – door – dog – cake” (Dodd et al., 2000).
b. Phoneme matching, for example, “Which word begins with the same sound as bat: horn, bed, cup?” (Torgesen & Bryant, 1994).
c. Phoneme completion, for example, “Here is a picture of a watch. Finish the word for me: wa____” (Muter et al., 1997).
d. Phoneme blending with words or nonsense words, for example, “What word do these sounds make: m – oo – n?” (Wagner et al., 1999).
e. Phoneme deletion, for example, “What would told sound like without the t?” (Dodd et al., 1996).
f. Phoneme segmentation of words or nonsense words, for example, “How many sounds can you hear in the word big?” (Dodd et al., 1996).
g. Phoneme reversal, for example, “Say na (as in nap). Now say na backwards” – an (Wagner et al., 1999).
h. Phoneme manipulation, for example, “Say dash. Now say it again, but instead of a, say i” – dish (Rosner, 1999).
i. Spoonerisms, for example, sit fun becomes fit sun, (Dodd et al., 1996).
j. Phoneme identification, for example, “What is the first sound in the word fish?” (Dodd et al., 2000).
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Phonological and Syllable Features of te reo Māori (Bauer, 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant Phonemes (in phonetics) and Graphemes</th>
<th>Vowel Phonemes (in phonetics) and Graphemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>/i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>/e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>/a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>/u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>/o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ŋ/ (ng) (a digraph)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/f/ (wh) (a digraph)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/h/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/w/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vowels can be lengthened or combined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>ā</th>
<th>ae</th>
<th>ai</th>
<th>ao</th>
<th>au</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>eo</td>
<td>eu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>ī</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>ie</td>
<td>io</td>
<td>iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>oa</td>
<td>oe</td>
<td>oi</td>
<td>ou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ua</td>
<td>ue</td>
<td>ui</td>
<td>uo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seven most frequent phonemes (in phonetics) spoken during conversational speech:

/ a, i, t, e, k, ɔ, u / (Bauer, 1993).

Syllable Structure

The vowel forms the nucleus of the syllable, with the option of a preceding consonant, or an added vowel to create a combination: (C)V(V). The (C)V reo Māori syllable structure in has been called a mora (Bauer, 1993).

Speech Rhythm

Māori is a syllable-timed language that was recorded according to an alphabetic orthography, in particular the Latin alphabet. However Maori relates more to a syllabic language in which the consonant is linked to an inherent vowel. However Maori differs in the respect that all the consonants can be linked to a, i, o, e or u. Sometimes Maori is referred to as mora-timed, with syllables that occupy equal time.
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Phonological and Syllable Features of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonant Phonemes (in phonetics) and Graphemes</th>
<th>Vowel Phonemes (in phonetics) and Graphemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/p/   (p) pet</td>
<td>/ei/   make, rain, day, eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/b/   (b) big</td>
<td>/i/    me, eat, key, see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/t/   (t) tie</td>
<td>/ai/   tie, my, kite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/d/   (d) duck</td>
<td>/ou/   go, boat, know, toe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/k/   (k) key, cat</td>
<td>/u/    two, suit, boot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/g/   (g) go</td>
<td>/a/    cat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/m/   (m) man</td>
<td>/e/    pet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/n/   (n) net</td>
<td>/ə/    sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ŋ/   (ng) sing</td>
<td>/o/    pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/f/   (f) fan, tough, phone</td>
<td>/u/    cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/v/   (v) van</td>
<td>/u/    foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/s/   (s) sun</td>
<td>/ɛ/    stir, her, fur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/z/   (z) zoo</td>
<td>/ə/    four, saw, for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/θ/   (th) teeth</td>
<td>/a/    car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ð/   (th) the</td>
<td>/ɔɪ/   boy, coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʃ/   (sh) shoe</td>
<td>/au/   cow, shout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʒ/   (zh) pleasure</td>
<td>/ə/    schwa vowel, a short sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/tʃ/  (ch) chook, watch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/dʒ/  (j) jar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/l/   (l) lemon,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r/   (r) read, write</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/j/   (y) yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/w/   (w) wet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/h/   (h) hen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seven most frequent phonemes (in phonetics) spoken during conversational speech: /t, n, s, d, r/ (Weiss, Gordon & Lillywhite, 1987).

Syllable Structure
The vowel forms the nucleus of the syllable, with the option of a preceding or following consonant: (C)V(C). Further consonants can be added: (C)(C)(C) V (C)(C)(C).

Speech Rhythm
English is a stress-timed language, in which syllables last for various amounts of time. The vowels in the unstressed syllables become schwa vowels.
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The information sheet given to the parents about the study. This was similar for all the Research Whānau adults.

University of Canterbury
Education Department

Information Sheet for Parents/Caregivers

Kia ora,

We have talked about a research study to find out about reading development for Maori children in schools. Your child is invited to take part in this study. If you approve of your child’s involvement please complete your written permission on the attached ‘Consent Form’.

This project is being carried out as a requirement for a PhD by Fleur Harris under the supervision of Drs Baljit Kaur and Helen Clothier who can be contacted at 366-7001. They will be pleased to discuss any concerns you may have about taking part in this project.

What is the aim of this study?
To find out how Maori children in a mainstream and bilingual school develop their bilingual and bicultural oral language skills, and English reading abilities, from 5 to 6 years of age.

What is involved for my child in this study?
Your child will take part in:
1. Story telling activities with the classroom teacher or myself and a member from the Maori community. Your child will be read or told a story and then be asked to retell it. This will be video taped, the retellings written down as the child has said them and studied according to how the stories are told.
2. Speech sound awareness games in English and te reo Maori. Your child will be asked to listen to the sounds in words and point to pictures. These activities will happen at least three to four times over the year, about one and a half hours at each time. This time will be broken up into half hour time slots so that your child will not become tired.

Is there any other information you want to find out about?
Yes, I also want to find out about the following. This will not take any extra time for your child.
1. Your child’s bilingual language, through observations and conversations with you and your child.
2. The type of reading tasks in the classroom, take copies of reading information and other school subjects as appropriate, that the teacher records for your child.
3. Your child’s telling of their own stories, which may be told during morning talk times or in the playground. These will be audiotaped, written down and studied according to how stories are told.
4. What your child thinks about the reading books they have read in the classroom and what they mean to him/her.
5. Your child’s medical history especially for ears and eyes, which would be gained from yourself and with your permission, your child’s doctor.
6. Your child’s general background, your background, the history of the school and how it works now, and background of the teacher and school principal.

Is there anything else I should know about this research?
Yes. I hope that a school/community research whanau will develop and be central to this study. It is planned that hui with this whanau will make sure that it: ensures the study is acceptable; is kept informed of it’s progress; ensures that the study is culturally safe for all involved and advises changes when necessary.

How confidential will my involvement and my child’s involvement be?
Confidentiality for all people involved – your child, your family, school and school personnel, is assured at all times. Personal and school names will be replaced with false names. All information will be securely stored in a cabinet in the Education Department, University of Canterbury.

Can I withdraw from the research?
Yes. You can pull out at any time without giving an explanation. You can also withdraw information at any time.

Do I have a say about future use of the information I or my child provides?
Yes. I am obligated by university regulations to give copies of the doctoral research for departmental, library and examination purposes. The study may also be published in journals and presented at conferences. However, I can only use the material you have provided for publications with your permission. At all times the identity of participants will not be made public without their consent.

What will happen to the video and audio tapes?
These will be stored for approximately 5 years, in the Education Department, University of Canterbury. They will then be destroyed. However, copies of these will be offered to you as appropriate.

Has this research had any ‘official’ approval?
Yes. The project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Canterbury Human Ethics Committee. Approval has also been given by Kaumataua and your child’s school whanau.

If you would like more written information about this study please contact me, Fleur, at 322 5550.

If you give your permission for your child to be part of this study please complete the attached ‘Consent Form’.
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The form signed by parents regarding approval for their children to be included in the research. Similar forms were used for all adults to sign, for example, the teachers and Boards of Trustees.

Research Project Consent Form: Parents / Caregivers

Provisional Title of Project:
Oral Language and Reading Development for Maori Children Bilingual and Mainstream Education

CONSENT (circle your answer)

I understand the description of the above study.  YES / NO
I agree to my child being a participant.  YES / NO
I approve Fleur's access to my child's school records.  YES / NO
I approve Fleur's access to my child's medical records for ear/eye health.  YES / NO
I approve the use of audio taping.  YES / NO
I approve the use of video taping.  YES / NO
I agree to publication of the study and its results, knowing that my child's identity will not be disclosed.  YES / NO
I understand that I can take my child out of this study at any time.  YES / NO
I understand that I can withdraw any information from this study at any time.  YES / NO

Parent/Caregiver Signature or Initials only (whichever you prefer)

________________________________________

Date

________________________________________
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Kākā the parrot puppet
Appendix 9
Waiata “A Ha Ka Ma.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ha</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td>ho</td>
<td>hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>ki</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>mo</td>
<td>mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>pi</td>
<td>po</td>
<td>pu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra</td>
<td>re</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wa</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>wi</td>
<td>wo</td>
<td>wu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nga</td>
<td>nge</td>
<td>ngi</td>
<td>ngo</td>
<td>ngu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wha</td>
<td>whe</td>
<td>whi</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>whu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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List of Books included in the Running Records Set
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Te reo Māori: Syllable Segmentation

Session 1: All the children together in a group.

Fleur: Kākā has come today to do some talking and funny dancing with you guys. Come on Kaka, where are you? Oh you’re in the kete. I bet you’re sleeping. Listen. (Make snoring noises.) Oh yes he is sleeping. Let’s wake him up. Wake up Kaka. (Doesn’t wake up.) See if you can make him wake up. (It is anticipated that the children will shout out “Wake up”. If they don’t I will ask them to say “Wake up”.) Come on Kaka. Come and see (children’s names).

Kaka: Oh, oh Fleur. Kia ora. (Then he looks around at the children). Oh kia ora (child’s name, going around each child). Kei te pehea koe? (Kaka yawns and says in staccato talking) I dreamed I was eating a huge plate of icecream. Yum. Ka pai.


Kaka: Not now. I have some pictures here in my kete to show the children and to do some talking about them. (Children’s names) let’s have a look at these pictures together. I have some special sentences about the pictures. (Child’s name) close your eyes and take a picture out of the kete.

(Go through the pictures talking about them, and Kaka saying the special sentence for each one. Kaka sometimes says the sentences in a staccato way, but always finishes saying them with ‘normal’ intonation, speed and rhythm. With each picture Kaka does some funny dance movements. Kaka can ask the children to do what he does, to imitate his actions and say the sentences.)

Session 2: With individual children

Fleur: (Child’s name), you know when we talked about these pictures (show the kete with pictures in it) and Kaka had some special sentences about each one. Today we are going to look at those pictures again and Kaka is going to be with us too.

Kaka: When we talk we can talk in sentences like this: “Kei te noho ahau”. Here I am sitting. (Kaka sits, say “Kei te noho ahau”, “I am sitting”). You know what? We can do some real funny talking and break that sentence up into words. And I can do a funny dance when I say the words, like this. (Kaka says each word of the sentence and jumps on each word as if he is dancing.) I can stamp my foot when I say each word too. Listen and watch. (Say each word and stamp the puppet’s foot with each word.) Kei – te – noho – ahau. Can you say those words and stamp your foot with each word? (With the child stamp feet and say the words.) Ka pai.

Now I wonder if we can say those words in a real silly way. I wonder if we can break the words up into smaller parts and stamp our feet ot do a funny dance. Like my name “Kaka”. I can break that up into “Ka – ka”, and I can stamp my feet when I do that (say “ka – ka” and stamp foot at the same time). Um … let me think. What about that sentence “Kei te noho ahau”? “Kei”. Is that just one part, or can we break that word up into more than one part? We could say “ke – i” or “kei”. What sounds best to you? What do you think? What about “te”? We could say “t – e” or “te”. What sounds better to you? What about “noho”? What about “ahau”?
Fleur: Gee Kaka has some really funny ways of playing around with sentences and words eh? Let’s have a look at those pictures out of the kete.

The child chooses pictures from the kete, and we talk about each picture. Kaka gets to say his special sentence and we go through the sentence breaking it up into words with the funny dance and then breaking the words up to how the children think they should be broken up. The child is encouraged to stamp his/her foot with each word part (or move their body however they wish – eg. clap hands, tap whatever they want to do).

Praise all the child’s responses such as, “Ka pai”, “Cool”, and high five with Kaka’s wing.

**Sentences**

1. I haere a Patariki a Tahi ki te toa. (Patrick and Tahi have been to the shop.)
2. Kei te kai ahau te aperikota. (I am eating an apricot.)
3. Kei te purei whutupaoro te matua. (Grandad/Dad is playing football.)
4. He ataahua ahau. (I am cool looking.)
5. Homai to ipu whero ki ahau. (Give me the red container.)
6. Tuku ki raro, Matiu. (Get down Matiu.)
7. Titiro ki te marama. (Look at the moon.)
8. Kei te tangi a Uenuku te taniwha. (The taniwha Uenuku is crying.)
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Te reo Māori: Phoneme Isolation

With individual children

Fleur: Oh (child’s name) Kaka is not well. He needs to rest, so he is resting in the
car. Anyway you know Kaka does some crazy games with words. Well now we are
going to do some more crazy things with words. Hey we can say a word and we can
work out the first sound in that word. I have some pictures here and we are going to play
a game of hide and seek with the pictures.

(Child hides their eyes while I hide four pictures. Then the child is asked to open their eyes and
we go looking for the cards. When cards are found, we say the word for the picture and I ask the
child what is the first sound they hear in that word. Then it is the child’s turn. I hide my eyes
while the child hides four pictures. Then I look for the cards, talking about how hard it is to find
the cards and hoping it’s not too tricky! When I find the cards we say the word for the picture
and I ask the child what the first sound is they hear for that word.)

Words

1. manu (bird)
2. kiwi
3. iota (yacht)
4. inanga (whitebait)
5. aihi (dolphin)
6. poaka (pig)
7. uira (lightning)
8. ngata (snail)
9. noke (worm)
10. waka
11. whare
12. arata (lettuce)
13. rohi (loaf)
14. taru (grass)
Appendix 13

Te reo Māori: Phoneme Segmentation

With individual children

Fleur: Now for some real crazy talking with words. Oh listen to Kaka.

Kaka: I c-a-n (can) s-ay (say) w-or-d-s (words) l-i-k-e (like) th-i-s (this). Ha ha ha. What a crazy old Kaka I am. Hey what about “Kaka” ha – k-a-k-a (kaka). Just imagine if we talked like that all the time. What a funny way of talking. I am saying the word with the sounds all taken apart. What about “kete”? How would you say “kete” like that, what I just did with my name “Kaka”? (If child does not do this, Kaka says the sounds separated. Then asks the child what it sounds like to them. Ask the child if it makes sense to say “ke-te” or “k-e-t-e” and why.) What about your name (child’s name)? How would you say your name with the sounds separated? Oh boy that sound so different eh? What about some other words? Let’s pick up these pictures and say the words in that funny talking eh?

(Pick out a word from the pile and Kaka says the word in Maori and asks the child to see if they can say it like we did with their name, “Kaka” and “kete”.

Words

1. ia (him)
2. urunga (pillow)
3. ika (fish)
4. hoata (new moon)
5. ao (cloud)
6. rangi (day)
7. kainga (eating)
8. ua (to rain)
9. ahi (fire)
10. tuna (eel)
11. kawhe (calf)
12. tui (the name of a native bird)
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Te reo Māori: Alliteration Awareness

With individual children.

Fleur: I have some pictures on these cards. Look, we can say the Maori word for each picture. (Go through each picture saying each word in Maori and asking the child to say the word too.) Now Kaka has a game to play with you, with these pictures. I will let him tell you about the game. Where is that Kaka? Come on Kaka. Where is he? I think he is hiding. (Look around the room to see where Kaka is. Encourage the child to look with me.) Oh, here he is. Hey Kaka you know that game with the pictures?

Kaka: Ae!

Fleur: Well, here’s (child’s name). Let’s play that game.

Kaka: Hey kia ora (child’s name). Well in this game we take turns. First time, you and Fleur will go over the words for the pictures, then you close your eyes, then Fleur covers up a picture with cardboard and then you guess what picture is covered over. Then it is Fleur’s turn to close her eyes, you cover a picture and then Fleur has to guess the picture. Okay (child’s name) and Fleur, I am going to sit and watch and make sure you play the game properly.

Fleur: Where will Kaka sit (child’s name)? Okay, over there. That is just great.

(Go through the game a couple of turns to get the idea of it. Then after a turn I say something like…)

(Child’s name), see these pictures, three of the words for these pictures start with the same sound and one does not. Let’s see which one does not belong here. (Say each word, pointing to the picture as I say it. Then ask the child what picture starts with a different sound to the others and say that we can work it out. If the child chooses the picture that does not, then go over the words and ask the child what the first sound in each word is. Work out which one does not start with the same sound.)

(Go through each of the cards in this manner, playing the game and taking turns, then going over each picture, pointing to it and asking the child what word does not belong.)
**Word Set 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>karu</th>
<th>kaka</th>
<th>kaha</th>
<th>niho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pahi</td>
<td>ngeru</td>
<td>pane</td>
<td>pata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>wheke</td>
<td>whero</td>
<td>turi</td>
<td>whengu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>tori</td>
<td>toru</td>
<td>toka</td>
<td>whare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>nguru</td>
<td>ngutu</td>
<td>pipi</td>
<td>nguha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>kete</td>
<td>moko</td>
<td>motu</td>
<td>moni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>nini</td>
<td>pune</td>
<td>niho</td>
<td>niti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ngata</td>
<td>huka</td>
<td>hupa</td>
<td>huhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>rua</td>
<td>pou</td>
<td>poa</td>
<td>poi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>kiwi</td>
<td>kimo</td>
<td>hopi</td>
<td>kihi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>teka</td>
<td>tere</td>
<td>tero</td>
<td>ngeru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>rangi</td>
<td>tuna</td>
<td>rare</td>
<td>rama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Word Set 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>hako</th>
<th>hopi</th>
<th>huka</th>
<th>toke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pipi</td>
<td>rangi</td>
<td>pango</td>
<td>puku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>kiwi</td>
<td>karu</td>
<td>maka</td>
<td>kete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>manu</td>
<td>mako</td>
<td>motu</td>
<td>turi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>kai</td>
<td>kau</td>
<td>pei</td>
<td>kea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>pune</td>
<td>rimu</td>
<td>rare</td>
<td>ringi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ngata</td>
<td>pahi</td>
<td>ngeru</td>
<td>ngohi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>whao</td>
<td>tai</td>
<td>tea</td>
<td>toa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>anuhe</td>
<td>ketete</td>
<td>kekeno</td>
<td>kanohi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>wae</td>
<td>wai</td>
<td>pou</td>
<td>wao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>niho</td>
<td>noke</td>
<td>neti</td>
<td>tama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>tinanan</td>
<td>momohe</td>
<td>takanga</td>
<td>taniwha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 15

Te reo Māori: Letter Knowledge

Fleur: You know what (child’s name). Here’s Kaka. He wants to watch us work something out. Here are some letters in this kete. When we say these letters out loud they make sounds. Let’s try some. (Place a letter out in front of the child and ask what sound does that letter make? If the child names the letter, say “Okay that’s its name. Can you say the sound it makes? After each one say “Ka pai”, or high five with Kaka.) Hey, let’s look in the kete and do some more letters. What is the sound of that letter? (Then the child can post the letters in the post box.)

Letters

1. p
2. wh
3. i
4. m
5. t
6. w
7. u
8. r
9. e
10. h
11. n
12. a
13. k
14. o
15. ng
Appendix 16

‘Onset-Rime’ Task

With individual children

Fleur: You know what, Kaka is so tired he is having a sleep. There is a card game in this box. I will tell you how to play this game but first we can look at some of the pictures. Oh this picture of ‘feet’. Mm. You know how I have asked you to break words up into two parts before, you know the words in your spelling book.

Well what if we were to do the same thing with this word ‘feet’, like break the word ‘feet’ into two parts, how would we do it? Um we could say ‘f-eet’ or we could say ‘fee-t’. Mm, now that’s a puzzle and Kaka is asleep so he can’t help us. F-eet or fee-t, what would you do? What sounds better to you – ‘f-eet’ or ‘fee-t’? (Do the same procedure with another picture – leaf.)

We are going to play a game, just the two of us. I have a pack of cards, two sets of the same cards. We can place them face down and mix them up. Then we will take turns and pick up two cards. If they are the same cards you get to keep them. If they are different you put them back. The person with the most cards at the end wins the game. We will play for a while to get the idea.

When the child gets the cards the same say “We can break that word up into two parts. Listen to the word for that picture. (Say the word.) We can break it like this (say the word in the form of CV-C) or we can break it up like this (say the word in the form C-VC). What sounds better to you? (Say the word CV-C or C-VC.)

Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C both languages</th>
<th>C English only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. pen</td>
<td>1. beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. moon</td>
<td>2. shoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. farm</td>
<td>3. bees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. fork</td>
<td>4. bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. meat</td>
<td>5. juice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. cart</td>
<td>6. cheese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial C English</th>
<th>Initial C both languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final C both languages</td>
<td>Final C English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. laugh</td>
<td>1. cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sing</td>
<td>2. peach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sheep</td>
<td>3. web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. shark</td>
<td>4. torch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. book</td>
<td>5. horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. jet</td>
<td>6. peg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Reading Measures for the Older Kura Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Running Record</th>
<th>Burt Word Reading Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Hello Hospital Flower” (9.06-10.06 yr level)</td>
<td>87.5% accuracy Hard Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapata</td>
<td>10y</td>
<td>“The Crane and the Butterfly” (9-10 yr level)</td>
<td>93% accuracy Instructional Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td>10y3m</td>
<td>“Encounter with a Falcon” (10-12 yr level)</td>
<td>92% accuracy Instructional Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10y2m</td>
<td>“Hello Hospital Flower” (9.5-10.5yr level)</td>
<td>94% accuracy Instructional Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10y1m</td>
<td>“The Crane and the Butterfly” (9-10 yr level)</td>
<td>95% accuracy Easy Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rata</td>
<td>10y2m</td>
<td>“Encounter with a Falcon” (10-12 yr level)</td>
<td>97% accuracy Easy Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10y2m</td>
<td>“Hello Hospital Flower” (9.5-10.5 yr level)</td>
<td>97% accuracy Easy Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10y1m</td>
<td>“The Crane and the Butterfly” (9-10 yr level)</td>
<td>98% accuracy Easy Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>9y6m</td>
<td>“Hello Hospital Flower” (9.06-10.06 yr level)</td>
<td>91% accuracy Easy Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9y4m</td>
<td>“The Crane and the Butterfly” (9-10 yr level)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tama</td>
<td>8y7m</td>
<td>“Number One” (6-6.06 yr level)</td>
<td>Hard Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8y1m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Reading Measures for the Younger Kura Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Running Record</th>
<th>Burt Word Reading Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td>7y3m</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Score: 2 Below lowest age band.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7y1m</td>
<td>“Number One” (6-6.06 yr level)</td>
<td>Hard Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>7y1m</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Score: 8 Below lowest age band.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6y11m</td>
<td>“Number One” (6-6.06 yr level)</td>
<td>Hard Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>6y8m</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Score: 26 Age Equivalent 6.01-6.07yr Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6y6m</td>
<td>“Number One” (6-6.06 yr level)</td>
<td>Hard Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td>6y1m</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Score: 4 Below lowest age band.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td>New entrant – Emergent Reading level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huriana</td>
<td>New entrant – Emergent Reading level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### The School Children Six Year Net

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Letter Identification</th>
<th>Concepts about Print</th>
<th>Word Reading</th>
<th>Burt Word Reading Test</th>
<th>Writing Vocabulary</th>
<th>Dictation</th>
<th>Running Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>Stanine</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>Stanine</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>Stanine</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>6y</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>5y11m</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>6y1m</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>6y1m</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>6y</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ella left her Year 1 school at the end of 2002. The teacher in her new class did not complete a Six Year Net with Ella due to wanting her to settle in to the new school. The teacher did complete running record assessments.
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The Children’s Responses to the PIPA Syllable Segmentation Subtest, according to syllable structures: Consonant (C) and Vowel (V) sequences. “Non-Achievement” of the segmentation according to the test requirements are highlighted in red.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIPA 1</th>
<th>PIPA 2</th>
<th>PIPA 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syllable Structures</td>
<td>Syllable Structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>CVC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Older Kura Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapata</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rata</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tama</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Younger Kura Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huriana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The School Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 21

Te reo Maori: Syllable Segmentation for all Children, according to the CV structures of the item words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration 1</th>
<th>Administration 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>CVV Ways of Segmenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Older Kura Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>CVV Ways of Segmenting</th>
<th>Vowel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapata</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>cv-v cvv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>cv-v cvv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rata</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>cv-v cvv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>cvv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tama</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>cv-v cvv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Younger Kura Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>CVV Ways of Segmenting</th>
<th>Vowel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>cvv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>cvv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>cvv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>cv-v cvv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>cvv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huriana</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>NA cvv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>v-v</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>v-v</td>
<td>v-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>v-v</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>v-v</td>
<td>v-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>v-v</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>v-v</td>
<td>v-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>v-v</td>
<td>v-v</td>
<td>v-v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>v-v</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>v-v</td>
<td>v-v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

I = Independent, a structure that stands independently as a word.

E = Embedded. A syllable structure that is embedded in a word.

* Correct response

Did not segment according to structure
### Appendix 22
Three Administrations of PIPA Rhyme Awareness - Item Analysis According to Position of Item in Test Sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIPA 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>PIPA 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>PIPA 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>3  4</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>3  4</td>
<td>1  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huriana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**
- • Correct response
- Incorrect response
## Appendix 23

**Children’s Selection of CV-C or C-VC Structures for “Onset-Rime” task**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration 1</th>
<th>Administration 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CV-C Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Kura Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapata</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rata</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tama</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Kura Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huriana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The School Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key for Appendices 24 to 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>The arrangement of consonants and vowels within the word.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>One phoneme corresponds to one grapheme, e.g., a.n,d for <em>hand</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>One phoneme corresponds to a number of graphemes, e.g., <em>star</em> (with 4 graphemes) is <em>s,t,a</em> (with 3 phonemes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Phonemes</td>
<td>The number of sounds that make up the word, e.g., <em>shoe</em> is made up of two sounds (phonemes) – <em>sh,oe</em>, <em>stand</em> is made up of five sounds (phonemes) – s, t, a, n, d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segmentation Patterns</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Segmented as the whole word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Segmented according to syllables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>Segmented with syllables, groups of sounds and phonemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat Vowels</td>
<td>A vowel in a syllable is immediately repeated as an individual sound e.g., <em>car</em> = <em>car-ar</em>) or repeated and attached to a following consonant e.g., <em>stand</em> = <em>sta-and</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add other Vowels</td>
<td>Vowels foreign to the stimulus word are added, e.g., <em>rabbit</em> = <em>ra-u-bi-u-t</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat C or CV</td>
<td>The consonant or consonant-vowel structure is repeated, e.g., <em>shoe</em> = <em>sh-shoe</em>, or <em>car</em> = <em>car-car-car</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain Blends</td>
<td>The consonant blends keep their combination in the segmenting, e.g., <em>spoon</em> = <em>sp-oon</em> and <em>stand</em> = <em>st-and</em> or <em>st-a-nd</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehearsal</td>
<td>There is practice before completing the task, e.g., <em>stand</em> = <em>sta-a-a-sta-a-and</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 24

**PIPA Phoneme Segmentation Subtest, Administration 1  The Kura Children (11*)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Stimulus Words</th>
<th>Segmentation Patterns</th>
<th>RepeatVowels (C)(V)V –V(C)(V)</th>
<th>Add Other Vowels</th>
<th>Repeat C or CV</th>
<th>Retain Blends</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1 or 1:Many</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Number of Phonemes</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Combined: syllables, phoneme groups, phonemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 1:Many</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tama, Rata, Mary, Ariel, Big JL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>shoe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC 1:Many</td>
<td>Eat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCV 1:Many</td>
<td>star</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC 1:Many</td>
<td>cake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCV 1:Many</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCV 1:1</td>
<td>lady</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVC 1:Many</td>
<td>spoon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rapata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCC 1:1</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rapata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVCC 1:1</td>
<td>stand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tama, Big JL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCVC 1:Many</td>
<td>rabbit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCCVC 1:Many</td>
<td>inside</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rapata, Hone and Huriana tested one time and their results included in this Table
### Appendix 25

**PIPA Phoneme Segmentation Subtest, Administration 1 The School Children (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Stimulus Words</th>
<th>Segmentation Patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1 or 1:Many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>shoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>Eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCV</td>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC</td>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>cake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCV</td>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>okay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCC</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>lady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVC</td>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>spoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCC</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVCC</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCVC</td>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>rabbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCCVC</td>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>inside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 26:

**PIPA Phoneme Segmentation Subtest, Administration 2 The Kura Children (8)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Stimulus Words</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Combined: syllables, phoneme groups, phonemes</th>
<th>Repeat Vowels (C)(V)V –V(C)(V)</th>
<th>Add Other Vowels</th>
<th>Repeat C or CV</th>
<th>Retain Blends</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV 1:1 or 1:Many</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Number of Phonemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 1:Many</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rata, Mary, Big JL, Ariel, Ana</td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC 1:Many</td>
<td>shoe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC 1:Many</td>
<td>Eat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary, Ariel</td>
<td>Mary, Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCV 1:Many</td>
<td>star</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC 1:Many</td>
<td>cake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCV 1:Many</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCV 1:1</td>
<td>lady</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVC 1:Many</td>
<td>spoon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCC 1:1</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVCC 1:1</td>
<td>stand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Big JL, Pere, Ana</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Rata, Mary, Roxy, Tama, Pere, Ariel, Ana, Big JL</td>
<td>Roxy, Big JL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCVC 1:Many</td>
<td>rabbit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rata, Pere, Ariel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCCVC 1:Many</td>
<td>inside</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 27
**PIPA Phoneme Segmentation Subtest, Administration 2 The School Children (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Stimulus Words</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Combined: syllables, phoneme groups, phonemes</th>
<th>Repeat Vowels (C)(V) V –V(C)(V)</th>
<th>Add Other Vowels</th>
<th>Repeat C or CV</th>
<th>Retain Blends</th>
<th>Rehearsals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV 1:1 or 1:Many</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Number of Phonemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 1:Many</td>
<td>car</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC 1:Many</td>
<td>shoe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC 1:Many</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCV 1:Many</td>
<td>star</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC 1:Many</td>
<td>cake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCV 1:Many</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCC 1:1</td>
<td>lady</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVC 1:Many</td>
<td>spoon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVC 1:1</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVCC 1:1</td>
<td>stand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nate, Ella, Jasmine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCVC 1:Many</td>
<td>rabbit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCCVC 1:Many</td>
<td>inside</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 28

**PIPA Phoneme Segmentation Subtest, Administration 3 The Kura Children (8)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Stimulus Words</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Combined: syllables, phoneme groups, phonemes</th>
<th>Repeat Vowels (C)(V) – V(C)(V)</th>
<th>Add Other Vowels</th>
<th>Repeat C or CV</th>
<th>Retain Blends</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CV 1:1 or 1:Many</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Number of Phonemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 1:Many</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mary, Big JL</td>
<td>Ana, Ariel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 1:Many</td>
<td>shoe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC 1:Many</td>
<td>Eat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Roxy, Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCV 1:1 or 1:Many</td>
<td>star</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC 1:1 or 1:Many</td>
<td>cake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCV 1:Many</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCV 1:1:Many</td>
<td>lady</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVC 1:1 or 1:Many</td>
<td>spoon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy, Roxy</td>
<td>Roxy, Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCC 1:1:Many</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVCC 1:1:Many</td>
<td>stand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>Mary, Ariel, Tama, Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCCV 1:1:Many</td>
<td>rabbit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tama, Pere, Ariel</td>
<td>Arile, Ana, Rata, Tama, Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCCVC 1:1:Many</td>
<td>inside</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 29

**PIPA Phoneme Segmentation Subtest, Administration 3 The School Children (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Stimulus Words</th>
<th>Segmentation Patterns</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Combined: syllables, phoneme groups, phonemes</th>
<th>Repeat Vowels (C)(V)V –V(C)(V)</th>
<th>Add Other Vowels</th>
<th>Repeat C or CV</th>
<th>Retain Blends</th>
<th>Rehearsals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1 or 1:Many Word</td>
<td>Number of Phonemes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 1:Many</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kylie Cathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:Many</td>
<td>shoe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jasmine Cathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC 1:Many</td>
<td>Eat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>Nate, Kylie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCV 1:Many</td>
<td>star</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jasmine Cathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC 1:Many</td>
<td>cake</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCV 1:Many</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCV 1:1</td>
<td>lady</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVC 1:Many</td>
<td>spoon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jasmine Ella Cathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCC 1:1</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kylie Cathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCVCC 1:1</td>
<td>stand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCCV 1:Many</td>
<td>rabbit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCCVC 1:Many</td>
<td>inside</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 30:
### Te Reo Māori: Phoneme Segmentation Administration 1 Older Kura Children (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Combined Syllable and Phonemic Segmenting</th>
<th>Repeat Vowels CV-V or V-VV</th>
<th>Consonant linked to Vowel, or CVC</th>
<th>Vowel Additions</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ao</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVV</td>
<td>tui</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ika</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ahi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCV</td>
<td>kawhe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tuna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rangi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVVCV</td>
<td>kainga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hoata</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCVCV</td>
<td>uranga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix 30:
### Te Reo Māori: Phoneme Segmentation Administration 2 Older Kura Children (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Combined Syllable and Phonemic Segmenting</th>
<th>Repeat Vowels CV-V or V-VV</th>
<th>Vowel linked to consonant or CVC</th>
<th>Vowel Additions</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ua</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVV</td>
<td>tui</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ika</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ahi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kawhe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tama</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tuna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rangi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVVCV</td>
<td>kainga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rata</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hoata</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCVCV</td>
<td>uranga</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Roxy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 31

**Te Reo Māori: Phoneme Segmentation Administration 1 Younger Kura Children (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Combined Syllable and Phonemic Segmenting</th>
<th>Repeat Vowels CV-V or V-V</th>
<th>Consonant linked to Vowel, or CVC</th>
<th>Vowel Additions</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ao</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVV</td>
<td>tui</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ika</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ahi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCV</td>
<td>kawhe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tuna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rangi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCCV</td>
<td>kainga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hoata</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCVCV</td>
<td>urunga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Te Reo Māori: Phoneme Segmentation Administration 2 Younger Kura Children (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Combined Syllable and Phonemic Segmenting</th>
<th>Repeat Vowels CV-V or V-V</th>
<th>Vowel linked to consonant or CVC</th>
<th>Vowel Additions</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ua</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVV</td>
<td>tui</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ika</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ahi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCV</td>
<td>kawhe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tuna</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rangi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCCV</td>
<td>kainga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hoata</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCVCV</td>
<td>urunga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 32
### Te Reo Māori: Phoneme Segmentation Administration 1 School Children (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Combined Syllable and Phonemic Segmenting</th>
<th>Repeat Vowels CV-V or V-VV</th>
<th>Consonant linked to Vowel, or CVC</th>
<th>Vowel Additions</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ao</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVV</td>
<td>tui</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCV</td>
<td>ika</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ahi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCV</td>
<td>kawhe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tuna</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rangi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVVCV</td>
<td>kainga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hoata</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCVCV</td>
<td>urunga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>&quot;too hard&quot; to say</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Te Reo Māori: Phoneme Segmentation Administration 2 School Children (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Structure</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Combined Syllable and Phonemic Segmenting</th>
<th>Repeat Vowels CV-V or V-VV</th>
<th>Vowel linked to consonant or CVC</th>
<th>Vowel Additions</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ua</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVV</td>
<td>tui</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCV</td>
<td>ika</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ahi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCV</td>
<td>kawhe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tuna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rangi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVVCV</td>
<td>kainga</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hoata</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCVCV</td>
<td>urunga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 33
‘Pass’ Status for Each PIPA Subtest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIPA 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PIPA 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PIPA 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LK</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>PI</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LK</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Older Kura Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapata</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rata</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Younger Kura Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huriana</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The School Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>●</td>
<td>‘Passed’ the subtest according to test scoring and analysis procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did not ‘pass’ the subtest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Syllable Segmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Rhyme Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AW</td>
<td>Alliteration Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Phoneme Isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Phoneme Segmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>Letter Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 34
The Raw Scores for each PIPA Subtest, The Older Kura Children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>LK</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>LK</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>PI</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>LK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapata</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rata</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tama</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SS: Syllable Segmentation  
RA: Rhyme Awareness  
AA: Alliteration Awareness  
PI: Phoneme Isolation  
PS: Phoneme Segmentation  
LK: Letter Knowledge  
NS: No score (due to unfinished subtest)  
12: Ceiling for SS, RA, AA, PI, PS (32 is ceiling for LK). Ceiling scores are in black and non-ceiling scores in red.
Appendix 35
The Raw Scores and Percentiles for PIPA Subtests, the Younger Kura Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PIPA 1 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 1 %ile</th>
<th>PIPA 2 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 2 %ile</th>
<th>PIPA 3 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 3 %ile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huriana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PIPA Syllable Segmentation Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PIPA 1 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 1 %ile</th>
<th>PIPA 2 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 2 %ile</th>
<th>PIPA 3 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 3 %ile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huriana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PIPA Rhyme Awareness Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PIPA 1 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 1 %ile</th>
<th>PIPA 2 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 2 %ile</th>
<th>PIPA 3 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 3 %ile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huriana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PIPA Alliteration Awareness Scores**

*NA/NA: Not appropriate because the child’s age was above 6 years 11 months
### PIPA Phoneme Isolation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PIPA 1 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 1 %ile</th>
<th>PIPA 2 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 2 %ile</th>
<th>PIPA 3 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 3 %ile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huriana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PIPA Phoneme Segmentation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PIPA 1 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 1 %ile</th>
<th>PIPA 2 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 2 %ile</th>
<th>PIPA 3 Raw Score</th>
<th>PIPA 3 %ile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pere</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ariel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big JL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huriana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PIPA Letter Knowledge Scores

*NA: Not appropriate because the child’s age was above 6 years 11 months
Appendix 36
The Raw Scores and Percentiles for each PIPA Subtest, The School Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PIPA 1</th>
<th>PIPA 2</th>
<th>PIPA 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td>Raw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PIPA Syllable Segmentation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PIPA 1</th>
<th>PIPA 2</th>
<th>PIPA 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td>Raw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PIPA Rhyme Awareness Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PIPA 1</th>
<th>PIPA 2</th>
<th>PIPA 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td>Raw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PIPA Alliteration Awareness Score
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIPA 1</th>
<th>PIPA 2</th>
<th>PIPA 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PIPA Phoneme Isolation** Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIPA 1</th>
<th>PIPA 2</th>
<th>PIPA 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PIPA Phoneme Segmentation** Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PIPA 1</th>
<th>PIPA 2</th>
<th>PIPA 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
<td>%ile</td>
<td>Raw Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasmine</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PIPA Letter Knowledge** Scores