

# FACILITATORS OF, AND BARRIERS TO, WHĀNAU ENGAGEMENT IN KAUPAPA MĀORI EARLY YEARS PROVISION

## A retrospective survey at a Taranaki-based centre

*Erana Hond-Flavell\**

*Aroaro Tamati†*

*Gareth J. Treharne‡*

*Reremoana Theodore§*

*Jesse Kokaua||*

*Will Edwards¶*

*Ruakere Hond\*\**

*Richie Poulton††*

*Mihi Ratima‡‡*

### Abstract

Kaupapa Māori early years provision (KM-EYP) has underpinned efforts to revitalise Māori language and culture throughout Aotearoa New Zealand. Although many tamariki and whānau have benefited from engagement in KM-EYP, less than 20% of tamariki Māori currently participate. Kaupapa Māori psychological research is needed to better understand what facilitates participation among whānau

\* Taranaki Iwi, Ngāti Ruanui, Te Whānau-ā-Apanui, Te Ati Awa. Research Fellow, Te Pou Tiringa, Ngāmotu/New Plymouth, New Zealand. Email: flavell@xtra.co.nz

† Taranaki Iwi, Ngāti Ruanui, Te Whānau-ā-Apanui, Te Ati Awa. Tumukāuru/Director, Te Kōpae Piripono, Ngāmotu/New Plymouth, New Zealand.

‡ Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

§ Ngāpuhi. Senior Research Fellow and Co-Director of the National Centre for Lifecourse Research, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

|| Ngāti Arera (Rarotonga). Senior Research Fellow, Va'a O Tautai—Centre for Pacific Health, Division of Health Sciences, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

¶ Taranaki Iwi, Ngāruahine, Tāngahoe, Pakakohi, Ngāti Ruanui. Director, Taumata Associates, Ngāmotu/New Plymouth, New Zealand.

\*\* Taranaki Iwi, Ngāti Ruanui, Te Whānau-ā-Apanui, Te Ati Awa. Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Te Pou Tiringa, Ngāmotu/New Plymouth, New Zealand.

†† Director of the Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Research Unit and Co-Director of the National Centre for Lifecourse Research, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

‡‡ Ngāti Awa, Whakatōhea. Senior Research Fellow, Te Pou Tiringa, Ngāmotu/New Plymouth, New Zealand.

who attend KM-EYP. This article describes findings from a study that aimed to understand whānau engagement in KM-EYP. An online survey was developed to test findings of an earlier qualitative phase of an overall study. The survey was completed by 121 parents/grandparents whose tamariki had attended one KM-EYP centre in Taranaki, at some stage, since it opened in 1994. This article reports on the top ranked motivations of whānau to enrol their tamariki in KM-EYP and the top ranked facilitators of, and barriers to, their engagement. The findings provide novel evidence about what impacts whānau participation and engagement in KM-EYP.

### Keywords

early years education, enrolment, Kaupapa Māori, Māori immersion, whānau engagement, survey

### Introduction

*Kia aroaro mahana ka taka mai te āhuru,  
ka wana a kōmata.*

*The warmth of spring is a time for  
revitalisation and the rapid growth of  
tender shoots.*

—Derived from the Taranaki recitation  
*Tangi te Kawekaweā*

The foundations for lifelong health and well-being are laid in early life, and every system that touches young children's lives is an opportunity to strengthen those foundations to make lifelong healthy development possible (Belsky et al., 2020). Early childhood education is such a system, recognised worldwide as one of the best investments a society can make to ensure an optimal start to life, with health, social and economic benefits evident across the lifecourse (Bakken et al., 2017; Mitchell et al., 2008).

There is potential for early childhood education to have an even more consequential impact in Indigenous communities, which have long endured educational, economic and health inequities (Gracey & King, 2009; Reid et al., 2014). There is evidence worldwide for quality early childhood education as an agent of positive change for children from disadvantaged backgrounds, including those in Indigenous communities (Elek et al., 2020). However, the children of these communities are less likely than those in the wider populations to access and then sustain engagement in early years provision (Gerlach et al., 2017; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2017; Taylor, 2010). Globally, enrolment rates have increased in recent years, but rates of sustained attendance have not kept pace (OECD, 2017). Therefore, the full potential of early years provision for the children and families of marginalised communities has yet to be realised.

Quality early years provision that is founded in local knowledge, values and practices, and the

sociocultural aspirations of parents and families has been demonstrated to be transformational for Māori and other Indigenous children, families and communities (Grace et al., 2020; Mitchell et al., 2006; Preston et al., 2012). However, widespread inequities exist, and not all Indigenous communities can access such provision. Furthermore, when available, multidimensional factors can intersect to hinder family access and engagement (Gerlach et al., 2017). In Aotearoa New Zealand, the Ministry of Education (2012) summarised six core factors that explain non-participation in early childhood education: cost, availability of the desired service, practical and personal issues, competing demands and commitments, limited access to information, and parental experience and mistrust of institutions.

Broader structural impediments are barriers to engagement in early childhood education and include the health and social inequities that oppress Indigenous communities, and the destructive legacy of colonisation that is at the heart of those inequities (Grace et al., 2020). Leske et al. (2015) also identified equity of access as one of two broad categories of explanatory factors for lower attendance rates in Indigenous communities. The second category is equity of relationship, which relates to ownership issues in the development of a centre and the ongoing relational characteristics within the programme. Further research that gives voice to Indigenous parents and families is vital to understanding how policymakers and the early years sector might better meet the needs and aspirations of Indigenous families and communities.

In Aotearoa, Kaupapa Māori early years provision (KM-EYP) has been at the heart of Māori development strategies for over 40 years (Waitangi Tribunal, 2013). The shared goal of centres for KM-EYP is to revitalise Māori language and culture, strengthen whānau, build capacity within Māori communities, and intervene in the legacy of colonisation for tamariki and whānau.

The descriptor KM-EYP is used to differentiate linguistically and culturally Māori immersive settings from other forms of early years provision (Hond-Flavell et al., in press; Hond-Flavell et al., 2021). Alongside the many kōhanga reo currently operating throughout Aotearoa and managed by Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust, other centres operate independently and are licensed directly to the Ministry of Education. Despite variations in provenance, most centres for KM-EYP are grassroots whānau-centred initiatives, and whānau development and support are inherent to the model (Royal Tangaere, 2012; Tamati et al., 2008). The whānau collectives of KM-EYP share a vision to promote the development and intergenerational wellbeing of tamariki, and their parents, whānau and communities (Hond-Flavell et al., in press; Hond-Flavell et al., 2021; Tamati et al., 2008).

The importance of family engagement in children's education is broadly accepted (ECE Taskforce, 2010). Halgunseth and colleagues (2009) emphasised the cultural and societal contexts of engagement in early childhood education, describing family engagement as a two-way process where families and early childhood programmes form a strong partnership, each contributing towards improved child development, wellbeing and positive family outcomes. Duncan and colleagues (2012) proposed reframing early childhood education in Aotearoa as a community and parenting resource to promote positive child learning outcomes and community wellness. In the postcolonial context of Aotearoa, few whānau have been spared the experience of cultural and linguistic dispossession (Grace et al., 2020; Hond, 2013). Consequently, the social and economic impact on Māori communities has been severe. Many Māori parents and whānau therefore enter KM-EYP deliberately seeking a service wherein the reclamation and strengthening of their Māori identity, language and connection to community can occur for them, their tamariki and their whānau (Hond-Flavell et al., 2021; Tamati et al., 2008).

Through enrolment in KM-EYP, two generations of tamariki have acquired te reo Māori as their first language and foundation for multilingual proficiency (May & Hill, 2008). Within these settings, the development of a secure Māori identity has been fostered as an impetus for academic achievement and, more broadly, contribution to the cultural strengthening of whānau and community (Education Review Office, 2017; Ritchie & Skerrett, 2014). The achievement of those ends relies on parents and whānau having access to

KM-EYP and then being able and willing to engage fully in the programmes.

Pihama and Penehira (2005) theorised that whānau engagement in community development initiatives such as KM-EYP has the potential to build the capacity of individuals and communities to enable their full and effective participation in society and areas of importance to them. KM-EYP may be pivotal because it occurs during the early life of tamariki Māori, when foundations for life-long outcomes are laid (Belsky et al., 2020; Tamati, Ratima et al., 2021; Tamati, Treharne, Kokaua et al., 2021; Tamati, Treharne, Theodore et al., 2021). At that critical point in the lifecourse, KM-EYP is well placed to support the development of secure Māori identity, sense of belonging, and the array of critical early learnings (Education Review Office, 2017).

KM-EYP commences the Māori-medium education pathway, which comprises early years settings and schooling where te reo Māori is the language of teaching and learning for over half of the time (Ministry of Education, 2013). Māori-medium education has been proven to advantage tamariki academically: the attainment of students leaving Māori-medium secondary schooling is higher than those in English-medium schooling at all National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) levels (Education Counts, 2020b). Māori-medium education, including KM-EYP, has been successful for tamariki Māori because the initiatives are located within a Māori worldview, are centred on whānau and community, build proficiency in te reo Māori, nurture secure identity, and in effect contribute to the politicisation and conscientisation of individuals and whānau (Pihama et al., 2004). Therefore, that less than 20% of tamariki Māori are currently enrolled in KM-EYP (Education Counts, 2020a) demands close attention to better understand the issues involved in the phenomenon.

The overall study, Tangi te Kawekaweā (Hond-Flavell et al., 2021), sought to understand better whānau engagement in KM-EYP by conducting research in one such centre based in Taranaki, Te Kōpae Piripono, which we refer to hereafter as the Centre. The Centre is whānau-centred; when tamariki are enrolled, their parents and whānau enter alongside them and are absorbed into the whānau collective. The Centre is 100% immersion te reo Māori and blends mātauranga Māori and teachings from Parihaka, a historically significant Māori community known for its doctrine of non-violent resistance (Hond, 2013), into a Kaupapa Māori approach to early years teaching and learning (Hond-Flavell et al., 2021; Tamati et al., 2008;

Tamati, Ratima et al., 2021; Tamati, Treharne, Kokaua et al., 2021; Tamati, Treharne, Theodore et al., 2021). The Centre was established in 1994 as an early childhood education centre and currently has a full-day licence for up to 40 tamariki. In 2005, Te Kōpae Piripono was named a Centre of Innovation by the Ministry of Education (Tamati et al., 2008). The Tangi te Kawekaweā study is part of the broader research programme Te Kura Mai i Tawhiti, a research collaboration between the National Centre for Lifecourse Research and Te Pou Tiringa Incorporated (the governing body of Te Kōpae Piripono) in Ngāmotu/New Plymouth (Ratima et al., 2019).

The phase of the Tangi te Kawekaweā study described in this article followed from the study's earlier qualitative phase (Hond-Flavell et al., 2021), which investigated the facilitators to, and barriers of, whānau engagement in KM-EYP. In that earlier phase, in-depth interviews were conducted with a sample of 36 whānau members from the Centre about their lived experience of engagement in KM-EYP. Ten expert informants with knowledge relevant to the research were also interviewed. Six categories of engagement factors were identified, capturing the following areas: colonisation impacts, emotional responses, whānau connections, institutional features, culture and identity, and socioeconomic position. The qualitative findings informed the current phase of the research described in this article and the design of a survey that was employed with a larger number

of former and current whānau members of the Centre (since foundation in 1994) to examine the factors influencing levels of whānau engagement in KM-EYP and the characteristics and outcomes of engagement.

The primary aim of this article was to report on the reasons these parents and whānau chose to enrol their tamariki in KM-EYP and the facilitators and barriers to their engagement. The secondary aim was to examine whether these reasons, facilitators and barriers differ by the age of the whānau member at the time their child entered KM-EYP, the gender of the whānau member, their relationship to the child, and the Māori-schooling experience of the whānau member (Table 1).

### Method

The survey phase of the Tangi te Kawekaweā study was retrospective in design. Between December 2019 and January 2020, we surveyed whānau who had enrolled children in the Centre since its inception in 1994. Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee (16/003).

### Participants

Participants were former, or current, whānau members of Te Kōpae Piripono who had parental or other caregiver roles for at least one child enrolled in the Centre at some point during its 25 years of operation (at the time of the survey). In that time, 135 whānau and 236 tamariki had

**TABLE 1** Characteristics of adult participants (n = 121)

Characteristic	Subgroup	n	percentage
Age at entry	<40 years of age	89	73.6%
	≥40 years of age	32	26.4%
Gender of parent/grandparent	Female	76	62.8%
	Male	45	37.2%
Relationship to child	Parent	107	88.4%
	Grandparent	14	11.6%
Experience of Māori schooling as a child (Any experience of the following: • Kaupapa Māori early years provision • Kura kaupapa Māori, wharekura, or similar Māori unit • Māori boarding school)	Some	33	27.3%
	None	88	72.7%

Kaupapa Māori = Māori worldview; Kura kaupapa Māori = primary school operating within a Māori worldview; wharekura = secondary school extension of kura kaupapa Māori

been enrolled in the Centre. Of a potential cohort of 231 eligible whānau members, four individuals were deceased and 79 could not be located, leaving 148 who were traceable. Of those 148 whānau members, 131 started the survey, with 121 completing it—a response rate of 82%. Of the final sample of 121 whānau members, 37.2% (45) were male (mean age 48.7 years) and 62.8% (76) female (mean age 46.3 years).

### Survey measures

The survey was developed using the Qualtrics web-based tool to facilitate a self-administered online survey (<https://www.qualtrics.com>). The development of the survey followed a review of both Centre documents and the literature (including relevant existing measures), and consultation with the Centre’s community, and built on findings of the qualitative phase of this study (Hond-Flavell et al., in press; Hond-Flavell et al., 2021).

The retrospective nature of the survey design relied on participants’ recall of whānau circumstances and personal details, feelings and behaviours, at specific time points. Key information specific to each potential participant was obtained from Centre administration records or direct contact with whānau members so that relevant dates, names and milestones could be incorporated into the online survey for each participant. Personal and contextual cues were also included to aid participant recall of events at each time point. The following is an example of the use of time markers and milestones to assist participant recall: 1996 was the year that [kaitiaki] left the Kōpae and moved to Wellington; the Waitangi Tribunal published The Taranaki Report . . . Taranaki won the Ranfurly Shield off Auckland. The sociodemographic section of the survey also helped focus participant attention on the enrolment of their first child to attend the Centre and the period of that child’s attendance. These memory cues have been shown to support recall accuracy, optimising retrospective survey administration and the reliability of data for analysis (Caspi et al., 1996).

The survey was piloted with 10 whānau members and minor modifications were made based on feedback. Centre networks were used to find current contact details for potential participants. Each eligible whānau member was approached in person, by phone, social media or email as appropriate, to inform them of the study and invite their participation. The survey was emailed via the Qualtrics platform for the majority of final participants ( $n = 114$ ). Further information on the survey was provided, and informed consent obtained

from participants prior to the survey beginning. Non-responders and those with incomplete survey responses were sent two reminder emails at one- and two-week intervals, each including a new link to their individualised survey. On completion, an email was sent thanking the participant. Two whānau members completed paper copies of the survey, which were posted out for completion alone in order to maintain equivalent self-report survey conditions for all participants.

### Survey structure

The three sections of the survey that provided the data for this article comprised 16 items each and used a 5-point Likert scale (agree strongly = 5 to disagree strongly = 1). For the purposes of analysis, “agree strongly” and “agree” were combined into one “agree” category and “disagree strongly” and “disagree” were combined into one “disagree” category (Tables 2–4). Section One pertained to the initial enrolment decision and pathways into the Centre, Section Two focused on factors that acted as barriers to whānau engagement in the Centre, and Section Three related to factors that facilitated whānau engagement in the Centre. The items are listed in Tables 2–4. Free-text spaces were available for participants to offer alternative or additional responses to the preceding questions. There was also an opportunity for final comment at the conclusion of the survey.

### Data analysis

The frequencies of responses within each section of the survey were calculated and organised in tables from most agreed to least agreed (Tables 2–4). Partially completed surveys were included in the analyses for the completed sections only. Frequency analysis of each section of the survey recorded items omitted by respondents as “missing”. Where pertinent, comments from whānau have been quoted in this article to supplement the quantitative findings using a mixed-methods approach driven by the quantitative findings (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Chi-square tests of association were run on each set of frequencies to test for differences across four participant characteristics: whānau member age at entry, gender, relationship to child, and Māori schooling experience. Demographic differences reaching significance are reported in the relevant frequency tables (Tables 2–4). A Bonferroni adjustment for multiple testing was applied to reduce the risk of type I error (falsely identifying a significant finding from repetition of similar tests).

**TABLE 2** Reasons whānau members chose to enrol their children in KM-EYP (ordered from highest to lowest agreement), n=121.

Question:	Endorsement patterns				
	% agree	% disagree	% other (na/ neither/ dk/ missed)	Unadjusted (P < .05)	Bonferonni adjusted
E10 Te Kōpae was 100% Māori immersion.	90.0	2.5	7.5	a-, c+	a, c
E7 I wanted [first child] to develop a strong Māori identity.	85.1	2.5	12.4	a-, c+	a
E9 I believed Te Kōpae would cater to [first child]’s needs and abilities.	81.0	2.5	16.5	a-, c+	c
E8 The skill and experience of the Kaitiaki at Te Kōpae.	80.2	1.7	18.1	c+	
E11 The quality of Te Kōpae’s tamariki programme.	80.1	1.7	18.3	c+	
E6 Te Kōpae’s focus on whānau not just tamariki.	78.5	3.3	18.1	a-, c+	
E14 No other preschool setting was providing the kaupapa Māori programme that I wanted.	76.0	6.7	17.4		
E5 My whānau members or my friends recommended Te Kōpae.	70.2	9.1	20.6	a-	
E12 I witnessed Te Kōpae children speaking Māori, and I wanted [first child] to be able to do that too.	67.8	5.0	27.2		
E2 My whānau members or friends had been involved in Te Kōpae.	66.9	15.7	17.3		
E4 My belief that Te Kōpae would help [first child] be successful at school.	66.1	5.8	28.0		
E13 Not many people in my whānau spoke Māori and I wanted to do something about it by putting [first child] in Te Kōpae.	63.6	18.2	18.2	d+	d
E3 My belief that Te Kōpae would help [first child] get on with other children.	62.8	7.4	29.8		
E1 Te Kōpae was convenient for me (e.g., location, transport).	34.7	31.4	33.9		
E15 Wānanga that I attended influenced my thinking.	33.9	21.4	44.6		
E16 Having [first child] in Te Kōpae gave me time out to attend to other things.	24.8	43.0	32.2		

a = Participant age at the entry to the Centre of their first child (a- = under 40 years are significantly more likely (>) than older participants above 40 years ; a+ = older > younger)  
 b = Participant gender (b+ = women > men; b- = men > women)  
 c = Participant relationship to child: parent; grandparent (c+ = parents > grandparents)  
 d = Participant experience of Māori schooling experience (KM-EYP or kura kaupapa Māori or Māori boarding school): some or none (d+ = none > some; d- = some > none)

dk = don’t know; Kaitiaki = teacher; tamariki = children; kaupapa Māori = Māori worldview; kura kaupapa Māori = primary school operating within a Māori worldview; KM-EYP = Kaupapa Māori early years provision; na = not applicable; Te Kōpae = shortened from Te Kōpae Piripono; Te Kōpae Piripono = Taranaki-based centre for Kaupapa Māori early years provision; wānanga = forum for sharing knowledge and learning; whānau = family, families

## Results

### *Section One: Decision to enrol their first child in the Centre*

The two most common reasons that motivated participants to enrol their first child in the Centre were its 100% Māori immersion programme (90%) and the perception that in that environment, their children would develop a secure Māori identity (85.1%) (Table 2).

A further three reasons reached levels of agreement of over 80%. These reasons were related to the Centre's provision for their children: catering to child's learning and development needs, the skill and experience of the kaitiaki, and the quality of the children's programme. In this regard, one participant added the following comment:

I had never been in such a positive environment before. . . . It was the first time I had realised that having different or specific wants was OK, and it in no way meant [my child] would miss out on all the learning that others too received. (Mother of former pupil)

There was over 75% endorsement that the Kaupapa Māori approach and the whānau focus motivated enrolment. Over 60% of participants had aspirations for their children to be equipped by the Centre to succeed academically and socially. Furthermore, 63.6% were motivated by the desire to build reo Māori capacity within their whānau. As one participant explained, "I believed strongly in the kaupapa and did what I could [with] my limited abilities . . . to support and help Te Kōpae educate our children in te reo Māori" (Father of former pupil). Endorsement dropped to below 35% for the influence of community-based wānanga, and for the consideration of location, transport, and time to do other things having motivated enrolling their child.

### *Section Two: Barriers to engagement*

The most common barrier to engagement in the Centre was participant whakamā about their capability in te reo Māori (45.5%) (Table 3).

One of the participants commented on their emotional response to the Māori immersive environment of the Centre as follows: "For the most part, I was not confident within myself or my own abilities. I had limited te reo and knowledge of te ao Māori. It was my own embarrassment" (Mother of former pupil). Almost a quarter of participants reported that they had no one to support them with te reo Māori at home. Whakamā about

circumstances in their personal lives was reported by 16.5% of participants.

Practical concerns hindered the study participants' levels of engagement, with 33% agreeing that the operating hours were difficult for them and a quarter of participants struggling with the commitment the Centre required of them. Just over 20% of participants indicated there was no one to help them with te reo Māori at home. There were transport issues, and the fees were a difficulty for almost 10%. Only 10.7% of participants felt discouraged by unsupportive family or friends. As one of the participants explained, "My mother would not attend due to her commitment to her [specific] faith—she did not support" (Mother of former pupil).

### *Section Three: Facilitators of engagement*

The cultural and social rewards of engagement for parents and whānau, including the positive relationships formed at the Centre, the social return to parents of involvement, the Māori environment of the Centre, and the available support for adult whānau members, were the most common engagement facilitators (Table 4). More than 90% of participants agreed that their positive relationships with kaitiaki facilitated engagement, and that the enjoyment derived from being with other Te Kōpae Piripono whānau members was helpful in facilitating their engagement.

Participants agreed that the Māori environment of the Centre, in which they felt comfortable, facilitated their engagement (89.2%). The practical support provided by kaitiaki and other staff was also frequently identified as a facilitator (88.3%). One participant commented on the important role of kaitiaki:

The Kōpae provided an extension to our village and filled a void for our whānau in terms of that aunty/grandmother mātauranga that we lost with the passing of my mother. This certainly was a factor that kept our engagement strong. (Mother of former pupil)

Additional facilitators that achieved over 85% endorsement were the whānau development approach, the Māori environment giving expression to participants' passion for te reo and tikanga Māori, and the learning they experienced as they engaged in the Centre's programmes. One of the participants commented on these outcomes: "The connection that Te Kōpae gave to te ao Māori for me and [my child] was invaluable. Parenting support, reo development, whānau environment,

**TABLE 3** Barriers to access and engagement experienced by whānau (ordered from highest to lowest agreement), n=121.

<i>Question:</i> The next set of questions ask you about potential barriers to your engagement with Te Kōpae. [First child's name] was enrolled at Te Kōpae Piripono from [start year] to [end year]. Thinking back to that time, were there things that made engagement in Te Kōpae more difficult for you? Below is a list of potential barriers to engagement with Te Kōpae Piripono. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about possible barriers to your engagement in Te Kōpae between [start year] and [end year]?		Endorsement patterns				
		% agree	% disagree	% other (na/ neither/ dk/ missed)	Unadjusted (P < .05)	Bonferonni adjusted
B3	I was whakamā/embarrassed about my limited reo Māori.	45.5	42.2	12.4	d+	
B2	Te Kōpae's operating hours (9am-3.30pm; with school holidays).	33.0	44.6	22.3		
B6	The level of commitment required of me.	24.8	47.9	27.3	d-	d
B4	There was no one to support [first child] and I in te reo Māori at home.	22.3	57.0	20.6	b+	b
B5	I had difficulty getting to and from Te Kōpae (transport issues).	21.5	63.7	14.9		
B8	I was whakamā/embarrassed about my personal circumstances.	16.5	68.6	14.9		
B11	My own experience of education/school was not positive.	11.6	68.6	19.8		
B1	My family or friends did not support my decision.	10.7	66.9	22.3		
B14	I found the fees at Te Kōpae expensive.	9.1	66.1	24.8	a-, d-	d
B13	Conflict in my home.	8.3	76.0	15.7		
B7	I had concerns about how it would impact [first child]'s English language development and education.	6.7	76.8	16.5		
B9	I (or someone in my whānau) had health issues.	6.6	78.5	14.8		
B12	Personal or whānau drug and alcohol issues.	5.8	80.2	14.1		
B16	I thought a Māori early childhood centre would not be as high quality as other mainstream early childhood centres.	3.3	85.9	10.7		
B15	The negative stories about Māori in the media made me doubt my choice of kaupapa Māori education, like Te Kōpae.	1.7	92.5	5.8		
B10	I was uncomfortable in an environment dominated by women.	0.8	89.3	9.9		

a = Participant age at the entry to the Centre of their first child (a- = under 40 years are significantly more likely (>) than older participants above 40 years ; a+ = older > younger)

b = Participant gender (b+ = women > men; b- = men > women)

c = Participant relationship to child: parent; grandparent (c+ = parents > grandparents)

d = Participant experience of Māori schooling experience (KM-EYP or kura kaupapa Māori or Māori boarding school): some or none (d+ = none > some; d- = some > none)

dk = don't know; kaupapa Māori = Māori worldview; KM-EYP = Kaupapa Māori early years provision; kura kaupapa Māori = primary school operating within a Māori worldview; na = not applicable; reo Māori = Māori language; Te Kōpae = shortened from Te Kōpae Piripono; Te Kōpae Piripono = Taranaki-based centre for Kaupapa Māori early years provision; te reo Māori = the Māori language; whānau = family, family member



**TABLE 4** Facilitators of engagement for whānau (ordered from highest to lowest agreement), n=120.

<i>Question:</i> Continuing to think about when [first child's name] was enrolled at Te Kōpae Piripono, [start year] to [end year], were there things that supported or encouraged your engagement in Te Kōpae? Below is a list of potential facilitators to engagement with Te Kōpae Piripono. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the things that helped with your engagement in Te Kōpae between [start year] and [end year]?		Endorsement patterns				
		% agree	% disagree	% other (na/neither/dk/missed)	Unadjusted (P < .05)	Bonferonni adjusted
F10	...my positive relationships with Kaitiaki at Te Kōpae.	92.5	2.5	5.0	b+	b
F13	...I enjoyed being with the other parents and whānau.	90.8	0.8	8.3		
F14	...Te Kōpae was a Māori place and I felt comfortable there.	89.2	3.3	7.5		
F2	...the practical support of the Kaitiaki and other staff.	88.3	2.5	9.1		
F12	...the whānau development approach of Te Kōpae.	87.5	2.5	10.0		
F6	...my passion for te reo Māori and tikanga Māori.	86.6	4.1	9.2		
F8	...the learning I was doing while we were involved at Te Kōpae.	85.9	5.0	9.1		
F11	...[first child] was enthusiastic about going to Te Kōpae each day.	84.1	5.0	10.7		
F4	...the progress [first child] was making.	82.5	4.1	13.4		
F3	...the practical support of other Te Kōpae whānau members.	79.2	5.9	15.0		
F5	...the engagement of my whānau in Te Kōpae.	71.7	8.4	20.0		
F1	...the practical support of my whānau or friends.	70.8	9.2	20.0		
F7	...the parenting advice the Kaitiaki gave me.	60.0	8.3	31.6		
F16	...the high expectations the Tumu and Kaitiaki had of me.	53.4	13.3	33.4		
F9	...the support Te Kōpae gave me with personal matters.	37.5	15.8	46.7		
F15	...the support I received from Government agencies or community-based social services.	20.0	36.6	43.4		

a = Participant age at the entry to the Centre of their first child (a- = under 40 years are significantly more likely (>) than older participants above 40 years ; a+ = older > younger) b = Participant gender (b+ = women > men; b- = men > women)  
c = Participant relationship to child: parent; grandparent (c+ = parents > grandparents)  
d = Participant experience of Māori schooling experience (KM-EYP or kura kaupapa Māori or Māori boarding school): some or none (d+ = none > some; d- = some > none)

dk = don't know; kaitiaki = teachers; kaupapa Māori = Māori worldview; KM-EYP = Kaupapa Māori early years provision; kura kaupapa Māori = primary school operating within a Māori worldview; na = not applicable; Te Kōpae = shortened from Te Kōpae Piripono; Te Kōpae Piripono = Taranaki-based centre for Kaupapa Māori early years provision; te reo Māori = the Māori language; tikanga Māori = Māori culture; Tumu = director; whānau = family, families

a sense of belonging—all koha that I really appreciated” (Mother of former pupil).

The progress and enthusiasm of tamariki, and the support and engagement of whānau and friends in the Centre both received endorsement in the range of 70%–84%. Specific supports provided by the Centre followed, before agreement dropped to 20% for the role of support from external services in facilitating engagement.

### **Differences by participant characteristics**

Significant differences by demographic characteristic are recorded in Tables 2–4. Differences that remained following adjustment are listed below.

#### *Participant age at entry*

Significantly more of the younger caregiving whānau members than their older counterparts agreed that enrolment had been motivated by the Centre’s 100% Māori immersion environment and the prospect of their child developing a secure Māori identity (Table 2).

#### *Participant gender*

Significantly more women than men reported lacking support with te reo Māori at home, which proved a barrier to their engagement in the Centre (Table 3). More women also agreed that their positive relationships with kaitiaki had facilitated engagement (Table 4).

#### *Relationship to child*

Significantly more parents than grandparents endorsed two of the top reasons for enrolling their children in the Centre—the Centre being 100% Māori immersion, and able to cater to their children’s needs and abilities. (Table 2).

#### *Māori schooling experience*

Significantly more participants who had not experienced any form of Māori schooling enrolled their children in the Centre to grow the number of Māori speakers in their whānau (Table 2). Significantly more participants who had experienced some form of Māori schooling found that the level of commitment the Centre required of them and the fees charged made engagement difficult (Table 3).

### **Discussion**

The survey phase of the overall Tangi te Kawekaweā study engaged with a large cohort of caregiving whānau members of Te Kōpae Piripono in Taranaki to more fully understand what helps or hinders Māori engagement in KM-EYP. Te Kōpae Piripono

provides a setting where Taranaki Māori identity is nurtured in a Māori language environment, and cultural knowledge, values and practices are normalised in the Centre’s daily life. The findings from this survey phase are summarised in Table 5 to show how they align with the engagement factors identified by the earlier qualitative phase and how they are interpreted in this discussion.

When considering the enrolment of their tamariki, participants viewed Te Kōpae Piripono as a quality whānau-inclusive programme in which their tamariki would acquire te reo Māori, develop a secure Māori identity and proceed to lead successful lives. Participants anticipated that in the whānau-focused centre, they too would learn alongside their tamariki. Te Huia (2015) explored the development of Māori identity amongst second language learners and noted the significance of the relationship between reo Māori acquisition, whakapapa connection and ongoing support in securing Māori identity and positive outcomes. KM-EYP is positioned to enable this development and is therefore crucial to ongoing community efforts to revitalise Māori language and culture, and to promote whānau health and wellbeing.

While Māori language and culture are the primary motivators for parents and whānau to enrol tamariki in KM-EYP, the unfamiliarity of a Māori immersive environment means it can be an uncomfortable one for some. This is particularly the case for whānau who have had limited exposure to their heritage language and culture yet have felt the weight of others’ expectations (Tamati et al., 2008). Parents and grandparents can enter KM-EYP with a deep sense of inadequacy, feel not sufficiently Māori, and fear being judged as such (Hond, 2013). This is the emotional response of whakamā which was identified as a barrier to engagement in the earlier qualitative phase of this study (Hond-Flavell et al., 2021) and in previous research conducted in the Centre (Tamati et al., 2008).

The whakamā of whānau on entry to KM-EYP is not unusual; other studies have reported parental discomfort on entering mainstream early childhood education and care facilities (Hornby & Lafaele, 2011; Ministry of Education, 2012). Reasons for this discomfort have included communication difficulties, embarrassment about aspects of parents’ private lives and past experiences. While these reasons were also common for participants in this study, for Māori and other Indigenous peoples there is an overlay of historical trauma (Pihama et al., 2014), cultural alienation and suppression, disempowerment and dispossession (Grace et al.,

2020; Ritchie & Skerrett, 2014) that is rooted in the impact of colonisation on their communities.

KM-EYP staff help new whānau understand that it is natural to feel whakamā if the environment is unfamiliar; participant responses indicate the importance of reassuring new whānau that they will be supported by kaitiaki and other tuakana whānau members who empathise with them, having required similar support in their own time. Support of this nature is the manifestation of manaakitanga, which in this context is judgement-free attentiveness to the tamariki, parents and whānau that enter. Centres that are well connected to their communities and critically aware of the historical contexts of whānau within those communities are more likely to understand the motivations and constraints of Māori parents and whānau (Tamati et al., 2008) and provide effective support. While colonisation is the undercurrent of much of what acts as barriers to whānau engagement, an intentional approach to whānau development comprising both structured and unstructured opportunities for wānanga, and caring relationships, in a whānau environment, is an example of decolonisation in practice, and the overriding facilitator of whānau engagement and positive outcomes for all the whānau (Pihama & Penehira, 2005).

The nature and degree of friends, family and community influence on participants' decisions to enrol their tamariki in KM-EYP and ongoing whānau engagement are likely to be associated with access to quality information about KM-EYP. Centres for KM-EYP have a role in promoting their provision within their communities but have limited resources at their disposal (Tamati et al., 2008). The findings provide further evidence to suggest that government policymakers must resource KM-EYP adequately and build public awareness of KM-EYP and its benefits, ensuring that Māori have access to the provision and can make informed decisions for their tamariki and whānau.

The findings of this phase of the Tangi te Kawekaweā study align with previous research showing that the socioeconomic constraints impacting engagement elsewhere in the sector and other parts of the education system (ECE Taskforce, 2010; Mitchell et al., 2014; Ritchie & Rau, 2009) are keenly felt by whānau Māori. While centres for KM-EYP are well placed to support whānau experiencing material hardship (Royal Tangaere, 2012; Tamati et al., 2008), the broader structural drivers of the social and economic inequities experienced by Māori are

the responsibility of government policymakers in response to evidence such as that provided by this study.

### ***Demographic differences in reasons for enrolling: Impact on facilitators and barriers***

The comparisons across key demographic characteristics (age at entry, gender, relationship to child and Māori schooling experience) indicate some significant aspects of variation in how different whānau perceived KM-EYP and were affected by the potential barriers to and facilitators of engagement (Tables 2–4).

Variations in life experience and exposure to te ao Māori and te reo Māori are likely to underpin differences between younger and older caregiving whānau members. The increase in recent years of Māori-medium education provision and other Māori community initiatives has enabled many of the younger parents to develop a familiarity with and capacity in Māori language and culture, with the expectation that the same would be standard for their tamariki, as has been found in other research (Tocker, 2012). In the Taranaki context of cultural and material dispossession stemming from the colonial period (Hond, 2013), older whānau members may be less likely to have had anywhere near the same access to opportunities to develop linguistic and cultural fluency. This reinforces a key finding from the earlier qualitative phase of the study: an engagement factor such as the 100% immersion environment of the Centre can act as a facilitator for some and a barrier to others (Hond-Flavell et al., 2021). With support, a barrier may also transform to become a facilitator and driver of further engagement.

The differences identified between parents and grandparents are likely due to the two cohorts' different stage-of-life priorities and life experiences. For some of the older whānau members (e.g., grandparents), the supportive whānau environment of KM-EYP is one where they find their voice in te reo Māori and can safely participate alongside tamariki and mokopuna (Tamati et al., 2008). The younger caregivers in this sample may have had a greater level of access to Māori language and culture and understood the value of those for their tamariki. Through the expression of manaakitanga, centres can ensure whānau members of all descriptions have what they need to access KM-EYP and then engage in the whānau collective.

The identified gender differences are more likely because women in the main continue to be the primary caregivers of tamariki (Alpass et al.,

2014). Women are more likely to manage the day-to-day responsibility of fostering their children's reo Māori, and to have had opportunity to form close relationships with the kaitiaki. Centres might use this information to develop targeted strategies to involve men outside of working hours, enabling tuakana-teina relationships to form (new whānau are supported by those more established) and ensuring all are adequately assisted.

Those whānau who were former students of Māori schooling were relatively young (Table 1) because the first kōhanga reo only opened in 1982. This may explain why the levels of commitment required and the fees were more likely to be barriers to engagement for those who were former students of Māori schooling (Table 3). These barriers may reflect the life and work demands of the younger age group and the external demands on those speakers of Māori within the workforce and the community (Rerekura, 2015). Centres that are responsive to the whānau in their communities will find innovative ways to accommodate their high levels of external commitments, ensuring they understand the importance of their engagement in the programme but also providing a variety of ways and times that whānau can participate.

### ***Strengths and limitations***

This study has various strengths. The lead researcher and two others of the research team are foundation members of the Centre, which is a strength in understanding the context and having the respondents' trust. This background with the Centre, however, may also have proved a limitation in the potential for biases and assumptions regarding participants' understanding of concepts, terms and processes, particularly participants who engaged in the Centre in the earlier years. However, survey development was informed by findings from the study's earlier qualitative phase, giving confidence that participants understood particular concepts discussed during this phase (Hond-Flavell et al., 2021). Furthermore, the process was undertaken with oversight and input from all co-authors (experts in Kaupapa Māori and survey research, and in working with tamariki and whānau in KM-EYP) throughout the development of the survey and during analysis and write-up of findings.

All participants of the study were whānau members of one centre for KM-EYP over 25 years of operation; therefore, the findings may not be generalisable to other settings that can differ philosophically or contextually from Te Kōpae Piripono, whether KM-EYP or another form of early years provision. Many of the whānau have

an ongoing relationship with the Centre or the wider local community, which contributed to the successful contacting of potential participants. The computer literacy of some participants and unreliable internet access were issues for this study and are recognised limitations of online survey research (Evans & Mathur, 2005). However, a paper version was made available to a small number of participants on request, which enabled their participation. The response rate was good for an online survey (Evans & Mathur, 2005), and there was adequate diversity within the participants to analyse demographic differences.

The survey method was retrospective in nature, which introduces limitations related to participant recall. However, participants were asked to recall their lived experience of a significant period in the early life of their first child/grandchild as a pupil of the Centre, and the survey was individualised using tailored memory cues based on the years in question and the insertion of their child's name within instructions and questions to provide clarity, consistent with the work of Caspi et al. (1996). The successful use of retrospective personalised online survey methodology within a Māori community, informed by earlier qualitative work, with supporting memory cues and devices, flexible delivery options, good communication and available support, speaks to the acceptability of these types of retrospective survey tools in other Māori contexts.

### **Conclusion**

The findings of this survey phase of the Tangi te Kawekaweā study provide insights into why whānau access KM-EYP, what barriers are encountered, and how access and engagement can be facilitated. These insights can help policymakers and practitioners who seek to improve the educational and other outcomes of tamariki and their whānau through increased engagement in KM-EYP.

The engagement factors identified in the earlier qualitative phase of this study and confirmed by this survey phase can act as barriers or facilitators, which is primarily determined by whānau circumstances, centre action and government policy (Table 5). Those who access KM-EYP are likely to be motivated to find a programme within which they and their tamariki can gain fluency in Māori language and culture and a strengthened Māori identity. Parents and whānau understand these outcomes to be critical for their tamariki to succeed in life as Māori. However, policy and planning on multiple levels are required to respond effectively

**TABLE 5** Quantitative patterns for barriers and facilitators of whānau engagement in KM-EYP compared to qualitative themes from Hond-Flavell et al. (2021)

Engagement factors	Barriers to engagement		Facilitators of engagement		Implications
<i>Hond-Flavell et al. (2021)</i>	<i>Qualitative findings from Hond-Flavell et al. (2021)</i>	<i>Relevant quantitative findings from this survey phase (may pertain to multiple engagement factors)</i>	<i>Qualitative findings from Hond-Flavell et al. (2021)</i>	<i>Relevant quantitative findings from this survey phase (may pertain to multiple engagement factors)</i>	<i>Qualitative phase—Survey phase—Implications</i>
1. Colonisation impacts	Pernicious effects of colonisation, including historical trauma	63.6% agreed that not many people in their whānau spoke Māori 11.6% did not have a positive experience of education/school 16.5% were whakamā about circumstances in their personal lives	Raising critical awareness of the historical context	87.5% of whānau found support and encouragement to persevere through the whānau development approach 85.9% agreed that the learning they did through the Centre programme encouraged engagement	When whānau engage in KM-EYP, they and those around them have access to information and support to help them understand the historical context and antecedents of current circumstances, which helps them make sense of their situations, find strength in the knowledge, and then see what must be done to effect positive change. This is the ethos of decolonisation. Such efforts have been shown to be powerful for Māori and other Indigenous communities (Pihama & Penhira, 2005).
2. Emotional responses	Whakamā—emotional responses including anxiety, embarrassment and shame	45.5% of whānau were whakamā about their capacity in te reo Māori Whakamā about circumstances in their personal lives was reported by 16.5%	Centre provides emotional and practical support that reassures and inspires confidence	The Māori environment of the Centre, in which they felt comfortable, facilitated the engagement of 89.2% of whānau The high expectations the Tumu and kaitiaki had of them supported 53.4% of whānau	Feelings of discomfort that are experienced in unfamiliar environments are normal but can be more pronounced for whānau Māori entering settings like KM-EYP, which are linguistically and culturally Māori, and yet foreign to them despite them being Māori. Kaupapa Māori settings can transform this common barrier to engagement into a facilitator, through the authentic expression of manaakitanga and aroha that can reassure parents and whānau that they are not alone; that their emotions are normal and that they have the support of the whānau collective, which will take good care of them and their tamariki and expects them to thrive in the centre and beyond.
3. Whānau and community connections	Whānau disconnection and limited social supports	Almost a quarter of participants reported that they had no one to support them with te reo Māori at home The family or friends of 10.7% of whānau did not support their decision	Fostering whānauranga—feeling and acting as a member of a whānau/community	78.5% of whānau were attracted by the whānau focus of the Centre Around 70% of whānau were influenced to enrol by their whānau and friends Over 90% of whānau agreed their positive relationships with kaitiaki (92.5%) and other members of the whānau collective (90.8%), encouraged engagement	Whānau connection and support are important and critical to initiatives that aim to work constructively with Māori. Whānau support can facilitate engagement; lack of whānau support can be a barrier. KM-EYP is a modern-day construction of whānau that is kaupapa-based yet grounded in Taranakitanga and local iwi traditions. The whānau collective of KM-EYP can extend on members' kin-based whānau, and support as needed in and out of the centre. The connection with past and present members of the whānau-collective builds the sense of belonging. It is essential that whānau and community have access to quality information to make informed decisions and facilitate engagement.
4. Institutional features	Centre expectation of engagement and commitment to kaupapa	45.5% of whānau were concerned about their ability to cope in the 100% Māori immersion programme 33% noted the operating hours were difficult for them A quarter of participants struggled with the commitment the Centre required of them	Quality programming in an inclusive kaupapa Māori environment	90% of whānau were motivated by the 100% Māori immersion programme More than 90% of participants agreed that their positive relationships with kaitiaki and their enjoyment derived from being with other Centre whānau members, facilitated engagement Participants recorded the practical support of the kaitiaki and staff (88.3%) and other Centre whānau members (79.2%) as facilitating their engagement	While enrolment in KM-EYP can be daunting and/or logistically challenging for whānau, the opportunity to participate in the quality immersive Māori education setting for their tamariki, with skilled kaitiaki, and a supportive whānau-collective, can attract whānau and sustain their engagement. Barriers can become facilitators. KM-EYP is “whānau ora” in action with the potential to wrap around parents and whānau to make a positive difference in their lives. The whānau development approach of KM-EYP requires additional resources if done well. Policymakers are encouraged to support the important role of KM-EYP in communities by making it easier for centres to function, by ensuring ongoing supply of the specialist workforce, and by resourcing increased delivery of and access to quality KM-EYP in all communities.
5. Culture and identity	Limited exposure to Māori language and culture	45.5% of whānau were whakamā/embarrassed about their limited reo Māori 63.6% of whānau recorded there were not many people in their whānau who spoke Māori	Cultural offering supports the development of local Māori identity	90.0% of whānau were attracted to the 100% Māori immersion setting of KM-EYP 85.1% of whānau were motivated by the opportunity for their children to develop a secure Māori identity	Engagement in initiatives like KM-EYP can be a political act of resistance by Māori to governments' efforts over many years to assimilate the Indigenous populations of Aotearoa and expropriate property and knowledge systems. KM-EYP offers parents and whānau the opportunity to reclaim their language and culture, to secure their Māori identity, and to be well-positioned to assert control over both the education of their tamariki and the cultural capacity and future prospects of the entire whānau.
6. Socioeconomic position	Social and material disadvantage	Whakamā about circumstances in their personal lives was reported by 16.5% Fees were a difficulty for almost 10%	Centre responds to the needs of whānau enabling engagement	Participants recorded the practical support of the kaitiaki and staff (88.3%) and other Centre whānau members (79.2%) as facilitating their engagement 37.5% attributed their engagement to the support the Centre provided them with personal matters	Māori continue to be the most marginalised in this country. That is the social context within which KM-EYP operates. Therefore, the real need exists for government policymakers to address the structural determinants of poverty and disadvantage within the Māori community and to endorse the Kaupapa Māori approach by resourcing Māori initiatives such as KM-EYP. This would ensure the continuity and expansion of quality Kaupapa Māori early years and whānau development programming that has been shown to be effective. With adequate resourcing and increased access to the provision, the positive outcomes of KM-EYP for community and country could be more widespread.

Aotearoa = New Zealand; aroha = love, caring, respect; iwi = tribe; kaitiaki = teachers; kaupapa = cause; kaupapa Māori = Māori worldview; KM-EYP = Kaupapa Māori early years provision; manaakitanga = caring, kindness; tamariki = children; Taranakitanga = characteristics associated with Māori of Taranaki; te reo Māori = the Māori language; Tumu = director; whakamā = embarrassment, shame; whānau = family, families; whānau Māori = Māori families; whānau ora = a healthy family; whānauranga = feeling and acting as a member of a whānau or community

to the considerable barriers whānau encounter, including whakamā, practical and economic constraints, and other access issues, which are the perpetuated impacts of colonisation on whānau.

Our findings affirm the vital role that KM-EYP continues to play for Māori communities seeking to improve the long-term outcomes for tamariki and whānau and their collective wellbeing. Supportive relationships within centres are vital, providing social, emotional and practical support and guidance to parents and whānau, helping them develop a sense of place and belonging to the centre whānau and community. In KM-EYP, with others of like mind, each whānau embarks on a shared journey towards fulfilment as Māori within te ao Māori and in other aspects of their lives.

The findings of demographic comparisons show some patterns suggesting older whānau members, men, grandparents and those who have not attended Māori schooling themselves are more likely to experience specific pertinent barriers. Such information is helpful for centre leaders. It indicates that whānau are not a homogeneous group but are products of various lived experiences and circumstances. Centres that effectively engage individuals and groups will demonstrate the principles and values of te ao Māori and Kaupapa Māori in their daily practice and prioritise responsive and constructive relationships, recognising both the strengths and needs they bring with them. These centres are well placed to successfully engage with and promote positive outcomes for all whānau members.

Policymakers can support the critical work of KM-EYP by accelerating efforts to address the structural barriers contributing to the social and economic hardship of whānau, which are critical determinants of Māori disengagement from early childhood education and KM-EYP. The government has a responsibility to ensure whānau and communities have access to quality information about KM-EYP and Māori-medium education so they can make informed educational decisions for their tamariki. Furthermore, policymakers must ensure the sufficiency of resourcing to KM-EYP to recognise the compound nature of its offering and ongoing contribution to efforts to revitalise Māori language and culture and rebuild whānau and communities. Resourcing should be increased to be commensurate with the expanded role KM-EYP has within communities. With such support, centres for KM-EYP and the kaitiaki within them can continue to deliver their programmes successfully and respond appropriately to whānau of different demographics. Once whānau throughout the country can access KM-EYP, the model might

then be scaled up to be accessible to families of all ethnicities throughout the country, which would contribute to a more collective and socially cohesive Aotearoa and allow the full transformative potential of KM-EYP for tamariki, whānau, communities and country to be realised.

### Glossary

Aotearoa	Māori name for New Zealand
aroha	love, caring, respect
iwi	tribe, people
kaitiaki	teacher at Te Kōpae Piripono
kaupapa	philosophy; purpose; paradigm; cause
Kaupapa Māori	a Māori philosophical framework; Māori approach; Māori worldview
koha	gift, contribution
kōhanga reo	a variety of Kaupapa Māori early years provision governed by Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust; literally, language nest
Kōpae	shortened from Te Kōpae Piripono; literally, nest
kura kaupapa Māori	primary school operating within a Māori worldview
manaakitanga	caring, kindness, respect, generosity
Māori	Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa
mātauranga	knowledge
mātauranga Māori	Māori knowledge
mokopuna	grandchildren
reo	language
reo Māori	Māori language
tamariki	children
tamariki Māori	Māori children
Tangi te Kawekaweā	study title; literally, the call of the long-tailed cuckoo heralds spring and the opportunity for growth
Taranaki	a tribal nation and region of Aotearoa
Taranakitanga	The characteristics typically associated with Māori of Taranaki, including local practices and beliefs
te ao Māori	the Māori world
Te Kōhanga Reo	Kōhanga reo movement governed by Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust
Te Kōpae	shortened from Te Kōpae Piripono

Te Kōpae Piripono	Taranaki-based centre for Kaupapa Māori early years provision
Te Kura mai i Tawhiti	title of research programme; literally, sacred legacy of an ancient era
te reo Māori	the Māori language
teina	younger sibling or peer
tikanga Māori	Māori culture, conventions, and protocols grounded in traditional values
tuakana	older sibling or peer peer
tumu	director
wānanga	forum for sharing knowledge and learning
whakamā	embarrassment, shame
whānau	family, families; group of people bound by genealogy or shared interest; the extended family structure principle
whānauranga	feeling and acting as a member of a whānau or community
whānau Māori	Māori families
whānau ora	a healthy family
wharekura	secondary school extension of kura kaupapa Māori
wharekura	secondary school extension of kura kaupapa Māori

## References

- Alpass, F., Keeling, S., & Pond, R. (2014). *Caregiving: Summary report for the New Zealand longitudinal study of ageing*. Massey University.
- Bakken, L., Brown, N., & Downing, B. (2017). Early childhood education: The long-term benefits. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 31(2), 255–269. <https://doi.org/gg259p>
- Belsky, J., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., & Poulton, R. (2020). *The origins of you: How childhood shapes later life*. Harvard University Press. <https://doi.org/h5d9>
- Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Thornton, A., Freedman, D., Amell, J. W., Harrington, H., Smeijers, J., & Silva, P. A. (1996). The life history calendar: A research and clinical assessment method for collecting retrospective event-history data. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 6(2), 101–114. <https://doi.org/bkc3xd>
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Duncan, J., Te One, S., Dewe, R., Punga-Jurgens, J., Shaw, L., Eaton, T., & Thomas, M. (2012). *Active adult participation in early childhood education: Enhancing child learning and community wellness*. Teaching & Learning Research Initiative.
- ECE Taskforce. (2010). *An agenda for amazing children: Final report of the ECE taskforce*. Ministry of Education.
- Education Counts. (2020a). *Early learning participation*. <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/participation>
- Education Counts. (2020b). *School leavers' attainment*. <https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/school-leavers>
- Education Review Office. (2017). *Hauhaketia ngā taonga tuku iho kia puāwai ai— Unearth our ancestral treasures so that we may prosper*. <https://ero.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2021-04/Hauhaketia%20Ng%C4%81%20Taonga%20Tuku%20Iho%20Kia%20Pu%C4%81wai%20ai%20%28English%29.pdf>
- Elek, C., Gubhaju, L., Lloyd-Johnsen, C., Eades, S., & Goldfeld, S. (2020). Can early childhood education programs support positive outcomes for Indigenous children? A systematic review of the international literature. *Educational Research Review*, 31, article 100363. <https://doi.org/gjk2tf>
- Evans, J. R., & Mathur, A. (2005). The value of online surveys. *Internet Research*, 15(2), 195–219. <https://doi.org/d8tcnt>
- Gerlach, A. J., Browne, A. J., & Greenwood, M. (2017). Engaging Indigenous families in a community-based Indigenous early childhood programme in British Columbia, Canada: A cultural safety perspective. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 25(6), 1763–1773. <https://doi.org/h5fc>
- Grace, R., Skerrett, M., Ritchie, J., Greenwood, M., & Trudgett, M. (2020). Early childhood education and care for Indigenous children and their family. In J. Murray, B. Swadener, & K. Smith (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of young children's rights* (pp. 313–330). Routledge. <https://doi.org/h5fd>
- Gracey, M., & King, M. (2009). Indigenous health part 1: Determinants and disease patterns. *The Lancet*, 374(9683), 65–75. <https://doi.org/bxvhzq>
- Halgunseth, L., Peterson, A., Stark, D., & Moodie, S. (2009). *Family engagement, diverse families, and early childhood education programs: An integrated review of the literature*. National Association for the Education of Young Children. [https://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/EDF\\_Literature20Review.pdf](https://nieer.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/EDF_Literature20Review.pdf)
- Hond, R. (2013). *Matua te reo, matua te tangata. Speaker community: Visions, approaches, outcomes* [Doctoral dissertation, Massey University]. Massey Research. <https://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/5439>
- Hond-Flavell, E., Tamati, A., Edwards, W., Hond, R., Treharne, G. J., Theodore, R., Poulton, R., & Ratima, M. (in press). Te kura mai i tawhiti: Ancestral knowledge and practice in Kaupapa Māori early years provision. In L. Pihama & J. Lee-Morgan (Eds.), *Tiakina te pā harakeke: Ancestral knowledge and the wellbeing of Māori children*. Huia.
- Hond-Flavell, E., Theodore, R., Treharne, G., Tamati, A., Edwards, W., Poulton, R., Hond, R., & Ratima, M. (2021). Tangi te Kawekaweā: Whānau engagement in Kaupapa Māori early years provision—an

- exploratory qualitative study. *MAI Journal*, 10(1), 3–16. <https://doi.org/h5ff>
- Hornby, G., & Lafaele, R. (2011). Barriers to parental involvement in education: An explanatory model. *Educational Review*, 63(1), 37–52. <https://doi.org/c35dk4>
- Leske, R., Sarmardin, D., Woods, A., & Thorpe, K. (2015). What works and why?: Early childhood professionals' perspectives on effective early childhood education and care services for Indigenous families. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 40(1), 109–118. <https://doi.org/dnp9>
- May, S., & Hill, R. (2008). Māori-medium education: Current issues and challenges. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Can schools save Indigenous languages?* (pp. 66–98). Springer. <https://doi.org/h5fg>
- Ministry of Education. (2012). *Participation in early childhood education: Evidence booklet*. [https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0006/114945/Participation-in-Early-Childhood-Education-Evidence-Booklet-121212.pdf](https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/114945/Participation-in-Early-Childhood-Education-Evidence-Booklet-121212.pdf)
- Ministry of Education. (2013). *Tau mai te reo: The Māori language in education strategy 2013–2017*. <https://www.education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Ministry/Strategies-and-policies/Ka-Hikitia/TauMaiTeReoFullStrategyEnglish.pdf>
- Mitchell, L., Haggerty, M., Hampton, V., & Pairman, A. (2006). *Teachers, parents, and whānau working together in early childhood education*. New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Mitchell, L., Meagher-Lundberg, P., Davison, C., Kara, H., & Kalavite, T. (2014). *ECE participation programme evaluation: Stage 3*. Ministry of Education.
- Mitchell, L., Wylie, C., & Carr, M. (2008). *Outcomes of early childhood education: Literature review*. New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2017). *Starting strong 2017: Key OECD indicators on early childhood education and care*. <https://www.oecd.org/education/school/starting-strong-2017-9789264276116-en.htm>
- Pihama, L., & Penehira, M. (2005). *Building baseline data on Māori, whānau development and Māori realising their potential: Literature review: Innovation and enterprise*. Auckland UniServices. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.539.4144&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Pihama, L., Reynolds, P., Smith, C., Reid, J., Smith, L. T., & Nana, R. T. (2014). Positioning historical trauma theory within Aotearoa New Zealand. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 10(3), 248–262. <https://doi.org/ckt5>
- Pihama, L., Smith, K., Taki, M., & Lee, J. (2004). *A literature review on kaupapa Māori and Māori education pedagogy*. International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education.
- Preston, J. P., Cottrell, M., Pelletier, T. R., & Pearce, J. V. (2012). Aboriginal early childhood education in Canada: Issues of context. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, 10(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/h5ff>
- Ratima, M., Theodore, R., Tamati, A., Hond-Flavell, E., Edwards, W., Korewha, H., Treharne, G. J., Hond, R., Craig, D., & Poulton, R. (2019). Te kura mai i tawhiti: A collaborative lifecourse approach to health, wellbeing and whānau development, *MAI Journal*, 8(1), 63–76. <https://doi.org/f5wk>
- Reid, J., Taylor-Moore, K., & Varona, G. (2014). Towards a social-structural model for understanding current disparities in Maori health and wellbeing. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, 19(6), 514–536. <https://doi.org/dvjr>
- Rerekura, E. (2015, June 3). Māori employees feel “used” for cultural knowledge. *RNZ*. <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/te-manu-korihī/275350/maori-employees-feel-%27used%27-for-cultural-knowledge>
- Ritchie, J., & Rau, C. (2009). Mā wai ngā hua? “Participation” in early childhood in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *International Critical Childhood Policy Studies*, 2(1), 93–108.
- Ritchie J., & Skerrett, M. (2014). *Early childhood education in Aotearoa New Zealand: History, pedagogy, and liberation*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/h5fj>
- Royal Tangaere, A. (2012). *Te hokinga ki te ukaipo: A socio-cultural construction of Māori language development: Kōhanga Reo and home* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Auckland]. ResearchSpace. <https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/handle/2292/13392>
- Tamati, A., Hond-Flavell, E., & Korewha, H. (2008). *Centre of Innovation research report of Te Kōpae Piripono*. [https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/118457/Te-Kopae-Piripono-COI-Full-Report.pdf](https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/118457/Te-Kopae-Piripono-COI-Full-Report.pdf)
- Tamati, A., Ratima, M., Hond-Flavell, E., Edwards, W., Hond, R., Korewha, H., Theodore, M., Treharne, G., & Poulton, R. (2021). He piki raukura: Understanding strengths-based Māori child development constructs in kaupapa Māori early years provision. *MAI Journal*, 10(1), 17–29. <https://doi.org/h5fk>
- Tamati, A., Treharne, G. J., Kokaua, J., Theodore, R., Ratima, M., Hond-Flavell, E., Edwards, W., Hond, R., & Poulton, R. (2021). He piki raukura: Assessing ao Māori developmental constructs—Part II: Mapping positive change over 10 months among preschool Māori children. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 50(2), 35–45.
- Tamati, A., Treharne, G. J., Theodore, R., Ratima, M., Hond-Flavell, E., Edwards, W., Hond, R., & Poulton, R. (2021). He piki raukura: Assessing ao Māori developmental constructs—Part I: Reliability of novel strengths-based measures among preschool Māori children. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 50(2), 22–34. <https://doi.org/h5fk>
- Taylor, A. (2010). Here and now: The attendance issue in Indigenous early childhood education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(5), 677–699. <https://doi.org/fqc6rm>
- Te Huia, A. (2015). Perspectives towards Māori identity by Māori heritage language learners. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 44(3), 18–28.
- Tocker, K. (2012). Hei oranga Māori i te ao hurihuri nei: Living as Māori in the world today—An outcome of kura kaupapa Māori. *MAI Journal*, (1), 15–28.
- Waitangi Tribunal. (2013). *Matua rautia: Report on the Kōhanga Reo claim* (Wai 2336). <https://waitangitribunal.govt.nz/assets/Documents/Publications/WT-Matua-Rautia-Report-on-the-Kohanga-Reo-claim.pdf>