Unfairness and structural injustice in a middle school in Aotearoa

Brian Anthony Moreton

A thesis submitted to the AUT University in partial fulfilment of

Doctor of Philosophy

2019

Abstract

This research commenced with an observation that unfairness/injustice encountered in a well-resourced school may be different from that experienced in a school challenged with behavioural concerns and academic underachievement. Part of this difference may be due to pedagogical, cultural unresponsiveness of the school towards the Māori and Pasifika participants; that is, relational cultural values. Alternatively, there could be other reasons entirely.

The thesis represents my personal growth in moving from a psychological/scientific view, that all could be found by applying the right instruments to the people in question, to a view that the responses and people needed to be seen in a political and social context. It represents an original contribution to critical psychology.

One way of finding out about unfairness/injustice is to ask students for their perceptions. Subsequently, I searched the literature for what it could reveal regarding student perspectives on unfairness. The literature proved to be mostly silent on the topic. I attributed the silence to the influence of a distributive justice paradigm and its associated metaphors.

To rectify this literature gap, and reveal the students' voice, I proposed two empirical inquiries and a critical reinterpretation of the data from the empirical findings. These research undertakings are aimed at opening the gap in the literature to enable these voices to be heard. The first empirical activity involved an innovative qualitative survey using a purposive sample of 77 early adolescents, middle school participants to determine the diversity of a phenomenon of experienced unfairness. The second empirical activity inquired into the processes behind assigning meaning to unfairness and involved interviewing 13 students.

Finally, I explored injustice at a whole school level by a critical reinterpretation of the data focusing on cultural, structural injustices.

The first interpretive activity was to analyse the survey data, using thematic analysis, in order to establish the *diversity* of unfairness within this student population. The second stage involved an analysis of data from 12 semi-structured interviews using interpretive phenomenological analysis, with a focus on the processes in assigning meaning to unfairness. The combined data revealed the possibility of a phenomenon of perceived unfairness as a *judgment of accountability* for unfairness (an adverse event, culpability being established for that event, and a comparison of the event against a breach of ethical standards, via counterfactual cognitive processes). This interpretation revealed four superordinate themes of: 'Why did she do that to me?'; 'It is not fair!'; 'Intense relational emotions'; and, 'Managing intense emotion.'

A third activity involved a critical reinterpretation of the unfairness themes as *structural injustices* resulting from unequal cultural, relational power. The structures were theorised as the result of a mutual conditioning process of neoliberal school culture and student cultural values. Students' Māori and Pasifika cultural, interpersonal, relational values provide the basis for the students' counter-conditioning. The neoliberal influenced culture was evaluated through the Education Review Office reports and the technical processes of performativity, managerialism, and competition. The students' counter-conditioning was through judgements of injustice. Mutual conditioning produced four structural injustices based on violations of Pasifika and Māori cultural, relational values. Four structures were analysed in the form of underachievement, intra-peer bullying as lateral violence, teacher bullying, and the closure of the participants' intermediate school.

I argue that counterconditioning contributed to students' marginalisation by maintaining their underachievement, disrupting the establishment of strong learner identity, silencing and stigmatising, and continuing colonial trauma. Teacher bullying was disrupting the development of a model of a successful teacher-student learning partnership.

A judgment of either individual judgement of unfairness or collective structural injustice may generate a 'force' of relational power from the embedded cognition of these judgements. Through emotional complexes, theorised as a social relational power, bodily euphoria as anger can affect a range of strategic action. Anger may be associated with strategic disengagement as resistance, but inadvertently contribute to marginalisation by withdrawal. Sadness, as dysphoria, may contribute to engagement coping skills. The utterance of "It is not fair" may be a protest and a warning of cultural, relational injustice.

Table of Contents

UNFAIRNESS AND STRUCTURAL INJUSTICE IN A MIDDLE SCHOOL IN AOTEAROA

List of Tables

Attestation of Authorship

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which, to a substantial extent, has been accepted for the qualification of any other degree, or diploma of a university or other institution of higher learning, except where due acknowledgement is made in the acknowledgements.

…………………………………………………….

18/04/2019

Acknowledgements

the Auckland Buddhist Mens' Sangha. I would like to extend my thanks for skilful proofreading by Shoba Nayar, and Rud Ward of thesiseditor.newzealand@gmail.com.

Chapter one: The contextualisation of unfairness and injustice

The utterance of 'it is not fair' has intrigued me for a long time. A sensitivity to un/fairness or in/justice have been part of my beliefs, values and action over much iteration of religious and political activities. The intrigue comes from being able to relate to unfairness yet, intuitively, I felt that there was more to it. I can remember parenting around fairness with our two boys and feeling that I had responded in a fair way. However, if you had to pull me aside and asked me what had been going on, I would have been perplexed. As a parenting topic, this issue is not paramount for most people. However, I was driven to find out more about it. As a psychologist, I have speculated about students who often seem to use the term 'It is not fair!' This speculation about unfairness is at the level of the individual and group.

As a psychologist the responses to large numbers of clients picked up from types of schools also provoked questioning. If I encounter unfairness in a 'successful school' it is taken seriously, the young person is listened to. Time is given to a full understanding of the parties involved. If unfairness was not dealt with promptly by the school, would have well-resourced and connected parents contacting the school. In a well-resourced school, with few behaviour challenges, the contrast in this level of behaviour makes it stand out. It demands immediate attention. Intervention goals may even be drawn from the early childhood curriculum (Te Whāriki), where fairness is a teaching goal. For the over-fives, it may be placed in the Essential Skills section of the 'Relating to others' of the New Zealand National Curriculum.

In contrast, young people, from an under-resourced school, expressing unfairness may be seen in a different light. In my experience, unfairness in schools coping with overwhelming

social and behavioural concerns will be ignored. Little time will be allocated to deal with the concern, and students may be dismissed as utilising unfairness. Parents will not be seen on the school playground demanding attention. It may even be dismissed as part of everyday life or dismissed as part of growing up. It will never get the Rolls Royce attention given to its counterpart in the 'successful school.'

What then is going on at the individual level of with unfairness and injustice at the societal level?

Introduction

In this chapter, I chart my approach to the voicing of unfairness and injustice. The map for my investigation is of Te Aroha Intermediate School (school years 7 and 8, aged from 10 to 14) in New Zealand/Aotearoa (henceforth, referred to as Aotearoa). (The school name has been anonymised in all documents.)

My journey starts with a review of the current literature to see what it can reveal about can about the nature of unfairness and injustice, using a critique based on a distributive justice paradigm (Young, 1990). Based on the findings from the literature review, I then argue for a return to a focus on the students themselves by 'voicing' their views on unfairness and injustice. Based on an argument for going back to basics, my two empirical activities are couched within an interpretive paradigm. My last research activity is a critical reinterpretation of the data, at a social level, from the first two interpretative activities. While this roadmap charts my research journey, it also records my transition as a researcher moving from the scientific practitioner model (Belar, 2003) that I   was trained in, to an interpretative orientation and then to one based on a critical psychology perspective (Williams, Billington, Goodley, & Corcoran, 2017). At the outset I was searching for a wider perspective within an

individual's psychology when I realised positivist psychological discourse perspectives were limited. These discourses also challenged the values upon which I was supposed to base my work. Consequently, I shifted my focus to a wider sociocultural one rather than a narrow 'logical' positive one (Costa & Shimp, 2011).

Based on the perspectives outlined above, Chapter One is organised into three parts. Part one consists of definitions leading into a critique of the distributive paradigm and associated metaphors in which most of the current research is situated. Part two consists of an argument for adopting a student perspective to voice students' perspective on unfairness utilising an interpretive paradigm. Part three focuses on a 'critical' reinterpretation of the unfairness as injustice at a societal level.

Part one: The current literature

The meanings of 'fairness/unfairness' and 'justice/injustice'

'Fairness' and 'justice' are necessary to human wellbeing and a sense of cultural identity, fulfilment of the human condition, and potentiality. 'Fairness,' at the individual level, evokes an expectation that a person may have a moral sensibility in the pursuit of fulfilling his/her potential and goals (Sabbagh, & Resh, 2016; Walzer, 2008). 'Unfairness' is a subjective experience perceived through the filtered lens of an individual's cultural values, ethical standards, past experiences, and future expectations (Finkel, 2001; Thorkildsen, 1989, a & b). 'Injustice' is a societal phenomenon that can be perceived at the group level, but not always with a shared understanding. If individuals experience an event they perceive as unfair they may experience a negative emotion or distress; resulting in an individual's retaliatory action to restore the consequences to a state of fairness (Young, 1990, 2001, 2006). If a group perceives an injustice, they may have shared feelings of distress and a drive to restore the

injustice to one of justice. However, at the group level, this sense of injustice may not be immediately apparent or is hidden via the process of 'normalisation' (Young, 1990).

"It is not fair!" can be seen as a protest at a miscarriage of fairness. It is so well known at the individual level that it has been referred to as a 'teenage lament' (New Zealand Listener, 2006). As a lament, I argue that it potentially represents unfairness only as an individualised phenomenon. It is to be put 'right' by a re-distribution of infringed fairness norms associated with the standards of equity, equality, and need (Deutsch, 2006; Damon, 1988). But as an injustice, the effects may be hidden due to a normalising of it as individual unfairness. In the literature, a hidden feature of injustice may be due to a normalising process which can lead to reification, by adopting a distributive approach to the investigation of unfairness (Forst, 2007). This can result in the exclusion of a broader view of unfairness as a socio-cultural process. What does the current literature have to say about either unfairness or injustice?

Literature embedded within a positivism paradigm

A review of the current literature on unfairness injustice is designed to answer the broad question, "What does the current literature have to say about the nature of perceived unfairness?" In this section, I develop a framework for my review of the current literature on unfairness and injustice, based on a critique of a positivist based distributive paradigm (Young, 1990). The concept of paradigm is a contested one (Mackenzie & Nipe, 2006). Creswell (2003), for example, refers to a paradigm as having three components of ontology (a position on the nature of reality), epistemology (what constitutes an acceptable way of knowing) and methodology (the model of the research process).

Philosophical concepts of justice long ago split into two broad streams of justice as distributive (positivism) and political justice (critical) (Forst, 2007). One stream, distributive

justice focuses on the goods people are allocated in a distributive scheme along with ethical standards which guide that allocation. This stream concerns itself with end states, and the material benefits people accrue. The other stream, political justice, centres on relationships between people and their relative power in exercising their relationships. Concerns in this stream also centre on the social and ethical legitimacy of power. Forst (2007) points out that the danger of the distributive channel is in neglecting how you are treated in favour of what you have. Forst (2007) argues that no matter what you have, the ultimate feature of justice is how you are treated and that justice is ultimately about the, … "relational virtue of actions, structures, and instructions in which persons stand to each other as social and political subjects, be they structures of production and distribution of material goods or the exercise of political power" (Forst, p. 261).

In his article, Forst (2007) argues that the Distributive Paradigm is restricted to distributions and ignores relational power. Young's (1990) in her *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, argues that justice is:

> Held captive by the "distributive paradigm," which restricts the question of justice "to the morally proper distribution of benefits and burdens among society's members." In her eyes, this leads to (1) a reified conception of "goods" to be distributed, reducing rights, and especially the power to goods that are "there" to be distributed. Thus the paradigm (2) ignores the social and institutional contexts that determine distributive patterns in the first place (p. 261).

The critique of the current unfairness and injustice literature presented in the first part of Chapter Two is based on a critique of an overarching positively oriented, distributive paradigm (Young, 1990). The specifics of the literature are manifest within several metaphors.

These metaphors are what Lakatos (1978) calls 'guiding metaphors' and operate at a lower level of organising research than that of paradigms and they are largely implicit. Two of these metaphors come from organisational justice, as applied to education in the form of homo economicus, and homo socialis (Colquitt et al., 2001). A further two metaphors, school climate (Gottfredson et al., 2001) and spheres of justice (Thorkildsen, e.g., 1989a) are directly from empirical educational research. The weathering metaphor is from epidemiological health sciences (Jackson et al., 2006). These metaphors discussed in the first part of Chapter Two along with a summary diagram. Based on this analysis I argue that the current literature is insufficiently developed to give voice to the early adolescent views on unfairness and injustice. In the next section, I will advance an argument for taking the students' voice as the starting point for research to fill in this gap in the literature, after which I will map out some alternatives routes.

Part two: Alternative routes

Voicing unfairness and injustice

If I am trying to voice student perceptions of unfairness and injustice, I start from the position that it is axiomatic that my co-participants are included directly in my research. Indeed much of part one of Chapter Two involves a critique of the research where viewpoints are more experimenter determined. Not to have voiced student views would have been unfair. The change of name of the former Ministry of Special Education Section to Student Support reflects a paradigm change that I will explore in this section on voicing.

This name change reflects a broader change in the literature emerging over the last decade that inclusion is not just about exclusion from education but includes a broader perspective, including a critique of marginalisation within education. Indeed Booth and

Ainscow (1998) position themselves thus, "Inclusion or exclusion is as much about participation and marginalisation in relation to race, gender, sexuality, poverty, and unemployment as they are traditional concerns with students categorised as low in attainment, disabled or deviant in behaviour" (p. 2). Other researchers and commentators also write about opening up the term 'inclusion' to cater for all students (e.g., Ainscow, Booth, & Dyson, 2006), including those who have been marginalised. As Rose and Shelvin (2005) argued, a marginalisation focus enables one to "reflect upon how future developments may afford greater opportunities to those who have been denied" (p. 160).

At the heart of my argument is the idea that unfairness conceptualised either individually or as a social process, is a dynamic process. In Te Aroha School, the face of unfairness involves teacher and students, peer to peer, and student to environmental interactions. Consequently, dialogue with students about sources of unfairness around culture, practices, and environment is essential if teachers are to monitor unfairness. As I argue, by the title of Chapter Seven: 'The canary sings,' it is essential to be in dialogue with students around issues where they have little input or where an issue may be hidden and requires adult assistance to voice. In support of this position, Dyson (2005) suggests that students can be viewed as hidden voices.

At the heart of fairness for Māori and Pasifika, students lie interpersonal relationships. For Māori, it might be conveyed in the Whakatoki (traditional saying) 'He Tangata he Tangata He Tangata' or 'it is people, it is people, it is people.' The Pasifika concept of Vā (Le Va in Tonga and in Samoan le va) refers to the space of relationships between people as well as between people, environment, ancestors, and spirituality (Reynolds, 2018). I believe that a good relationship with students and listening to their voices is part of unpacking their opinion of

cultural relationships as a source of unfairness. It is the student, after all, who has the first-hand experience of marginalisation in the school setting (Messiou, 2002). Much of the unfairness literature reviewed in Chapter 2, based on a distributive paradigm, is best viewed as research *on* children and not *with* the student (Okane, 2008). The fundamental causes of unfairness as marginalisation for some of my co-participants may not be made clear unless priority is given to listening to the views of students (Messiou, 2012). I take the position that students are social actors (Christenson & Prout, 2002), and I consequently involved them as active partners in the research process.

An interpretivist path

In this part of the chapter, I will present the first of two alternative paradigms (the other, a critical paradigm is in Part Three of this chapter) as the basis of an alternative interpretive path to voice the gap in the literature. After defining an alternative interpretive paradigm, I will set out my theorisation for two pieces of empirical work, a qualitative survey, and semi-structured interviews, based on fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 1989; Cropanzano & Folger, 2001) and Burkitt's (2014) social relational theory of emotion. Finally, a case for the voicing of early adolescent views on unfairness at the individual level is partly based on negative findings for unfairness a range of educational, health and social and emotional factors is presented.

The interpretivist path is based on constructivism. Ontologically in a constructivist reality being "socially constructed, subjective, may change" (Wahyuni, 2012, p. 70) and has multiple forms. Epistemologically interpretivism is focused on "Subjective meanings and social phenomena. Focus upon the details of the situation, the reality behind these details, subjective meanings, and motivating actions", (Wahyuni, 2012, p. 70). The interpretivist

paradigm axiologically is "Value-bound and emic. Research is value bound; the researcher is part of what is being researched, cannot be separated and so will be subjective", (Wahyuni, 2012, p. 70).

In order to place the subjective nature of interpretive paradigm in line with much of the interpretive research, I will use the term 'experience' for the subjective nature of unfairness, after Dewey (Stuhr, 2000). As Stuhr (2000, p. 437) puts it, "experience is an activity in which subject and object are unified and constituted as partial features and relations within this ongoing, unanalyzed unity' For Dewey, experience is a continuous interaction with elements of our surroundings.

The research methodology for the two empirical activities (survey and interviews) may be interpretivist, but the research methods are different. A methodology may be seen as a map, while a method may be seen as the steps of the journey (Jonker & Pennink, 2010). The research method is the pragmatic application, whereas the methodology is the theoretical and ideological basis.

The two data collection methods are those of a qualitative survey and semi-structured interviews. While I inherited the concept of a survey from an earlier iteration of the methodology, it is the work of Jansen (2000) which provides a theoretical basis for a qualitative survey (Jansen, 2010). "While the statistical survey analyses frequencies in member characteristics in a population, the qualitative survey analyses the diversity of member characteristics within a population." The diversity of member characteristics may either be predefined or developed in open coding (Jansen, 2010, p. 1). The choice of the qualitative survey is designed to scope the diversity of the experience of unfairness amongst the early adolescents' of Te Aroha School. Specifically, the survey is designed to answer the

second research question, "What is the diversity of the perceived unfairness in the student population of the Te Aroha Middle School?"

The second data collection method is that of a semi-structured interview. The main characteristic of the interview is to facilitate the participants' sharing of their perspectives of unfairness. The semi-structured interview offers the merit of using pre-determined themes but maintains flexibility to enable the early adolescents' to talk freely about their experiences of unfairness. The in-depth qualitative interview is directly embedded in the interpretivist research methodology (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The in-depth interviews are designed to obtain a deeper understanding of processes rather than breadth or diversity about experienced unfairness. Specifically, the interviews are designed to answer the third research question, "How do students in the Te Aroha School give meaning to perceived unfairness?"

Qualitative data analysis is focused on the drawing of inferences from the survey and interview data about experienced unfairness. It involves disassembling, segmenting, and reassembling data to develop meaningful themes in order to draw inferences about the process of assigning meaning to perceived unfairness. For the data analysis of survey data I have chosen Braun and Clarkes' (2012) Thematic Analysis (TA) and Smith, Flowers, & Larkens', (2009) Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA).

Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 6) indicate that "TA is a method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data "TA has been around for a long time, and it has been subject to a number of critiques. In response Braun and Clarke (2006, p. 1) revised TA so that it "adequately outlines the theory, application, and evaluation of thematic analysis."

I use the six steps developed by Braun and Clarke (2006) to conduct a TA. These involve: interviews are transcribed verbatim; features are identified in initial codes general codes; preliminary codes and collated interpretations are developed into further themes; the

coded data is developed into a thematic map; in order to refine each theme clear definitions is derived for each; and finally, the themes are theorised in order to move beyond a surface level.

IPA (Smith & Osborn, 2009) has three theoretical underpinnings. Phenomenology is a philosophical approach which aims to produce an account of the lived experience. IPA recognises that this is an interpretative endeavour because humans are sense-making organisms. Finally, IPA is idiographic in examining the detailed unfair experience prior to the move to more general claims.

The transcribed interviews in IPA are analysed following the procedures devised by Smith et al. (2009). Each transcript is read several times and summarised with comments made for each segment of significant discourse. Re-reading allows the preliminary themes to be modified and structured hierarchically. A framework of interlinking categories, with subcategories, is developed across the cases to ensure the emerging master list of themes remained valid within the data.

The theorisation that I will use is for the qualitative survey and interview data and is Fairness theory (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998; Cropanzano & Folger, 2001) which centre on all three subdivisions of Organisational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional) bringing them into the one cognitive process of as an assignment of blame. In their theory, blame is conceptualised as a process of accountability. It employs *counterfactuals* (Roese, 1997; Epstude, & Roese, 2008), which are defined as "contrary to the facts" (Roese, 1997, p. 133). One decides by comparing a perceived 'fact' and cognitively compares it to ones which may be better or worse. The theory postulates three counterfactuals relating to an injury which causes damage, an individual's control over discretionary conduct, and moral transgression. Fairness theory (Folger and Cropanzano, 1998; Cropanzano & Folger, 2001) is

essentially a cognitive theory without a substantive role for emotion in the unfairness decision making the process.

In addition to fairness theory, a theory that fits in the joint between emotion and action in unfairness judgement is Burkitt's (2002, 2005, 2014) theory of social relationships and emotion. Burkitt (2002) defined his theory in part as:

> The view is put forward of emotions as complexes rather than things, ones that are multi-dimensional in their composition; they only arise in relationships, but they are a corporeal, embodied as well as a socio-cultural one. … Furthermore, these techniques of the body are part of the power relations that play an essential part in the production and regulation of emotion (p. 37).

Finally, emotion works through social relations as the structuring of actions that can affect the whole field of possible actions. Burkitt (2002) drew on Foucault when he indicated that power works as a series of *affects* on a structure of possible actions, "it is said these incite, induce, or seduce" (p. 165).

The current dispersed literature on individual experienced unfairness indicates the importance of inquiry into the wellbeing of early adolescents in a number of areas. In the school setting a range of issues have been found to be associated with unfairness by students in the form of negative academic performance (Powell, & Arriola, 2003; Elovaino et al., 2011; Kazemi, 2016; Vandiver, 2001), academic motivation (Kazemi, 2016), and distress (Correia & Dalbert, 2007; Dalbert & Stoeber, 2005). School behaviours in the form of general school problems (Farrell, Ampy, & Myer, 1995; Graham, Bellmore & Mitze, 2006), being aggressive (Graham et al., 2006), emotional problems (Farrell et al., 1995), truancy (Elovaino et al., 2011),

and violent behaviour (Vieno et al., 2011) have been associated with unfairness in empirical research.

Teacher behaviours perceived as unfair are associated with a range of factors including: aggression and hostility (Chory-Assad, 2002; Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004); discipline (Smith & Thomas, 2000); higher rates of discipline infringement (Gregory & Thompson, 2010); dissatisfaction with school going (Elovaino et al., 2011); school rules (Kupchik & Ellis, 2008; Thornberg, 2008; Kazemi, 2016); levels of bullying (Leni et al., 2013; Santinello et al., 2010); and deviant judicial level behaviours (Sanches, Gouveia-Pereira, 2012). At the individual level, perceived unfairness by students has been associated with a wide range of adverse outcomes.

To articulate the individual voice of early adolescent's following my argument that the current literature is insufficient to the task, I have proposed two empirical undertakings seated in the interpretivist paradigm. For both the qualitative survey and semi-structured interviews, I have provided methods for data analysis and theorisation. Finally, from the current literature, I have provided indicative findings that unfairness may have implications for the social, emotional, and health wellbeing of early adolescents. Besides, a range of unfair teacher behaviours may play a role in limiting access to school and academic achievement.

Part Three: A diverging critical route

In this section, I will outline an alternative position for a critical approach to reinterpreting the interpretive data for the qualitative survey. This undertaking is aimed at voicing the early adolescent participants at the social level and, answering the final research question "How might structural injustices contribute to the marginalisation of students in the Te Aroha Middle School?" My critical reinterpretation is based methodologically on critical

hermeneutics and theorised on a definition of power provided by Young (1990). Finally, I argue this undertaking may be justified as I explore a potential relationship between disengagement as resistance and educational marginalisation.

My reinterpretation of data from the qualitative survey and semi-structured structured interviews is seated in a critical or critical realist paradigm. Ontology, Wahyuni (2012, p. 70) describes this paradigm as "Objective. Exists independently of human thoughts and beliefs or knowledge of their existence, but is interpreted through social conditioning (critical realist)". Epistemologically it can be described as "Only observable phenomena can provide credible data, facts. Focus on explaining within a context or contexts", Wahyuni (2012, p. 70). In contrast to the 'value-free' positivist paradigm axiologically a critical paradigm, according to Wahyuni (2012, p. 70) is "Value-laden and etic. Research is value-laden; the researcher is biased by world views, cultural experiences, and upbringing".

Critical hermeneutics (Dowling, 2004) is the specific critical methodology that I have chosen on which to base my reinterpretation of the empirical interpretive data.

Critical hermeneutics combines the interpretive and critical paradigms. Gadamer's philosophy represents the interpretive element, and the philosophy of Jurgen Habermas resides in the critical paradigm, which regards knowledge as active and entrenched in a socio-political context. Critical hermeneutics stresses the need to expose individuals to the meanings that they cannot see themselves (Dowling, 2004, p. 11).

The hermeneutic component fits with the Heideggerian phenomenology utilised by Smith et al. (2009), but a critical deconstructionist stance underpins the critical aspect. The critical component is based on the position that realty is not only multiply constructed but is based on a

context of unequal relational power. I argue that this approach will enable me to expose structural inequalities and give 'voice' to my potentially educationally marginalised participants.

Iris Marion Young (1949 – 2006) a researcher predominantly in the domain of political science and on structural injustice (Young, 1990) and an allied approach to responsibility (Young, 2006), in the form of a social connection model. Central to Young's ideas in her influential book *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (1990) is her recognition that the social group is vital in readdressing structural injustice. Young distinguished herself from the liberal political philosophers Rawls and Dawkins who equated "the moral equivalence of people with procedural rules that treat all people equally" (Young, 1990).

Young argues that structural inequality …" consists in the relative constraints some people encounter in their freedom and material wellbeing and a the cumulative effect of the possibilities of their social positions, as compared with others who in their social positions have more options or easier access to benefits, (p. 15).

Young argued for five types of oppression which were not reducible further and cannot be condensed to generalisable elements of distributive justice. Young's "five faces" of oppression include Exploitation; Marginalisation; Powerlessness; Cultural Domination; and, Violence. I am arguing for unfairness as injustice as a structural inequality possibly associated with disengagement and educational marginalisation.

While Young's (1990) thesis of structural inequality is a theoretical explanation for the phenomenon of unfairness as an injustice, it does not have an active emotional component. As Finkel (2001) describes

instances of unfairness (like instances of injustice and instances of inequality) have

clarity and concreteness to them; they typically come with heat and passion, anger

and outrage; and they instantly press for action or redress. These instances have

primacy, come to mind and voice before fairness concepts can be articulated (p. 57)

Burkitt's (1997, 2002, & 2014) theory of social relationships and emotion can sit in the joint between emotion and action. Burkitt (1997, p. 37) defines his theory in part as:

The view is put forward of emotions as complexes rather than things, ones that are

multi-dimensional in their composition; they only arise in relationships, but they are a

corporeal, embodied as well as a socio-cultural one. … Furthermore, these techniques

of the body are part of the power relations that play an essential part in the production

and regulation of emotion.

Finally, emotion works through social relations as the structuring of actions that can affect the whole field of possible actions.

Power is central to the critical perspective and refers to networks of social relations that lie between people. "According to Michel Foucault (1986), power is exercised through people acting on the actions of others (1986: 427); every-one who is capable of action is caught up in power relations with others who are also capable of action" (Grant & Giddings, 2002, p. 21). Young's (1990, 2001 & 2006) position on power is similar to that of Foucault in that power is impersonal; does not come from individuals holding power. Power, argues Young (1990) is relational in that it 'resides' in power relations between people. Power is characterised by its multi-focus nature, meaning it is not top down.

In this section, I outline issues related to educational under-achievement and associated structural inequality in Aotearoa that are possibly associated with student withdrawal from education. In Aotearoa educational achievement studies indicate inequalities in student achievement. The Ministry of Education (MOE) statistics from the 2012 National Standards Achievement results usually showed a significant disparity between Māori/Pasifika students at secondary school against the national core curriculum domains of reading, mathematics, and writing. At the elementary (New Zealand, primary schools) school level, further disparities are evident: Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) provides information on the reading literacy of New Zealand's Year 5 students in both international and national contexts (Wylie, 2013).

In the assessment year 2011, the results showed a significant average disparity between school deciles. Schools from the two lowest socio-economic deciles produced 49% of students that passed at an intermediate level (measured as a school averages), or above and 4% that passed at an advanced level. Of the students from schools in the two highest deciles levels, 90% passed at intermediate or higher, and 23% at an advanced level (Wylie, 2012).

Injustice as a structural phenomenon associated with relational power has not been reported in the literature. However, there have been some studies from a critical perspective of withdrawing or disengagement, from a critical perspective, reported in the literature (Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Ruglis, 2009, 2011; Ruglis & Vallee, 2016, 2017). Much of the literature, for example, a review of engagement in New Zealand in Years 7-10 (Gibbs & Poskitt, 2010), is positivist in nature. Engagement is conceptualised as behavioural, emotional, and

cognitive commitment to learning located within the student, a meaningful review by Lawson and Lawson (2013) recommended:

> engagement research policy and practice must be more nuanced and less formulaic, and the ensuing review is structured accordingly. Guided in part by socially-ecological analysis and social-cultural theory engagement is conceptualised as a dynamic system of social and psychological constructs as well as the synergistic process (p. 432).

Acting on this review, and as an example of the previously cited critical oriented research, Vallee and Ruglis (2017) theorised student school dropout as culminating from a process of school disengagement. The research themes for their Canadian students are reported as … "inequality, low-income status, experiences of failure and pass/fail paradigm, the elementary/secondary school transition, normativity, and, finally, the public, private distinction in schooling" (Vallee & Ruglis, 2017, p. 285).

In contrast to above social resistance according to some researchers' disengagement at the individual level can be seen as a form of non-compliance (e.g., Austin & Fitzgerald, 2007). In Aotearoa, Bishop and Berryman (2006) identified Māori students who disengaged when subjected to unfair treatment by teachers who "spoke of retreating into themselves, or into drugs, and/or using selective absenteeism … told how they had 'fought back' signalling to us they were striving for their own self-determination they saw as being manifestly unfairness" (p. 255). This from of resistance is conscious, deliberate and personal.

In Part Three, I have laid out a map for the voicing of early adolescents' 'views' on injustice at the societal level. I propose a reinterpretation of the interpretive data via a critical hermeneutic methodology (Dowling, 2004). Power has been defined after Young (1990) as

residing in relationships rather than positions. The reinterpretation is theorised within Young's (2001) concept of structural injustice and Burkitts (2014) theory of social relational emotion. Finally, I argue the import of this approach based on a potential relationship between disengagement as resistance and education underachievement.

My argument

A review of the current literature will be based on a critique of the dominant distributive justice paradigm. In order to amplify knowledge of the student voices, three pieces of work are proposed to articulate early adolescent' views. Two of these activities are empirical in the form of an innovative qualitative survey of the *diversity* of unfairness and a number of case studies on *processes* related to assigning possible meaning to their perceived unfairness.

A third piece of work is based on articulating structural injustice at the group level via a critical hermeneutic reinterpretation of the earlier qualitative data. The structural injustices may be associated with both an educational and a broader marginalisation. The three research undertakings are philosophically located, defined, theorised, and justified from current literature. This undertaking is actioned in order to enhance the veracity of extending the literature on enhancing the student voice on unfairness and injustice.

Based on the arguments presented in this introduction, I now offer the one research question aimed at establishing the present knowledge of the students' voice in the literature. Then, I present three further empirically oriented questions to extend an understanding of a student perspective on unfairness and injustice.

Study questions

1. What does the current literature have to say about the nature of perceived unfairness?

2. What is the diversity of the perceived unfairness in the student population of the Te Aroha Middle School?

3. How do students in the Te Aroha School assign meaning to perceived unfairness?

4. How might structural injustices contribute to the marginalisation of students in the Te Aroha Middle School?

Chapter Two, the literature review, is presented next in four sections. Section one, is a review of the current literature indicating that as a body it is insufficiently developed to tell us what the current literature has to say about the nature of early adolescent views on unfairness and injustice. In Part Two, I develop my three pieces of research. These consist of a qualitative survey of individual unfairness to provide the data to establish the *diversity* of unfairness phenomenon. The second undertaking is a series of semi-structured interviews to provide richer data to establish the *processes* associated with assigning meaning to a judgement of unfairness. Finally, a 'critical' reinterpretation of the findings from the two earlier empirical pieces of work is introduced. Part three establishes the theorisation for a judgement of unfairness, as accountability, using Fairness theory, a social relational theory of emotion, and coping theory. Part four provides the theorisation for the 'critical' reinterpretation based on analysis of *structural injustice.*

Chapter Two: A literature review on voicing unfairness and injustice

This literature review chapter is developed in Four Parts. In Part one I critique the current literature on voicing unfairness and injustice. This undertaking is based on a critique of a distributive paradigm and associate metaphors on which much of this positivist literature is based. In Part Two, I develop two paradigms to undertake two piece of empirical research and a critical reinterpretation to establish new knowledge. This action is in response to my finding that the current literature in insufficiently developed to voice early adolescent views on unfairness and injustice. In Part Three, I develop a theorisation for my innovative qualitative survey and series of semi-structured interviews based on Fairness theory (& Folger & Cropanzano, 2001), a social relation theory of emotion (Burkitt, 2014) and coping theory (Frydenberg & Lewis, 2002). In the final Part, I develop a theorisation for the a 'critical' reinterpretation of the empirical data based on the work of Young (1990, 2001, 2016) on structural injustice and Burkitt's (2014) theory of social relation emotions. The aim of this undertaking is to enhance the 'voice' early adolescent 'views' on injustice at the social level.

Part One: A review of the existing literature on unfairness

Introduction

The first of Part One focuses on providing an answer to the first research question: What does the current literature have to say about the nature of perceived unfairness? My review indicates that the largely positivist literature is grouped around four organising metaphors (Homo economicus, Homo Socialis, Climate, & Weathering). Two other metaphors (Spheres of justice & Interpretive) offer the possibility of an alternative qualitative approach to address the mostly absent empirical research on unfairness. Utilising a critique of the distributive central paradigm behind the four positivist metaphors, offers a bridge to the

alternative paradigms and metaphors. Finally, the terminologies of un/fair un/just, which will be seen in the review to be conflated, will be clarified.

Paradigms, Metaphors and Inquiry in Unfairness Research

In order to understand the nature of existing empirical research on unfairness, I first need to deconstruct the nature of its epistemologies. Doing so, will require an exploration of specific ways of knowing by examining the relationships between world views, modes of theorising, and research questions apparent in the research work on unfairness. Kuhn's (Eckberg, & Hill, 1979) work on paradigms provides a launching point for this examination.

Kuhn (Eckberg, & Hill, 1979) described a paradigm as a broad matrix which can be seen to operate at three different levels. Firstly, it presents a definite world view. Secondly, it relates to the organisation of 'science,' understood as schools of thought associated with specific outcomes. Finally, it relates to specific research agendas based on specific tools and texts.

Possibly the most important aspect of Kuhn's (Eckberg & Hill, 1979) concept is its focus on paradigms as alternate separate realities. The term paradigm is employed here at a philosophical level or meta-theoretical level. To reveal the organisation of a particular paradigm requires an analysis of relationships which define their character and assumptions. Multiple schools of thought are possible within the world view of a particular paradigm. I argue that, in the social sciences, these schools are often organised around metaphors as means of enabling empirical inquiry. Much of the inquiry in social science on unfairness takes place at the metaphorical level. The inquiry of particular schools of thought looks to work out the research implications of the metaphors with which they are associated. Thus, an awareness

of interrelationships between paradigms, metaphors, and inquiry is crucial to unpacking the paradigms of modes of inquiry on unfairness.

The Epistemological role of Metaphors

In everyday life, we are continually trying to give our experiences concreteness and form by symbolically constructing them to give meaning via an essentially subjective process. They are not representations of things 'out there' as under the distributive paradigm; rather, they are means of capturing what we perceive to be 'out there.'

Empirical inquiry, as conceived of within interpretive and critical paradigms, is created as a symbolic form; therefore, it is important to consider the role of metaphor. Metaphor is a basic mode of symbolic conceptualisation. Metaphor involves an examination of the similarities and differences of two phenomena via comparison, substitution, and interaction in order to create new meaning. In empirical inquiry, theorists contribute to the creative process by viewing their topics of focus via metaphorical process. They refine the process through language and concepts, which channel and structure their subject perceptions as they develop their framework for analysis. The impact of guiding metaphors (Lakatos, 1978) is at a lower level of organising research than that of paradigms, and is largely implicit in terms of their structures, conceptual developments, and areas of challenge on the topic of unfairness. By attempting to open up this body of literature on unfairness, a substantive critique can be developed of the relevant literature relating to the research question for this dissertation.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980), in '*Metaphors we live by*', sparked a renewed interest in the phenomenon of metaphor in the fields of cognitive linguistics and (to a smaller extent) psychology. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) defined the essence of metaphor as "understanding and experiencing one thing in terms of another" (p. 5). Metaphors are not necessarily visual.

Apart from their linguistic functions, Lakoff and Johnson argued several components of their thesis: metaphors represent a manifestation of the arrangement of our cognition; our theoretical thought is metaphorically organised, that is, "human thought processes are largely metaphorical" (p. 6); metaphors can be seen as a manifestation of thought rather than of language; and metaphors organise and induce actions. Consequently, the choice of metaphors by which to guide research on unfairness can significantly impact the outcomes.

Two Paradigms impinging on this Inquiry

The two paradigms germane to my inquiry are the positivist/post-positivist and interpretive. The positivist paradigm is the one under which most of the existing empirical inquiry on unfairness has been undertaken. A much smaller component of the research reviewed is based on an interpretive paradigm (Mertens, 2014).

Positivist

This positivist ontological view of society sees it as having a systemic nature enabling the possibility of discovering a rule-driven, ordered, and regulated epistemology. Positivism is a form of philosophical realism that is based on the ontological position that the reality of unfairness has a concrete character. The ontological assumptions support the concept of the neutral value free researcher. This distance is to be achieved through the exactitude and application of the scientific method. Action is contextually bound in an objective world of concrete and tangible social relationships around unfairness. Consequently, positivism is closely allied to the hypothetico-deductive method (Mertens, 2014).

The scientific method focuses on observation and the description of unfairness within a particular model or theory. First, hypotheses are developed to test relationships within a particular model. An execution of a controlled experimental model follows with results

analysed via the use of inferential statistics. Finally, the statistical results are interpreted within context of the original model of unfairness. The positivist paradigm is concerned with an understanding of unfairness in a manner that generates empirical knowledge (Mertens, 2014).

Positivism has its origins in the 19th century and the work of Mill's *'A system of logic'* (Guba & Lincoln & Guba, 2005). Guba and Lincoln (2005) summarised Mill's logic as: (1) All unfairness sciences have the same goals of generating laws which lead to explanation and prediction; (2) All sciences should have the same hypothetico-deductive methodology; (3) all concepts should be informed by empirical categories of unfairness; (4) nature has an order and uniformity across time and space; (5) unfairness generalisations are derived from observational data; (6) large samples smooth outliers with the aim of creating generalised laws about unfairness; (7) a nomothetic (people in general and etic – language general) orientation to research is preferred over an emic (language specific as the source of data) and idiographic (case study or individually focused) one.

Postpositivism emanated out of dissatisfaction with the applicability of the positivist stance to social science research (Mertens, 2014). The main difference is in their respective orientation to ontology, with postpositivists questioning the possibility of an objective, concrete reality. In their respective epistemologies there is a different focus on the role of theory. Positivists stress theory verification in contrast to postpositivists who stress theory falsification. Both paradigms share the other's goals; methodologies, especially control and prediction; neutral researcher and nomothetic and etic orientation. These two paradigms remain the orthodox basis of the ontology, epistemology, and methodology of unfairness inquiry for early adolescents.

Interpretivist

The interpretative paradigm on the other hand is predicated on the supposition that social worlds are based on relativist ontology, and assumes there are multiple, knowable, and relative realities, which have equal validity. This stands in contrast to the singular, concrete, objective, and naïve view of positivism (Mertens, 2014). For interpretivists, social reality is a precarious concept (Holloway, 2008). Reality is the product of subjective and inter-subjective experience of human beings and is interpreted in the mind (Smith et al., 2009). Social realty is interpreted from the standpoint of the lived experience of the participants in action; and not the observer (Holloway, 2008).

The interpretivist inquirer employs a hermeneutic approach which maintains that the meaning is 'hidden' and can be interpreted through deep and iterative reflection. The reflection can be enhanced by dialogue between the inquirer and the co-participants. Only through the dialogue of the double hermeneutic (Smith et al., 2009) can a more profound meaning be uncovered. The findings are created in dialogue between the inquirer and the research participants and their interpretations (Holloway, 2008). The goals of the interpretivist inquirer in this process are idiographic and emic (Smith et al., 2009; Holloway, 2008). There is an order to reality but, for interpretivists, the positivist goal of establishing an objective reality is unattainable.

The epistemological goal of interpretivist inquiry is to understand the 'lived' experience of those who live it daily. This lived experienced occurs within a specific social, historical context of reality. The status of interpretations, as empirical epistemology, is tentative, subject to change and reinterpretation.

Metaphors in un/fairness and in/justice research

The literature review addresses empirical research on un/fairness and in/justice research based on six metaphors: two from organisational justice, as applied to education in the form of homo economicus, and homo socialis (Colquitt et al., 2001). A further two metaphors, school climate (Gottfredson et al., 2001) and spheres of justice (Thorkildsen, e.g., 1989a) are from empirical educational research. The weathering (wearing down slowly through stress etc.) metaphor is from epidemiological health sciences (Jackson et al., 2006). Finally, I group those empirical studies on unfairness, which had only a tenuous link to an interpretative epistemology, into a metaphor which, I have called interpretive (McParland et al., 2011).

What I present in the following six sections is a summary of my original metaphorical analysis. This activity was based on deconstructing each research metaphor in terms of its assumptions, terminology, types of a research question, methodology, and epistemology. I only comment where I think a feature of a metaphor is either a distractor or useful for contributing to an understanding of the first research question. Finally, for convenience, I have grouped the research studies by metaphor into a summary table (See Table 2.1, p. 55).

Metaphor: 'Homo Economicus'

The theoretical ideal 'person' envisaged by this economic metaphor is that of homo economicus (Skitka, 2009). The ideal person is a negotiating, instrumental, and self-interested 'being', when interacting with others. In particular, people are conceptualised as operating a cost–benefit ratio analysis, but they are able to postpone their immediate gratification of rewards and cooperate in the longer term in order to maximise their own self-interests. The main mechanism operating from this metaphor is that of formalist rationality or logic

46

However, the rationalist orientation omits subjective and emotive experiences as an area for research exploration.

The standards of justice, according to Deutsch (2006), are based on the distributive norms of equality, equity, and need. The terminology of recent research studies varies with terms used interchangeably or conflated, in subordinate and ordinate positions, and unfairness is often undefined. The methodology is largely positivist, leading to searches for relationships between variables, via inferential statistics.

More recent work has moved away from the search for universal chronological sequences when age-related norms come into usage in cognitive operations (Damon, 1988). This body of work has moved into examining a wider range of factors, but is still anchored in the universal, decontextualised, distributive norms of equality, equity, and need.

Some of the research using homo economicus metaphors also uses a post-positivist, mixed methodology, allowing participants to define their experience in a 'phenomenologically' oriented first section of a study. The research is still mainly based on fairness as the cognitive process of selecting appropriate ethical rules associated with distributive justice judgements. The exception is Evans et al. (2001), who defined unfairness in a subjective way with an affective component but still used a mixed methodology. The homo economicus metaphor has usually inhibited the individual perspective from emerging. Further, the homo economicus metaphor has components which seem to prevent it contributing to a return to a first principles study. Again, Evans et al. (2001) are the exception having featured some methodology and terminology allowing subjective experience to enter into their study of unfairness.

Metaphor: 'Homo-socialis'

The second metaphor, relating to relational or interactional justice, is that of 'homo socialis' (Skitka, 2009; Skitka & Wisneski, 2011). The salient characteristic of this metaphor is the need to take cognisance of the volition to enhance social relationships. Rather than the self-interest of the economic metaphor, there is a social need to be respected, valued, and to participate in social groups that are important to the individual. Thus, research utilising this metaphorical structure has shifted to allow the concepts of belongingness, status, or standing, to be part of its agenda.

The methodology is a post-positivist one of mixed methods. The terminology is experimenter–defined, and the statistical analysis determines the need for large samples. The promise of focusing on a homo socialis metaphor to investigate the relational components of an experience of unfairness is not able to be realised, as methodologically these studies are still embedded in a distributive justice paradigm (Young, 1990).

Metaphor: 'School Climate'

As a farmer, I might be interested in the average temperature, range and so on, in a new area where I was contemplating buying a farm. As a hydrologist, I would be interested in the averages of past patterns of rainfall to track trends and forecast the water demands for a city population. Climate, then, can be defined as the "aggregate weather conditions of an area over a long period of time which allow for the designation of seasonal patterns and expected future weather" (Castree, Rogers, & Kitchen, 2013, p. 232). This has been used as a metaphor which applies to the systems level study of school climates.

The metaphor for the empirical research on 'school climate' envisages the individual perceptions of the unfairness of teacher actions as having only a small part to play in the

48

examination of school climate at the institutional level. Fairness, or unfairness, is but one of the components of school climate, and is merged with a whole host of factors in its investigation. The impact of school climate is *typically* investigated by cross-sectional designs with large questionnaire measures and statistical analysis which dictate the need for very large random samples. However, more recent statistical processes can use much smaller samples. In addition, the questionnaire measures used for investigating either fairness or unfairness in the context of school climate research are limited. They usually involve only one or two questions which are of experimenter origin without reference to the student context. The methodology employed in school climate research is strictly positivist, with 'big' data and large samples. Analysis is focused on data aggregation to produce findings at the institutional level. The individual student's perspective is not evident in the school climate metaphor.

Metaphor: 'Weathering'

The origins of the fourth metaphor, 'weathering', lie in the physical sciences of geomorphology and geology. A key feature of the erosive process is that of weathering; that is, the slow incessant break down of geological deposits by physical, chemical, and mechanical mechanisms and processes. In the perceived health unfairness metaphor, weathering is defined as "the cumulative impact of repeated experiences with social, economic or political exclusion" (Geronimus, 2006, p. 133), and has been associated with premature negative health outcomes for minorities, e.g. Māori (Tangata Whenua, people of the land, or first peoples of Aotearoa) and Pasifika peoples, lower socio economic groupings, and areas. The weathering process is associated with both physiological and psychological mechanisms which influence the at-risk social groupings in the form of physical health risks. The metaphor has

had an impact via the combination of empirical investigations based on the social, personality, and health psychological literatures, and health epidemiology literature.

While geared to understanding perceived unfairness in relation to a physical health phenomenon, this theoretical work does not make a significant contribution to understanding how an individual adolescent might perceive unfairness. Nor is it designed to do so. The model developed by Jackson, Kubzansky, and Wright (2006) enters at the point where an unfairness judgment has already taken place. Thus, the antecedents relating to standards of unfairness which have been breached, and the related affect, are not considered germane to the weather metaphor's scope. The consequences following a judgement of unfairness, in this model, are restricted to toxic stress and responses, and to coping behaviours. It ignores the range of potentially rich individualistic personal responses which are possible.

In the model of health unfairness, while perceived unfairness is present in the form of an experimenter definition, the model does not develop the antecedents to judgement of unfairness, and only examines a limited range of consequences. This series of studies are positivist in nature, where the individual's experience of unfairness is buried under the requirements of a strong logical-positive method requiring large measures, samples, and high powered statistical analysis. However, the findings from an Italian series of studies on the health impact of toxic stress include headaches, high blood pressure, death, and mental health challenges. These findings highlight the need for a greater understanding of health unfairness from the individual perspective.

Metaphor: 'Spheres of Justice'

In the domain of fairness of classroom practices, Thorkildsen and colleagues have taken a contextual stance, in contrast to those employing a positivist methodology with a

search for universal laws. The 'spheres of justice' metaphor can be characterised by the following features: contextual reasoning relating to a particular place and time; it depends on the goal or contractual basis and these are understood; language and structure are treated thematically, which allows for the possibility of emotional content to be explored (Sabbagh & Rest, 2016). Each sphere has its own boundaries and when one is stable and ordered then justice is established. Part of Walzer's (2008) thesis is that 'goods' are established by the socially determined understandings of the members of the community. When the sphere's members perceive the social goods, how they interact with one another through this perception, and develop a range of criteria illustrative of the range of social goods, then fairness can prevail.

The choice of a metaphor, in the forms of spheres of justice (Walzer, 1983) has enabled the subjective fairness of classroom practices to become the focus of a series of studies by Thorkildsen and her colleagues (See Table 2.1, p. 54). This research group has established that the evaluations of the fairness of classroom procedures, by children and adolescents, develop contextually, pluralistically, and reflect their growing perceptions of social justice. Unfairness featured incidentally in this series of studies, but the approach utilised indicates what can be achieved by taking an alternative metaphor. The negative side to this series of studies is that the second part of the mixed methodology is still positivist and removes the student voice. The focus is on the fairness of classroom procedures, not unfairness. The contribution of these studies to this dissertation is largely methological, in indicating that an interpretive paradigm and metaphor can have a contribution to the conceptual design of my study.

Metaphor: 'Interpretativist'

The interpretive metaphor (Morgan, 2007), under which the interpretative empirical inquiry is organised, is characterised by several distinctive features. The metaphoric use of language denies the distributive class of metaphors concrete status. It presents unfairness as interpretations based on words, thoughts, and actions. This metaphor suggests that a phenomenon of unfairness emerges as rule-governed, symbolic structures as individuals interact within their social realities to bring meaning via the use of codes of praxis and language. Unfairness 'realities', from this perspective, are based on different uses of language. Language is not just communication, but ontological (Morgan, 2007). Just as being a middle school student involves a particular way of being in the world, defined by language codes that the student 'uses' or 'operates within' to be recognised as a student. Viewed by these characteristics, unfairness can be investigated within a language-based metaphor, created and sustained as social activity, by emic patterns of language (Morgan, 2007).

The research undertaken within this metaphor has a very wide focus and is fragmented, often placed within this classification because unfairness is interpreted as but one of the minor subthemes. The two studies in my literature review utilising an IPA methodology (Smith, et al., 2009) are more directly focused on unfairness. For example, McParland et al., (2010) proposed that there is a dearth of research on the experience of pain and perceptions of injustice, finding that:

> The dominant theme of the upper socioeconomic group was 'seeking equality'. For the middle socioeconomic group, the dominant theme was 'battle for quality of life' and for the lower socioeconomic group the dominant theme was 'the unfair advantage of others'. It is concluded that this group of chronic pain sufferers prioritize justice-

related issues in terms of what is dominant to their social concerns and personal needs.

(p. 459)

Their findings indicate that the IPA methodology is one sensitive to inquiry of unfairness as being in the world as a lived experience. In addition, based on the emic used of language and interpretation, this methodology is sensitive to context.

Table 2.1 Literature associated with metaphors in unfairness research

Literature relating to the various metaphors

Metaphor	Literature associated with specific metaphors
Homo economicus	Carson & Banuazizi, (2008); Coloski, (2002); Damon, (1975, 1980); Evans, Gayler, & Smith, (2001); Fredrickson & Simmonds, (2008); Leman, et al., (2009); Marshall, Adams, & Ryan, (2001); McGuillicuddy-De Lisi, De Lisi, & Van Gulik, (2008); Piaget (1932/1969); Tai, (1998); Thomson, (2007); Vandiver, (2001).
Homo socialis	Coloski, (2002); Gouveia-Pereia, et al. (2003); Vieno, Gini, & Santinello, (2011).
Climate	Farrell et al., (1998); Gottfredson et al., (2005); Gregory & Thompson, (2010); Kupchik & Ellis, (2008); Kuperminc et al., (2001); Powell & Arriola, (2003); Rigby & Bagshaw, (2003); Ripski & Gregory, (2009); Santinellio et al., (2011); Vassallo, (2008); Vieno et al., (2013).
Weathering	Elovainio et al. (2011); Harris et al. (2006); Santinello et al. (2008); Vannatta, (1996); Yi et al, (2009).
Spheres of justice	Thorkildsen, (1989a, 1989b, 1991, 1993); Thorkildsen et al., (1994); Thorkildsen, Sodonis, & White-McNulty, (2004); Thorkildsen & White-McNulty. (2002).
Interpretative	Bishop & Berryman, (2006); Coker, (2007); Colnerud, (2006); Cruz et al., (2016); Demetriou & Hopper, (2007); Dobbs (2007); Einberg et al., (2015); Eatough et al., (2008); Finkel (2001); Flint, (2007; McParland et al., (2011); Pomeroy, (1999); Sanders, (2015); Stuart, (2003); Szklarski. (2007);

Conclusion to the review of the literature on unfairness

In order to provide an answer to the question, 'what does the existing literature contribute to our understanding of an experience of unfairness for early adolescents?' several metaphors and related research were reviewed. These metaphors included: homo economicus, homo socialis, school climate, weathering, spheres of justice, and interpretive.

In conclusion, I argue that five of these metaphors are not sufficient to an understanding of perceived unfairness within the Te Aroha middle school context. There are components of individual metaphors which have been indicated as beneficial in pointing out

aspects of unfairness. The main argument advanced here is that the choice of metaphor has clouded the possibility of empirical work based on these metaphors contributing to an understanding of an individual early adolescent's experience of unfairness.

The commonality of this difficulty is derived both from the choice of metaphor and the related distributive paradigm. In particular, the theoretical models are often adult models applied to adolescents and children. The terminology required to operationalise the model is confused, adult-determined, and the contexts for the research are often too wide. The research issues raised are substantially posed around the relationships between experimenter-determined variables. This is the result of what Thorkildsen et al. (1994) referred to as experimenter fallacy. The positivist methodologies used in the reviewed literature require large random samples in order to meet the requirements of aggregating data analysis methods and to have the ability to generalise the empirical findings to wider populations. As a consequence of the metaphors and methodologies articulated by the literature to date there is a dearth of studies sufficient to explain an experience either as individually perceived unfairness or as injustice at the social level.

Part Two: Alternative directions

Having completed my review of the existing empirical literature, where do I we go from here? The first signpost emerging from the review of metaphors is in the form of interpretivism. An interpretive paradigm seems to be a possible means of uncovering the views of my study participants. One interpretive study by McParland et al. (2010) indicated that unfairness, as a process, could be successfully explored subjectively and contextually within an interpretivist epistemology and specifically an IPA methodology. From a justice perspective, there appear to be no studies available on injustice or 'unfairness as a collective injustice.' Alternatively, I will take a critical approach (Young, 1990) with which to examine relation power as a structural injustice within the Te Aroha middle School. Consequently, I will develop an interpretivist epistemology as the basis of the two empirical activities of my project, and a critical epistemology for the reinterpretation, to answer the remaining three research questions. These activities are designed to further develop the knowledge of the early adolescent 'voice on unfairness and injustice.

Two differing world views on unfairness

There has been a strong dichotomy in the thinking, writing, conceptualising, and research about justice (Young, 1990). One route is distinguished by the distribution of goods that a young person might receive, for example educational grades, and in comparing these with those that they or others receive against a standard associated with a particular distribution scheme (Sabbagh & Resh, 2016). The other route focuses on the relationships of the people involved and their respective places within a scheme for the implementation of power. The first route, which Young (1990) has called a distributive paradigm, is focused on distributions, patterns of distributions, and the outputs of the distributions (for example Tata,

1999, examined grade distribution from a justice perspective). This route is the basis of four of the six positivist-oriented metaphors already reviewed.

In this thesis, based on a 'critical' orientation (Young, 1990), I argue that there is danger in the structure of the distributive paradigm neglecting the question of processes of relational power. A critical perspective takes a view of social existence and the underlying suppositions in relation to dominance and power, while critiquing and challenging existing social structures. The issue is not what you have, but how you are treated. Young (1990) argued that justice must be free of social relations of an arbitrary nature, regardless of the form it takes, be it distributive or relational.

From a critical orientation perspective, justice does not have a primary perspective on distributions or how they came into being. It is oriented to the ethics of how people stand in relation to one another, as social beings, in their behaviours, culture, emotions, structures, and institutions. This applies both to distributions and to the inappropriate exercise of power.

Young (1990) argued that the distributive paradigm holds research captive to what are distributive ethics orientations with a product. She argued that this sway on research has the consequences of reifying something to the conception of goods to be distributed; reducing power to that of a distribution; disregarding the role of power, ignoring the importance of context, and ignoring the social, cultural, and historical influences on its development.

A critique of the distributive paradigm as a bridge to interpretive and critical processes

Iris Young (1990), in her seminal work '*Justice and the politics of difference'* criticised Rawls' (2009) position on what she named the distributive paradigm. The main contribution

57

to the discussion centres on the focus of how each philosopher views the concept of justice. Rawls (2009) focused on the concept of fairness as the ethicality of what one has received in a distributive scheme. The focus for Rawls is on the end-state of an allocation process. In contrast, Young's (1990, 2001, 2006) position, which has a political justice orientation, emphasises the legitimacy of where individuals or groups are positioned in order to be considered legitimate. This focus is on a comparison of social and political relationships and their standing in terms of an arrangement for utilising power, for example, within a school. Justice is an evaluation of the ethics of the behaviour, structures, and institutions within a school - of the relationships between peers, and between other staff in authority, and students. For Young (1990), justice is a social order which is free of a capricious exercise of power by those in authority.

For Young (1990), social justice is the elimination of institutional domination and oppression. This is to be initiated by an examination of the role of socio-cultural power. I would attribute a significant component of the inaudibility of the early adolescent voice to the distributive paradigm (Young, 1990). The patterns of distribution Young is referring to include the material goods of a school. In the middle school this includes numbers of teachers and students, budgets, assessment patterns, and the distribution of social positions among teacher aides, counsellors, and social workers. Young (1990) defined a paradigm as "a configuration of elements and practices which define an inquiry: metaphysical presuppositions, unquestioned terminology, characteristic questions, lines of reasoning, specific theories, and their scope and mode of application" (p. 16). Thus, the distributive paradigm refers to social justice as the ethics of the distribution of material goods and social positions in a school including teachers, students, and assessments.

Young (1990) contributed four features to her critique of distributive social justice processes. The first issue is that the distributive paradigm assumes a universal model of fairness in which individuals are atomised, as social agents, making individual internal ethical un/fair choices about the allocation of resources and goods from universal justice standards. Another feature of this concern is that the distributive paradigm "presupposes and obscures the institutional context" (Young, 1990, p. 18). This identifies the primary determmnt of injustice as oringinating in inequity or inequity of distributions, rather than in external social relations. This has the impact of focusing inquiry on fairness as economic ones related to the ethics of determining the distributions of goods and resources. The consequence of this is restricting the scope of justice, as "it fails to bring social structures and institutional contexts under evaluation" (Young, 1990, p. 20). Young (1990) argued that culture is one of those areas featured as neglect in that it ignores "the symbols, images, meaning, habitual comportments, stories and so on through which people express their experience and communicate with one another" (p. 23).

The second feature of Young's (1990) critique comes from what she called the overextension of the concept of distribution. The danger comes in extending the metaphor and not recognising the limits of the application of the logic of distribution. Young (1990, 2001) argued that this reifies social processes by focusing on patterns of distribution as end-states rather than on social processes as dynamic. A dynamic process would focus on what social actors are doing, based on institutionalised rules, how their action is constituted via these rules and positions, and how it is combined in their experience of unfairness. This conceptualisation of unfairness obscures the importance of social groups and the uniqueness of each context to its understanding. Justice as an ahistorical, static, universalistic, and single

theory of distributive justice fails to focus on social justice as power, embedded in groups. For Young (1990) the distributive paradigm tends to have "an implicit social ontology that gives primacy to substance over relationships, moreover, the distributive paradigm tends to conceive of individuals as social atoms logically prior to social relations and institutions" (p. 27).

The third component to Young's (1990) critique centres on narratives around distributive justice. Placing power in a distributive system focuses on the concept of power 'as the resources held', ethically or unethically, by individual agents. This obscures power as a relational phenomenon and elevates the importance of the isolated, individual agents over that of social processes. Consequently, this supports the narrative of power as being one of narrow unethical distributions, as opposed to one embedded in relationships and institutions.

Finally, on a methodological level, Young (1990) posited that the distributive account confuses the issue of the causation for a particular distribution and moral issues of the justness or unjustness of a distribution. From a critical perspective, Young discounted the separation and distinction of the empirical and normative theory.

In summary, "Without a structural understanding of power and domination as processes rather as patterns of distribution, the existence and nature of domination and oppression in these societies cannot be identified" (Young, 1990, p. 33).

A critical paradigm

Critical inquiry is designed to offer interpretations of social reality. It is heavily value laden and oriented towards changing unfair social structures (Mertens, 2014). As with other paradigms, this one has many streams. One is critical social theory which arose in response to

criticisms of the positivist paradigm, especially to its focus on rationality, capitalist ideology and authoritarianism. Another stream, is feminist research, has its sights on women's unequal position in groups.

The relationship between theory and reality in critical inquiry is different from both the 'neutrality' of positivism and the 'thick description' of interpretivists. For radical inquirers the move away from interpretation, as reality, has been clouded in the orthodoxy of everyday experience through structural mechanisms. This radical orientation has implications for how data are collected and analysed.

The critical inquirer's role is value laden and oriented to praxis (action). This requires a normative stance that the inquirer's beliefs about social reality are powerful and can result in social/political transformation. The roles of researchers and participants are those of co-inquirers; although, the actual relationship depends upon the methodology adopted. However, some values common to the relationship include reciprocity and participation. As a critical inquirer, my attention is on the voices of the marginalised, but I may not always agree with the way in which my co-participants read their social/political worlds.

Interpretivist paradigm

The core of the interpretivist paradigm (Holloway, 2008; Morgan, 2007) is to understand the student's lived, subjective experience of unfairness. An interpretivist paradigm aims to walk in the shoes of a research participant in order to understand what a participant thinks of unfairness or the meaning made of it in a particular context. The focus is on the observed or interviewed rather than a researcher's viewpoint (Morgan, 2007). The research on unfairness is focused on the individual student and his/her perception of the

world. Consequently, there is a strong focus on how reality is socially constructed (constructivism). Theory comes after the data are interpreted.

The interpretive paradigm assumes a subjectivist epistemology (Morgan, 2007) which means that I make sense of my co-researchers' interpretation their lived world. My construction of the participants' understandings comes from my knowledge of the context. From the qualitative survey and interviews, I will attempt to make sense in interaction with the participants through transcribed data, listening, questioning, reading, writing, and reflecting. This research activity is predicated based on a relative ontology where I hold the possibility of constructing multiple realities. Following on from this relativist stance is my belief that these socially constructed realities can be the focus of empirical inquiry and explored, and meaning made of them in conjunction with my co-researchers.

In summary, an interpretivist paradigm may have some of the following features: a social world is socially constructed in interaction; possible realities are numerous; interaction between researchers and co-researchers is essential; knowing resides in the socio-cultural context; and, the interpretation of the individual perspective (idiographic) is the focus of research rather than generalisability of the findings (Morgan, 2007).

In the next two sections I tease out various meanings for unfairness and develop an argument for unfairness conceptualised as an experience.

The fit between interpretivism and qualitative methods

Having outlined my perception of the interpretivist paradigm on my journey of voicing my participants' views, in this section I will trace some relationships between the paradigm and methods.

62

The interpretive paradigm allows me to view the world of perceived unfairness through the perception of and experiences of my participants. In following the journey via an interpretive paradigm, I will use the experiences of my participants' unfairness to construct and interpret my understandings of the data gathered from the survey and case study interviews. Interpretivism will give me the means to explore the world of the participants' understanding of perceived unfairness.

Interpretivists hold that knowledge of the context where research is undertaken is crucial to the interpretion of that data (Willis, 2007). Interpretivism seeks to gain some understandings of a specific context which in my case is that of Te Aroha School. Willis' (2007) view supports my selection of interpretivism to investigate perceived unfairness with a group of participants in a particular school. For Willis (2007), in contrast to positivism, interpretivism is focused on obtaining multiple perspectives, is change orientated, and choses data techniques which are emergent.

The interpretivist paradigm mainly utilises qualitative methods (Nind & Todd, 2011). Willis (2007) posits that interpretivists tend to prefer methods such as case studies. It can be argued that qualitative methods will give me the rich data necessary to an understanding of contextually based data. This feature of the interpretivist paradigm stems from the belief that the socially constructed world of a context is complex and is in a constant state of flux. Consequently, interpretivists see the world through a series of individual perspectives and choose participants who have their own views of perceived unfairness. According to proponents of interpretivism, qualitative methods are practical means of exploring subjective phenomena (Willis, 2007).

Consequently, following my argument above, if I seek an understanding of my participants' experiences of subjective unfairness then qualitative methods are possibly going to be the most appropriate methods for my interpretive-based research undertakings. If, under, an interpretive paradigm one of the most important functions is to gain insight and in-depth data, then a qualitative paradigm and numbers would not likely be productive. Punch and Oancea (2009) are of the opinion that qualitative methods obtain rich in-depth data partly because an interviewer approaches the research process with an orientation which is extremely empathetic.

In conclusion, I am undertaking two empirical pieces of research to answer questions 2 and 3, with the aim of voicing my participants' understandings of the diversity of, and the processes by which they give meaning to experienced unfairness. As an interpretive researcher, in these undertakings, my aim is understanding the lived world of my participants' experience, beliefs and meanings of perceived unfairness. Therefore, I have argued that an interpretive paradigm and qualitative methods seem to be most appropriate means for these research undertakings. In the next section I examine the specific methods of a qualitative survey and semi-structured interview.

Two interpretative qualitative methods

In this section I will outline the concept of a written, qualitative survey method and a case study method in the form of a semi-structured interview as the steps involved in my voicing my participants view on unfairness. First, I present my innovative, written, qualitative survey method theorised from the work of Jansen (2010), then the semi-structured interviews, with support where relevant from the literature. I have chosen the concept of a written qualitative survey for a combination of pragmatic and theoretical reasons. The concept of a survey was left over from previous iterations of design for my project which I was encouraged to retain. The

qualitative survey method is designed to provide data in order to answer the second research question, but also first empirical one of "What is the diversity of the perceived unfairness in the student population of the Te Aroha Middle School?"

The theorisation for this method comes from a paper by Jansen (2010). Jansen developed the qualitative survey in reaction to criticism of weak methodological justification (e.g., Reichertz, 2009, cited in Jansen, 2010), or confusion, around empirical research labelled as 'qualitative research'. As applied to my research, the foci of this method are fourfold: firstly, the diversity of any phenomenon (e.g. experienced unfairness); secondly, within a population (e.g., the students in Te Aroha School); thirdly, with the unit of data collection as an individual from of a population (e.g., student); and, fourthly, with the primary knowledge function as description (e.g., the diversity of perceived unfairness). A written format for the survey may be associated with deeper cognitive processing of information (Berninger and Chanquoy, 2012). I pick up a more detailed justification for my use of this method in first half of Chapter Five.

Finally, Jansen (2010), after Cresswell (1998), places the qualitative survey within the tradition the five qualitative methods. As IPA is *phenomenological*

unrelated individuals are interviewed, as in a qualitative survey. These individual persons are not selected because of their membership in a given population, however, but because of their experience with the topic of study, e.g. drug dependency, divorce, or being recently in love"

Jansen (2010, p. 18) further argues that the quantitative survey is a method that is

not paradigmatically bound but a qualitative survey may be useful in a *positivist* or *post-positivist project* (including ontological realism and epistemological objectivism), but it could also be performed in the context of *critical theory* or *constructivist* projects. For example a constructivist feminist project could use a qualitative survey to analyze the diversity of constructions regarding economic equality in couples

Moving on from the qualitative survey the second method that I will use in my empirical research is that of the case study of semi-structured interviews in order to answer research question three (the second empirical research question) - "How do students in the Te Aroha School assign possible meaning to perceived unfairness? In order to provide data for the second research question with the aim of voicing student on assigning meaning to unfairness, I will use an Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (Smith et al., 2009).

According to McIntosh & Morse (2015)

Semi-structured interviews (SSI). The SSI is designed to ascertain subjective responses from persons regarding a particular situation or phenomenon they have experienced. It employs a relatively detailed interview guide or schedule, and may be used when there is sufficient objective knowledge about an experience or phenomenon, but the subjective knowledge is lacking … These interview questions focus on the responses of each participant and constitute the *structure* of the SSI. Participants are free to respond to these open-ended questions as they wish, and the researcher may probe these responses. This framework and flexibility of the responses constitute the *semi-structured* aspect of this method. It makes it unique among interview methods for the degree of relevancy it provides on the topic, while remaining responsive to the participant (p. 1).

As the SSI method has matured, McIntosh and Morse (2015) argue that it has acquired greater plasticity and is non-philosophical in a paradigmatic sense. However, according to McIntosh and Morse (2015, p. 2) it has acquired philosophical and methodological influences, especially phenomenologically. Based on this tenet, McIntosh and Morse (2015) have identified four types of SSI (descriptive/confirmative, descriptive/corrective, descriptive/interpretative, and descriptive/divergent) of which I am focusing on the descriptive/interpretative type. The descriptive/interpretative style of SSI is characterised by a purpose of discovery. Epistemological privilege is held by the knower. The role of the participant is that of an informant. The outcome the journey is understanding, and, in my case, these are processes by which meaning is assigned to an experience of unfairness.

The specific quantitative methodology that I will be using is that of IPA (Smith et al., 2009). IPA is characterised by a focus of a phenomenological emphasis on the experiential unfairness claims and concerns of the participants. The second is an interpretive focus on 'what unfairness means for the participants in this particular context of Te Aroha school. Third, IPA has an ideographic or individual focus. According to Larkin, Watts, and Clifton (2006) IPA has "Two complementary commitments of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA): the phenomenological requirement to understand and 'give voice' to the concerns of participants; and the interpretative requirement to contextualize and 'make sense' of these claims and concerns from a psychological perspective" (p. 102).

Unlike the qualitative survey which has no associated empirical literature, IPA has a developing body of empirical literature, but is short of studies relating to both early adolescents and to unfairness. In the first of only two studies of unfairness and IPA, McParland et al. (2010), studied the experience of chronic pain and its relationship to justice and fairness.

The results yielded three different discourses. The upper socio-economic group was 'seeking equality'. For the middle group, the 'battle for quality of life' was the dominant theme. Finally, the lower socio-economic group the dominant focus was 'the unfair advantage of others'. The analysis by the authors involved a search for themes, connections between themes, and finally attempted an analysis across cases for superordinate themes.

The second adult study using an IPA format, by Eatough et al. (2008), impinging on unfairness, reported a qualitative, phenomenological study of anger and aggression in the lives of individual women. The study purposefully situates itself as a hermeneutic, phenomenological idiographic study of individual women, with the explicit aim of establishing the IPA as a useful approach for the study of reactive aggression. The study of individual anger and anger-related aggression by Eatough et al. (2008), with a sample of five adult women participants, revealed an interpretation of three superordinate themes.

Three superordinate themes were interpreted: the subjective experience of anger (subthemes: bodily experience of anger, escalation of anger, crying/frustration accompanying anger, anger and other emotions/feelings), forms and contexts of aggression (direct physical aggression, direct verbal aggression, indirect aggression, and aggressive fantasies), and anger as a moral judgement (anger caused by perceived injustice, anger as a response to rule violation).

While the interpretative findings of the two IPA studies are not relevant to early adolescent participants the methodology was designed to explore experiences of the unfairness phenomena, and the findings indicate that the IPA methodology is sensitive to different contexts, being able to report different contextual interpretations.

A contested terminology

One of the more striking features of the review of metaphors is the degree of confusion around the terminology associated with un/fairness – in/justice. The following examples are presented as being illustrative of this confusion.

In the review of the homo economicus metaphor, the following three potential confusions were noted. The interchangeable use of the terms 'just' and 'fair' were to be seen in the studies by Leman et al. (2008), Marshall et al. (2001), McGuillicuddy et al. (2008), Tai (1998), and Thomson (2007). The following example highlights the second source of confusion where one term, justice, assumes an ordinate position and the other, fair, a subordinate position. Thomson (2007) used the terms in the title of her article in the following way '*Justice in the home: Childrens' and adolescents' perceptions of the fair distribution of household chores'*. The third example is the use of unfairness as a convenience dependent variable, usually on the end of a five- or seven-point Likert-like scale. If no correlations are found, then unfairness rarely gets developed or discussed. The third, and final, example may be referred to as an experimenter fallacy, where the author of an article assumes knowledge of what unfairness is, taking it uncritically from the literature and passing it on, unacknowledged, into his or her own work. Vieno et al. (2011), used a definition from previous work done by Santinello et al. (2008) that is based on only one item "Our teachers treat us fairly" (Vieno et al. 2011, p. 540). In this case, it is the only item to measure a significant variable in the study, and an example of a less than valid operationalisation of the measurement process via questionnaire items.

I contend that the above confusion and conflation result from the requirement of a positivist epistemology. One of the key requirements of this methodology is to have mastery

of the variables to enhance predictability. This may be achieved by having precision over the definition of terminology. The definition of terms, in a qualitative study, is not an a priori process, as this research is required to be open, flexible, and inductive theory generating, or building. The focus is on discovery and interpretation, rather than developing laws or generalisations. However, this does not excuse the random and careless use of terminology or concepts! Often the a priori research work is prior to the qualitative work.

An Experience of Unfairness

In most qualitative psychological research based on *interpretation* or *construction;* experience emerges fairly quickly. In fact, the relationship between experiences as representing internal something was investigated externally via the methods of the physical sciences in the 19th century (e.g., Fechner 1801-1887). The experimental work of early psychologists utilising this methodology for example, that of Wundt (1832-1920), was challenged by Franz Brentano (Crane, 2006), who reconceptualised 'immediate' experience. This was to model experience as a process in which different types of experience arise by the way we gain consciousness of the object of experience. Consequently, different types of experience involve different orientation to an object.

For Brentano (Crane, 2006) the key feature of conscious activity is *intentionality,* which refers to the relationship of consciousness to the object of attention. To paraphrase Brentano, all consciousness is conscious of something which is termed intentionality. Brentano's concept of intentionality was adopted by Husserl and other phenomenologists. The goal of interpretivist paradigm is to understand the lived experience from the standpoint of the research participants (Berger & Luckman, 1991).

We are much more familiar with the other meaning of experience by way of its everyday usage by advertisers wishing to enhance our shopping experiences. This term was adopted from theory of Dewey's (1938-1997) experience. Dewey (1990) built his conceptualisation on a link with education: "I assume that amid all uncertainties there is one permanent frame of reference: namely, the organic connection between education and personal experience" (p. 25). Dewey placed these differences in contrast when he emphasised employees as thinkers engaged in scientific exploration, rather than "mere devices of hand and eye" (p. 23).

In putting forward his "principles that are significance in framing this theory" (Dewey, 1990, p. 33), he emphasised continuity and interaction. The first criterion of experience is that of continuity or "experiential continuum" (Dewey, 1990, p. 33). For Dewey (1990), continuity evoked the idea that experience can never be divorced from that of other experiences, both in terms of the past and the future. Dewey (1990) contended that experiences, "opens up a new environment of growth and leads to further growth, curiosity, and desires" (p. 37).

The second principle of experience is interaction between the internal and external conditions. Dewey (1990) posited that "… any normal experience is interplay of these two sets of conditions. Taken together these two principles interplay to form a situation, all human experience is ultimately social, that is, it involves contact and communication" (p. 38). The various people, stressors, standards of fairness, and blame processes comprise the experience of unfairness of a young participant. Dewey used the term interaction to signify the interplay of internal conditions, such as standards of fairness or those standards that ought to be, with those external behaviours being experienced. The result is an experience of unfairness. The experience of unfairness from the past moving into the future also plays a role.

This conceptualisation and definition of phenomenon of unfairness as an experience, I argue, is compatible with the philosophical bases of my qualitative survey and interviews. As advanced by Dewey, an experience is the result of interplay between continuity and interaction, and the concept can reflect the historical and environmental features of the context of unfairness as a reflection of relational power in the middle school environment. As a socially interpreted or constructed reality, as advanced by Dewey, it is also compatible with the relativist ontological position of my thesis. Henceforth, I will conceptualise unfairness as 'experienced unfairness' or as an experience of unfairness's.

In this section I have explored the relationships between an interpretivist paradigm and qualitative methods. In doing so, I have indicated their respective capacities to answer the two empirical research questions. In the next section I will explore the capacity of a critical paradigm and method in the form of structural inequality to answerh the final research question.

A Postpositivism perspective and voicing in educational psychology

For the past forty to fifty years or more theory development and verification in educational psychology has been dictated by mainstream research seated in a positivist paradigm (Williams, Billington, Corcoran, & Goodley, 2016). However, debates by critical social and psychologists in that time have provided a basis for what Billington (2017) has viewed as "not only developing qualitative research but also developing critiques of our own discipline, some with the aim of developing a research and practice agenda which could aspire to be emancipatory" (p. 10). In this endeavour Billington et al. (2017) maintain it has been possible to articulate in recent critical educational psychology

- the ways in which the (mis) use of able-ist, gendered and racialized explanations continue to misrepresent and undermine the potentialities of human subjects;

- that the aetiology of human functioning is a complete reversal from that popularly circulated; rather, as human organisms our development is defined and constrained by the 'conditions' (James, 1890) of our environment and we are thus always 'relational beings. (Gergen, 2009);

- to show that psychology's tendency to individualise invites a reduction of the complexities of being-in-the-world to simplistic psychological categories supposedly existing in isolated individuals (p. 4).

However, several educational psychologists have adopted interpretive paradigms framed within constructivist ontologies with methods based on qualitative approaches. These, in turn, have been based on a foundation of subjectivist epistemologies. My two pieces of interpretivist empirical research come within this category. In contrast, is the approach of postpositivism (Williams et al., 2016) for my critical reinterpretation, which I start to develop the next section.

A poststructuralist analysis of power relations

Despite development of a more interpretivist orientation in educational psychology, it is still imbued with objectivist ontology. It is based on an ontology the 'reality' of educational psychology that can be investigated via empiricism, that educational psychology is scientific where hypotheses can be statistically verified in order to generate generalisable knowledge. Relatively recently educational psychology researchers are exploring more idealistic and natural variants. These developments are more concerned with more intrepretation and subjectivity, and others are socially or politically oriented (Williams, et al., 2016). I will be focusing on the socially-oriented stream in order to voice early adolescents' views of injustice at the social level.

I am now ready to consider the poststructuralist transitions in educational psychology thinking that have enabled enable me to entertain the type of question that I have posed for my final research activity. This is in the form of a critical reinterpretation activity such as, "How might structural injustices contribute to the marginalisation of students in the Te Aroha Middle School?"

Foucault (1982) is central to this recent critical perspective with his an emphasis on relational power in contrast to the reproductions of inequality-oriented Marxists of the 1960s and 1970s (e.g., Bowles and Gintis, 1976). For Foucault (1982), power is primarily productive in its purpose. In the school setting, educational power acts on students' consciousness via an internalization process, influencing speech, actions, and emotions (Burkitt, 2014). Like a panoptic site, a school produces control through the processes of supervisory control and correction (Foucault, 1982).

In the school setting, power manifests itself not in behavioural techniques of reinforcement and punishment but assessment, school reports, Education Review Office reports, parent interviews, and community meetings. Foucault (1982) places emphasis on discourse as the basis of power in contrast to the reproduction concept of Marxists. In the proceeding sections, I will diverge from Foucault to establish the main theorisation for my basis of 'critical' interpretation, to voice to voice early adolescent views on unfairness. The theorisation I will utilise is based on Young's (1991) concept of structural injustice.

Although power and injustice are different concepts and enable researchers to come to an area of interest from different critical perspectives, they do have many critical features in common. Power and injustice (Young, 2001) at the societal level are *impersonal* in that they are not the power of a regent or office holder. Injustice and power are *relational.* By relational

I mean that power and injustice are always seated in power relations between people as opposed to an amount held by virtue of membership of a class or an individual. Injustice and power are *diffuse* and not centred on individuals, types of individuals or class. Finally, power and injustice are not random, but have an intentionally either as energy or force (Foucault, 1982) which is strategic and deliberate. Having briefly sketched out the chief tenet of the nature of a critical paradigm and similarities between power and injustice, I now proceed to develop the concept of structural injustice in the final section of part One.

From analysis of the writers cited above in Aotearoa and overseas, I can envisage a school site as an interrelated web of relational power expressed through structures. Within these structures will be competing ones including a dominant one of a neoliberal agenda for education (Davies & Bansel, 2007). This paradigm has replaced the formerly progressive one of education as a public good. However, all is not stable, and this agenda has been contested for the last three decades and has had to reposition itself time and time again. For example, Haque, (2018, p. 69) indicates in contesting the neoliberal agenda "Unhealthy competition between schools hasn't improved the quality of education".

A critical hermeneutic re-interpretation to voice injustice

In this section I develop via a critical reinterpretation a means of answering the question "How might structural injustices contribute to the marginalisation of students in the Te Aroha Middle School?" In the earlier part of Part one I explored the role of a distributive justice paradigm in order to see what the current literature could tell us about unfairness. In response, I concluded that it was insufficiently developed to be able to respond to the question. Part of the answer to its limitations lies in what Corcoran (2009, p. 3) calls, "the first nature psychological accounts uncritically limit questions of human being to essentialist

discourse". In contrast, to answer the final question, I will adopt what Corcoran (2013) calls second nature psychologies, because psychologists are open to:

> shifting from generalised theories to practical-situated accounts … interest on activities rather than things … relational activity as opposed to individual behaviour, embedded constructions developing within a flow of situated historical practice … the capacity of language to constitute practice and coordinate activity, not merely to represent the known world … critical examination of the social processes that inform how we construct experience … investigations validated from within circumstances that need not be founded on external authority (p. 32).

While this applies to psychological practice, I argue it applies equally to a critical educational research and will drive my reinterpretation. In this final section I will address an overview of my theorisation of Young's structural injustice and show how I will apply it to a critical-hermeneutic reinterpretation of the interpretive data from Te Aroha School.

For, Young theorises (Young, 2001) structural inequality

> consists in the relative constraints some people encounter in their freedom and material well-being, the cumulative effect of the possibilities of their social positions, as compared with others who in their social positions have more options or easier access to benefits (p. 14).

How Young's (2001) structural inequality operates can be summarised for the purposes of an introduction only, in five basic principles. First, the impact of conditioning operates via the actions and interactions of people in one structural entity (e.g., the Intermediate school teachers influenced by a neoliberal pedagogical culture) being able to condition and reinforce the rules

76

and resources available for people in other roles (intermediate school students). Second, this conditioning is a mutual process (students can 'react' and condition with underachievement or resistance). Three, the inadvertent impact in the convergence of many actions and interactions reinforces and limits opportunities and constrains life chances of those occupying those collective roles (it does not operate at individual level but at a group level). These actions and interactions also constrain the future behaviour, and expectations (over-time underachievement may continue to further limit schooling and create possible disengagement from school). Four, this mutual conditioning makes it hard to change if the structures persist over time (it may be associated with the tail of educational underachievement in Aotearoa). Five, despite this mutual conditioning, it does not necessarily constrain individuals, who might have exceptional talents, but members of the group as a whole. I explore Young's thesis of structural injustice in the second half of Part Four as part of the theorisation for my critical reinterpation undertaking. In the later part of Chapter Five, I develop an argument in moving from an IPA based hermeneutic to one of critical hermeneutics (Dowling, 2004).

Within the context of Te Aroha School, the conditioning by the neoliberal-influenced school culture is mediated through the Education Review Office (ERO) accountably reports. I argue that the neoliberal reforms introduced in the later 1980s operate within the school through an agenda of 'technologies' of performativity (Ball, 2003), managerialism (Thrupp, 2006), and the marketisation of schooling (Ball, 2003). The neoliberal agenda denies the need to accommodate, or to consider the role of culture in either pedagogy or learning. In the more recent literature this is referred to a culturally unresponsive pedagogy (Lynch & Rata, 2018). I critique the neoliberal culture in detail in the first half of Part Three of this review and examine the role of neoliberal conditioning in Chapter 7.

Mutual conditioning of the school neoliberal culture comes from students in the form of academic underachievement, intra-student bullying as lateral violence and interschool completion leading to the closure of the school. I argue that mutual conditioning from the school culture to the students and students to the school lead to three structural injustices. In Chapter Seven I explore the impact of these structural injustices, arguing that these may have resulted in a school beset with academic underachievement, intra-peer and teacher bullying as forms of lateral aggression and eventually to the closure of the school. Finally, I argue that resistance in the form of disengagement may count as a contribution to the long tail of underachievement within Aotearoa.

Part Three: Interpreting unfairness as an accountability process

Introduction

In Part Three, I continue my movement away from the possibility of a normative, theoretic orientation being able to voice early adolescents' views on unfairness. I maintain a relativistic ontology and interpretive epistemology, but move away from the thematic analysis used to develop the survey themes. This, I posit, is required on the grounds that the data from semi-structured interviews will be of a 'richer and thicker' nature. To facilitate thematic development, the IPA methodology, as indicated in Part One, seems to be sensitive to individual and contextual nuances associated with experienced unfairness. This strength, I maintain, comes from its hermeneutic interpretative, Heideggerian phenomenology and idiographic features which are designed to scaffold an inquiry to answer the second research question, "How do early adolescents assign meaning to unfairness?"

In structuring this section of the review, I am presented with a conundrum; that is, the absence of literature on a process of arriving at an understanding of the phenomena of an experience of unfairness from an interpretative viewpoint. The existing literature is largely in the domain of social psychology, with a positivist or post-positivist methodology, and based on a cognitive behavioural metaphor. A consequence is that the narrative tends to be a linear one, where events may be interpreted by a cognitive process. The affective process is often presented as resulting from antecedents and a cognitive comparative evaluation and the associated emotional and behavioural consequences. The cognitive-behaviour metaphor has a particular way of deconstructing a phenomenon in order to understand it, just as an interpretive metaphor is more holistic in orientation in responding to its metaphorical

constraints. As a caution, these findings need to be held lightly, as the sum of the whole is greater than its parts in relation to an interpretative metaphor.

From this review I will develop a *tentative* thesis of unfairness interpreted as an accountability judgement (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001). Fairness theory, from organisational justice, is based on the theorisation of unfairness as essentially deciding to hold someone or something to account. From this perspective, social justice is a process of assigning blame. In this theorisation, unfairness is a consequence of related thinking processes. Fairness theory has three main components: (1) a perception of an event impacting a person's well-being, or it being made worse, (2) an offender who is perceived as having control over their behaviour, and (3) a breach of a moral or ethical standard. These three components all involve counterfactuals (Roese, 1997). These cognitive processes supply alternative narratives that provide a framework for an event. The consideration of counterfactuals provides a process of construction during which meaning is ascribed. Folger and Cropanzano (2001) described counter-factual thinking as "what the nature of the experience *would have been* like if the event had not occurred or had unfolded differently" (p. 5). Three comparisons are of injury, culpability of conduct, and ethical standards: (1) what *would* it be like if my being were different, (2) what *could* the 'offender' have done differently, and (3) what *should* the offender have done differently in terms of an ethical or moral standard. The conduct and moral standard of an offender act in a counterfactual comparison to determine the culpability. The perceived injury and accountability are counterfactually compared for unfairness judgements and behavioural responses. The counterfactuals are not theorised as occurring in a linear sequence. Like many accounts of justice, within organisational justice (Colquitt et al., 2001), the domain of emotion is often neglected. I

propose to open a role for emotion by linking the lack of power from a judgment of unfairness through emotion, as relational power affecting fields of potential action. I will theorise this relationship via a modification of Burkitt's (2014) theory of a relational understanding of emotions.

This thesis is developed with two cautions in mind. First, most of the literature forming this review is positivistic; and second, that interpreted unfairness, being more subjective, holistic, and related to a particular individual's forestructures, might differ from the existing literature.

Section One: Events causing injury or damage in a judgement of unfairness

As I am developing a thesis of unfairness as a judgement arising out of a comparison of counterfactuals, I will open my review with what the literature has to say about 'triggering events'. In the education environment, only five studies which have components of either unfair or unjust events have been identified (Bempechat et al., 2013; Demetriou & Hopper, 2007: Fan & Chan, 1999; Israelishvili, 1997; Mikula, 1986; Mikula, et al., 1987). The results of these studies on unfair events are more apparent for their diversity than for their coalescence or cohesion. The findings range across the spectrum of standards of unfairness, namely, distributive, procedural, and interpersonal unfairness. This reflects the contexts in which the studies were undertaken, including universities, high schools, and primary schools. The studies also employed a variety of inductive methods and deductive methodologies in their goal of establishing what events participants experienced.

Section Two: Ethical standards of expected behaviour

Introduction

At the core of my theorising about unfairness is a judgement of accountability and associated emotions and reactions. This cognitive component is based on counterfactual comparisons between the trigger events and ethical standards. In this section, I lay out what the existing positivist literature has to say about standards of ethics coming from distributive, procedural, and interactional justice (Colquitt et al., 2001).

Organisational justice is presented as a multi-dimensional construct. The four components of organisational justice are distributive, procedural, informational, and interpersonal justice (Colquitt et al., 2001). Distributive justice (Adams, 1965) is conceptualised as justice associated with decisions about outcomes and the allocation of resources. Procedural justice (Leventhal, 1980) refers to the justice of decision-making processes leading to outcomes. Interactional justice (Bies & Moag, 1986) focuses on the treatment an individual receives as decisions are made.

This section presents my understanding of the existing literature on standards of organisational fairness or in/justice breached. These are thought to have a significant role in deeming a negative event to be an unfair experience.

Ethical standards from distributive justice

In contrast to the organisational justice research undertaken on distributive justice (defined above with adults, the research with adolescent and child participants is relatively scarce. The research with children has been done within a cognitive-developmental theoretical framework (e.g. Damon, 1975; Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969; Piaget, 1932/1969). This research was largely positivistic and sought generalisations based on which standards of

justice children began employing at particular ages in their reasoning about distributive justice; that is, external cues, equality, equity, and need (e.g., Damon, 1975). The assumption was made that context did not significantly influence distributive choices.

Subsequent research indicated contextual factors matter in children's understandings of reasoning and behavioural choices in distributive tasks (Damon, 1988). The research on adolescent reasoning and the parameters which impact the utilisation of justice principles is limited (McGillicuddy-De Lisi, et al., 2008). Culture is to the fore in two studies with adolescent participants (Carlo et al., 2008; Han & Park, 1995), following on from the pioneering work of Nisan (1984), who was the first to demonstrate the impact of culture on resource distribution.

The research reviewed above reflects the limited psychological investigation of unfairness conceptualised as distributive justice based on the standards of equality, equity, and needs (Deustch, 1983). Fairness is about personal rules and how justice is perceived at a personal, ethical level. It is about the ethicality of the rules of determining distributions. Evans, Gayler, and Smith (2001) following the earlier work by Thorkildsen (1989a, 1989b), defined unfairness as "subjective judgements of receiving unjust treatment as opposed to reasoning about dispensing justice. This subjective experience of how one is being treated allows the investigation of children's perceptions of fairness to include important emotional components", (p. 213).

A consistent parameter to emerge from this research about influences on distributive justice is that context matters as much if not more than age-related reasoning resource allocations

Ethical standards from procedural fairness

In the most comprehensive body of work on procedural justice (defined in the Introduction section) in high and middle schools, Thorkildsen and colleagues examined student perceptions of the fairness of instructional procedures. The first of the studies (Thorkildsen, 1989a) looked at pupil perceptions in tailoring instructional procedures to student ability including the following: continue working, wait quietly, peer-tutor slow workers, work on computer or read, and all move on when the fastest ones are finished. Peer tutoring was deemed to be the fairest overall; the oldest (18+ years) saw chances for accelerationism as the fairest, and early adolescents and adolescents (10-18 years) reasoned that procedures which enabled all to learn the same things was fair. Thorkildsen, Nolen, and Fournier (1994) confirmed their earlier findings, when looking at the impact of four different instructional practices in relation to student academic motivation, for students aged 7-12. Those practices emphasising praise of excellent performance (highest level) were experienced as unfair. The procedure deemed fair and motivating was praise for something done well (second highest level of achievement); thus, confirming egalitarian or equality rules.

Interactional justice

The third type of unfairness standard identified in the adult-influenced organisational justice is that of interpersonal treatment. This category focuses on reactions to the experience of interpersonal treatment received from others, and is related to concepts such as respect, trust, and understanding. Interactive justice judgements may mirror one's standing in the groups to which they belong (Lind & Tyler, 1988). In their theory, Lind and Tyler (1988) go so far as to elevate this factor; that is, how a person is valued by the group, to that of the most important consideration in experiences of interactive unfairness. The literature on

interactional justice indicates that this is more relevant to behaviour in organisations than distributive or procedural justice (Barling & Phillips, 1993).

While researchers examining procedural justice have given prominence to voice, others have looked to the respect which people consider that they are entitled to from others (Miller et al., 2001). Some researchers (e.g., Cropanzano & Greenberg 1997; Skarlicki & Folger, 1997) have focused on what they call interactional justice. Miller et al. (2001) argued based on recent interactional justice work, that "people's sense of entitlement comes down to broad requirements" (p. 531). The first is interpersonal sensitivity, and the second is accountability. Miller argued that people have difficulty explaining what they experience as a violation of respect, but they understand when a psychological "contract" has been violated; "People may not always be able to articulate what their entitlements are in a particular relationship, but they know when a sense of rightness has been violated" (Miller, et al., 2001p. 532).

A study by Berti, Molinari, and Speltini (2010), measured teacher and student perceptions of ideal justice and psychological engagement. The study was conceptually based on spheres of justice (Walzer, 1983), organisational justice, and perceived discrepancies between what 'is' and what 'ought' to be. Assessment data indicated that student participants reported a diffuse and shared treatment of being treated unjustly, which impacted upon their school engagement as measured by a feeling towards one's class, motivation, and communication with their teachers. The authors argued for development of an educational justice sphere of research agenda.

In summary, the amount and range of literature on interactional or interpersonal justice that focuses on teacher-student interactions is reasonably well researched when compared to that of peer-to-peer interactions. Most of the literature cited here, except for

the study by Berti et al. (2010), does not take an early adolescent student perspective into account. Literature on peer-to-peer interactional justice in the range of 10-14 years is absent.

Ethical standards coming from identity and cultural values

Just as theorising about organisational justice, from a positivist paradigm, can provide insights into what might constitute the comparative counterfactuals for unfairness, so too can the cultural beliefs of students provide such information. In fact, a breach of cultural values, relating to people of a particular group, fits under the heading of interactional justice. This understanding is more likely to be important in an interpretive study where students' viewpoints are at the core of the inquiry. As Pasifika and Māori students' cultural beliefs and practices might constitute acceptable standards of beliefs and behaviour, I will explore what the literature has to say on these issues.

While there is no definitive consensus on the core of being Māori, Moeke-Pickering (1996) suggested that it centres on two broad concepts: relationships with the land (whenua) and traditions of the Māori people (tangata). The three paramount Māori social structures focus on whanau (family), hapu (extended family), and tribe (iwi). The concept of whanautanga links the individual to family, sub-tribe, and tribe.

The Māori language (Te Reo Māori) is important for Māori. Related to knowledge of the language is the concept of understanding of culture and procedures (tikanga Māori).

A third dimension, related to tikanga, is that of Wairuatanga (spirituality). Again, there is no definitive definition, as whanau, hapu, and iwi oral histories and traditions, as well as colonial and post-colonial experiences, and land loss all come to bear (Barlow, 1991) on Wairuatanga. However, at the heart of spirituality for Māori are the concepts of tipuna

(ancestors) and mana (self-respect and social standing). The holistic consideration of relationships between ancestors and natural environment is intertwined in spirituality and inseparable in identity (Walker, 1996) and iwi boundaries. Finally, being Māori is linked to the natural world and embedded in spirit, body, and mind. In summary, Pere (1988) outlined six core elements of Māori identity in the form of: a sense of belonging provided by relationships to the land; a sense of meaning and connection provide by spirituality; tikanga coming from links backward and forward, and to and from, tipuna; Māori values and customs based on Tikanga Māori; well-being obligations based on whanautanga; and a sense of humanity based on being related to a wider community.

Pacific islanders originally from Tonga, Samoan, Tokelau, Niue, and the Cook Islands, from the South West Pacific Ocean, are part of a diaspora that have moved to New Zealand/Aotearoa, Australia, and the USA via American Samoa. In New Zealand, employment was initially the main pull factor, driven by the need for unskilled industrial labour in manufacturing, mainly in the 1960s and 1970s. Subsequent contacts have been driven by family relationships, inter-country obligations in the case of Samoa, sport, education, and on-going employment opportunities.

In Aotearoa, the term Pasifika is used by the Ministries of Education, Health and Pacific Island Affairs. The term is one of convenience to refer to the diversity of Pacific island peoples, some of whom are small as a percentage of the whole population of Aotearoa. The term is contested; with some researchers arguing (Anae, 2010) that it is ineffective for executing real change as research guidelines need re-addressing. Other researchers argued for an emerging Pacific identity different from the first generation of migrants (MacPherson, 1996) and conveyed in language, media, fashion, and cultural events (Zemke-White, 2001). Bearing in

mind the contested nature of the term Pasifika, I am adopting the term as defined by Hunter and Anthony (2011) referring to it as "… a multi-ethnic, heterogeneous group of people who originated from the island nations of the south Pacific" (p. 103).

The values associated with Pasifika peoples, as identified in literature, include island identity, family, spirituality, and culture. Mila-Schaaf et al. (2008) argued that that positive group is associated with pride in one's island group. Family (Anae, 2001) is important and the structure through which Pasifika peoples gain social support and nurture. The church (Anae, 2001; Kupa, 2009; Macpherson, 1996) is central to the identity of the families of island peoples gaining social support, religious and cultural needs. Finally, a sense of identification is apparent, especially amongst Pasifika youth (Zemke-White, 2001). The only research available on Pasifika youths' views on the role of values in their lives is a holistic study (Fletcher et al., 2005, cited in Fletcher, et al., 2009). In this study, the perceptions values perception with reading success were, in descending order:

> the centrality of parental support and love, the maintenance of cultural identity for Pasifika people, the importance of high expectations from school staff and parents of Pasifika children's success, the importance of home-school relationships, *and* the central role of the church. (Fletcher et al., 2005, p. 35)

In this section I have explored what could be the standards of cultural practices which might give some conceptual insights into my interpretation of the participants' perception. This information is to be held tentatively; tempered by multiple cultural identities and individual family, island and whanau, and iwi influences.

Fairness theory

Fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001) is a manner of explaining how a young person denotes a negative event to be unfair. It is essentially a formal expression of the 'is' with 'ought' comparison explored in the previous section.

Throughout fairness theory, there are evaluations (*would, could, and should*) which are central to the processes of arriving at a judgement of unfairness. The tension lies between beliefs and prescriptions about behaviour. This tension has led to the concepts of rights and truths being examined in isolation and within separate philosophical, conceptual, and empirical domains. The developing conceptions of what is right and proper are usually examined, without reference, to the changing understanding of those beliefs. Conversely, the study of belief entitlement takes place without reference to the values which invest beliefs with meaning and understanding. Thus, there is a disconnection between our understanding of adolescents' rights and beliefs or between moral reasoning changes and their changing theories of mind. Part of the reasoning for this dichotomy is the 'is to ought' fallacy (Hume, 1978). This comes from historical warnings about the necessity of drawing clear distinctions between how things are and how they ought to be. The dangers lie in disguising what is true and what is of value. Classical philosophical scholars warn conflation between the two must not be taken lightly. This tension, however, should not stop an examination of the commonalities within theory of mind and moral reasoning development for developmental psychology.

Fairness theory postulates that the four components of organisational justice (distributive, procedural, interactive, and informational) can give rise to negative experiences of fairness, via the role of accountability. This involves a search for the motivations and

accountability for an offence in the form of blame and focusing, in particular, on the factors of intention, responsibility, causality, and controllability. Accountability is central to fairness theory as if an event is to be labelled as unfair, someone or something is required to be blamed.

In applying fairness theory to events in early adolescents' lives, three components of accountability are required to come into play. The first involves a negative event where harm has been done to a participant, for instance, damage to self-esteem. The negative incident must hold someone to account. Secondly, the negative event must be under the volitional control of an offender. If a negative event is deemed not to be an accident and is under the volitional control of an actor, then he or she can be blamed. This involves intent to do harm and the lack of an excuse or factors of mitigation. Finally, a normative ethical, cultural, or fairness standard must be breached. A teacher, who changes a student's maths mark down, is acting in a manner that 'proper' teachers would not do. Consequently, an offender can be held as accountable for violating a normative standard applicable to a professional teacher.

Counterfactual thinking, or contrastive thinking, is contrasting what has been with what might be (Roese, 1997). In this form of cognitive review, the person may alter the events to assess the impact of an alternative scenario. In fairness theory, it can be argued that counterfactuals can be used to reassess the accountability of an action. These are actions counter to the facts. The offended adolescent could perceive events, within a contrastive framework, where the sequence of events might have been different along with the interpreted consequences.

Thus, in fairness theory, three judgements - "would", "could" and "should" - are involved in determining a judgement of unfairness. These judgements of accountability are in

response to three questions: What *would* have been the result if the event had not occurred? *Could* the actions of the offender have been undertaken in a different manner? *Should* the actor have acted in the manner that she/he did?

When an individual evaluates what *would* have happened, she/he undertakes a comparison with a counterfactually developed alternative. The degree to which the alternative explanation contrasts with what happened can impact the perceived harmfulness of the actions. These evaluations have been postulated to be both automatic ones and consciously, deliberate cognitive processing (Bobocel, McCline, & Folger, 1996).

When an individual is evaluating what *could* have been in an unfair event, she/he is evaluating the extent to which the action was flexible, or could have been avoided. A victim is less likely to hold the 'offender' to account if there is a possibility of an alternative action. The model recognises that this evaluation is often made through automatic processing of information (Roese, 1997).

Finally, when the evaluation of the *shoulds* of an actor's action is undertaken, she or he is focusing on the moral components of their performance. This refers to what is ethically or morally appropriate with the actor's behaviour. As with the "*would*" and "*could*" evaluations, fairness theory postulates that this evaluation too, can be automatic. Only when *would*, *could* and *should* evaluations come into play is there a possibility of a judgement of unfairness being made.

There is no literature available on using Fairness theory in research with either children or early adolescents. One method of getting some understanding of the utility of the theory

might be to examine what the literature has to say about counterfactual thinking with adolescents. I present this in the next section.

Empirical research on adolescent counterfactual thinking

Developmental psychology is the setting for the empirical work on most counterfactual thinking concerning children and adolescents. This work has focused on how counterfactual thinking develops and the linkage with moral development. According to Rafetseder et al. (2013), counterfactual thinking appears to be a gradual developmental process. Early research pointed to the development in this type of thinking as emerging early (Harris et al., 2006) but was challenged by Beck and Guthrie (2011) who argued the claim was unsubstantiated and that the results were false positives. Their results indicated that counterfactual thinking started to emerge after five years of age. However, even this has been challenged by Rafetseder et al. (2013) who argued that their findings for 9- to 10-year-olds was comparable to the 6-year-olds studied by Harris et al., (2006). The 12- to 14-year-olds in their study approximated those of adults (Rafetseder et al., 2013). While there is some contention around the ages at which young people can manipulate counterfactuals there seems to be some accord that it is a continuing process.

Consequently, based on the research for counterfactual thinking presented above with early adolescents, there is some justification for employing Fairness theory with early adolescents in research on unfairness.

Section three: Reactions to unfairness

Literature on blaming an offender

Blame is part of the comprehensive theory of fairness advanced by Folger and Cropanzano (2001). However, the only study of unfairness/injustice and blame or

responsibility is that of Mikula (1993). Mikula's (1993) theory is based on an attribution of responsibility which is composed of attributions for *causation, control*, and *intention.* In testing his attribution-of-blame model of judgements, Mikula (2003) found support for attributions of causality, intention, and perceived lack of sufficient justification, but no support for controllability. Some of the research by Mikula was undertaken with adolescent girls; in the first such study, there was some support for intention and lack of justification, but not violation of entitlement, personal causation, and lack of controllability.

Emotional responses

Much of the work on emotions and unfairness with young adults and children has been based on Adams' (1965) equity theory with two parameters, i.e., over-rewarded and under-rewarded conditions, being examined via the use of vignettes. Both conditions are deemed to be unfair (e.g., Evans, Galyer, & Smith, 2001).

In experimental situations involving unfair procedures resulting in *over-reward, gain, or goal achievement*, guilt is often the dominant reported emotion (Cropanzano et al., 2008) when gaining an undeserved reward or getting out of a disciplinary procedure. Positive emotions have also stemmed from the 'happy victimisers' phenomenon where participants are younger children. While recognising this as a breach of a moral rule, the observing younger children thought that an offender would be happy with their gain (Arsenio & Gold, 2006; Arsenio & Kramer, 1992). Averill-Roper and Rucklidge (2006) undertook a comparison study of emotions elicited in fair and unfair punishment conditions of children with and without behaviour problems aged 6-11 years. The "unfair scenario with a positive outcome for the participant produced the greatest group differences with the behavioural group reporting emotions consistent with antisocial theory such as less guilt, anger and fear, and more pride

and happiness than the controls" (Averill-Roper & Rucklidge, 2006, p. 140). Equity theory (Adams, 1965) contends that when victims have been treated in an unjust manner this is likely to lead to negative emotion states of distress.

Adolescent anger experience within a residential setting was the issue explored by Swaffer and Hollin (1997) in a grounded theory study involving semi-structured interviews with 18 participants. One of the common themes was that disrespectful treatment and perceived unfairness were setting events for anger.

Other compounding factors leading to variability in the intensity of the emotional responses have been reported in the literature. Hostility is a strong emotion elicited from children who have been disadvantaged and who have a history of unfair experiences (Evans, Heriot, & Friedman, 2002). Participants who have been rejected tend to show more anger (Hubbard, 2001). There is also a gender difference, with boys displaying anger more frequently than girls (Hubbard, 2001). Situations where unfairness is experienced as being less serious tend to elicit more neutral emotions (Royzman, Leeman, & Baron, 2009).

A theorisation for a relational emotional approach to unfairness judgements

In this section I lay out a role for emotion which possibly links the role of relational power involved in a judgment of accountability, the hot emotion associated with a judgement of unfairness and the role of retaliative action or inaction. Such a theorisation is advanced by Burkitt (1997, 2001 & 2014) with his theory of emotion and social relationships. Taking a social interactionist orientation, Burkitt (2014) takes on an ontological position where social relations are the cauldron in which emotions are generated.

In fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001) laid out a theory for assigning meaning to an incident of perceived unfairness as a judgment of accountability. This involves

94

three elements of accountability involving injury where ones 'state, has been damaged, culpability is a moral transgression or a departure from a moral or ethical standard (injury, conduct, and moral principles). These sets of the embedded cognitive process have the potential to continue some relational power differentials in either the culpability or moral breach components. In my theorisation of power encapsulated in the utterance of 'It is not fair!' I utilise Burkitt's definition of power after Foucault (2002, p., 164) as a:

> Total structure of actions brought to bear upon possible actions: it incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult: in the extreme it constrains or forbids absolutely; it is nevertheless always a way of acting upon an acting subject or acting subjects by virtue of their acting or being capable of action. A set of actions upon other actions. (Foucault, 1982: 220).

For Burkitt (2014) without a relational sense, there would be no emotion, "My argument here is that we are always in patterns of relationship to other people and the world, and feelings and emotions form our embodied, mindful sense of different aspects of those relationships." (p.15). He further suggests that a positivistic attempt to reduce emotions to either social or psychological situations will only be partially successful at most. Burkitt argues this point as, "a complex understanding of emotion allows us to understand how socially meaningful relationships register in our body minds and, at some level of awareness, are felt" (p.15).

Another critical aspect of Burkitt's (2014) theorisation of feeling and social relationship is the concept of 'affect'. The term affect is defined as involving the 'intensity' (p., 11) of experience as opposed to a cognitive quality.

95

Thus, the quality of experience is to do with the emotion associated with it, something which can be expressed in language or discourse, while affective intensity is non-representational and non-conscious, therefore escaping all attempts to articulate it. Unlike in the psychological sciences, affect is seen as relating to the body rather than the conscious mind and is concerned with the flow of intensities that pass and circulate between bodies, almost like a contagion. Because of this, affect is also characterised as non-rational and accounts for the irrational forces (Burkitt, 2014, p., 11).

In Burkitt's (2014) theory intensity is likely to be experienced as euphoria if the power of action of the body is increased or dysphoria if it is not. According to Burkitt indicates that power works as the *affects* of a structure of actions, it is said these incite, induce, or seduce … In order to be incited, one must be angered or provoked by the strategic action of others into a counterattack or retaliation, an opposing strategy that seeks to counter the opponent's move (2002, p., 164).

Burkitts (2014) theory works at both individual and *micro level*, and the *macro* or the institutional al level of a school. In summary, unfair emotions associated with the social relations of accountability for unfairness may work as a structure of actions that aims to affect a field of possible actions as either student engagement or disengagement.

Behavioural reactions

Only six studies deal directly with the impact of organisational justice and student reactions. There are, however, a number of what might be called indirect or implied studies, and a smaller number of attributional studies (Demetriou and Hopper, 2007; Flint, 2007;

Mikula, 1986) of which only Ampy-Thomas (2000), Vannatta (1996) and Sanches and Gouveia-Pereira (2010) involve some early adolescent participates.

In her unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ampy-Thomas (2000) used a longitudinal design to explore the relationships between peer support for engagement in violent behaviour, unfair experiences, and attitudes with aggression. Her participants were grade 7 students at T1 (n=572) and T2 (n=531). The participants were 94% African American. Ampy-Thomas used structural equational modelling to explore relationships between variables. The Perceived Injustice Scale of the Interpersonal Situation Inventory for Urban Adolescents (Farrell, Ampy & Meyer, 1998) has four subscale items of perceived injustice, and was used to measure unfair situations. This subscale correlated only with three items: aggression, drug use, and anxiety. The hypothesis that the "level of peer support for engagement in violent behaviour and experience of unfair situations would be positively correlated with subsequent aggression was not supported" (Ampy-Thomas, 2000, p. 87

Vannatta (1996) examined gender differences in self-reported suicidal behaviour in relation to risk factors from the Survey Instrument of Attitude and Behaviour (SIAB). The author used data from 3461 participants, in grades 7-12. The sub-measure for Unfair/Strict rules was defined as "Poor perceptions of parental rules in terms of fairness and strictness, 30 - day frequency of getting in trouble with parents" (Vannatta, p. 153). Stepwise forward regression analysis was employed to prioritise the independent factors' ability to predict contributions to gender differences of suicide activity (Unfair/Strict rules was 4th for males and 3rd for females) and tendencies (3rd for both males and females). Vannatta (1996) concluded that:

3. Leading predictors for male and female suicidal activity were violence, home environment, unfair/strict rules, and forcible sex. 4. The leading predictors for suicidal tendency among males and females were school misconduct, unfair/strict rules, and home environment, unique leading predictors for female suicidal tendency were over-the-counter drug use and cigarette use, a unique leading predictor for male suicidal tendency was forcible sex (p. 159).

The effect of teacher procedural unfairness on adolescent feelings of exclusion, and on their intent to participate in deviant behaviour, was the focus of a correlational study by Sanches and Gouveia-Pereira (2010), with 110 Portuguese adolescent participants, aged 13-16 years. The method involved a vignette of teacher procedural unfairness with a Likert-like response scale of 1-5, measures of exclusion and intent to engage in deviant behaviour. The findings indicate both school failure and unfair teacher procedures were associated with students' intent to engage in deviant behaviour.

Having looked at the scant literature on behavioural reactions to unfairness how do early adolescents cope with such behaviour and with judgements of unfairness in general? In the next section I present theorisation of coping strategies and associated literature.

Coping with unfairness

Until recently, much of the research on children and adolescents has been grounded in the theories of Lazarus and Folkman (1984). One of the more robust and well-researched models of child and adolescent coping is that of Frydenberg and Lewis (2002). This measure has been tested extensively in Australia with both an empirical foundation and theoretical basis (Frydenberg, 1997). The theoretical model is made up of three coping styles – productive, non-productive, and other-referenced, following data relating to the 89 items on

the Adolescent Coping Scale (Frydenberg, 2002). *Non-productive* coping style strategies include ignoring the issue, self-blame, not having any coping strategy, tension reduction strategies, worrying, keeping problems to self, and wishful cognitions. *Productive strategies* encompass such behaviours and cognitions as: working hard, problem solving, relaxing, fitness, and positive cognitions. The final category focuses on *seeking social support,* and concerns strategies associated with the following seeking behaviours: the support of friends, general support, professional help, seeking to belong, spiritual support, and taking part in social action. The psychometrics for the Adolescent Coping Scale is robust. For example, the productive and non-productive coping styles have reliabilities at above .80 and the social coping style between .67 and .79.

Several factors, such as gender, present as being related to how adolescents respond to both stress and the particular deployment of coping strategies. Male adolescents tend to focus on physicality, getting involved in sport and physical fitness (Frydenberg & Lewis, 1991). In contrast, girls utilise social support, wishful thinking, and tension – reduction strategies. Although gender stands out as a salient factor affecting the utilisation of strategies, there is a significant range of factors that impact the utilisation of strategies including culture, familial experience, and age (Frydenberg & Lewis, 1993, 2002h; Wilson, Pritchard, & Revalee, 2005).

Another approach to coping is seen in the social cognitive theory of Bandura (1993, 2002) where he presented a few self-serving biases which can lead to aggression via moral disengagement. These strategies help the wrong doers from being impacted by negative emotions such as shame, and have the same coping effects as outlined above. Bandura (2002) identified four broad categories of moral disengagement: cognitive restructuring, minimising the agentic role, disregarding the consequences, and blaming or dehumanising the victim.

Work by Paciello and colleagues (2008), via a longitudinal study with Italian adolescent participants, established some temporal developmental support for Bandura's categories.

There is minimal published work on unfairness and coping styles in education. The exception is that of Finkelstein, Minibas-Poussard, and Bastounis (2009). In a cultural-comparison study the authors asked French and Turkish university student participants in their early 20s about organisational justice and coping. They used a coping inventory developed for their study, measuring the preference for problem-focused coping, emotion-focused coping, or seeking social support. Turkish students were higher in seeking social support, which in turn was correlated with organisational justice perceptions. Linking seeking social support with problem solving coping was, in turn, correlated with a positive interpretation of justice in the Turkish, but not in the French, cohort.

Conclusion

In this part of the literature review, I have proposed Fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001) as the tentative means of underpinning the question design to establish the processes associated with a judgement of unfairness. This would see the interpretative themes theorised as a judgement of accountability, potentially with support from a social relational theory of emotion (Burkitt, 2014). The aim of this section has been being to enhance my understanding of the 'voice' of early adolescents by generating new knowledge of the processes associated with experienced unfairness.

Part Four: A Critical perspective on injustice

Introduction

In Part Four, I develop a conceptual basis for the critical part of my thesis. This is 'voicing' relational unfairness as potential structural inequalities associated with marginalisation in response to neoliberal stressors (Young, 2001 & 2006). In order to develop my stance, I will: take and explain the basis for adopting a critical stance to structural inequality; examine the source of neoliberal education reforms; explore marginalisation as a consequence of structural injustice; add a relational emotion component; and finally, look at withdrawal as disengagement from a critical perspective. The aim of Part four then is to provide a theorisation for the development of a critical perspective in order to enhance an understanding of critical injustices at the collective-social level of the school. An understanding of a critical perspective is vital as structural injustices may be linked to marginalisation.

In Chapter Three, Methodology, based on the conceptual foundations outlined in this part of Chapter Two, I will develop a criterion from Young's work (2001 & 2006) with which to interrogate the interpretive themes developed in Chapter Four. I will critically re-interpret this earlier work later in Chapter Seven.

Section One: A critical perspective

Introduction

The word 'critical' has some definitions in the New Zealand Oxford Dictionary (Deverson & Kennedy, 2005) two of which, relating to literary criticism and scientific inquiry, are germane to my inquiry. The term has its etymology in the Greek word *kritikos* denoting the skills of judgement, argument, and comment on the merits of a piece of literature, music

or art. In educational psychology there is an ongoing tension between scientific definitions of unfairness and 'critical' usage of the term: (1) as applied to the 'science' of educational psychology (see the literature reviewed in Part Two) emphasising rationality and logic and those; (2) focusing on political philosophy, ideology, and cultural and social constructs. While the first usage searches for universal truths, the second seeks understanding and interpretations in the social, cultural, and ideological features relating to the history and geography of particular contexts. The diversity of the critical stream is more extensive than the braided bed of a Canterbury river.

Influences within a critical vein

Such is the diversity of the critical stream that I will highlight only three Freire, British cultural studies, and the Poststructuralists. First, Freire (1972) who drew from a wide variety of sources: Marx, other dialectical materialists, and political economists; various views of the selfhood; and Socratic and interactive models of 'narrative'. Freire's focus was to critique the skills and knowledge in underpinning the 'banking' model of Brazilian education. This banking model was the default notion of the official perspective school and teacher knowledge, and consequently devalued indigenous knowledge. In place of the banking system, Freire advocated a problem-posing education model which supported dialogue between teacher and learner. Literacy acquisition then became a naming/renaming process beginning in analysing the daily lived reality of students. In this way, the traditional binary of oppressed and oppressor could be questioned.

Secondly, British educational psychology, this stream drawing from British cultural studies. This vein of research began with studies by Hoggart (1957), and Williams (1958), of the relationships between mass culture and ideology. This resulted in themes of development

102

within English curriculum theory on how to teach English, while undermining the working class voice (Rosen & Zlotnik, 2001).

Finally, post-structuralist models which have influenced critical educational psychology development (Mertens, 2014). For the 1980s one focus was on a critique on binary models with their power to obscure the convolutions of a cultural and social phenomenon (Pennycock, 2001).

In attempting to summarise critical theory, Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, (2011, p. 164) caution "Critical theory should not be treated as a universal grammar of revolutionary thought objectified and reduced to discrete formulaic pronouncements or strategies." Holding to this admonishment, Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, (2011, p. 164) defined a 'criticalist' in researching, theorising or teaching, as "one who accepts certain basic assumptions when undertaking social or cultural criticism". These include:

All thought is fundamentally mediated by power relations that are social and historically constituted; Facts can never be isolated from the domain of values or removed from some form of ideological inscription; The relationship between concept and object and between signifier and signified is never stable or fixed and is often mediated by the social relations of capitalist production and consumption; Language is central to the formation of subjectivity (conscious and unconscious awareness); Certain groups in any society and particular societies are privileged over others and, although the reasons for this privileging may vary widely, the oppression that characterizes contemporary societies is most forcefully reproduced when subordinates accept their social status as natural, necessary, or inevitable; Oppression has many faces, and focusing on only one at the expense of others (e.g.,

class oppression versus racism) often elides the interconnections among them; and finally mainstream research practices are generally, although most often unwittingly, implicated in the reproduction of systems of class, race, and gender oppression (p. 164).

A critical perspective from Iris Marion young

In this section I will outline the political philosophy of Iris Marion Young (1990; 2000; 2001 & 2006) on structural inequality and marginalisation. In Chapter Two, I used Young's work on the distributive paradigm as the basis of a critique of the current positivist research on unfairness. Rather than focusing on *distribution* as the basis for her conceptualisation, Young argues 'justice' should instead be replaced with the concepts of 'domination' and 'marginalisation'. Included in her conceptualisation, to call out oppression, she uses cultural and social structures, divisions of labour, social group differences, and acknowledging privilege.

Young (1990) argues that the distributive paradigm ontologically does not accommodate the possibility of a school group. Further, she challenges the focus of the distributive paradigm on a limited number of abstracted principles from across some societies. In doing so, Young argues these theorists seek 'justice' answers outside of the social milieu and particular contexts. Taking a critical stance with which to theorise her conception of justice, Young (1990) envisages it as a social context based on the differentiated, culturally plural network.

While Young draws heavily from Habermas (Finlayson, 2005), particularly his critiques of advanced capitalism and his notion of communication ethics, she in fact rejects his commitment to a homogenous social life. Young (1990) also acknowledges her feminist

connections. She attributes her focus on positive group social differences to a group of postmodern writers including Derrida, Lyotard, Foucault, and Kristeva. She is very much a contextually based theorist in dealing with ontological and epistemological issues, preferring not to abstract the issues which initially arose out of a social context.

I will return to the core of Young's conceptualisation in the middle of this chapter, after examining the possibility that neoliberal stressors operate within Te Aroha School.

Section two: The conceptualisation of neoliberalism in education

I open my endeavour to voice early adolescents' voice on unfairness, by defining the context in which my research is located, as one impacted by the neoliberal reforms which resulted in the closure of Aroha Intermediate School. Specifically, I map out a theme in the neoliberal educational reforms of parental choice, interschool competition, the concepts underlying the creation of 'winner and loser schools,' what Thrupp (2007, 2008; Thrupp & White, 2013) calls the *Unfortunate Middle Classes Advantage.*

Brief history of the neoliberal reforms of 1984

Education, since 1984 is viewed as the efficient return of capital investment by the state in education and an opportunity to free up central control and therefore reduce the possibility of provider capture. The individual school became the administrative unit in competition with other schools. The students, as clients, were to be prepared by schools for the needs of the market, acquiring the knowledge and skill required for employment.

The education reforms of 1989 followed on from the election of the Labour government elected in 1984 and new administrative and management practices, which I experienced as a newly trained psychologist in 1991. These changes were all-embracing, the

result of what I determined as a palace coup, with a right-wing ideology emerging from out of a left of centre, Labour government (1994-1991). Although actioned at lightning speed the reforms had been in gestation via discussion, consultation and in development through the 1980s. The reforms moved education administration from central control to local control by parents and schools. This transference was repeatedly called devolution. These shifts were planned and were an attempt to be responsive to different sectors to implement ideological reform which focused on 'efficiency,' and 'effectiveness' and 'equity' (Butterworth & Butterworth, 1989; Fancy, 2006; Hawke, 2003). Smelt (cited in Butterworth, & Butterworth, 1998, p. 66) referred to the rate of action as "when all the lights went green", as there were effectively no barriers to the implementation of the reforms.

In July 1987, the Picot Taskforce (name after supermarket owner, Brian Picot) was set up to make recommendations on the role of 'efficiency' in the school administration sector. The result was the Review of Educational Administration (Department of Education, 1988), published after six weeks of consultation. The changes were not viewed very favourably from the beginning, focusing as they did mainly on schools being treated as efficient business units. The Treasury drove these changes through the State Services Commission, the State Sector Act 1998, and Public Finance 1998 Act.

Separately, Codd et al, (1990) and Mackenzie (1999) indicated that there was an initial strong desire for a genuine partnership between the government and the education sectors. The reforms identified local control as the means to generate more consumer choice, but in doing, so excluded some communities, especially Pasifika and Māori (Ballard, 1999; Codd et al., 1990; McKenzie, 1999; Olssen, Codd & O'Neil, 2004).

Poor people must accept their neighbourhood schools regardless of quality … General equity issues tend to be neglected such that an emphasis on choice will result in a corresponding increase in inequality and consequential social divisions between rich and poor schools and between rich and poor communities. … The critics of choice … argue that choice proposals jeopardise the ability of public schooling to promote equal outcomes and equality of opportunity. (Olssen, Codd, & O'Neill, 2004, p. 204)

School choice created quasi-markets for parents; others advocated minimising the neoliberal reform. Others based on experience from the United States of America, saw the danger of a new form of segregation (Moore & Devonport, 1990, cited in Olssen, Codd & O'Neil, 2004). Some parts of the neoliberal reforms were effective in terms of the agenda. Others did not move to local control because of difficulties of the delegation, such as the former Psychological Service where I was employed.

Parental choice of the local school in which to enrol their children became popular. Initially school choice resulted in Pasifika and Māori parents choosing to send their children to schools outside of their immediate neighbouring suburb (LaRocque, 2005). A decade, later in the 1990s, the situation had reversed, and more Māori students attended their local school. Ladd and Fiske (2003) cited cost, transport, and enrolment changes for the changes. This resulted in Māori and Pasifika students being concentrated in low decile schools, such as Te Aroha Middle School.

A 1999 conference 'A Decade of Reform in New Zealand Education: Where to Now', provided a summative assessment of the reforms. John Codd et al. (1990, p., 8) in an attempt to summarise the reforms concluded:

participation and partnership became competition and consumer sovereignty; the intended democratisation of education resulted in marketisation and increasing privatisation; schools have become independent self-managing units competing with each other for staff and resources; policymakers vision of education not widely shared by professional educators; the market way is not the New Zealand Way; managerial culture within education institutions … emphasis on efficiency and external accountability competing with traditional professional culture; the national curriculum framework is a curriculum for social control, small content to conform to pre-determined objectives.

Finally, much of the negativity around the reforms arose out of the lack of consideration of education as a public good. It was also centred on opposition to the marketisation of education rather than being based on a social good concept (Butterworth & Butterworth, 1998; Smelt, 1998). Smelt identified the implementation mechanisms of Tomorrows Schools as:

Increased choice for parents between schools; Increased delegation of powers to school level and removal or reduction of intermediate levels of administration (devolution); Increased voice for parents within schools, both directly through the board of trustees and indirectly through the threat of exit (or of seeking the creation of a school within a school); A move to a contractual relationship between schools, the centre and the local community, through the school charter and the activities of ERO (1998, p., 10).

Neoliberalist ideology in Te Aroha School

Tomorrows Schools' created a marketised education system bringing marginalising 'winner' and 'loser school' (Thrupp, 2015); where did these concepts originate from? The answer lies in the world rise of the New Right (Olssen, Codd & O'Neil, 2004) and individually as Thatcherism in the United Kingdom, Reaganomics in the United States of America and as Rogernomics in Aotearoa (named after the Minister of Finance in the Labour governments of 1984-1988). Olssen, Codd, and O'Neil (2004) in their conceptualisation of the New Right identify this movement as an alliance of market liberals and moral conservatives. These movements are characterised by monetarist policies, reduced public spending, privatisation of public functions and the deregulation of local markets (Benade, 2012).

What is at the hub of the New Right ideology is a cluster of values centred on a belief in individual freedom where the consumer can exercise their choices in an unfettered free market and coupled with a massively reduced government social spending (Benade, 2012). As identified by Leon Benade (2012, p. 4):

> The key intellectual trends that led to the development of neoliberal thought include the rising influence of monetarism, the work of theories linked to the Austrian and Chicago schools of economics, and the emergence of human capital, public choice, and agency.

Of these, I wish to focus on the impact of Public Monetarism and Public Choice Theory (Devine, 2004; Benade, 2012) as the drivers behind the marginalisation (Young, 1990) of the students of Aroha School. Monetarism is defined by Benade (2012, p. 2) as, "associated with Milton Freedom of the Chicago school (Olssen & Peters, 2005), monetarists keenly support a

laissez-faire market, thereby rejecting Keynesian welfare economics and attendant public spending".

One of the key features of monetarism impacting on Smelt's (1998) drivers is that of the a priori individual freedom to choose. Public Choice Theory (Olssen & Peters, 2005) is about the marketisation of education and public choice within it.

In her book, *Education and Public Choice: A Critical Account of the Invisible Hand of the Market in Education*, Nesta Devine (2004) traces the role of Public Choice Theory in what Smelt (1998) terms as parental "choice" and by implication competition between schools, students, and teacher, as performance-based remuneration. The latter was never implemented due to the vigorous opposition of the united teacher unions of Aotearoa.

Devine (2004) traces the application of Hayek's (1979, cited in Devine, 2004) evolutionary theory of economics to the public sector and education, which he terms catallactic or the science of exchange. Devine traces the influence of Hayek's concept of market competition via the teleology of Darwin's theory of evolution. Darwin focused not on the explanation for phenomena but in the purpose they served. Referring to competition Devine (2004, p. 158) indicates that "There is some disagreement as to how this mechanism works: Hayek regards competition as the mechanism that dis-covers the best."

The idea of Public Choice Theory has been applied to the competition of nations and schoolteachers and students. Education is to be competition in terms of market efficiency rather than as a Keynesian type of good. This requires that the government footprint in the education market should be reduced to a minimum. From a neoliberal perspective:

in line with the teleological view of the markets in general, it is believed that competition between schools for students and resources will improve the standard of service schools offer to their pupils. … In a myriad of ways, competition has been introduced to or reinforced in the education field. The assumption is generally made that the competitive model of organising schooling will deliver 'better' forms of schools because they must compete for students and parent support – that is, for funding (Devine, 2004, p. 160-161).

Finally, competition should be applied to the classroom with its rewards as academic advancement. The failure of the market to realise educational nirvana allows the government to individualise failure as the result of individuals, students, and schools, that is, of schools in decline as result of their inability to compete in the marketplace of education (Devine, 2004).

Neoliberalism in Te Aroha School

Turning now to the context for my study, how can you distinguish between a context that has been affected educationally by a low socio-economic factor and, one compounded by ideological, neoliberal reforms. A tentative answer possibly lies in the ideological nature of Te Aroha Schools closure in 2013.

Aroha Intermediate school had a declining school roll for some years (ERO Reports, 2005, 2006 & 2008) along with a process known as a recapitation (this involves the closure of an intermediate school and allocating school Years 7 and 8 back to the contributing primary schools, Years 1-7). Intermediate schools (Middle School catering for Years 7-8) are not popular with primary school (Years 1-7) administrators in this community. They are viewed as unnecessary by this group and disruptive in in terms of the numbers of transitions before starting high school in Year 9. The interschool competition for scarce resources is fierce and

led by one principal who was very much interested in the neoliberal orientation to educational achievement.

The decision to close the school can be interpreted as an ideological process. In the mid-2010s, both the National government and the Labour political parliamentary opposition party were still driven, in their educational policies, by a modified neoliberal ideology. Announcing the decision of Education Minister Tolley to close Aroha School the New Zealand Herald newspaper reported the following:

> Te Aroha Intermediate School has been told it will have to close its doors in 2013 - while five other local schools will expand their student rolls because of crowded primaries. Education Minister Anne Tolley has been considering the future of Aroha's schools since several local primaries applied last year to expand and provide education for students in Years 7 and 8. The community was asked in April to consider several options for the future of the local schools, including maintaining the status quo, closing Te Aroha Intermediate and putting some full primary schools back to just Years 1-6. Yesterday, Ms. Tolley said feedback from that public consultation made it clear there was a preference for full primary schools up to Year 8 in Te Aroha. As a result of the consultation, five primary schools would change from Years 1-6 to Years 1-8 and Aroha Intermediate would close. "The expanding rolls at these seven schools will have an impact on the already falling roll at Aroha Intermediate, and therefore I have decided that Aroha Intermediate School should close," she said, (Binning, 2011).

The decision of Education Minister Tolley to close Te Aroha School can be interpreted as an ideological one, as I translate the consultation process with the broader community into a form of competition for numbers and resources. It is also a form of competition for the

organisational structure of education within the broader area of student recapitation versus maintaining an intermediate school. Under a centrally structured education system, each area had its non-competing school. What of the immediate schools own views?

> Earlier in the year, Mr. Horan said the school's 144 students were proof the community was behind the school, despite the fact the roll is nearly half of what it was in 2008. He said a survey last year found that 87 percent of parents wanted it to stay open", (Binning, 2011).

The final piece in the puzzle may be contained in the announcement from Chris Hipkins, Minister of Education, in new Labour-led government that:

> Schools are being told that the era of competing for students may soon end, as the new Labour Government plans wide-ranging changes to the education system. Education Minister Chris Hipkins has announced a three-year programme to review the "Tomorrow's Schools" model of competing schools that dates from 1989 (Collins, 2018).

Thus, the neoliberal educational component of competition is to be possibly replaced by a yet unknown ideological model from a left of centre leaning coalition government.

Having traced the theoretic nature of the neoliberal reforms, their conceptual origins and impacts I will pick up the empirical work on how winner and loser schools come to be stressors which led to the closure of Te Aroha School. In the next section, I advance a thesis based on a critical hermeneutic orientation to give voice to the student perspective on neoliberal reforms.

In the field of education, Public Choice has had profound and arguably irreversible effects. It would be difficult now to undo the elements of marketisation, the valorisation competition in all aspects of the system, the profound cynicism towards the objectives of people who teach and administer education, wariness, and tiredness of teachers towards administrators, government agencies, politicians, the community and even their pupils. For, saddest of all, it is the students themselves, in a world focused on norms and efficiency, who pose the biggest threat to the ability of teachers to "deliver the curriculum" – that is, to conform and perform. Moreover, so we have the phenomenon of escalating suspensions, increasing exclusion, and the rhetoric of inclusion, the narrowing of the curriculum to summative testing, (teaching to the test) and an unarticulated sense by many that this is not what it is supposed to be about. (Devine, 2004. P. 166).

Literature on School Competition

In the first section of the literature reviewed, I developed the ideas behind the marketisation of schools in Aotearoa. From Public Choice theory (Hayek, cited in Devine, 2004) emerged the concept of parent choice, a Darwinian-based competition of 'survival of the fittest' resulting in 'winner' and 'loser' schools. Many policies were introduced to enhance 'parental choice' in the form of Education Review Office (ERO) reports, decile rankings, the removal of zoning, and league tables of school academic performance.

The ERO reports directly provided information to parents on how a school was performing as measured against some external, national, compliance criteria. Indirectly, school zones were abolished, and students and their parents were expected to compete for entry into the 'best' schools. Information, to 'enhance' parental choice, came from a school's

decile ranking (Socio-economic Status, with 10 as the highest and 1, the lowest). League tables emphasising winner and loser schools, at the secondary level, were published in daily newspapers and lifestyle magazines, and resulted in what has been described as a 'climate of competitive contagion' (Thrupp, 2007 & 2008). The mechanism behind the competition for best schools, it is argued, would lead to enhanced performance in the failing schools, individual students, and labour markets. Assumptions behind this meritocracy include the idea that all school could compete equally, if they worked hard enough and that failure was caused by a lack of effort, on the part of individual school or students. The result was 'justifiable' school closure, which was the fate of Te Aroha School in 2011, and another intermediate school in the same suburb, some ten years earlier. Thus, failure is individualised. As Thrupp, quoting the former Finance Minister in the Labour government, Rodger Douglas (1993, p. 94) in *Unfinished Business* puts it,

> With choice, school performance would matter. Good schools would prosper and expand badly performing schools would shrink, poor educational practices would be weeded out and good practices exposed and die if they did not change.

It is nearly a generation and a half since the comprehensive neoliberal reforms have impacted the lives of the young. The phenomena of the neoliberal reforms have been reasonably researched both academically and in the popular media. The young people in the United Kingdom have been called *Thatcher's Children* (Ball, Macrae & Maguire, 2000) and in New Zealand as the *Children of Rogernomics* (Matthews, 1999). More recently in the post-secondary school transition to work and further study, an older group is the focus of research attention in *Children of Rogernomics: A Neoliberal Generation Leaves School* (Nairn, Higgins, & Sligo, 2012).

A critical perspective on empirical work on the mechanisms, by which neoliberal reform impacted school performance, has been undertaken by the educational policy sociologist, Martin Thrupp (2007 & 2008), who develops what he calls 'Education's Inconvenient Truth: The Middle Classes Advantage.'

Thrupp's unpublished doctoral thesis (1996) focuses on the concepts of class and the middle classes. He is influenced by the work of Pierre Bourdieu and other post-modernist and post-structuralist academics, which has refocused on the study of class, but in a much more 'critical' way with a focus on social and cultural relational power.

In his 2007 and 2008 papers, Thrupp develops the 'Inconvenient Truth' aspect in four ways. (1) Much of the advantaging occurred outside of education, and the initial criticisms were not well received. (2) It was not questioned because of the middle classes' own self-interest. (3) The denial of the possibility of that a worse contagion might be imported, in the form of an even more rabid neoliberal, ideology. (4) Finally, we sit in our inertia as Thrupp's thesis is inconvenient. Thrupp also addresses the ethnic components of a more persistent middle classes advantage which impact on Pasifika and Māori when they are a large part of loser schools, enrolment numbers.

There are some ways in which persistent middle-class advantages can be articulated, and Thrupp (2007 & 2008) briefly canvases Home Advantages, class biases in the curriculum, middle-class resistance, and performative policies in education. However, Thrupp focuses on how the middle classes access middle-class schools and their attendant advantages. The foci for Thrupp are threefold and include educational as a positional good, pseudo-zoning, and selection by the mortgage. The positional good referred to is that middle-class schools are perceived to "offer positional advantage that helps to explain why such schools are nearly

always more popular than low socio-economic schools which have little positional value irrespective of what they do" (Thrupp, 2008, p. 80). The second component of the thesis is that of pseudo-zoning where the school Board of Trustees (BOT) set a home zone (School Enrolment Scheme), in consultation with Ministry of education with that excludes the underprivileged and admits people like 'us'. With the demise of central control under the neoliberal reform and zone control passing to the local BOT, the school can easily manipulate their enrolment policies to include and exclude. With sometimes overlapping pseudo-zones schools can 'cream off' the best academic students from a lower socio-economic school. Finally, the rise in the dollar value of houses in a wealthy school's enrolment zone school increases its positional value. This, in turn, is exacerbated either directly by macro governmental policies or their indirect consequences. These include the rising costs of rental properties within middle-class school zones. Another is the decline in the value of a school's operating grant from the government putting pressure on school for local fundraising, again advantaging middle-class schools. Finally, the greater discrepancy between the wealthy and the poorest, while waiting for trickle-down effects of the neoliberal reforms some thirty years ago, increases the income differences between the families of middle-class school attendees and those of the lower-class ones.

In the second part of Thrupp's (2008) two articles he argues how teachers, policymakers and politicians and academics enhance the middle classes advantages. Thrupp argues that teachers and principals collude with the middle classes to bring their children into advantaged educational settings. Policymakers, analysts, along with policymakers and politicians, do not refer to these advantages for fear of rocking the boat. Besides, Thrupp argues that intervention is privatised and over-emphasises school-based interventions and

consequently neglects the importance of a school's context. Finally, the middle-class advantages are supported by academics who are what he refers to as "textual apologists," for supporting non-threatening interventions.

Section Three: A critical take on marginalisation

Iris Marion Young, in her book, *Justice and the Politics of Difference* (1990), explores the idea of community as a substitute for oppression and exploitation which typifies capitalistic and patriarchal social organisation. While Young interprets marginalisation as a function of the mediation of social relations, I have used but a sliver of her work for my analysis of the impact of marginalisation, unfairness, and disengagement on students' school experiences (impacted by reforms). She offers a critique of the concept of an individualist, liberal social ontology, behind the neoliberal reforms, that I develop for the conceptual underpinnings of the neoliberal reforms.

My discussion proceeds in five parts. I introduce her central thesis then explore her concepts of 'oppression', what makes up a 'social group', the five faces of 'oppression', and her critique of the distributive paradigm, which she posits that her framework supersedes.

Introduction to Young's Thesis

Young's account of oppression explores injustice rooted in relational components of culture and follows contemporary social movement writings in giving prominence to culture, despite her background in political economy. Young's critique is targeted at approaches, like Sen's (1985) *Commodities and Capabilities*, for instance, which treat nontangibles such as capabilities, as foci and objects of distribution. Young's target is a reification of distributions and cultural justice. In this, Young (1990) identifies herself with contemporary social movements – feminism, anti-racism, LGBT+.

118

These movements are characterised by Young (1990, 2001), as having the dominant cultures at the core of their oppression, rejecting assimilation, and the recognition of their differences as a fundamental value in calling for a cultural revolution. She advances the interpretation that cultural images, symbolic associations, and narrations may degrade and denigrate some groups. She advances a solution where social group differences are viewed as variations rather than as deviations from the norm to be affirmed and conserved. Culture can be oppressive, unjust and unfair and is essential to an examination of the role of power in oppression.

Structural injustice

Social critics describe inequalities by scrutinising the role of structures or systemic relations. Those working in a Distributive Paradigm will have a different orientation, looking to patterns of injustice distributions from an individual perspective. Young (2001, 2006) takes a systematic approach to oppression presenting a multi-theoretical orientation. In her definition she draws from: a spatial metaphor of social positions; a basic structure of social relationships which are relationally constituted; the rules and resources brought to action and interaction; the socio-historical, collective outcomes, under which actors act, including practico-inert ones (Sartre, 1976, cited in Young, 2001); and finally, the structure of social action and interaction which can have unintended consequences. Young's (2001, p. 14-15) formal definition of structural inequality is as follows:

> Structures refer to the relation of basic social positions that fundamentally condition the opportunities and life prospects of the persons located in those positions. This conditioning occurs because of the way that action and interactions in one situation conditioning that position reinforces the rules and resources available for other actions

and constraints, and these often make their mark on the physical actions, as well as the habits and expectation of actors. This mutually reinforcing process and interaction involves people in other structural positions. The unintended consequences of the confluence of many actions often produce and reinforce such opportunities means that the positional relations and the way individual lives are trying to change.

Structural inequality, then, consists in the relative constraints some people encounter in their freedom and material well-being as the cumulative effect of the possibilities of their social positions, as compared with others who in their social positions have more options or easier access to benefits.

In Chapter Three: Methodology, I will tease apart the components of Young's definition to develop a more detailed protocol with which to interrogate the interpretive themes from a critical perspective. In the next section, I will discuss the more specific forms of oppression arising from structural inequalities.

Oppression arising from structural inequalities

In a broad sense Young (1990, p. 37) presents oppression as the "institutional constraint on self-development" and to be oppressed is to be constrained from "developing one's capacities and expressing one's experience", Young (1990, p. 37). As a fully developed definition:

Oppression consist in systematic institutional processes which prevent some people from learning and using satisfying and expansive skills in socially organised settings, or institutional processes which inhibit people's ability to play and communicate with others or to express their feelings and perspectives on social life in contexts where others can listen" (Young, 1990, p. 38).

This definition stands in contrast to those who cast their position in terms of the distributive paradigm as inactive agents.

In Young's definitions, the cultural components are held in "experiences," "play and communicate," "express their feelings and perspectives." These items define oppression as constrained expression rooted in a lack of cultural recognition. These emphases suggest that oppression of people lies in their misrecognition and in undervaluation of the group-specific mode of expression and thus the issue is one of lack of recognition of difference.

Defining a social group

Young's (1990) conception of a social group is fundamental to her definition of oppression as the group suffers 'oppression', in the case of my research 'marginalisation'. She argues that groups existed before individuals and that individuals are oppressed in so far as they belong to an oppressed group. In this case, they are members of a marginal school body which continues to exist after individual school students have passed through the school in the two years that they are members of the intermediate school. They are not members by aggregation, classification by objective criteria, or voluntarily association. In Young's (1990, p. 43) words:

> a social group is a collective of persons differentiated from at least one other group by cultural forms practices or ways of life. Members of a group have a specific affinity with another because of similar experiences or way of life, which prompts them to associate with one another than those not identified with the group or in a different way.

Young's definition is characterised by its sense of connection and not by its objective position. The affinity is based on culture, ways of life or practices suggesting the possibility of a multiplicity of different causes for their formation and on different bases. This leads to

different scenarios such as ethnic group(s), gender, or shared position in the division of labour? Young is particularly interested in groups which are culturally based social groups, as well as ethnic groups. This can include Pasifika, gays, lesbians, and working-class people. Young 'justice' is served by upholding these groups and enhancing their cultural diversity.

The five faces of oppression

The definition of oppression endorsed by Young avoids claims of oppression based on prime and secondary. The five definitions, or faces of oppression, may be attributed to a group either singularly or via amalgamations. She defines (Young, 1990) varieties of capacity-inhibition as; (1) Exploitation; (2) Marginalisation (3) Powerlessness (4) Cultural imperialism (5) Violence. My focus is on 'marginalisation' out of the difficulties in accessing education, employment and effective participation in social life. Marginalisation Includes racially marked underclasses, youth, old people, disabled and solo parents. Young (1990) argues these groups suffer reduced rights and opportunity to develop their capabilities in forms valued by the larger society.

The impact of the neoliberal reforms is mostly experienced in the form of winner and loser schools via an Unfortunate Middles Class Advantage (Thrupp, 2007, & 2008). Having worked for fifteen years as a teacher and nearly thirty year as a psychologist in such schools I would characterise them, in comparison to winner schools, by having students who are of Māori, Pasifika and poor Pakeha student origin; underachieving academically on average by one to two years; having higher levels of behavioural, truancy and social work issues; having variable teaching standards and staff turnover; they do not have access to generous school donations; lacking the cultural capital for the BOTs which winner schools have in the community or which they can buy in; poor ERO reports; having periods of BOTs being replaced

by full-time or limited statuary managers' and being subject to corporate makeovers with statement branding and corporate entrances.

This is the marginalised context in which students from Te Aroha School react in their unique way with cries of unfairness and with disengagement.

Responsibility for oppression

In Part Three, the literature developed under the positivist paradigm conceived of blame as nomothetic and etic. In contrast under a critical perspective, blame can be conceptualised as emic, or unique to an individual, sociocultural context. The most common model for assigning blame as utilised in Part Two has its origins in legal reasoning to assign fault for harm. In contrast when the actions are the result of "… structural social injustice, a liability model is not sufficient for assigning responsibility. The liability model relies on a fairly direct interaction between the wrongdoer and the wronged party" (Young, 2006, p. 118.).

In contrast Young (2006) proposes a social connection model of responsibility where individuals bear responsibility for structural injustice from "participation in the diverse institutional processes that produce structural injustice" (Young, 2006, p.119), but not blame. In other words, structural injustice and interactions often have results that no one intends and may even be contrary to the intentions of participants. In contrast Young's (2006) Model of Responsibility is by five characteristics: (1) it is not isolating, in that it does not blame those participants responsible, by virtue of their collective participation; (2) the model judges background conditions; (3) it is more forward-looking than backward-looking in that it looks to identify conditions leading to political change; (4) it has shared responsibility in that all those who have contributed to structural processes share responsibility for such injustice; and (5) the responsibility can only be discharge via collective action.

123

In summary, structural injustices are impairments that come to people as a result of fundamental processes where there are numerous people involved. For many, there is no causal relationship as it is impossible to delineate the specific action and action and consequently it is impossible to assign individual specific blame.

Section Four: Emotions and power in unfairness

Introduction: Emotions as social relationships

Feeling and emotion are contested issues in social psychology, often being undefined, ignored or hung out on a bipolar Likert scale. Theoretically and methodically, the area of emotional research probably reflects the broader divisions within this topic in social science. Burkitt (2002, 2005, & 2014), in contrast, sets out a relational approach to the study of feelings and emotions in context. Burkitt posits that emotions are produced within relationships. It is not inherent unfairness which triggers anger but, unfair relationships trigger feelings related to unfairness. These relationships are social, cultural, and specific to a particular time and place.

The emotional narrative is given meaning within cultural relationships which involve displays of action emotion which indicate certain emotions. The emotion is the action itself and is governed by the relationship matrix in which it occurs and in fact, is constituted by those relationships. Thus, emotions are multidimensional complexes embedded in relationships which are not things (Burkitt, 2014).

Embodiment

In this section, I will give my understanding of Burkitt's (2014) concept of emotions as physical, practical, and discursive components of relational emotion. In his conceptualisation, the sensate experience is both biological and social. From this angle, emotions are socially

constituted and have corporal sense experiences that are essential to our experiencing of that emotion. He argues that sense experiences and thoughts arise simultaneously as learned bodily responses within specific cultural contexts. The emotions associated with unfairness are not cognitive or physiological interpretation but a corporeal expression within a social situation. "It's not fair!" is not the expression of either an inner or outer cause but the expression is the feeling of unfairness. Unfairness is not having the cognitions or feeling of unfairness but is unfairness itself, which can be expressed in unfair cognitions or behaviours. In summary, because emotions involve bodily sensations, there may be a necessary patterning across cultures, but they can be attenuated and displayed in various ways.

Bodily techniques of emotion

Burkitt is utilising Bourdieu's use of the term 'bodily techniques' to focus on the powers of the body to behave in numerous ways, emphasising that they are the result of social learning from infancy. From another angle, emotions are complex with bodily behavioural and cultural components. The function of emotion is communication between interactants, not the expression of personal cognitive appraisals. They are signifiers in the matrix of social relationships. This interaction is composed and is made up of gesture, bodily movements, and signals, which in turn are the reflection of the context in which people are raised. In summary, the techniques of bodily communication of the emotional life of individuals cannot be divorced from the context of culture and the physical. However, emotional experiences are substantially embedded in relationships, including power relationships.

Power relations and emotions

Burkitt (2002, cites Foucault, 1979; 1982) as an excellent example of power as a relational matrix patterning action.

a total structure of action brought to bear upon possible actions; it incites, it induces,

it makes it easier or more difficult: in the extreme it constrains or forbids absolutely; it

is nevertheless always a way of acting upon an acting subject or acting subjects by

virtue of their actions or being capable of action. A set of actions upon other actions.

(p. 164).

Power works via social relations as a structure of action to direct a field of potential

actions. This is not able to take place without the role of emotions. As Foucault describes it

power incites, induces, or seduces and is only possible when the relational matrix is charged

with emotion. In response to unfairness, to be incited, one must be angered or provoked by

the behaviour of others to block an offender's strategy. In a seductive action, one must be

desirous of an offender's objects or goals. For unfairness to induce the matrix of relationship,

it must motivate us to bring forth a particular style of action from us.

Burkitt (2014) posits that aggression does not define power, but the essential feature

in its definition is the modes of action that structure the range of actions available to

offenders. It can operate at the individual and contextual level. In summary, Burkitt (2002)

puts his definition as "if emotions are complexes that express our whole way of being – our

physical and discursive life, our material and ideal presences and absences – then it is hardly

surprising that power relations and emotions are also inimical" (Burkitt, 2002, p. 166).

Section Five: Disengagement from a critical perspective

Conceptually, engagement is defined by a multiplicity of concepts and methodologies

that directly impinge on how disengagement is researched. The dominant model is a social-

psychological one, where the focus in on cognitive, affective, and behavioural engagement

indicators, "We proceeded with the assumption that this line of social-psychological research

126

was necessary (i.e., essential and required) but insufficient to improve outcomes for the most vulnerable students" (Lawson & Lawson, 2010, p. 459). The limited amount of research on unfairness has been undertaken and that within this positivist paradigm.

Taking a social-cultural orientation Lawson and Lawson (2013) in their ground-breaking review offer an alternative conceptualisation of disengagement as, "Our review suggests that such an engagement-as-technical-problem-solving approach has limited salience." (p. 462). Their orientation is more contextual, embedded, and cultural providing a basis to investigate the consequences of unfairness as marginalisation.

The philosophical shift away from positivist, reductionist orientation can be perceived in terms of the recognition of the limitations of seeking generalisations outside of the context in which disengagement from unfairness occurs. Contrarily, research on disengagement must account for interactions in terms of spatial and temporal factors. A key concept in my conception of disengagement is the importance of relational quality among peers and teachers, and their interactions in their lived contexts. The participants interpret adverse events, comparisons of fairness standards, emotions and disengagement through an embodied orientation that is socially grounded. Unfairness and marginalisation are both entrenched in differences between economic social, social, cultural, symbolic and psychological actualities. Consequently, the middle school student is not different from any other part of society.

The literature on engagement places fairness as a facilitator (Reschly & Christenson, 2012) through its relation to school discipline, as measured via School Relational Climate (Peers and Teachers). Indicators of engagement and disengagement include student perceptions of affective (belonging, school identification, and connectedness) and cognitive

perceptions (self-regulation, school relevance, and goal setting). Affective engagement is the relational quality between peers and teachers, and behaviour engagement can be connected to disruption as a reaction to unfairness as marginalisation. Unfairness is not often utilised as a concept in disengagement research within Aotearoa (exceptions include Bishop, & Berryman, 2006; Wylie & Hodgen, 2012). However, Prilleltensky (2012) argues unfairness that it is an essential mediator of disengagement because of its level of impact on wellbeing.

Conclusion of my critical stance on unfairness

My thesis with which to scrutinise the interpreted data from my earlier empirical work conceives of unfairness as a structural inequality. While I acknowledge that the basic social positions of Te Aroha Middle School are impacted by the stressors of both economic and neoliberal education, the focus here is on the role of neoliberal stressors. The basic positions consist of the Year 7 and Year 8, students, females and males, teachers and teacher aides, and the community volunteers supporting mostly sport and cultural activities. The school administration consists of a male principal, female deputy principal and female assistant principal.

The neo-liberal stressors of successive government policies, I argue, are mediated for Aroha School through three ERO accountability reports. In brief, these stress (a) some curricula achievement issues, as measured against national standards, (b) government policy audits and (c) self-assessments by school staff indicating an unsafe and stressful environment. These stressors have the impact of collectively conditioning the opportunities and life prospects of Year 7 and 8 students.

The students perceive these stressors as unfair via a counterfactual comparison of what they experience, and they expect from the cultural the values they hold as being

important. These values come from culture, religion, and the wider society. These comparisons and associated power components result in a matrix of emotions which consist of are both singular and more complex negative emotions. These reactions, both emotional and behavioural, set the conditions available for other students in other roles including academic, skills, sport, queuing for the tuck shop et cetera. These actions and interactions in one position reinforce the rules and resources available for other students in other structural positions.

The relational reactions, both emotional and behavioural, set the scene for further unfairness because of themselves creating opportunities and modelling unfairness as possible further reactions. As Young (2001, p. 11-12) indicates, the "unintended consequences of the confluence of many actions often produce and reinforce such opportunities and constraints. The main effect is that of disengagement from school life in those areas perceived as being irrelevant to their lives, and the enhancement of these areas such as sport which are valued.

In this section, I presented a tentative thesis for voicing unfairness as a form of structural inequality with which to further scrutinise the interpreted data, from the earlier empirical work. This is conceived of as being based on the 'structural inequality' of Young (1990), the 'relational, emotional concepts' of Burkitt (2014), along with a critical reworking of 'disengagement' by Lawson and Lawson (2013). One of the consequences of the responses to unfairness as structural inequality to be explored is the possibility of marginalisation for my co-researchers.

Literature review conclusion

To enhance the 'voice' of early adolescents on unfairness and injustice in the literature, I have tasked my literature review with answering four questions: What does the current literature have to say about the nature of perceived unfairness? What is the diversity of the

perceived unfairness in the student population of the Te Aroha Middle School? How do students in the Te Aroha School assign possibly meaning to perceived unfairness? How might structural injustices contribute to the marginalisation of students in the Te Aroha Middle School? These questions are designed to contribute new understandings to both the individual unfairness and collective structural injustices.

In Section One, I addressed these questions, by initially arguing that the largely positivist literature is not sufficiently developed to contribute to our understanding of the early adolescent voice of unfairness and injustice. Consequently, the voice of the participants remains unheard. I concluded that the current literature is inappropriately conceptualised in the ontological, epistemological, and methodological domains. Based on this conclusion, I propose a qualitative survey to address this gap in the literature.

In Section Three, I concluded that the most appropriate method for conceptualising the related question was to address it as a judgment of accountability. Based on this conclusion, I propose a series of semi-structured interviews to be analysed via IPA. A relativistic ontology and interpretive epistemology are proposed for both the survey and the semi-structured interviews.

Finally, to address the last question, I argue that it is appropriate to take a critical perspective with which to explore the relationship/s between unfairness and marginalisation. I conceptualise the neoliberal school reforms as impacting on the students of Te Aroha School. The unfair student responses to these stressors can be possibly conceptualised as a form of structural inequality. This may contribute to the marginalisation of my co-researchers. In order to advance this question, I propose to 'critically' scrutinise the interpreted themes from the survey and semi-structured. For this proposal, a criterion will be developed from Young's (1990, 2001) work on structural inequality.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Chapter overview

This project is focused on opening spaces for an early adolescent voice on unfairness via research. In Chapter Two, I critiqued the current literature on unfairness from an interpretivist viewpoint and subsequently went on in Chapter 2 to provide an alternative conceptual voice and literature for this aspect of the project. Chapter 2 examined the conceptual basis for a qualitative survey and semi-structured interviews along an interpretivist analysis of both sets of data. In Chapter 2, Part 4, I moved from an individualist, interpretive psychological orientation to one of a critical position. This shifting emphasis reflects my changing position on the most appropriate method to open space for a students' voice. Now, in this chapter, I provide the philosophical and methodological basis for the gathering and analysis of data.

Introduction

The existing literature on early adolescents' perception of unfairness, within a school context catering for this early adolescent age group (10-14), is both under-researched and fraught with some difficulties, as identified in Chapter two. The literature reviewed suggests that elements of organisational justice (distributive, procedural, interactional and informational unfairness (justice) may, or may not be present, but that we need to find out about these possibilities. It was argued in Chapter two that we need to go back to the experience of unfairness itself.

Part One1: Research issues

Experience can be defined in a number of ways, but the one advance by VandenBos (2007, p. 354) is useful as a starting point "a conscious event: an event that is lived through, or undergone, as opposed to one that is imagined, or thought about."

A researcher within an interpretivist research paradigm focusing on experienced unfairness must look for full and multiple meanings, instead of the narrow viewpoint found within a positivist paradigm. Broad general questions with a focus on the context of the intermediate school and in the interactions with their peers and teachers and environment, help to understand. Thus, my role is to interpret what early adolescents' participants say about the role of unfairness in their lived world (Cresswell, 2013). My initial research question focuses on the very beginning of a consciousness of unfairness as perceived by early adolescents within the context of their school. Thus, research question one is:

What is the diversity of the perceived unfairness in the student population of the Te Aroha Middle School?

In my second broad research question, I am interested in how my co-participants assign meaning to experience something they identify as unfairness. Previous research would suggest that the process involves an event being *perceived* as negative, a *violation of personal standards* of un/fairness based on resources, procedures, or the qualities of interpersonal interaction, for example, lack of respect. This may be accompanied by seeking *culpability* of the event. This body of research reviewed would lead one to intuit that *reactions* be they emotional, behavioural, or cognitive, might also be present. Besides, the process of assigning blame, coping with an unfair event and corrective *coping actions* were could also be canvassed

as productive areas in which to answer question two Thus research question two is: How might students in the Te Aroha School assign meaning to perceived unfairness?

In my final non-empirical activity, I will interrogate the interpreted themes from the qualitative survey and semi-structured interviews, from the critical perspective of a structural inequality lens (Young, 1990, 2001, & 2006). This is designed to answer the final question: How might structural injustices contribute to the marginalisation of students in the Te Aroha Middle School?

A philosophical positioning for my project

This research is both qualitative and interpretivist. As my study methodologically utilises a Quantitative Survey of the Diversity (QSD) of unfairness coupled with a thematic analysis (TA) and semi-structured interviews analysed via Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), this section of the Chapter aims to anchor these methods philosophically. This section will address how I position my methodology philosophically on a foundation of relativist ontology and interpretivist epistemology.

A relativist ontology

Ontology is that branch of philosophy which focuses on the conundrum of the contested nature of 'being' (Avis, 2003). Specifically, social ontology has as its domain the nature of social creations in their different forms of reality and what can be known about them. Ponterotto (2005, p. 130) puts it this way "what is the form and nature of reality and what can we know about reality?" in this section I endeavour to clarify the ontological and epistemological positions (Ramazanoglu & Holland, 2002) which underpin the methodologies. Each of these constructs guides to deeper understanding.

I have adopted for my study a relativist ontological positioning. This stance holds as its central tenet that no single pre-existing social reality has an objective and universal truth situated 'out there' somewhere (Willig, 2008). This position argues instead that there are multiple socially interpreted 'realities.' From this perspective 'truth' and what is taken as reality is only interpreted within a particular spatial/temporal context and that the knowledge produced is only accessible within it.

Ontological relativism then is a philosophical term which holds that there is no absolute truth. That there is no ultimate truth, which stands in stark contrast to a realist position, which underpins the positivist, based on the natural scientific method. This realist position is based on objectivity, law-like generalities, numerical control, cause and effect, and prediction and control.

In a relativist position, there is no one universal absolute truth. Everything in this positioning is associated with a frame of reference. Judgements fall to the frame adopted, as well as those involved in the adjudication. There is no one privileged perspective on the nature of ontology, and all stances are equally valid. The data analysis and interpretations are guided by the stance that I take as the inquirer (Green & Britten, 1998).

On ontological positioning, both interpretivist and social constructivists can be placed within relativist ontology but have fine-grained differences in their respective use of details. Despite the similarity between these two paradigms, there are differences in how they situate the role of psychological structures. Interpretivists put more emphasis on the representative validity of language, but the social constructionist position is that language constructs, rather than represents reality (Franklin, 1998).

In interpretivism itself, there are some possible positions, but they are held together by a common core in that they, "take(s) human interpretation as the starting point for developing knowledge of the social world" (Prasad, 2005, p.13). As an interpretivist researcher, my goal is to discover how my participants feel, experience and understand their social world of experienced unfairness. It behoves me to understand how the participants' subjective understandings of their reality affect their creations of reality so I can obtain an explanation of their experience of unfairness.

An interpretivist inquirer's relativism in the ontology can be sourced in the phenomenological concept of the understanding of perception. What I am interested in is the participants' subjective interpretation of their lived world, rather than a positivist researcher's idea of their objective world. Nevertheless, interpretivists' ontological postponing can come in a range of possibilities from realism to relativism and mine is that of relativism.

An interpretivist epistemology

The word epistemology has its origins in the Greek word episteme, which means knowledge can take various forms. It has its origins in the various theories of how we might know. The significant core part of the epistemological tradition focuses on how one can know what counts as valid knowledge, the position on which truth claims are based, how a claim might have trustworthiness and what is outside of the domain claims of epistemology. Consequently, in this section, I will examine my stance on what is the nature of my knowledge view, how I can lay claims to know about experienced unfairness, and how I make claims for its validity.

According to Willig (2008) in epistemology, there is a range of possible stances with one end of the continuum being naïve realism, the other end, a radical relativist (Willig, 2008).

136

Phenomenology, with epistemological empiricism is close to the realistic end, as it emphasises a 'neutral' discovery from a participant's point of view and arrives at essences (Sion, 2003). The essences, or eidetic reduction, are the processes of establishing the components which are both necessary and invariable (components). This leaves only the essential requirements or essences of a phenomenon, required. In this example, the epistemological stance is close to the realist end of the continuum. As I take an interpretivist epistemological stance, I am more to the relativist end of the continuum, as I am more cautious about what knowledge claims I make, and I acknowledge that whatever I claim as a researcher can be challenged (Gubrium & Holstein, 2008).

In the remainder of this section, I will further position my interpretivist epistemological position by referring in more detail to the role of the researcher and co-researchers and the role of language.

Although most researchers stress the importance of reflexivity, they have different positionings within it. My position is that the researcher's role is implicated in the process of inquiry, but some phenomenologists have criticised the ambiguity implicit in the interpretivist accounts of research the role played by the interpreter (Willig, 2008). According to Willig (2013), inquirers believe that they can only understand the psychological world of participants by engaging with and interpreting participants' transcripts.

Thus, not only am I implicated in the inquiry process, but it is both phenomenological and interpretive. It is phenomenological in that I am trying to present my participants' views on unfairness, but I am also trying to interpret it which implies a reflexive stance. As Willig explains "the terminology in the presentation of its findings invokes a sense of discovery rather than of construction" (Willig, 2008, p. 70).

The role of language in the interpretivist paradigm can again rest in a range of positions on a continuum from what Willig (2008) terms, 'language. as a tool through to language as a 'core interest.' Interpretivist enquirers place language as a central tenet of interpretivism. In part of my dissertation where I utilise IPA, language is central as the argument depends on the "representational validity of language" (Willig, 2008, p. 66). Therefore, I am working on the basis that language has the potential to describe the experience of unfairness. Finally, the knowledge claims in an interpretivist inquiry, as represented by IPA, can never claim to be sure, but in their tentativeness still enable understanding and action in the lived world (Willig, 2008).

In the interpretative paradigm that I have adopted I will attempt to interact with my participants to understand their experience and give meaning to their experience of unfairness. In this role, I am an active listener, observer, and co-data collector, making explicit my placement in the research while reflecting on the data to interpret it. This involves much reflective iteration between the whole and part, and back again. It is essentially my making sense of the participants making sense of their experience of unfairness (Grant & Giddings, 2002).

While I share similar ontological (relativist) beliefs with other users of the interpretive paradigm around being, as well as epistemology (interpretivist), I use a different theory and methods to interpret unfairness. As the methodological lens that I have chosen is phenomenology, this means that I use a survey and interviews and attempt to speak with what the participant is saying. However, I depart from those phenomenologists who seek to find the essence of unfairness through description (descriptive phenomenologists). By focusing

more on my participants' speech acts I am taking a hermeneutic stance, which places me in the Heideggerian hermeneutic phenomenological school (Koch, 1989).

In summary, the philosophical stance adopted for both studies is the relativist one in ontology and the interpretivist one in both epistemology and methodology.

Part Two: Methodology

The two main research issues of the 'What' and 'How' of an incident of unfairness experienced by early adolescents, were 'operationalised,' by using the methods of a Qualitative Survey of Diversity (Jansen 2010) and Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (Smith et al., 2009). This section will present the main features of each methodology.

A Qualitative Survey of the Diversity of Unfairness

The APA dictionary defines a survey as "a study in which a group of participants is selected from a population and some selected data about or opinions of those participants are collected, measured, and analysed" (VandenBos 2007, p. 912). Thus, the knowledge aim of my survey is to describe the diversity of unfairness among of early adolescents, within a low socio-economic middle school in urban New Zealand/Aotearoa in order to answer my first research question.

The qualitative survey in my study aims to establish the variation of experienced unfairness within the early adolescent population of an urban, multi-cultural, Intermediate School. "This type of survey does not count the number of people with the same characteristic (value or variable), but it establishes the meaningful variation (relevant dimensions and values) within that population" (Jansen 2010, p 2). Jansen (2010) recommends this method as a way of examining meanings and experiences. Jansen defines the qualitative survey as "all studies of diversity in a population without restrictions" (Jansen, 2010, p.10).

139

The Qualitative Data Survey is utilised in this inquiry in combination with a thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006 & 2013) of the data. Braun and Clarke (2006 & 2013) argue that as it stands, thematic analysis is weak unless it has a clear philosophical positioning. They suggest that the status of the focus of the dataset and thematic analysis needs to be aligned with the epistemology and methodology adopted for the study, that is, relativist ontology, interpretativist epistemology and methodology.

The focus of the data in a qualitative study can either be an in-depth, rich data set or narrow focus on a detailed aspect of the data. In this inquiry the focus for both data sets is wide based on a rich dataset, as I need to answer questions on the nature of the diversity of an experience of unfairness and how meaning is assigned to an experience. The way of determining the nature of what counts as the prevalence of a theme can be determined numerically, or by using by researcher judgment as to the theme's contribution to the research question (Smith, et al., 2009). As I am interested in the dataset, a theme will need to have something significant to say about the overall research issues (Smith, et al., 2009).

Two questions arise on the status of the themes in both studies', that is, are they inductive, or theoretical themes and do they have a surface semantic or latent aspect. As I am going back to things themselves in the phenomenological sense to examine the phenomena of unfairness for the first time, my themes will be inductive. Thus, my interpretation will be based on 'going up' from what my participants have said, to interpret them and have the sense of the participants making sense. As I am working on the level of language reflecting thought, I am interested in a semantic level of thematic analysis. This position is contentious in the literature on IPA. Willig (2013) argues that is incompatible with some aspects of

phenomenology, however, other definitions of phenomenology contain more cognitive components.

Smith (Brocki & Wearden, 1996) initially devised IPA as a bridge between discursive and cognitive psychologies. Langdridge (2007) argues that while there are issues that need to be resolved, the reality is that in practice, IPA, and the status that I have adopted for QSD, make these methods phenomenological. Recently this issue has been resolved by Larkin, Eatough & Osborn (2011) conceptualising cognition as an embodied, active, and situated phenomenon, rather than as a cognitive process alone. Consequently, as I am concerned with the meaning of the experience of unfairness for my participants, the two studies of my inquiry are phenomenological. An embodied experience of unfairness takes place in a context of meaning, relationships, and the participants' lived world.

Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis

IPA is tripartite in its foundations: phenomenology (inquiry of subjective experience), hermeneutic (interpretation) and idiographic (knowledge production that is specific and individually focused), Smith et al. (2009). The stream of phenomenology within IPA has its origins in the work of Husserl, a German philosopher, who brought the interpretive action in philosophy, to the fore. Cresswell (1998, p. 51) describes this as "the lived experiences for several individuals about a concept or phenomenon." Jones (2001), in Pringle, Hendry and McLafferty (2011) elaborates on this definition indicating that it lets the "researcher go beyond the factual accounts to look at everyday life experiences. An IPA orientation tends to participants' experience and an understanding of phenomena (Smith et al., 2009).

In my case, I am attempting to make sense of how early adolescents experience their experiences of unfairness. An IPA based inquiry makes sense of phenomena by asking study

questions and utilising an inductive approach to evolve an interpretative stance on what constitutes an experience of unfairness. As adolescents are not always able to articulate their experience, a researcher co-works with them to make explicit their thinking on unfairness through an interpretive action. Therefore, an IPA inquiry is both phenomenological and interpretivist in its epistemology. IPA aims to create empirical research of experience, but Smith et al. (2009) caution about attempting too much.

The phenomenological strand of IPA aims to make explicit how one experiences the phenomena of everyday life such as unfairness. The hermeneutic aspect of IPA focuses on how a human being interprets experience and attempts to make sense of it (Smith et al., 2009). In an IPA inquiry, a double hermeneutic is in operation where the co-researcher is trying to make sense of the participants making sense of their experience of unfairness (Smith & Osborne, 2003). This involves the researcher in a dynamic dance between his/her own understandings and the 'insider perspective' (Smith, 2004) of his/her participants, as a dance partner, in order to interpret their perspective on unfairness. The knowledge that the researcher brings to the interpretive act makes sense of the participants making sense of their world. This is the quintessence of the interpretive action in an IPA inquiry.

The final stream to the IPA stance is an idiographic orientation to analysis (Smith et al. 2009). The researcher commences with one case and works until resolution of the themes has been reached, before moving on to the next detailed case analysis. The individual case study maintains its idiographic stance, partly using individual quotations, which can be traced from individual cases and then into summary for individuals and finally into the cross-case analysis which contribute to the final themes or superordinate themes. Consequently, an individual contribution can be traced right through the analysis process.

Part Three: Data analysis methods

Thematic Analysis

A thematic analysis of data is not radically different to that of other qualitative methods, but it does have its unique features as outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006 & 2013). They describe the overall process thus, "Analysis involves a constant moving forward and backward between the entire dataset, the coded extracts that you are analysing and the analysis of the data that you are producing" (Braun & Clarke 2006, p. 86). The analysis process aims to identify patterns of meaning in the experience of unfairness and terminates with writing up the conclusions on the patterns of meaning interpreted in the data. The sequence is as follows: Step one: reading and re-reading the data, Step two: Generating the initial codes, Step two: looking for themes, Step four: thematic review, Steps 5 and 6: defining the themes and writing up. Data analysis for the QDS on steps one to two was undertaken via Nvivo 10.

IPA Analysis

Data analysis for the semi-structured interviews was via an IPA analysis (Smith, et al., 2009). The primary analytic tool for an IPA study is thematic analysis carried out on a case-by-case basis. It involves the following steps: Step one: reading, Step two: initial noting, Step three: developing emergent themes, Step four: searching for connections across summary and Step five: moving to the next case. The penultimate step involves moving to other case studies that are treated in an idiographic manner. This involves 'bracketing' each case study. Step six looking for patterns (Superordinate themes) across cases the whole set of the semi-structured interviews.

Part four: Ethical procedures

Section five will cover the ethics of the inquiry procedures and specifically the site of the study, survey procedures, semi-interviews, trialling procedures, sampling and recruitment and sufficiency of data strategies.

The location for the two studies for this project was an intermediate school in Auckland, New Zealand/Aotearoa. An intermediate school covers school years 7 & 8 that is approximately ages- 11 to -12 years, (New Zealand total schooling covers Years 1-13) and is placed between the primary school (Years 1-6) and secondary school (Years 9-13).

This school is a decile one school. A school's decile ranking is used to determine how much additional social/educational funding it receives, in addition to the standard per capita grant generated operational funding. The decile ranking is arrived at by using a socio-economic formula based on household income and unemployment levels. Individual households are not identifiable as the deciles are calculated on mesh-block data.

The ethnic structure of the school for this study is Māori 34%, Tongan 24%, Samoan 16%, Cook Island 13%, Niuean 5%, European 4%, and other ethnicities 4%. The gender balance is Boys 58% and Girls 42%.

Demographic data were collected on the date of birth, family structures, and ethnic characteristics, friendships, along with their participants' views on their academic and behavioural status within the school. This demographic data is reported in Chapters Four and Five.

The researcher recruited the participants by talking twice to whole school assemblies and visiting all classrooms to talk about the project. The student recruitment pamphlets were

left in strategic places around the school buildings. A return box was left with school reception for expression of interest. Once a student's expression of interest was obtained, a parent pamphlet was mailed out to obtain written consent, explain the project and answer question around parental interest or concerns.

Initial indications of interest for the interviews were asked for on the responses to the written survey responses. The remainder was recruited in snowball fashion via word of mouth, classroom, and assembly presentations. Home visits were made to the final 21 (of the 21 all of the participants were volunteers, and no one was turned away) interview participants' guardians, or parents, in order to explain the research inquiry, outline risks, answer questions and finally obtain permission for their daughter, or son, to participate in the interviews.

A qualitative survey

A critical incident technique (CIT) was used to identify unfairness behaviours relevant to the student (Houston and Bettencourt, 1999; Ronan & Latham, 1974) The CIT is a robust qualitative technique used in a variety of research settings. It is relevant to this study as it addresses the first question by eliciting the respondent's memories of incidents perceived as unfair. Data were obtained from 77 self-reported, survey responses. The guidance provided for the responses were relatively open-end with general directions, adapted from Finkel's (2001) method and the provision to write about an event, through thinking, feeling and responding to the reported incident of unfairness (See Appendix B).

Semi-structured interviews

The data-collection process, a protocol for the semi-structured interviews followed the nine steps suggested by Kvale, & Brinkmann, (2009). The first step involved the selection of 21 participants who met the criteria of having experienced a recent episode of unfairness (all

145

of them). Step 2 (data gathering) centres on the development of an interview protocol with the aim of gathering responses that would enable responders to answer the inquiry questions. Step 3 focused on the obtaining of a quality digital data recorder along with becoming proficient in its usage. Selection of a location was step 5. As the timing of the recording was after school the researcher, research support person (female) and the participant had a choice of various locations around the school where the young participants were comfortable. Most of the interviews took place in an unused office, made available by the principal. Step six was to obtain parental consent. Participant assent and principal consent to the research inquiry were attained and constitute step 6. Step 7 emphasises researcher patience and flexibility. The design and piloting of the interview questions was the focus of step 8. Professional conduct and the ethics of dealing with potentially vulnerable young research participants was the centre of attention for step 9. The researcher used a one-off, one-on-one interview with the respondent, in the presence of the research support person, for all 21 interviews. The female support person was a recent university graduate, aged 22, awaiting confirmation of her first permanent career placement. The participants were assured of security arrangements for the location of their transcribed interview protocols. Finally, the participants were assured of anonymity by being able to select their pseudonym to be used in place of their real names within the typed transcripts.

Following an initial analysis of the interview transcripts and the creation of a narrative containing the summary from each case, I took the narrative transcripts (2-3 pages) to the participants to read and comment on. These visits to their homes in the school holiday gave the opportunity to verify the participants' interpretations of the case studies. Most changes to the interpretations were temporal or involved minor details.

The trialling of procedures

For the researcher involved in a qualitative inquiry to gain a deeper initial understanding of how participants understand the events and reactions to unfairness, Maxwell (2008) advocates the use of the trialling of procedures. This is essential for the framing of both the interview schedule and written response schedule. Maxwell (2008) suggests several strategies to clarify their understating for useful schedule constructions, putting myself into the shoes of the young participants and attempting to imagine their perceptions and understandings of unfairness and reactions. Another approach was to draw on the opinion of my research community for feedback on the effectiveness of the schedules. Finally, pilots were conducted with similar participants to those planned for use in my study.

The second approach to trialling involved consulting two teacher colleagues who were registered and experienced intermediate schoolteachers currently teaching Years 7 & 8, (That is, 11- and 12-year-olds). All teachers thought the schedules would be useful in bringing forth unfair experiences. Some changes were made to the wording, for example, the word 'deal' was substituted for 'coping.' The strategy of reading out the questions was incorporated into the schedule for the administration. However, the researcher and research support person moved about the group to be readily available for any participant questions and difficulties.

Finally, both schedules were trialled with the first two participants in each procedure. Data from these two participants were not used in the final analysis. Two gains emerged from this piloting procedure. Firstly, the questions in each schedule gave sufficient detail of the participants' experience of unfairness. For the researcher, two understandings were enhanced. Secondly, this gave me a gestalt understanding of the interview procedures as a whole and where participant boundaries might be.

Formal ethical approval for the study was granted on 12 April 2010. The AUTEC reference number is 09/132.

Purposive sampling

Purposive sampling was identified in Brocki and Weardens' (2006), meta-analysis of Interpretative Phenomenological Interpretative studies as the most common method of sampling. Purposive sampling is defined by Braun & Clarke (2009, p.335) as "a mode of sampling typical of qualitative research, involving collecting participants or data on the basis that they will have certain characteristics or experience."

Maxwell (2005) indicated that purposive sampling has four functions, namely, representativeness, heterogeneity, the ability to demonstrate the phenomena being studied and to generate enough cases, or data, for comparison and contrast, to generate themes and be able to answer the study questions. To reach representativeness, the young participants had to have experienced a recent unfairness event within the school environment. That is, within the classroom, corridors, or other aspects of the internal school structure. In order to achieve phenomena heterogeneity, the final selection of either participants for the diversity survey and semi-structured interviews the unfair events need to have included those adverse incidents centred on disputes over resources (e.g. stealing, cheating, using a possession with permission), procedures (e.g. test procedures, sport rules and judging) and interpersonal interactions (e.g. bullying, name calling, lack of respect).

The interview and survey respondents needed to have experienced an unfairness event in order to be able to demonstrate aspects of the phenomena. This would require information to be available on the event, an explanation of how it was unfair, responses to the event, i.e., cognitive, emotional or behavioural, along with how they cope with it and

allocate blame. If this information was not forthcoming, then the case or survey response was dropped from the analysed information. The purposive survey data yielded 77 completed data sets.

Some researchers have used the term saturation, borrowed from grounded theory (Morse, 1995) to determine how much data is needed for a study. Holloway (2008, p. 34) defines saturation as "when data collection and analysis are complete, and further sampling does not uncover new ideas important for the study." I used this definition to determine saturation along with an additional five sets as a safety margin. For the survey to reach saturation, it took 77 data sets. The sets were used according to the order of their arrival to the researchers.

Another perspective on the issue of what sufficiency of data, is that of 'shallow' as opposed to 'rich data' (Morse, 2000). The participants in my study, being early adolescents, have relatively short attention spans, emerging literacy skills, and being from migrant homes speaking English as a second language, have tended to respond to written questions in 'telegraphese,' or phrases, rather than full sentences.

Smith et al. (2009) indicate that enough data should be available to indicate key categories and themes. This data level must enable the substantive similarities and differences to be available for interpretation, without burying the researcher in an avalanche of data. At the same time, the idiographic aspect of IPA has a focus on the experience of unfairness and requires in-depth exploration and, consequently, smaller homogeneous groups of participants are required (Langdridge 2007; Smith et al., 2009).

Summary of the research methodology for the interpretivist research

What is being advanced for this research undertaking is a project based on an interpretive methodology, which is deeply rooted in the phenomenological tradition. It is embedded in the phenomenological, hermeneutic, and idiographic stances of IPA (Smith, 2008). The ontology of the thesis is relativistic with an interpretative epistemology and methodology based on the representational validity of language. In other words, language can describe what is going on in some circumstances (Willig, 2008). In the analysis, I will be focused on how it can be argued that my hermeneutic interpretations of unfairness are related to the early adolescent participant's meaningful experience of unfairness (Chen, Shek, & Bu, 2011). Finally, I will argue that my interpretations may have a degree of instrumental validity by arguing that while things can never be regarded as predictable, if I have addressed transferability, adequacy, authenticity, and trustworthiness I can make some claims to valid knowledge (Chen, Shek, & Bu, 2011). The implication is that any interpretations can guide other research on unfairness and my findings may have a degree of instrumental utility (Nomm, 2001).

Part Five: Axiology

One of the core strands of IPA is that it is heavily dependent on my capacity to make sense of (interpret) the participants' experience of unfairness. One of the main theoretical foundations of IPA is hermeneutics, the theory of interpretation (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). The double hermeneutic, where I am attempting to make sense of the young participants making sense of their experience of unfairness, is highlighted by Smith et al. (2009). It is understood, of course, that I can never have direct access to the unfairness experience of my participants (Smith, et al., 2009). As with other researchers utilising an interpretive paradigm, I made use of my personal stories and experience of unfairness. Being

cognisant of this position is highly crucial when reflecting upon the interviews. The following account of some of my experience with unfairness will highlight both my choice of topic and may have impacted on my interpretations of a participant's unfairness.

My interest in unfairness topic reflects my values

My interest in the topic arose out of my work as an educational psychologist collaborating with clients who are behaviourally challenged. This group of girls and boys aged between the ages of ten and thirteen seems to have a higher level of the expression of the lament "It's not fair." I was intrigued by this phenomenon, both as to its nature and origins. Much of my interest in this topic comes from my upbringing and my values of social justice which have either or acquired or inherited from my family.

From my father Vince, who was primarily a self-educated man, I acquired a sense of curiosity, of wanting to find out about the nature of things. It was he who took me to the library on Friday nights before we went to stay with my grandparents for the weekend, where I devoured the books that I acquired from the public library, in Westport. That sense of curiosity, wonderment and pondering about the Nature of things, has never left me and remains one of the abiding features of my character. To him, I owe my sense of what makes things tick, a strong sense of intellectual curiosity. In my professional life, I have jokingly referred to this as socially sanctioned nosiness. This characteristic has been channelled into a strong parallel path of justice, which I have acquired from my mother's strong belief in Catholicism.

My primary education was with the Sisters of Mercy (R. C. order of nuns) teachers. Their values extended to a strong sense of justice for the Catholic underdog. This was nowhere more apparent than with those nuns who came to teach in New Zealand/Aotearoa, from the

Republic of Ireland. They brought with them not only their experiences of the "troubles" (civil strife and the war in Ireland in the 1920s) which in some cases blighted their upbringing, but also a long history of anti-English stories, jokes, beliefs, and attitudes. By the time I was twelve I had long shaken off any positive beliefs regarding Catholicism, but I was left with an abiding belief in justice for the underdog.

By the time I was in my 20s, I was involved in some social justice causes including anti-racism and anti-war protests. By occupation, I was teaching high school social sciences, but I was more interested in those students who were atypical and involved in either discipline issues and/or who had personal problems. My involvement in the life of a high school focused more on pastoral issues than on the curricula or administrative hierarchies. I moved into a deaning role, the organisation of student activities and was very much involved on the fringes of the high school organisation instead of involving myself in advocacy. At this juncture, thoughts of the future, after some twenty years of high-school teaching, lead me to retrain as an educational psychologist. This appealed to my sense of social justice, advocating for clients, and in the use of my curiosity enhanced by new training to help whanau and individuals solve behaviour and learning problems.

As a psychologist, I was involved with the assessment of and intervention on behalf of children aged between eight and twelve years who had behavioural problems. One of the issues which I became intrigued about was the greater sense of unfairness which seemed to be apparent with this group of girls and boys. The organisation for which I worked did not have a history of encouraging research, nor did it have an ethics committee, to facilitate such research. Research outside of this setting would see attempts at identifying groups of girls and boys as "behaviourally challenged" being labelled as unethical. Consequently, the focus of my

interest has become unfairness as expressed by "average" girls and boys within the cry of "it is not fair."

In the latter part of my life, I have become involved in Mahayana Buddhism, the central tenet of which is the Bodhisattva (Williams, 2008) principle which emphasis the postponement of achieving enlightenment until all sentient beings have become enlightened. For me, this principle is expressed through Karuna (compassion) toward all sentient beings. If a lack of understanding of a judgment of unfairness cuts off the possibility of advocating for adolescents, then researching the topic of unfairness may contribute to knowledge that will lead to effective advocating on behalf of adolescents.

Part six: The issue of rigour

This section, on rigour, focuses on the qualitative diversity survey (Jansen 2010) along with the thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2013) method for organising and undertaking this process. Jansen (2010) has nothing to say on the issues of validly or rigour as his focus in his paper is on the issues of definition, justification, and exploratory analysis rather than providing a methodological base. Taking Creswell's (1998) current typology of the qualitative methodologies: "biography, phenomenology, grounded theory ethnography and case study," Jansen (2010, p.11) indicates how the qualitative survey might fit within existing current methodologies. By implication then, the issues associated with rigour will be dependent on the methodology adopted for a project and be aligned with its associated ontology and epistemology rather than explicit to the qualitative survey per se.

In attempting to give more rigour to the thematic analysis method, Braun and Clarke (2006 & 2013) have provided a fifteen-point criteria for what they define as proper thematic

research. They focus on processes associated with transcription, coding, analysis, overall and what is in the write-up on the results.

The transcripts of the young participants' interviews were written up in a way that is consistent with the interpretive methodological stance of the qualitative survey. In this case, as the stance of the themes is semantic, this means that I am largely focusing on what is being said about the experiences of unfairness at the level of the surface meaning of the experience. Thus, the transcription focused on a good level of explicitness, but not at the micro-level required for an underlying theme write up. However, the transcription process did aim to include as much contextual detail as was possible. Following the completion of the transcription process, each was checked against the audio data for 'accuracy', with a focus on grammatical accuracy and contextual detail, where evident.

Braun & Clarke (2006 & 2013) indicated that in order for the coding process to be of good quality it that requires that each datum item receive equal attention, that the coding is thorough inclusive and comprehensive. The advantage of doing this level of coding via a qualitative programme (Nvivo 10) is that it can be more accurate and have more significant number of check and searching iterations (Bazley, 2007) than a manual process, such as with the earlier manual process of analysis with post-it notes. This program can quickly and easily allow the researcher to check the accuracy of a coding extract against the original transcription. I did 5 'formal' coding analyses of the data at the vertical level along with numerous partial checks as I worked through the core of reaching each 'child' node. This use of the Nvivo 10 programme also allows checking of the word find as a check that all extracts for a theme have been coded and collated to the relevant node. Finally, the data in the initial themes were checked for internal consistency, coherence, and distinctiveness.

The rigour, or value, of my write up for the qualitative survey is determined by what Braun & Clarke (2006 & 2013) describe as the analysis assumptions and procedures being explicit. Thus, the described method and the analysis utilised are aligned, and the epistemological stance is consistent with the language and concepts used. The themes of the write up are 'interpreted' rather than 'emerge' as one would expect in an interpretive paradigm.

Semi-structure interviews

In addition to the questionnaire, this project is planned around the added development of 21 semi-structured interviews.

Researchers have responded to the challenge of developing guideline criteria to ensure the validity of qualitative research studies (Yardley, 2000; Creswell, 2008). Yardley (2000, p 219) has developed a criterion for what a quality research project should feature- "sensitivity to context, commitment and rigour, transparency and coherence, and impact and importance."

Sensitivity to context centres on the ability of the researcher to be aware as much as possible of the nuances of the more subtle aspects of the total surroundings and all qualities of the interview both temporally and spatially. In conducting an IPA-based study, one must be aware of these issues in developing an active interview schedule, and in having the skills to have the rapport with both site authorities and participants (Smith, Flowers, & Larkin, 2009). Another issue related to the sensitivity of context is that gender-based power differences can have an impact on the interaction between the interviewee and interviewer (Williams & Heikes, 1993). The researcher, who is male, approached this issue well before negotiating the actual interview. The researcher spoke to all the participants at the very start of providing

information about the study by addressing the school assembly about the study and indicating that a female support person would be present on all occasions that any student may be present, in the interviewing context, with the author.

Regarding transparency, I have presented the findings of the diversity survey to the annual conference of the New Zealand Psychological Association. A modified summary presentation of findings was made to the school assembly in which the survey was undertaken. This has allowed my data to be made accountable to their scrutiny and feedback. Two future papers are planned for submission to peer-reviewed journals, and another presentation to the New Zealand Psychological Society.

Part Seven: A Critical Perspective

Introduction

In this iteration of my evolving thinking and theorising about unfairness, I will provide an argument for moving from an interpretive stance to a more critical one when interrogating the unfairness themes. This movement is more of an evolution than a paradigmatic jump or revolution. To answer the third question posed in Chapter One "Is unfairness associated with marginalisation?" I interrogate the interpreted themes from the qualitative survey and semi-structured interviews from the critical perspective of a structural inequality lens (Young, 1990; 2001; & 2006).

This stance represents a developing understanding and theorisation of the research material. This involves a shift from an individualistic, almost scientistic view along with associated methodologies (survey, and interviews). The axis of my compass bearing is that of interpretation, moving toward a more social, philosophical and political/ideological stance. Specifically, I will trace my journey from IPA, via interpretation, to a more critical perspective.

This necessarily brings into play my values and axiology as these are a big driver in propelling my evolution towards a more critical perspective. In the IPA methodology my values are bracketed, and here they are in full play. The organisation of this section is focused on: the limitations of IPA, critical hermeneutics; phenomenology; moving from IPA to structural inequality; structural inequality; and a scrutinising criterion and unfairness.

The Structure of the Bridge: Hermeneutics

With his highly influential book "Being and Time," Martin Heidegger (1962/1996) placed hermeneutics to the fore, with it having the fundamental claim of being both the subject and object, belonging to the same world. Human beings are not a subject but exist in the world. For Heidegger (1962/1996) one of the hallmarks of the importance of human existence is our capacity to make sense of things including our own sense of being. From this perspective, understanding does not come from the scientific method but, from an element of 'being in the world' (Bernstein, 1983). Understanding for Heidegger is 'being there,' which he describes as Dasein. Understanding is Dasein's very nature, and consequently, hermeneutics is its central mode of existence (Ponterotto, 2005).

Accordingly, to Heidegger (1962/1969) understanding is the ontological nature of Dasein. He aimed to understand existence as he introduces the existential turn in phenomenology. Being always assumes the being of something and its investigation must choose a themed being for analysis **(**Ponterotto, 2005). It does not mean another term for the human condition or existence. It is an ontological term referring to the structure which makes understanding possible and contains a dimension of disclosure.

Dasein is an issue for its being as it understands itself in its being (Heidegger, 1962/1969). The method of investigating our understanding is understood to be

phenomenology which can shed light on the structures of our understanding of Dasein. Our interpretation of that understanding must uncover it, "Phenomenological interpretation makes it possible for Dasein itself to disclose things primordially; it must, as it were, let Dasein interpret itself" (Heidegger, 1962 p. 179). Thus, description for Heidegger involves interpretation and phenomenology and accordingly takes a hermeneutic direction. Phenomenology then rests on the description which Heidegger argues constitutes interpretation (Ponterotto, 2005).   Interpreting involves making things explicit, or understanding, which is situated in time and place. Our understanding is centred in a world of doing and practice.

As explored in Being and Time, Heidegger (1962) our experience is explored in a temporal context of past, present, and future, and directedness. Dasein is ahead of itself being directed toward the future, its factual element, that is, thrownness and in being absorbed in a daily focus. Understanding is based on our thrownness and finding meaning always involves an element of interpretation. For Heidegger, phenomenology means to make sense of the appearing, and our appearing is always founded on forestructure. Forestructure is always there, but we can only discover this through an analysis of the phenomena themselves (Ponterotto, 2005).

Understanding begins with self-understanding which means that Dasein and the world are forming a hermeneutic circle which is the basic structure of human experience. The implication of this is that to understand ourselves we need to call up our fore-structures or enter into the hermeneutic circle. "The meaning of phenomenological description as a method lies in interpretation … The phenomenology of Dasein is hermeneutics in the primordial significance of the word, where it designates this business of interpreting" (Heidegger, 1962,

pp 61-62). Avoiding this, according to Heidegger, would be a failure. "Heidegger follows Husserl (1913/1983) in conceiving of phenomenology as a theoretical enterprise that takes the ordinary experience as its point of departure, but which, through an attentive and sensitive examination of that experience, aims to reveal the a priori, transcendental conditions that shape and structure it" (Wheeler, 2018, p. 8).

Heidegger opened phenomenology to interpretation through language. Through language, he anticipated the narrative approach. Thus, Heidegger's conception of hermeneutics is part of a sequence that paves the way from IPA toward critical hermeneutics.

The Right bank: Limitations of IPA

As a piece of work, the thematic analysis on unfairness reported on in Chapter 7, is a robust piece of work regarding reporting to my psychology colleagues, but not to those who might be 'critically' inclined. More importantly, concerning voicing my co-researchers, it is limited. The limitations come from the IPA epistemology and method and relate to time and place. Using a phenomenological methodology enables me to inquire into the lived unfairness experiences of the Decile One students as interpreted by them and myself. However, an extra layer of a critical research perspective is necessary since I argue that my co-researchers are from a marginalised and othered group in this society.

IPA has three components in the form of phenomenology, a double hermeneutic and an idiographic orientation. In taking a more social turn, some limitations with IPA became apparent especially from the phenomenological and idiographic components. I wish to highlight some limitations that became apparent as I applied this interpretive paradigm. The view that a single reality does not exist can be confronting (Gillis & Jackson, 2002). From a critical perspective, one can argue that marginalisation does exist whether it is perceived or not. There are broader social

events which impact this multicultural context despite an individual's interpretation of the meaning of a phenomenon of unfairness. The second limitation is concerning the interpretive paradigms to generalise as it is contextually dependent (Gillis & Jackson, 2002) and therefore it is difficult to argue about the impact of neoliberal educational reform. This is significant contextually, as critical psychology is trying to move away from explaining individual differences to moving toward minimising the harm caused by socio-cultural circumstances (Nortvedt, 2001).

Thirdly, while unfairness research based on interpretation of experience will undoubtedly help uncover new interpretations of unfairness as an individual experience, this needs to have a broader application to voice student oppression. These limitations are apparent when conceiving of unfairness as an interpretive phenomenon based on idiographic, internal and to no small extent socially and historically decontextualised (Williams, 2013). Finally, advocacy is a crucial consideration in educational psychology and stems from an understanding of young peoples' circumstances and their bearing. Williams (2013) also posits that by understanding the contextual factors that influence educational difficulties for young people, they may be released from being individually blamed.

The question then arises as to how I can offer a solution to these limitations. In the next section, I argue that interrogating my IPA thematic analysis from a critical hermeneutic perceptive based on Young's concept of structural injustice is one way of breaking out of this conundrum.

The Left Bank: Critical hermeneutics

In this section, I do not intend to undertake a general review of a critical perspective (see Chapter 2, Section Four), but instead, place hermeneutics within a critical perspective.

This is intended as a shaky bridge between the individual perspective and the critical perspective of structural inequality.

In this section, I can offer are some tentative proposals from the literature, based on the idea of extending the boundaries of hermeneutics. These writers are responding to the critiques raised by Gardiner (2002) that hermeneutics ignores the constructs of power and the ideological deformation of language. Some writers offer solutions: for example, Caputo (2000) calls for a merger of Heideggerian hermeneutics and Derrida's deconstruction to produce what he calls radical hermeneutics. In response to those who criticise such proposals as negative, Caputo, (2000) argues that we must own up to the fix we are in.

DeLuca (2000) proposed the analogy of a theoretical marriage between critical perspective and Gadamerian hermeneutics, where all points do not have to be agreed on. Kearney (2003) argues a position of intercommunion where a critical perspective can provide insights on power, language, communicative selves, along with an acknowledgment of the difficulties of the fix we are in. Finally, as Hoy (1991, p. 159) argues, "Although we start from a context, we can nevertheless transcend that context."

Both approaches have value for my research since interactions between my co-researchers and context played a role via unfairness in their marginalisation. Where does this leave me with the flavour of the above debate? I would argue that a hermeneutic-based philosophy must take on an overtly critical stance recognising the discourses, histories, and traditions that have been marginalised. This stance requires recognition of who is left out of conversations, marginalised, and subordinated in Aotearoa context by neoliberal reforms. This will allow critical hermeneutics to create a space for repressed voices to speak out:

Ideology provides the grounds, argues Roberge (2011), for the complementary relationship between hermeneutics and critical theory. Ideology lends meaning to the lives of people, by providing ways of representing themselves to each other and the world-an ensemble of legitimising practices and it is making sense of these meanings, for Roberg, which provides a place of intersection where hermeneutics and critical theory meet (Roberge, 2011, cited in Benade, 2015, p. 46).

Neither critical phenomenology nor hermeneutics is used as a mainstream methodology, yet it is used in some studies. Campbell (2008) and Ray (2008) for example, have combined methodologies to inquire into the lived experience of individuals who function within a context that has different structures involving power differentials. Although a critical hermeneutic perspective is viable with which to critique the themes since there are multiple realities dependent on context. Besides, a critical perspective pushes the boundaries of multiple realities by stressing the role of social, cultural contexts within which the neoliberal view is privileged (Merriam, 2009).

Structural Inequality as a Critical/Transformative Paradigm

The critical paradigm of Iris Young (1990; 2001; & 2006) places its inquiry within social justice concerns. This paradigm has as its goal to address the political, social, cultural and structural issues which can lead to oppression and marginalisation. As this paradigm seeks to change social injustice, it is also termed Transformative (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011)

I utilise Young's concept of structural inequality within a context of an ontology of historical realism; a transactional epistemology; a dialogic methodology; axiology which

respects cultural norms; a first person and personalised rhetorical structure; and a methodology which is dialectic dialogue.

An ontology of historical realism

From an ontological perspective, critical theorists hold that what we call reality has a historical hue. That is reality is 'created' within a social and historical setting and is assumed to be discoverable. Above all, for criticalists, reality is conceptualised as concerning power relationships. This reality is shaped by social, political, cultural, and ethnic and gender factors and was once pliable (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011)

However, with time this reality has been crystallised into a series of social structures which have assumed a 'taken- for -grantedness' by becoming a normalised status quo (Guba, & Lincoln, 2005). The social structures have become reified that is they have become 'authentic' and to all intent and purpose are real in the form of historical reality, natural and immutable (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011). When the normed claims cease to benefit the whole population equitably, then power struggle and oppression can occur (Ponterotto, 2005).

A transactional and subjectivist epistemology

The epistemology of the criticalist makes a separation, or distance, from co-researchers an impossible construct, as inquiry is value determined and the two are interactively linked. The value position of the investigator inexorably enters into the inquiry. Emphasis is focused on the individual within society and the researcher (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011).

This interaction of the inquirer and participants is the source of knowledge creation which results in both being enlightened from the inquiry process. As Freire (1972, p. 113)

163

observes this is the process of "equally knowing."   As the marginalised person may not be aware of the social context in which they are situated, they may not be aware of this situation (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011; Billington et al., 2017)

The role of the inquirer is transformative in that they may have a higher level of awareness of processes in play as oppression which enables the confrontation of the ignorance of oppression and hegemonic practices in play. The inquirer is ultimately seen in a 'liberating mode' in concert with the participants by informing insight and facilitating confrontation of oppression in creating a more egalitarian and democratic society (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011; Williams, 2013).

An axiology which respects cultural norms

May and Sleeters' work on Critical multiculturalism (2010) will be used to facilitate an examination of the application of socio-cultural power in the context of a school impacted by neo-liberal reform. In their definition of critical multiculturalism May & Sleeter (2010, p. 10), rather than focusing directly on culture, give priority to "structural analysis of unequal power analysis relationships, analysing the role of institutionalised inequalities, including but not necessarily limited to racism." This orientation to critical multi-culturalism is capable of respecting cultural norms and facilitating a deconstruction of power.

A methodology which is dialectic and dialogue

The taken for granted, or even unconscious assumptions, behind daily interpretations in this context are the core of my critical methodology. This type of methodology is referred to as a dialectic dialogue. A dialogue between the researchers and participants requires it to be of a transactional nature. The transformative dialogue is designed to bring about a change from 'naivety' whereby historical structures are taken as incontrovertible into a more

164

informed consciousness. A successful dialectic dialogue is ongoing with research participants and can result in a perception both that structures can be changed, and also indicate a programme for that change.

How Do We Know That An Injustice Is Present?

A criterion for determining whether an injustice is present in a group setting is provided by Young (2001). Her criterion consists of group comparisons to establish if categories of individuals are unequal on essential measures. A plausible narrative is also required for the processes and cumulative conditions which impact the lives of the group members, causing an injustice.

In more detail, Young (2001, p. 15), argues that the groups involved in the comparison will need to be constituted according to "generally recognized social positions which already have broad implications for how people relate to one another." I would posit that an Intermediate School focusing on the teaching and learning of early adolescents, based on the social positions of teacher, students, and administration, meet such a criterion. The second component of the comparison constitutes a search for pattern(s). Young (2001, p.15) understands a pattern as "the mapping of the distribution of some good across all social positions at a particular time." The search for the patterns of inequality will involve a comparison of the average social status of the group members. For an Intermediate (middle) school in Aotearoa this outcome may depend on measures from within the school, including academic achievement and the quality of teaching. Education is but part of a broader picture of marginalisation that I will paint. The third criterion is not about the pattern of distributions, as such, but the processes which cause them.

Each distributive pattern offers only a piece of a puzzle, a clue to an account of generalized social processes which restrict the opportunities of some people to develop their capacities or access benefits, while they enhance those of others. A large class of social inequalities can be judged as unjust because they violate a broad principle of equal opportunities: that it is unfair to some individuals to have an easy time flourishing and realising their goals, while others are hampered in doing so, due to circumstances beyond their control," (Young, 2001, p. 16).

I am advancing the possibility of unfairness as one of the processes as a cause for the possible marginalisation of Aroha Middle School students, rather a comparison of groups as Young has done in the above quote.

Fourthly, Young (2001) states we not entitled to say that a thesis of structural analysis is complete unless we can tell a "plausible structural story" (p. 16) that explains the process for the causes of the distribution of inequality. A plausible story is one that can explain how a pattern of inequality comes into being via the school rules and policies, individual behaviours, and the cumulative, collective impact of these, often unintended, outcomes. They reinforce one another and can direct the opportunities for others' life chances, leading to marginalisation.

Finally, Young (2001) indicates that the pattern of structural inequality will show little change over the decades. In the case of this inquiry, I am making a case for the unfairness judgements being in place since the inception of the neoliberal education reforms of 1987.

The five components of Young's criteria can be used to offer independent advice for intervention. The goal is to focus intervention on the structural inequalities which constrain opportunities.

Unfairness as a Process of Structural Inequality

I have proposed a thesis for unfairness as a structural process producing inequalities adding to already-existing marginalisation. The neoliberal stressors which early adolescents are subject to in Aroha Intermediate School are reinforced by the ERO accountability reports conditioning teacher behaviours. Teacher and other students' unfair behaviour conditions the actions and interactions of those in other relational positions by process of unfairness judgements. This comparison of what 'is' experienced compared to what 'ought' to be experienced arises from values held to be important. This in turn conditions relational emotion which leads to withdrawal of students from the unfair situation. This allows the stressors to continue impacting students' opportunities and reinforcing their marginalisation. The consequences may include toxic unfairness leading to future actions, attitudes, and expectations from life for early adolescents. Among the outcomes may be health concerns both physical and mental, the risk of disengaging and lowered educational expectations and achievement.

Conclusion to the critical part of the chapter

In this section, I have canvassed the philosophic nature of the third part of my inquiry, that is, into unfairness as marginalisation. This involves a journey which is both dialectical and transformative for me, where I have moved from an individual, emic, and interpretive orientation to a more philosophical, social, and ideological stance. What bridges this movement from an interpretive to a more critical one is the domain of critical hermeneutics.

This critical mode of interrogation will be actioned via Young's (1990, 2001, 2016) work on unjust social structures. This work is built on a philosophical basis of ontological realism, a subjectivist and transactional epistemology, and a methodology which is both dialogic and dialectical.

Conclusion to Chapter 2

In previous Chapters, an argument was advanced for the presence of a void in the literature on this topic. It is planned to fill this void by voicing (interpreting) the interpretations that early adolescences may bring to unfairness within the context of a middle school. This Chapter advances the philosophical basis, methodology, and methods for an empirical study to rectify this situation. The studies are designed to answer the broad research questions of the 'what' and 'how' participants may interpret a meaning for this phenomenon. A philosophical basis for the study advanced in the form of realist ontology, and a qualitative interpretive epistemology and methodology. A qualitative diversity survey and semi-structured interviews are planned as methods to gather data. Data from the survey will be analysed via thematic analysis and that from the interviews via interpretive phenomenological analysis. Both methods are couched in the one philosophical basis for the study, but also recognising tensions between some study components. The axiology backstory was canvassed as well as the ethics of procedures for the study.

The final component to the project is a critical reinterpretation of the interpretive themes via a critical hermeneutic methodology. The re-analysis is theorised with the use of Young's (1990, 2001) model of structural analysis. Structures come into being by the largely unintended mutual conditioning of the culturally pedagogically unresponsive school culture.

Students may counter condition the dominant culture by their reactions of judgements of injustice.

In Chapter 5, I will report my interpretations of the codings and themed interpretations of the participants' experience of unfairness from the survey. In previous Chapters, an argument was advanced for the presence of a void in the literature on this topic. It is planned to fill this void by voicing (interpreting) the interpretations that early adolescences may bring to unfairness within the context of a middle school. This Chapter advances the philosophical basis, methodology, and methods for an empirical study to rectify this situation. The studies are designed to answer the broad research questions of the 'what' and 'how' participants may interpret a meaning for this phenomenon. A philosophical basis for the study advanced in the form of realist ontology, and a qualitative interpretive epistemology and methodology. A qualitative diversity survey and semi-structured interviews are planned as methods in order to gather data. Data from the survey will be analysed via thematic analysis and that from the interviews via interpretive phenomenological analysis. Both methods are couched in the one philosophical basis for the study, but also recognising tensions between some study components. The axiology backstory was canvassed as well as the ethics of procedures for the study.

The final component to the project is a critical reinterpretation of the interpretive themes via a critical hermeneutic methodology. The re-analysis is theorised with the use of Young's (1990, 2001) model of structural analysis. Structures come into being by the largely unintended mutual conditioning of the culturally pedagogically unresponsive school culture. Students may counter condition the dominant culture by their reactions of judgements of injustice.

In Chapter 4, I will report my interpretations of the codings and themed interpretations of the participants' experience of unfairness from the survey.

Chapter 4: Qualitative survey results

In this Chapter, I convey the findings from an analysis of the data relating to a written survey of the diversity of unfairness, as experienced by my co-researchers. The survey of the diversity of a phenomena methodology (Jansen, 2010) was selected to answer question one of this qualitative study: "What is the diversity of perceived unfairness in the student population of Te Aroha Middle School?"

This research undertaking is intended to be an initial step in enriching my understanding of the phenomenon of students experienced unfairness. The survey is designed to map the boundaries of unfairness via the concept of diversity. This concept developed by Jansen (2010) and studies the diversity of unfairness within the specific population of Te Aroha School. In contrast, the quantitative survey is focused on the statistical distribution of the characteristics of a topic in a group. My focus is a survey as a descriptive design to explore the features of early adolescents understanding unfairness. The knowledge aim is to develop an initial explanation for the variance of unfairness in the adolescent population of the school in terms of contextual elements.

The first section of Chapter 4 presents a descriptive statistical analysis of the demographic features relating to the participants. The second section of the chapter will show the results of thematic analysis (TA) of the survey data. The first part of this section presents the categories from the initial coding analysis. A set of 28 categories is given, with illustrative quotations. From the TA of the codes, three essential themes and associated sub-themes were eventually interpreted.

The three interlocking themes were developed using the TA method as advocated by Braun and Clarke (2006, 2009, & 2012). Their TA framework has six phases: getting to know

the data; creating the first codings; searching for themes; reviewing potential themes; defining and naming themes; and, generating a thematic write up.

Demographic analysis of the survey respondents

In this section I present features of the study-participants' demographic characteristics using descriptive statistics. The role of such statistics in this study is not to establish statistical validity of the sample; rather, it is a description of part of the context for the study, i.e. some of the features of the participants themselves and their relationships with family and school life. The specific features analysed include the response rates to the survey, their ethnicity, gender, age, school year group, and number of friends.

Once several response sets were eliminated (n=32), based on incomplete data or blank responses, the survey yielded 77 full response sets from a total pool of 112 responses. This represents a 'usable response rate' of 68.7%. The overall response rate from the school was 18.58%. The low response rate may have been related to several variables, including the end of the school year, competition for attention with sports after school, and the impending graduation of the Year Eights. This is seen in a 10 percent difference between the response rates of Year 8 and Year 7. The numbers allocated to identify individual participants, for quotation purposes, are those allocated upon receipt of a participant's written survey response. They are numbered consecutively from 1 through to 112.

The early adolescent participants were asked to self-identify their racial/ethnicity. Their responses were analysed as a percentage of the total of 77 participants for each self-identified ethnic grouping that was coded (Refer Table 4.1, p. 175). The percentages for each group, in descending order, is: Tongan 31.17% (n=24); Māori 16.88% (n=13); Cook Islander 16.88% (n=13); Samoan 11.69% (n=9); Other 10.3%, (n=8); Māori/Tongan 5.19% (n=4); European

4.00% (n=3); Māori/Samoan 2% (n=1); Niuean 2% (n=1); and Papua-New Guinean 2% (n=1).

The official school demographic data (2008), at the time of the survey, indicated that the school population had the following ethnic composition: Māori 34%, Tongan 24%, Cook island 13%, New Zealand European/ Pākehā 13% (Pākehā is the Māori term for Europeans), Samoan 12% and others 4%.

Table 4.1 Survey responses compared with the school demographics.

Racial Ethnic Grouping	Response Rates as Percentages	School demographic data as Percentages
Tongan	31.17	24.00
Māori	16.88	34.00
Cook Island Māori	16.88	13.00
Samoan	11.69	12.00
Other	10.30	4.00
Māori/Tongan	5.19	NA
European	4.00	13.00
Māori-Samoan	1.29	NA
Niuean	1.29	NA
Papua-New Guinea	1.29	NA

The official statistics for this particular school gives a gender balance of boys 58% and girls 42%, (Refer to Table, 4.2 on p. 176) showing a marked difference with the participant group, where the girls predominated. The percentage for the gender structure of the total sample of 77 was 62.34% female and 37. 66% male (n=48 female and 29 males). The participants for the study were drawn from the two groups constituting the two class levels of an Aotearoa/New Zealand intermediate school, named Years 7 and 8. The percentage of participant students in Year 7 was 54.55% (n=42), and 45.45% in Year 8 (n=32).

Table 4.2 Survey returns

School gender balance (%)	Survey gender response	Response rates by year /class

	Female	Male	Female	Male	Year 7	Year 8
			rate (%)			
Percentile	42	58	62.34	37.66	54.55	45.45

Participant ages ranged from 10 years and 1 month to 13 years and 8 months. The mean age for the sample of 77 participants was 12.18 years. The number of friends (Refer to Table, 4.3 p, 176) reported, in ascending order, were: 1 friend, 9.09% (n=7), 2 friends, 7.79% (n=6), 3 friends, 9.09% (n=7), 4 friends, 7.79 (n=6), 5 friends, 7.79 (n=6), 6 friends, 1.3% (n=1), 7 friends, 10.39% (n=8), and 7+ friends, 46 .75% (n=34).

Table 4.3 Percentages of participants reporting numbers of friends

Number of Friends	Number by category	Percentile of total (n= 77)
1	7	9.09
2	6	7.79
3	7	9.09
4	6	7.79
5	6	7.79
6	1	1.3
7	8	10.39
7>	34	46.75

In summary, the sample consisted of 77 participants, who were overwhelmingly of either Pasifika or Māori origin, with a mean age of 12.18 years.

Thematic Analysis of the Survey Results

Phases one and two: 34 initial coding categories

My initial coding process produced 32 categories which are presented in a series of tables: Table 4.4, Negative Events, p. 179; Table 4.5, Standards of fairness breached, p. 180; Table 4.6. Offender Blame, p. 181; Table 4.7, Negative emotional responses, p. 182; Table 4.8,

Reactions, p. 183; Table 4.9, Initial coping, p. 184; and, Table 4.10, Matrix Queries Coding queries, p. 180) presented below, along with representative quotes. This helps maintain an idiographic orientation to the TA where individuals can be tracked through the process of thematic development. The categories were developed using a combination of the Nvivo 10 (Beazley, 2007) computer software and manual coding.

TA (Braun & Clarke 2006, 2009, 2012) was the method utilised to provide the framework for the analysis of my survey data. Phase one involved getting to know the data. Phase 2 emphasised the coding of an initial set of coding categories. These units are usually the most basic ones possible, with an emphasis on an inductive analysis and a broad approach to the data set as a whole. There is an emphasis on what may form a repeating pattern for the development of the themes. Thus, phase 2 involved identifying and coding key ideas until the point of saturation. In this phase, I emphasised coding for the maximum number of codes along with supporting extracts. I did so to maintain the contextual relationships, contradictions, and outliers of the data set.

Before presenting the initial coding categories, I will address two issues relating to purposive sampling and the sufficiency of data (saturation) required from the participants' data. In a qualitative survey methodology (Jansen, 2010) the aim is not to measure the distribution of features in a population, rather, the diversity of the phenomena of unfairness within the specific population. The sample in a qualitative study can be selected purposively, that is, should be able to represent the diversity of unfairness in an early adolescent school setting in Aotearoa. To establish the success of this undertaking, two challenges needed to be met: (1) the ability of the sample to generate sufficient incidents of unfairness, and (2) sufficient incidents of unfairness to allow for an analysis of the diversity of these incidents. All 77

participants were able to cite an incident of unfairness at school, and their responses allowed

for an analysis to be undertaken. Consequently, I posit, this established the effectiveness of

the purposive sampling.

To determine the sufficiency of data, I used the criteria established in the methodology

presented in Chapter 3; namely, that the analysis of participant data sets should yield no new

significant codes. This is the point of data saturation (Jansen 2010).

In summary, because of the analysis of the qualitative data, my interpretation has resulted in

the creation of 28 categories of coding and 2 coding queries as a result of a matrix coding

(Nvivo 10) query (cross-tabulation) x attribute (age, gender, school Years 7 and 8), were

revealed. These 28 coding categories and 2 queries form the material for Phase 3 which

entailed searching for themes across the data (codes are grouped into tentative themes are

presented in Table 4.4, through to Table 4.10) to answer the first empirical question of 'What

is the diversity of the perceived unfairness in the student population of the Te Aroha middle

school population?'

Phase 3 searching for themes

Following the attainment of a satisfactory list of codes, the next step in a TA is to interpret

themes from the multiplicity of codes. This involves working at a broader level than that of

the codes. The process is achieved by gathering the codes into themes and then ordering the

coded data within the themes into overarching themes and subthemes. However, at the end

of this process, the structure, or make up of the coding categories, is still very fluid.

The total coding categories codes (28) generated in Phase One were interpreted as six initial, overarching themes. This reduction in the number of codes was the result of five iterations involved in the process of searching for initial themes.

Table 4.4 Coding categories for the negative events

Coding number	Name	Definition	Illustrating quote
1.	Verbal abuse	Verbal abuse (verbal teasing or mocking, issues over friendships, people trying to get others into trouble, gossiping, and getting smart).	Participant 76 (Year 8, Tongan, female), "getting smart".
2.	Getting physical	This code is defined as the use of physical aggression within peer interaction.	A Year 8 girl reported that she got "punched" (Participant, 77).
3.	Sporting disputes	Direct verbal disputes over a sporting rule or subsequent disputes, often relating to the application of a sporting rule.	Participant 12 (Year 7, Māori, male), "Me Akrim and they were playing handball, then when I got a line akime (Akrim) sais (says) it was a full (foul)".
4.	Arguments with teachers	Argument with a teacher who is imposing a discipline obligation either is not being fair or has no reason for doing so.	Participant 16 (Year 8, Māori, male) was of the opinion that his teacher, "Ms, R. she is mean and when I was in my old class, she growl me because she think that I copied my spelling and she told me to stay in class".
5.	Taking of other possessions	The taking of other possessions.	"Taking my pencil" (Participant 7, Year 7, Samoan, female student).
6.	Pushed out of line	Being pushed out of line while queuing.	Participant 20 (Year 7, Māori female) "I was lining up and I got pushed out and I had to go to the back of a long line".
7.	Cheating	This code is defined as the taking of others intellectual property without the permission of the owner and passing it off as their own.	A Year 8 student, Participant 68 (female Tongan) said that it was, "mostly about someone taking my ideas and doesn't want to do their own work. And that's not fair".

Table 4.5 Coding categories for fairness standards breached

Coding number	Name	Definition	Illustrating quote

8	Stealing from others	The code is defined as the taking of possessions without the permission of the owner.	"Stealing my stuff which my Mum pay for" (Participant, 44).
9	Not playing by the rules	This code is defined as the breaking of either formal or informal rules governing the appropriate ways behaving contexts.	"Some of the students started their test when the teacher didn't tell us to. Every student should start their test at the same time" ..."it's not fair because they get better grades than us" (Participant, 55).
10	Peer verbal abuse	The salient feature of this code is the use of verbal abuse to inflict some cognitive or emotional harm, upon the victim.	"My young brother always teases me in front of his and my friends" was experienced by a Māori/Tongan who attribute the unfairness to the frequency of it "he always does it every day" (Participant, 62).
11	Attributing offender characteristics as cause of unfairness	A negative incident of unfairness is attributed to an internal aspect of the offender's character.	"My brother was jealous so he started punching me"… "because of the jellous" (Participant, 41).
12	Negative adult Interaction	This code is defined as a perception that a teacher has not acted in an appropriate manner as perceived by participants.	A Tongan, Year 7 (Participant 21) "she got pushed and teased by a boy and when I pushed him back the teacher growled instead and done nothing to the boy". The cause of the unfairness was attributed to "the teacher didn't see the boy push me and tease me, but she saw me push him and she didn't give me a chance to speak".

What is of note in this, the first of the initial candidate themes, is a leitmotif relating to

'*Negative events*' (See Table, 4.4, p. 179) which involved the folding of seven codes into this

one tentative theme - verbal abuse, getting physical, sporting disputes, arguments with

teachers, taking of others' possessions, being pushed out of line, and cheating.

The second theme of "'*Standards of fairness breached*" (See Table 4.5, p.180) is based

on the 5 coding categories stealing, or loss of possessions, such as a place in a queue,

disagreements over rules of procedure, attributing offender characteristics as a cause for

unfairness, peer verbal abuse, and unfair teacher judgements and actions.

In the third theme, three initial codes which centred on blame were collapsed into one

theme on the blaming of a group or single offender. This theme has been termed "*Offender*

blamed" (See Table, 4.6, p. 181).

Table 4.6 Coding categories for the offender blamed

Coding number	Name	Definition	Illustrating quote
13	Blame individual	This code is defined as blaming a single peer perpetrator for an incident.	"… her because I deserve some respect. everyone does" (Participant, 34).
14	Blame-peer group	This code is defined as negative events where a peer group is held to be responsible for an incident.	"The girls because they didn't give us a turn" (Participant 26).
15	Blame-adults	This code was assigned to the adults who are deemed be responsible for a negative incident.	"Mrs didn't believe me and another person" (Participant, 40).

The themes identified through the question regarding the reaction to unfairness were

emotionally related. Emotional responses to unfairness constitute the fourth theme termed

"Negative emotional responses to unfairness" and incorporate the four codes of - sad,

anger/sad, sad/anger, and anger (See table 4.7, p. 182). Two of the codes were single focused

emotions directed internally and externally. The externally directed code was termed anger

and was directed at the offender. The internally directed code, sadness, was self-directed at

the victim. The two remaining codes were transitional emotions, or dual emotions, between

the victim and offender. These were the two co-emotions codes of anger/sad and sad/anger.

Table 4.7 Coding categories for the negative emotional responses

Coding number	Name	Definition	Illustrating Quote
16	Sad	This code had several internal negative emotional responses coded to it with 'sad' being the most common description reported. Other nouns associated with sadness including unhappy, upset, lonely, and unfair.	"felt unhappy and I wanted my old friend back, so I told one of my other friends how I felt about it" which was in response to a breach of trust by telling of secrets entrusted to friends" (Participant, 74).
17	Sad/anger	This is characterised primarily by a negative emotional response moving from an inward focus to an outward emotional momentum as its focus.	Year 7 Tongan girl who "felt sad, angry frustrating and I was wandering what did I do unfair to this person" (Participant, 72).
18	Anger	An emotional, hostile response in nature, was coded as anger if it were associated "with a negative external event associated with frustration, slight, injury or experienced unfairness".	Year 8 Māori student who was hit by peer. "I felt so angry I hit her" (Participant, 23).
19	Anger/sad	This is characterised primarily by a negative emotional response moving from an inward focus to an outward emotional momentum as its focus.	Tongan girl in Year 7, calling her names "took my place in the "que" which result in an angry/sad response and a behavioural response of seeking social support from her sister (Participant, 32).

The fifth theme (See Table 4.8, p. 183) is interpreted out of the codings relating to the

"*Action and inaction*" to an experience of unfairness. The *inaction* sub-theme subsumes the

two codes of "inactions" and "thinking". The *actions* subtheme was made up of the codes of

"behavioural actions", "told an offender off", "seeking of peer social support", and "told an

adult".

Table 4.8 Coding categories for reactions

Coding number	Name	Definition	Illustrating quote
20	Inaction	No reaction of any nature was reported in response to a negative event.	One participant said that "it wasn't that big" (Participant, 47).
21	Thinking	The core feature of this reaction is the report of cognition in response to experienced unfairness.	"but I did not hit him because I did wount to get him in chraboll" (Participant 19).
22	Behaviour Actions	This code records those reactions to an incident of unfairness which are action oriented in nature. The moderately sized code splits evenly into self and other oriented actions.	"I just cried" (Participant,15)
23	Told off an offender	This code is defined as the making an assertive verbal response to an offender.	"back of the line" (Participant, 71).
24	Seeking of peer social support	This is defined as the seeking of social support form peers.	"I got all the girls, and we talk about what we had said about each other" was the response of a Year 7 Māori girl (Participant, 74).
25	Told an adult	The key reason for telling the teachers presents as seeking support to redress or resolve the incident of unfairness.	"I went and told my coach and by the time my coach got there the ref was gone" (Participant, 48).

"Seeking social support or not" (See table 4.9, p. 184) in reaction to unfairness was the

sixth theme to emerge from the following 3 codes: "deliberate withdrawal", "telling a peer or

an adult", "nothing"; along with the two sub-themes of *avoidance* of the problem and the problem *approach*.

Table 4.9 Coding categories for initial coping

Coding number	Name	Definition	Illustrating quote
26	Withdrawal	This coping category is characterised by the planned withdrawal of social interaction using various strategies. These include physical withdrawal and socially ignoring the offender/s.	This is exemplified by a Year 7 Tongan boy who, in response to the mocking of his brother, coped with the negative event when he "walked away" (Participant, 9).
27	Telling	This coping category focuses on a verbal style of coping by telling an adult, the offender, and friends.	In response to an incidence of cheating a Year 8 Papua/New Guinean girl "told the teacher to check the test paper before we started the test" (Participant, 55).
28	Inaction	Inaction is the key to this code to the existence of this code.	"I didn't do anything" conveyed by another Year 7, Tongan girl (Participant 21).

Table 4.10 Categories as a Result of Matrix Queries explanation and examples

Matrix Coding Number	Name of Code	Explanation of code	Example
29	Year 7 have greater use of coping strategies	Year 7s used a greater proportion of coping strategies overall than the Year 8 students.	"Sat down" (Participant, 12). "I did nothing" (Participant, 16). "So, I told my Mum after school" (Participant 2).
30	Female participants have a greater usage of reaction Strategies	Females used a greater proportion of telling their best friends and adults as reaction strategies than boys did.	"I told them to go to the back of the line" (Participant, 11). "I stood up and told my BF" (Participant, 32).

These thematic interpretations are examined in detail against the existing literature in Chapter 6.

Table 4.11 Initial themes from the qualitative survey of diversity survey of unfairness

Theme No	1	2	3	4	5	6
Theme Name	Stressors	Differences between what 'is' and what 'ought' to be	Offender blamed	Negative emotional responses	Action and inaction	Seeking social support not

Phase 4: Reviewing themes

The fourth phase of TA focused on refining the themes (See Table 4.11, p. 185), established in phase 3, into a narrative based on a shared meaning for experienced unfairness. This section will report only on the final version arrived at via this process of refinement. As outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006, 2009), this process involved deleting candidate themes through lack of evidence and, more commonly, collapsing themes to generate new themes. More rarely, some themes were broken down into new separate themes. This process was guided by the dual principles of internal homogeneity and external heterogeneity (Patton 1990, cited in Braun & Clarke, 2006), and operated at two different levels. The levels involved operationalising these two criteria: "data within themes should cohere together meaning fully while there should be clear and identifiable distinctions between themes" (Braun & Clarke 2006, p. 91). Examples of this process of internal homogeneity have been reported in phase 3. Phase four 'reviewing of the themes' can run the risk of being repeated in phase 5 'defining and naming themes'. To avoid such repetitiveness, the remainder of this section will only review the relationships between themes, and themes and sub-themes, as represented by the final three themes.

The first refined theme of "A moral judgement of, it's not fair", is supported by three initial sub-themes: of stressors, differences between what is and what ought to be, and the blaming of an offender. It is posited that a stressor, when identified as such, prompts a search

183

for a difference between what a participant "is" experiencing, and what they think "ought" to be experienced and who is responsible for the negative event. Each of these sub-themes stands valid in terms of its internal and external homogeneities. This is the result of a number of review cycles to establish if the themes worked with the data set as a whole. The function of this theme is to report on the negative event, (standard of fairness breached), which made up a participant's experience of *a judgement of unfairness*.

The second theme of emotional distress is a single-feature theme of an affective response to a judgement of unfairness–*emotional distress*. Whilst the relevant coding categories have been subjected to much iteration, what finally dominated my reflections was the overriding negative emotional distress response, rather than four discrete emotional responses. This aspect of emotional distress presents as the main driver in the final theme. These issues will be further developed in Chapter 6.

The final theme is that of behavioural reactions to unfairness, with a particular emphasis on *withdrawal and seeking help.* This is named *behavioural reactions to unfairness*.

In summary, these three themes cohere as a judgement of unfairness, an emotional and a behavioural reaction to that judgement. This theme is termed *reaction response.* A miscellaneous code was kept for the codes deemed not to be significant (coded "Nothing"). Thus, the six initial themes have been replaced by three refined themes as seen in Table 4.12, (p. 187).

Table 4.12 Final themes from the survey of the diversity of experienced unfairness

1 It's not fair!	2 Emotional distress	3 *Reactions to a judgement of unfairness*

Phase 5: Defining and the Naming of Themes

This final section focuses on the definition and naming of the themes.

Theme 1: *"It's not fair!"* A judgement of unfairness in this age group involves a stressor, the breach of a standard of unfairness, and an offender who can be blamed. The survey indicated seven sources of negative events which were experienced by participants: peer verbal abuse, peers getting physical with one another, disputes over rules in sport, arguments with teachers imposing discipline imposition without a perceived justifiable reason, taking of other possessions, being pushed out line, and cheating. The second requirement for a judgement of unfairness is the breach of a standard of fairness. Four of these standards were raised by the participants. The least common was stealing of possessions. This contrasted with early research on distributive justice in childhood, where the bulk of the research focuses on the cognitive rules by which allocations of resources are made - equality, equity, and need (Deutsch, 1983). The second standard is on rules governing appropriate ways of behaving in sports and assessments. The dominance of sporting rules reflects the importance of sport in this community context. The largest category was of inappropriate ways of behaving towards another person. Most of such incidents were with peers, in the first instance, and then teachers. Mocking or teasing was the dominant category, followed by being laughed at, racism, name calling, put downs, rumours, lies, bullying, and the breaking of secrets. The fourth standard was a teacher not having a perceived justifiable reason for his/her action. The fifth standard is attributed to a feature of the perpetrators' character or behaviour. The characteristics singled out by participants included jealousy, meanness, liking, popularity, and stupidity. The behaviours shown by the perpetrators included: displaying bad manners, rushing, tired of waiting or couldn't wait, wanting to be at the front, and doing it for fun. The third condition is for a perpetrator to be blamed for the incident of unfairness. Single peers

185

were the most common perpetrator, followed by groups of peers and adults from within the school community, i.e., teachers and parent volunteer coaches. *Consequently, for a judgement of unfairness to be arrived at, an event was required to be interpreted as negative, a standard of justice to have been breached, and a perpetrator to be blamed for the breach of fairness*.

Theme 2: *"Emotional distress"*. There were a few nuanced affective responses to a judgement of unfairness in the form of sadness, sad/angry, angry/sad and anger; these are more structural features. The most common response is one of emotional distress in the form of anger.

Theme 3: *"Reactions to a judgement of unfairness"* is made up of two subthemes, withdrawal and engaging. "Withdrawal" appears to be a reaction to the emotional aspects caused by a judgement of unfairness. Immediate inaction was reported by a number of respondents, along with thinking which did not result in any action. Coping, which refers to a later time frame, resulted in further withdrawal action and inaction and, finally, a later theoretical timeframe called restorative action resulted in further inaction. Action responses to the emotional responses to unfairness initially saw a single reactive engaging response of telling the perpetrator off. The later time frame was associated with coping strategies of telling friends, the perpetrator, and adults about the incident.

In conclusion, the participants' experience of unfairness has been interpreted in three themes: a judgment of unfairness, a negative emotional reaction of distress, and reactive response themes.

Summary

Chapter 4 has presented the results of my unique interpretation of the data from a written qualitative survey (Jansen, 2010) of the experiences of unfairness for early adolescents (ages 10-14 years) in an intermediate school. The TA methodology and was used to provide the empirical data to answer the first question of the dissertation, "What do early adolescents experience when making a judgement of unfairness?" From the TA, 30 codings contributed to the establishment of three major themes: It's not fair! Distress, and Reactions. These three themes represent an initial knowledge contribution to enrich the understanding of unfairness in early adolescents in Te Aroha School. The diversity perceptive will be further developed within the context of a wider the literature in Chapter 6.

Chapter 5 presents the results of an interpretation of the 13 semi-structured interviews from an IPA methodology. Both survey and interview data will be examined against the literature on early adolescents' experience of unfairness, in Chapter 6.

Chapter 5: An Interpretation of 13 Semi-Structured Interviews

This chapter presents an Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) of the data from 13 semi-structured interviews from an original pool of 21. Chapter Five follows the IPA process by discreetly analysing each case to interpret the summary relating to each one. In the final stage, the process moves across the 13 case studies, searching for the commonalities and differences, to interpret the superordinate themes and subthemes relating to experienced unfairness as a phenomenon. The overall analytic process yielded four themes representing in an interpretation of unfairness.

Organisationally this chapter is presented in four parts. Part one displays the descriptive statistics for the 13 participants. Then analysis stopped at case number 13 as data saturation was reached at this point (Holloway, 2008). The second part demonstrates the individual case analysis, using Irene as a standing example for all cases. For all 13 cases, 2–3-page narratives can be seen in Appendix C. Part three presents the thematic analysis and interpretations pertaining to the four superordinate themes and their subthemes. Finally, part four presents an integration of the four superordinate themes, subthemes, and related case processes. Chapter Six will situate my interpretation of findings in the existing knowledge and models relating to perceived unfairness by devolving a higher order understanding, in the form of a heuristic model of unfairness, as experienced by early adolescents.

This chapter is focused on providing data to answer the question about the processes involved in assigning meaning to a judgement of unfairness. In Chapter Two, it was tentatively theorised as a judgment of accountability. If this tentative theorisation proves to be valid, then this analysis may provide a central component to the interpreting judgments of unfairness.

Part One: Demographic data

Demographic data (See Table 5.1, p.192) relating to the 13 participants were summarised by gender, age, ethnicity, and year group. Of the 13 participants, 61.5% (n=8) were female, and 38.4% (n=5) male. The mean age of the 13 participants was 12 years and 3 months. Student participants were asked to self-identify their racial-ethnic identity (Cross & Cross 2008) which was parsed as follows: Dinka (South Sudan), 7.7% (n=1); Cook Island, 15.4% (n=2), Pakeha, 15.4% (n=2); Tongan, 15.4% (n=2); Māori, 24% (n=3); and Tongan, 24% (n=3).

The academic year groups, 7 and 8, were further broken down by number, age, and ethnicity. Year 7 had 31% of the 13 participants, with a mean age of 11 years and 4 months. The gender composition of the Year 7 group was 7.7% (n=1) female and 23.0% (n=3) males, out of a total of 13 participants. Ethnically, the Year 7 group was spread equally across Dinka, Tongan, Māori, and Samoan, at 7.7% each (n=1 for each ethnic group), of the 13 participants.

The Year 8 group had a gender composition of 54% (n=7) for females and 15.4% (n=2) for males of the 13 participants, with a mean age of 12 years and 7 months for the 9 members of the subgroup. Ethnically the Year 8 group is composed of Cook Island, Māori, Pakeha, and Tongan, making up 15.3% each (n=2, per category), along with Samoan category consisting of 7.7% (n=1), out of 13 participants. Table 5.1 overviews the demographic statistics for the 13 participants.

Table 5.1 Participant interviewees' demographics

No.	Pseudonym	Description	Gender	Age	Ethnicity	School Year
1	Willow	Treating me differently to others for talking	F	11.11	Dinka/South Sudan	7
2	Paris	Mocked by a boy when called a gorilla	F	13.4	Māori	8

3	Chris	Being unfairly sent off the sport field	M	11.11	Tongan	7
4	Herbi	Friends don't choose her to be in their team and talk about her behind her back	F	13.3	Māori	8
5	Chair	Teacher changes a maths mark, lies about it, and is therefore not a reliable teacher	F	12.0	Pakeha	8
6	Rock	Pen stolen by teacher	M	12.10	Samoan	8
7	Snoop – Dog	Physically and verbally bullied by peers for racist reasons	M	12.11	Pakeha	8
8	Hemi	Bike stolen	M	12.5	Māori	7
9	Charlie	Peers don't bring the required gear; Charlie argues that the blame should be shared equally	F	13.0	Tongan	8
10	Tina	Verbal bullying by being called a "fucken bitch"	F	12.0	Cook Island	8
11	Nate	Loses a friend when no one chooses him for sports groups	M	11.10	Samoan	7
12	Paris Hilton	Verbal bullying by references to her monthly hygiene	F	13.1	Cook island	8
13	Irene	Unfair treatment in sport When the other team gets to bat more times	F	13.3	Tongan	8

Part Two: Interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA)

Irene's case study was selected as an example of my utilisation of the IPA case analysis process. The process informally commenced long before the interviews with my interest in the topic, literature, absorbing the findings of the qualitative survey, and design of the interview protocol questioning process. The IPA formal analysis process began with a transcribed copy of Irene's audio recorded, semi-structured interview. The transcript was

verified against the audio recording for accuracy and entered into a three column Word document. The three columns were named, from left to right: emergent themes, original transcript, and exploratory comments. The initial exploratory comments on the transcripts were the result of an analysis utilising descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual structures. An example of this process, using the IPA methodology, is given from Irene's transcript. The next step was the combining of the summary from the 13 case studies, which are present in Appendix C, into superordinate themes which occur across the cases.

As flexibility in IPA (Smith et al., 2009) is encouraged, I combined Irene's summary into a narrative account, and did so for all 13 cases. These were typically 2-3 pages in length. This step was undertaken for two reasons. The first was to aid my analysis of the emergent themes. The second, was so I could report back to the participants in a succinct manner in order to establish the veracity of my analysis of their accounts. In the school holidays I met with each of the 13 participants. Any issues raised by the participants relating to the veracity of their narrative which resulted in changes were entered into the narrative summaries at this point. The superordinate themes were then combined to form the dissertation themes. The links between the themes were discussed in terms of the phenomena processes operating between themes. Finally, the themes relating to a phenomenon of experienced unfairness were presented in a heuristic model with the aim of aiding an explanation. The IPA process is explained in Table 5.2. (p. 195)

Table 5.2 Steps in the IPA process

1. Checking accuracy of transcription
2. Reading and familiarisation; noting those features that spark an interest
3. Initial coding by attending to narrative, linguistic, and conceptual features

4. Searching for summary within each data set, i.e. case study

5. Searching for connections across themes within each data set

6. Producing a table of analysis

7. Defining and naming themes

8. Stages 3, 4, and 5 are repeated, across each data set

9. Final analysis across the entire data set producing a table of superordinate themes

10. Write up

IPA analysis at the case study level

This section is an attempt to elucidate the process I utilised to interpret Irene's transcript. The focus is on the descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual comments, before binding these into a more holistic emergent theme. Smith et al. (2009) defined these analytical tools as:

> *Descriptive* comments focused on the content of what the participant has said, the subject of the talk within the transcript (normal text). *Linguistic* comments focused on exploring the specific use of language by the participant (italic). *Conceptual* comment focused at a more interrogative and conceptual level. (p. 84)

The transcript was organised from left to right as emergent themes, original transcript, and exploratory comments (See Table 5.3, p. 198). I treated each of these three types of analysis as discrete entities before commenting on them more holistically. The function of the descriptive analysis was to highlight what was important to Irene which, in her case, was her sport, friendships, competition, winning, being outside, and the team: "we're really competitive at the school, about our Houses" (Irene, 13:24). (A school House is an administrative, organisational, academic, pastoral and sporting, internal subdivision of the

school; often organised to include students from Years 7 & 8). In this case the game was 20/20 cricket, which is a short form of the game of cricket, consisting of a team batting for 20 'overs' where each over consists of six turns in facing a bowler and attempting to run between wickets to earn points. These summative descriptive comments were also designed to eliminate a significant amount of interview material relating to the interview process, such as the interview questions and minimal encouragers, e.g. "Okay um now I'm going to ask you how – how did you feel as a result of that unfairness" (Extract 1 B). These did not appear to have any significant function in terms of exploratory notes. The following note by me: "Irene's emotional response is anger. Driven partly by comment that her House could be a winner of overall competition for the house shield and they lost that week as a result of that game" is my attempt to pull out the key features of the background to Irene's anger. In my next note Irene looks for a way to express the competitive values "Results in a confirmation that competitiveness" (Extract 4, explanatory notes) which I see as a significant aspect of her anger. The rest of the explanatory notes were either confirmations, or the end of sub-features of Irene's narrative, "No further way of describing her anger". Thus, my notes regarding the double hermeneutic were to establish that Irene's emotional response to her experienced unfairness was anger and that it related to her personal value of competitiveness. In addition, the competitiveness may be heightened by a context of group competition, facilitated by the school's House structure. In essence these are background notes about what I intuited to be important for Irene in this section of her narrative.

In the linguistic noting analysis, I have highlighted features relating to Irene's exclamations, remembering, and being embarrassed, and finally her use of simile and paradoxical awareness. In extract two I noted that, "*Mhm,* remembers/confirmation that she

lost last week" (Explanatory note 1), as I am speculating here that this may have enhanced her level of anger, as a component of the longer, ongoing, nature of the House competition. In another representative example, I noted with comment that, "*And ah* remembering the level of her anger. In extract five (exploratory comments) I am becoming more aware of the nature of her anger when she uses a simile: "like running the whole field" and draws upon her sport experience to explain the nature of her anger". The simile aids the explanation of the energised nature of her anger. In the next part of the extract, I comment on her awareness of paradox in not being able to take any action, "she wasn't able to do anything".

At the conceptual level, of the explanatory notes, they started to tell the nature of my understanding of Irene's emotional response to the unfairness that she experienced. By chaining the extracts together, I became more aware of the conceptual nature of my understanding of Irene's anger at a holistic level. "Really, really angry. Didn't want to tell anyone" (Extract 2); "Also jealous" (Extract 3); "competitiveness value may have had an impact on both her levels of emotions" (Extract 4); "High level of anger really energised Irene" … "A paradoxical reaction of tremendous energy, but an associated paralysis of inaction" (Extract 5); "level of energy associated with anger" (Extract 6).

The following extract, from my narrative write-up of Irene's emergent themes, indicates how the initial explanatory notes based on the descriptive, linguistic, conceptual analysis of the two pages of the transcript finally contributed to the emergent themes, "In response to the teacher's action Irene felt:

> … really angry cause … my house was in a lead of … winning – so get to win the house
>
> shield and … we kind of lost that week because of that game … and it ended up that

house actually won – our opposition – and ah I felt really, really angry but I didn't want to tell anyone. (Irene, 13:20)

Her intense emotion was experienced as a surge of energy in her chest, such that she could run the length of the field and could have then kept on going but, paradoxically, she could not do anything, as it was so unfair. The depth of Irene's anger may have had a dampening effect upon her successive emotional responses.

This section has demonstrated how the IPA analysis at the descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual levels led to the development of part of an emergent theme. This was only part of my aim of developing trustworthiness by transparently tacking the interpretation of Irene's account as a way of standing for all of the interpretations of the semi structured interviews.

Table 5.3 Transcript for Irene experiences of unfairness

Emerging themes	Original Transcript	Explanatory notes
	1B: Okay um now I'm going to ask you how – how did you feel as a result of that unfairness?	
	2 I: Um I felt really angry cause um my house was in a lead of um winning – so get to win the house shield and um we kind of lost that week because of that game [mhm] and it ended up that house actually won – our opposition – and ah I felt really, really angry but I didn't want to tell anyone.	Irene's emotional response is anger. Driven partly by comment that her House could be a winner of overall competition for the house shield and they lost that week as a result of that game. *Mhm remembers/confirmation that they lost that week.*
	3 B: So did you feel anything else other than the anger?	*And ah remembering the level of the anger.* <u>Really, really angry. Didn't want to tell any- one.</u> (House is an internal unit of school organisation)
	4 I: Um jealous.	
	5 B: Yeah.	

	6: It's um – we're really competitive at the school about our houses.	<u>Also Jealous</u> *Yeah. Confirmation of emotional status*
	7 B: Yeah.	
	8 I: Yeah.	*Irene looks for a way to express the competitive values Yeah.* Results in a in a confirmation that competitiveness <u>value may have had an impact on both the levels of emotion i.e. angry & jealousy.</u>
	9 B: And anything else? Okay so I'll talk about ah the anger then the jealously or which of those came first?	
	10 : I Ah the anger.	
	11 B: Okay so let us run with the anger. About how angry were you?	
	12 I: I was angry like I could just run the whole field and like don't stop, but like it was just so unfair that I couldn't even do anything.	What is she saying here? It gives a sense of complete inability to cope with the situation. She seems to be overwhelmed. But she is angry and usually deals with that by using the 'energy' of anger for physical activity which probably makes her feel better afterwards (emotion focused coping). I am wondering if there is something else here
	13 B: Mhm. So, the anger had um lots of energy?	
	14 I: Yeah.	

15 B: Yeah. And how – is there any way of describing how you feel anger or how you felt anger?

16 I: Um not that I can think of.

17 B: So, there's a lot of it?

High level of anger really energised Irene like (simile) running the whole field and not stop but at the same time she was not able to do anything. A paradoxical reaction of tremendous energy, but an associated paralysis of inaction.

18: Yeah.

19 B: Yeah. Um now where do you feel the anger in your body?

20 I: Ah just around the chest.

Yeah confirmation of level of energy associated with anger.

21 B: Mhm.

22 I: Yeah.

23 B: And it made you feel as though you had heaps of energy that you could run around the field or run it off?

24 I: Yeah.

*No further way of describing the ange*r

25 B: Did it make you feel anything else?

26 I: Not really

Felt that anger in her chest.

Mhm, confirmation

An associated confirmation

Confirmation of the simile for anger

Summary interpreted within each case study

This section, which comprises the interpretation of the interviews to establish the emergent themes, presents the process utilised in each case study, along with an example.

The IPA process involves an inductive and iterative cycle via a "line-by-line analysis of the detailed experiential claims, concerns and understandings of each participant" (Flowers et al., 2009, pp. 79-80). This process is undertaken by an initial noting of descriptive, linguistic, and conceptual comments. The summary "reflect a synergistic process of description and interpretation" (Flowers et al., 2009, p. 16). Furthermore, these initial notes might feel "very loose, open and contingent, summary should feel like they have captured and reflect an understanding" (Flowers et al., 2009, p. 17).

In a departure from the standard IPA format, each case study is presented in detail with the summary placed in a context of the individual participant's narrative. The term 'emergent theme' was coined by Flowers et al. (2009). It does not mean that the themes are coming out of the mire, preformed, and awaiting discovery; rather, that they are present as nascent and tentative in nature.

The write–ups, themselves, are organised as the antecedents to a judgement of unfairness and the resultant consequences. My organisation of the write-ups, along with semi-structured interview protocols, were influenced by the use of a cognitive-behavioural, ABC model (Beck, 1976; Ellis, 1962); A is the antecedents to an event or activating event, B is the belief system or cognitions, and C is the consequences, both emotional and behavioural.

Emergent themes case example: Irene, participant 13

Back-story

In interview, Irene presents as a young woman of intelligence, personality, and sporting prowess. She is of Tongan ethnicity, New Zealand born, aged 13 years and 3 months at time of interview. She was about to leave intermediate school and start secondary school the following year. Unlike most of her peers Irene was going to a secondary school in the central business district of the city, rather than one of the suburban secondary schools to which her intermediate school contributes students.

Both Irene's parents live in the family home. She has seven siblings, all of whom are still at home. Irene is third in birth order of three male and four female siblings. Irene has an extensive circle of seven or more best friends. Academically and behaviourally, Irene sees herself at the top end of her peer group.

Emergent themes for Irene

Irene (See Table 5.4, p. 205-206) is a highly active sportswoman who likes playing team games including rugby, league, netball, and cricket. She reported feeling happy before the event as her team was winning on points and they were on their way to getting the House shield for the term. Irene elaborated further at one point:

… I was actually excited cause … I think we had pretty good players in our team and … I was being a bit cocky so …. yeah and … when the game started I was really pumped cause our team started getting the lead. (Irene, 13:64)

The following extract is an overview of the event Irene reported as being unfair:

… every Friday our school has house sports and it was my house versus another house - and we were playing non-stop cricket and … the opposition got to bat twice - and

201

then my house got to bat only once so of course we lost because we didn't get as much turns as the other house so that wasn't fair. (Irene, 13:2)

The teacher/referee stopped the game of 20/20 cricket 15 minutes early, before Irene's team had finished their allocated number of batting turns, allowing their rival team to win. Irene thought they could have bowled the remaining 10 overs (6 bowling turns per over) in 15 minutes. Consequently, the teacher broke a procedural rule relating to the playing of 20/20 cricket. Irene held the teacher responsible, "Yeah" (Irene, 13:150), with her having no excuses for her action, "Not that I know of" (Irene, 13:152). According to Irene she did it intentionally, "probably" (Irene, 13:154). Irene's reasoning for the blaming process ran as follows, "that was her house that we were … and they were … – we were close – they were coming second … and we were coming first … so I think she got a bit too competitive" (Irene, 13:156). In addition, "She actually stopped the game and … she took us to assemble under the awning but it was like 15 minutes before games that actually stopped" (Irene, 13:146). In response to the teacher's action, Irene felt

> … really angry cause … my house was in a lead of … winning – so get to win the house shield and … we kind of lost that week because of that game … and it ended up that house actually won–our opposition–and ah I felt really, really angry but I didn't want to tell anyone. (13:20)

Her anger was experienced as a surge of energy in her chest, such that she could run the length of the field and could have then kept on going but, paradoxically, she could not do anything, as it was so unfair. The depth of Irene's anger may have had a dampening effect upon her successive emotional responses. As Irene has a very competitive streak, she also felt a little jealous of the other team's win and a lot of disappointment, which led to Irene being

202

quiet for a while, because her team did not keep their lead in house points. Irene was thinking of complaining but was inhibited by shyness and the possibilities of her peers commenting upon her actions. "… I was – I really, really wanted to complain at that time so that we could get our fair chance but … I was a bit shy that the kids might go oh she's just being like … yeah" (Irene, 13:74).

Following the incident Irene spoke to her friends, who were mainly in her house team, complaining about how she felt about the unfairness and they "co-operated" (Irene, 13:86) in setting a goal to win the shield which they did the following term, "so that got us really, really excited" (Irene, 13:94). When asked about the possibility of restorative action Irene replied, "Ah they'd probably have to give both teams the fair amount of batting or … like yeah … both so that when it comes to the results, we could be like happy or disappointed, but it was a fair game" (Irene, 13:104).

Table 5.4 Emergent themes from Irene's transcript analysis

Emergent Themes
• Feeling happy before the event as Irene's team was winning on points and on their way   to getting the house shield for the term.
• Irene's team did not get as many chances to bat in a game of 20/20 cricket as their rivals.
• Teacher/referee stopped the game of 20/20 cricket 15 minutes early, before the other teams had finished, allowing their rival team to win. Irene thought they could do the remaining 10 overs (a cluster of 6 bowling attempts per over) in 15 minutes.
• Teacher was held responsible, with no excuses for her action (the other team in the teacher's house) and did it intentionally. Therefore, she is fully blamed.

- Emotional reactions involving anger, jealousy, and disappointment, felt in the chest, as they were close to winning the cricket match.

- Real anger directed at her teacher, felt in her chest, which had a paradoxical impact as it energised Irene but also paralysed her. Anger first, turned into jealousy/disappointment.

- A bit of mixed jealousy and disappointment of the other team, their rivals, for 'winning'. A lot of disappointment (she went quiet).

- Cognitive reaction of wanting to complain but feeling shy of what others might think of her if she did.

- As a coping strategy she was helped to forget the incident by talking about it to her friends. Complaining about how unfair it was. They also set a goal to win the house shield which they did the following term.

- In order to restore the incident to a fair position they would have need to give their team equal number of overs.

Part Two: An interpretation of superordinate (recurring) themes and subthemes from across individual cases

Irene's story can stand as representative of all the stories of experienced unfairness. The following analysis is drawn from all participants but clearly applies to Irene's story. The function of the third part of IPA is to present an interpretative account of the recurrent themes relating to the early adolescent participants' experience of unfairness from across the 13 cases. A double hermeneutic facilitated an interpretation of the participants' narratives.

For Smith et al. (2009) and Smith (2008) there are two criteria for classifying a recurring theme across cases as a valid superordinate theme. The first validity measure of recurrence is

how the status of recurrence is defined. So, for example, a decision may be made that for an emergent or superordinate theme to be classified it must be present in a third or a half or, most strikingly, in all participant interviews. Counting like this can be considered one way to enhance the validity of the findings of a large corpus (Smith et al., 2009). Additionally, Smith et al. (2009) contended that for recurrent themes "Other factors, including the richness of particular passages that highlight the themes and how the theme helps illuminate other aspects of the account are also taken into account" (p. 75)

The criterion for establishing the validity of a recurring superordinate theme was that the theme was present in 60% of the 13 cases, as well as the importance of the theme in the overall interpretation. All four themes and sub-themes reached the 60-percentile level.

Irene's account clearly shows the suddenness and unexpected nature of the negative event that she experienced, along with insight about her emotional state at the time of the incident. She evidences a wide range of speculative questioning about her teacher's motivation and blame for the incident. Irene's description of her anger is both evocative and insightful. She has a clear idea of why her initial response was subdued by her shyness and not wanting to appear boastful in front of her peers. Irene and her friends were proactive and dignified in response to their teacher's unfair actions; setting a goal to win the House cup and achieving that by the end of the following school term.

Irene's account of the unfairness highlighted the four themes to emerge from my interpretation of her story. The first centred on the questioning of why the negative event took place, which in turn gave rise to the second one, where it was deemed to be unfair as a result of finding a breach of a fairness standard and someone to blame, or be held to be accountable. While Irene's emotional response is nuanced with anger and disappointment, it

is the overwhelmingly intense emotion which is the core of the third theme. The final theme is characterised by Irene's initial subdued reaction to her teacher's action, rather than her group's proactive and competitive action of setting themselves a goal to win the House cup and achieving it by the end of the following term.

Superordinate theme and sub themes

Theme one: Why did she do that to me? "Give me a reason" (Willow, 1:109).

This theme has two main components relating to early adolescents' experience of an unfair event—a significant negative event and a subsequent search for some meaning in the event.

Sub Theme One: Stressors, Tina called a "fucken bitch" (Tina, 10: 64)

The events (See Table, 5.5, p. 209) experienced by the participants were, on the whole, substantial negative events with a deep impact. All 13 cases involved a sudden, unexpected event, resulting in a significant change of emotional state. Several the participants reported being in a positive emotional state before the unfair event which resulted in a change to a distressed negative emotional state. Herbi was fervent about her rugby playing, "like I love playing rugby" (Herbi, 4:154); while Chair reported that as a result of achieving her highest ever marks "I was feeling happy cause I'd never got that high in a test before" (Chair, 6:116). As a result, Chair was in a positive mood and looking forward to telling her mother of her success.

Table 5.5 Emergent case studies contributing to the superordinate theme of Stressors

Stressors

- "She's like always growling me and blaming things on me for no reason" (Willow, 1:6).

- "oh the ball kept on going and Mr. X. told us to go somewhere else like on the courts" (Chair, 3:16).

- "and then when it came to picking the teams both teams picked me last – like the last team picked last (Herbi, 4:101).

- "first she marked it correct – and then later on she marked it incorrect" (Chair, 5:06).

- "The teachers are not allowed to take stuff off from students unless it's theirs" (The Rock, 6:52).

- "I was just waiting out on the field for everybody and they were like all swearing at me" (Snoop, 7:26).

- "Someone stole my bike and I thought that was unfair" (Hemi, 8:1).

- "And um well me and this other girl we told our teacher that um this girl didn't bring the red colouring" (Charlie, 9:15).

- "Being bullied" (Tina, 10:1) by being called "Rude names" (Tina, 10:26).

- "no-one really let me. And I felt like really disappointed in everyone" (Nat, 11:1).

- "she called me names" (Paris, 12:18).

- "Then my house got to bat only once" (Irene, 13:2).

Early adolescence is a time of significant physical, emotional, and social changes. In addition, adolescents often struggle to find strategies that can help them to work through the challenges associated with these negative events. Often it is the first time that the events may have been experienced. Nate's experience of theft would have been significant, as this community is a poor one where possessions have a special scarcity value. For Rock, losing his

special orange coloured pen, when it was snatched by his teacher, could be a new experience for him. As pubertal and menarche changes take place, both Paris Hilton and Paris experienced areas of difficulty following changes to the body morphology (for instance the abusive term "gorilla") and physiological functioning ("period smell"). The negativity and intensity of peer relationships is seen in Tina's experience of being called a "fucken bitch". Relationships with teachers can change too, with the warmer experiences of primary school being replaced by ones that can be strained, as relayed by Willow who experienced a new intensity of being picked on by her teacher, and Chair who experienced marked changes of teacher behaviour in different contexts. Finally, this Decile One school community can be described as a sport mad community. Thus, while these adolescents are experiencing social and morphological changes, they are developing more sophisticated sports skills, greater knowledge of games' rules, strategies, and roles, along with increased competitiveness.

Subtheme two: A search for meaning

All 13 case studies showed significantly strong evidence of a search for meaning for the causes, or the reason, why a negative event had taken place. This questioning was characterised by three different groups of participants: not currently knowing what caused the event; evidence of active searching via the presence of counterfactuals; and, presenting a defined hypothesis as the basis of a search for meaning.

In the first group, while the participants labelled an event as unfair, they were puzzled by the absence of an obvious cause for the unfairness. For example, Willow asked directly for a reason as to why she was being picked on by a teacher, "Give me a reason" (Willow, 1:109). Tina said that a group had "no reason" (10:38) for calling her rude names. While Snoop initially indicted "I don't really know" (7:168), he was able to present a hypothesis for the cause of the

unfairness "they were getting smart cause I am the only white person in the class" (Snoop, 7:116).

In the second group, the presence of counterfactuals within the reasoning of Rock and Chair are features of active searching for meaning in their unfair events. A counterfactual is defined by VandenBos (2007) as "imagining ways in which events in one's life might have turned out differentially" (p. 238) and are an important feature of Folgers Fairness Theory (2001). Rock, seeking answers for why his pen had been taken by his teacher, speculated on an alternative, fairer, scenario "… oh I thought she would like take all our pens out and have them checked" (Rock, 6:99). When Chair had her maths mark changed, she projected two counterfactuals, as part of her search for meaning, "… I was wondering if she could like understand the question herself" (Chair, 5:61) and "like her calculator isn't working correctly" (Chair, 5:63). The presence of counterfactuals is clear evidence of participants searching for alternate explanations by the consideration of various courses of action related to the cause of unfair events.

In the third group, four participants were able to present definite alternative hypotheses for the cause of the negative incident that they had experienced. In a difference of opinion as to where the blame lies for not bringing a piece of equipment for a science experiment, Charlie said that "it "should've been equal" (Charlie, 9:75). When her teacher gave an extra batting turn to the opposing team, Irene speculated that "I think she was being too competitive" (Irene, 13:156). When Nate did not get chosen by his friend to be in his group he labelled it as unfair, "Oh you know its unfair cause like you know he didn't like actually choose me like he was supposed to" (Nate, 11:65).

In summary, all 13 participants showed evidence of experiencing both a negative event and an associated questioning as part of a search for meaning of their negative event. This is a theme with strong validity as all participants show clear features of questioning the origins of the unfairness they had experienced. Their questioning falls into three groups. Firstly, being puzzled as to why anyone would do something to them when, in their opinion, they had done nothing to the offender. Secondly, questioning via counterfactuals, where the participants ran through alternative scenarios of what could be or ought to be. The third group appeared to have a definite hypothesis that they were pursuing in their search for the meaning of the negative event.

Theme Two: "She treats me unfairly" (Willow, 1:89)

Across the 13 case studies, a recurring theme of "It's not fair" was revealed. This theme has two sub-themes relating to a breach of a standard of fairness and an assignment of blame for that breach.

Theme two: Subtheme one: What is and what ought to be. "We're allowed to play on the field – it's not his field" (Chris, 3:60).

All cases reported a breach involving the utterance of 'it's not fair' in one form or another (See examples in Table 5.4, p. 216). The standards of fairness violated relate to accepted rules concerning possessions, sport rules and how, within this cohort, other people treat you. Again, I will not discuss all instances; rather, I will focus on three cases.

Table 5.6 Emergent case studies contributing to the superordinate theme of "is" "ought"

Emergent case studies contributing to the superordinate theme of 'is' 'ought'

Distributive rule

- "The teachers are not *allowed to take stuff off from students* unless it's theirs" (Rock, 6:52).

- "Someone *stole my bike* and I thought that was unfair" (Hemi, 8:1).

Procedural rule

- "and then my house *got to bat only once* so of course we lost because we didn't get as much turns as th*e other house so that* wasn't fair" (Paris, 14:2).

- "Oh, we were like – um – oh yeah we were saying it's not even fair because we're allowed to play on the field – *it's not his* field (Chris, 3:60).

Interactional rule

Teacher

- "That she *treats me unfairly to other* kids" (Willow, 1:89).

- "like *reliable cause I know that they wouldn't* do that" (5:170).

- It should've been equal" (9:X) ... "I thought that it was unfair because me and my friend got the blame for it but it was actually that girl's fault" (Charlie, 9:20).

Peers

- "they're meant to be there for one another and not back stabbing each other" (Name, 4:212).

- "Ah they could just like be nice to me – just to stop bullying me – stop hitting me (Snoop, 7:132).

- "kind" (Tina, 10:124).

- "he was supposed to have like choosed me cause we were all friends" (Nat. 11:64).

- You should be treated like - like I was being a friend" (12:163), with "Kindness – respect" (Paris, 12:165).

The stealing of possessions is the focus of the unfairness for Hemi and Rock. In response to a teacher grabbing his pen, Rock had this to say on the standard by which he had

judged his teacher's action to be unfair, "The teachers are not allowed to take stuff off from students unless it's theirs" (Rock, 6:52). In his statement Rock has a clear idea, or belief, about the boundaries between teacher and student possession and ownership and evaluates the teacher's action as that ought not to have taken place. When someone unknown took Hemi's bike, his response was "Someone stole my bike and I thought that was unfair" (Hemi, 8:1). For Hemi stealing is a violation of his thoughts on ownership; it should not take place, especially as it was a present.

The breach of a fairness standard in relation to sport was the focus of three cases. Paris was involved in Friday afternoon sport when: "…my house got to bat only once so of course we lost because we didn't get as much turns as the other house so that wasn't fair…" (Paris, 14:2). This violation of the equality rule is a breach of the 20/20 cricket rules and was evaluated by Paris as an unfair situation. When a girl in a group of three did not bring food colouring for a science project and the group got the blame from their teacher, Charlie "decided that it should've been equal … I thought that it was unfair because me and my friend got the blame for it, but it was that girl's fault" (Charlie, 9:20). For Charlie, the belief that individual blame, rather than collective blame, was appropriate for the girl not bringing her share of the science resources was at variance with teacher assigning group blame. Finally, Chris was sent off the field by the coach when several balls intruded into the match the coach was refereeing. He responded, "Oh we were like … oh yeah we were saying it's not even fair because we're allowed to play on the field – it's not his field (Chris, 3:60). Chris clearly believed that being allowed to play on part of the field, after school, was allowed, and he evaluated that teacher's action in sending them off the whole field as unfair. Consequently, all three cases involved a

212

breach of formally or informally understood rules of proceeding with activities where the participants deemed the standard to have been breached or labelled "not fair".

The final standard involves seven cases of breaches involving inter-personal relationships, two with adults and five with peers. Chair's experience revolved around her teachers' action when, "… she marked it uncorrect but first she marked it correct – and then later on she marked it uncorrect" (Chair, 5:06). For Chair this behaviour offended her view of what made a good teacher, "… because if they don't have that reliability they probably shouldn't be like – they shouldn't be a teacher because teachers need to be like reliable" (Chair, 5:171). Chair has evaluated her teacher's action as being unreliable and violating her ideas about how a good teacher should be reliable. Willow has faced a pattern of being picked on by her teacher, that has been both long term and frequent which she experiences as "… she treats me unfairly to other kids" (Willow, 1:89). Willow regards her teacher's long term behaviour of picking on her in a disproportionate manner as unfair. Snoop indicated that the cause of his reported incident of unfairness was due to racism when his classmates were, "… calling me fathead and then they were getting smart cause like I'm the only white person in the class." (Snoop, 7:116). By assigning the term racism to the behaviour to which he was being subjected, Snoop evaluated the treatment he was receiving as unfair. Tina said that she was verbally "Being bullied" (Tina, 10:1) by being called "Rude names" (Tina, 10:26). Being bullied and called rude names was at variance with Tina's idea that peers ought to treat one another in a "Kind" (Tina, 10:124) manner.

This theme represents a wide range of beliefs about the appropriate manner in which to behave toward possessions, sport, and interpersonal relationships between peers and staff. What holds the superordinate subtheme together is when behaviours are evaluated as not

213

being what ought to be. The beliefs about what *is* are clearly connected to what participants

evaluate as they *ought* to have. This evaluation is at the core of this superordinate subtheme.

The is/ought evaluation has a long history of being addressed in the literature. What is missing

here is detail about the actual mechanism at the core of this evaluation.

Theme Two: Subtheme Two, Assigning blame. "She blames everything on me"

(Willow, 1.85).

This second sub-theme of "It's not fair" presents three examples of the assigning

blame (See Table 5.7, p. 217-218) process from Willow, Chris, and Herbi. The examples

indicate assigning blame as a process involving personal responsibility, controllability and

intent, and a lack of excuse for their action. According to Willow, her teacher is the cause of

the unfairness when "she blames everything on me" (Willow, 1:85) and she holds her teacher

to be personally responsible, "Like when I'm at school she's like – I'm like the target – and

she's like – if she gets angry – she blames everything on me" (Willow, 1.85). The controllability

of the teacher's actions is evidenced when the context changes and other adults are present:

"if Mr [name] or Miss [name] is in class she's like all kind" (Willow, 1:85) and her behaviour

toward Willow changes. Finally, Willow says that "She does it on purpose. No excuses"

(Willow, 1:97). Willow is clear that her teacher could control her actions, did it on purpose, or

had intent and that there was a lack of justification present when she declared "No excuses"

(Willow, 1: 34).

Table 5.7 Emergent case studies contributing to the superordinate theme of blame

An attribution of blame
• "Like when I'm at school she's like-I'm the board and she's like-if she gets angry, she blames everything on me" (Willow, 1:85). "She does it on purpose" (Willow, 1:97).

- Blame "Mr …" (3:78), "Oh um so it doesn't interrupt his game" (Chris, 3:90).

- "I think it was Emmeline because she was the one that asked me why I was captain" (Herbi 4:186).

- "I think she did it because it was the way she said it to me" (Herbi, 4:196) … "Like she sounded really demanding and serious – like why are you captain – like in that voice, so I knew she was saying it on purpose" (Herbi, 4:198). No excuse for Emmeline's actions. "Hum no, she didn't" (Herbi, 4:186).

- Um so you think she gets the blame 100% for that? "Yeah" (Chair, 5:156). "Yeah she did it on purpose" (Chair, 5:150). No excuse for her teacher's action. "I don't think so" (Chair, 5:154).

- "So, do you think she was to blame for that" (Rock, 6:176) … "Yes" (Rock, 6:177). Rock allowed that there was a possible excuse "Oh she thought she – oh she thought that she left it somewhere" (6:179) and "thinking that you had stolen the pen" (6:182). Which, "Um kind of excuses her" (6:185). Rock concedes that it only excuses her a little by laughing "Kind of – but not too much otherwise your anger would have been down wouldn't it? (Rock, 6:186). "[Laughs]" (Rock, 6:187). "Well cause that was the first time a teacher took stuff off me" (Rock, 6:193).

- The blame was attributed to the whole class group of 27. Snoop indicated that they did it on purpose, intended to do it, and that there was no excuse for the experience "Yeah" (Snoop, 7: 164, 166: and 215).

- The two boys were blamed by Hemi because they intended to do it, did it on purpose. "Ah I think" (Hemi, 8:132), and had no excuses for their action in stealing his bike. (Hemi, 8: 80).

- From Charlie's perspective the girl had no excuses for not bringing the experimental requirements and about her intentionality, "I don't know" (Charlie 9:108) "Until that girl brang food colouring and then she stopped nagging us" (Charlie, 9:37). Thus, intent is implied in the ongoing nagging and she also had no excuses for her decisions.

- …. had intended to do the bullying "Yes" (Tina, 10:168). "I think – I think" (Tina, 10:166) and there was no excuse for verbally abusing Tina "Trying to make trouble" (Tina, 10:170).

- Nat focused on Mr. Y, "Probably the one person" (Nat, 11:41). In addition, there was no excuse.

- According to Paris, Michelle is responsible for the unfairness, "Yes." (Paris, 12:178). Michelle has to take most of the blame because she treats a lot of people this way. "Most…" (Paris, 12:187), of the bullying herself and is therefore held by Paris to be doing it intentionally, "Paris' is shaking her head in agreement" (Paris, 12:180). Paris indicates that there are no excuses for what Michelle did to her "Paris' is shaking her head in agreement" (Paris, 12:180).

- Irene held the teacher responsible, "Yeah" (13:150), no excuses for her action, "Not that I know of" (Irene, 13:152). Irene she did it intentionally, "probably" (Irene, 13:154).

In selecting the incident, he relayed as unfair, Chris clearly had an idea that a violation of entitlement had taken place "when he was sent off the field" (Chris 2:19). When Mr X sent the boys off the field, Chris blamed Mr. X: "They kick it by accident–then it goes onto their field" (Chris, 3:80) ... "Oh … so it doesn't interrupt his game" (Chris, 3:90). For Chris, there was a lack of justification in Mr X's action as "our field was big enough to share" (Chris, 3:92).

Finally there was no justification, "Oh yeah" (Chris, 3:94) … "Oh … so it doesn't interrupt his game" (3:90) and that he had intended to do it "I'm not sure. Yeah, he did" (Chris, 3:96).

When neither team picked her, to be in their team, Herbi signposted her reaction as, "I was like oh this is pretty unfair" (Herbi, 4:101). It was a violation of her expectation about friendship. One of her friends was held to be personally responsible, "I think it was Emmeline because she was the one that asked me why was I captain" (Herbi, 4:187) … "I think she was cause she got more girls involved" (Herbi, 4:191). Herbi said that she intended to do it.

Table 5.8 Emergent case studies contributing to the superordinate theme of intense emotion'

Intense emotion
External   • "Oh quite angry" (Chris, 3:22). Felt like a fighter who "get beaten up and they feel angry" (Chris, 3:32). "I just want to get violent sometimes" (Chris 4:127) "and then I got confused as well as I was getting angry" (Chris 4:150).   • "Oh strong" (Rock, 6:46).   • "Oh like um I was going to blow" (Snoop, 7:48).   ***Shifting emotional focus: External to internal focus***   • "I was really angry like I could just run the whole field and like don't stop" (Irene 13: 110).   • "Um it kind of changed into disappointment/jealous when the house shield was announced that they had won and how they won" (Irene, 13:60).   ***Internal focus***   • "I felt frustrated – me and my friend felt frustrated cause the teacher took it out on us" (Charlie, 9:22).   • "Bit sad" (Tina, 10:52) making her "Feeling small" (Tina, 10:56). She felt uncomfortable about the possibility of telling the offenders how she felt, as well as being a little "Worried" (Tina, 10:216) that Miss X might do the bullying again.   • "Embarrassment" (Paris: 12:44) "sad like nobody like me" (Paris, 12:48). "And I was all alone" (Paris, 12:50). "It was mixed up together" (Paris, 64).   ***Shifting emotional focus: Internal to external focus***   • "Um shameful because on that day she said I got all correct and then like also disappointment when I found out that I didn't when I did" (Chair, 5:40); "quite embarrassed and confused" (5:18), disappointment, confusion, "mainly confusion" (5:25) and anger. "A little bit" (Chair, 5:98).

- "I felt unhappy and angry" (Snoop, 7:15). "It came in at the same time" (Snoop, 7:29). "It was just really strong cause I was just sitting outside and I was bawling my eyes out" (Snoop, 7:23). (Of perpetrators) "No just a bit scared" (Snoop, 7:17).
- "I had a sad feeling that someone stole my bike" (Hemi, 8:40). Anger "the person who took it" (Hemi, 8:62). "It felt like I was going to rip apart" (Hemi, 8:70).
- Wanting to cry followed as an expression of Herbi's sadness, "I felt left out" (Herbi 3:144). Sadness wasn't as strong as the expression of her anger, never-the-less "It was really bad cause it wanted me to – it made me feel like I really wanted to cry [yeah] and I don't really cry much so that made it even worse" (Herbi, 4:132). As, "I think she did because it was the way she said it to me" (Herbi, 4:197) and there was a lack of justification "… no she didn't" (Herbi, 4:195).
- Sad "only a little" (Willow, 1:18) sad "Because I just like had to get used to it-and now I just have to get used to it" (Willow, 1:24). Anger as "very strong" (1:123) being much stronger than that of sadness.

In summary, the second theme of 'It's not fair' consists of two sub-themes involving the violation of standard of fairness and a search for a perpetrator. The violated fairness standard consists of stealing, rule breaking, and expectations about respect.

Theme Three: Intense emotion. "I just want to get violent sometimes" (Chris 4:127).

The third theme relates to an emotional response following a judgement of unfairness (See Table 5.8, p. 219-220). Such a robust response meets Smith et al., (2009) validity requirements. While the affective response to the judgement of unfairness is essentially a negative distress response in the form of anger or sadness, it is nuanced and has four threads: 1) anger directed externally, 2) a shift of focus from external anger to an internal negative emotional state, 3) internally self-focused, and 4) internally to externally directed, negative emotion. While the focus of the emotion may shift, what is consistent in this theme is the high intensity of emotional distress following a judgement of unfairness.

Four of the participants reported anger at a high intensity when it was externally directed. In addition, the presence of secondary factors appears to compound their externally directed anger, in Chris' case confusion and in Rock's case sensitivity to the presence of an audience. Chris reported feeling "quite angry" (Chris, 3:22) … "I just want to get violent

218

sometimes" (Chris 4:127). "… and then I got confused as well as I was getting angry" (Chris 4:150). He felt like a fighter who "get beaten up and they feel angry" (Chris, 3:32). Chris was dealing with being sent off the field when his understanding was that he and his friends could have access to, and share, the field after school. Herbi got angry when she did not get picked for one of the teams and she felt that the rule "friends don't do that to one another" (Herbi, 4:210) had been broken. Anger was Herbi's strongest emotional response "I just want to get violent sometimes" (Herbi, 4:127). This response was experienced in her head and fists and "sometimes my legs if I want to kick" (Herbi, 4:130). When Rock had his pen stolen by his teacher he indicated that she had broken a norm understood by him as, "teachers are not allowed to take stuff from students unless it's theirs" (Rock, 6:52). Anger was very much to the fore for Rock and at a very high level "strong" (Rock, 6:77). Rock described this as, "Oh like … I was going to blow" (Rock, 6:69). Rock's anger was compounded by his sensitivity, "Oh … I sometimes do that when people stare at me getting into trouble" (Rock, 6:81) … "I'd be in class and … people tease me" (Rock, 6:89).

In a second thread, Irene showed the transition from internal to external, reporting that "we were playing non-stop cricket and um the opposition got to bat twice - and then my house got to bat only once so of course we lost because we didn't get as much turns as the other house so that wasn't fair" (Irene, 13:2). Irene felt her anger as "I was really angry like I could just run the whole field and like don't stop, but like it was just so unfair that I couldn't even do anything" (Irene, 13:30). Her anger evolved, "Um it kind of changed into disappointment/jealous when the house shield was announced that they had won and how they won" (Irene, 13:60). This story shows the transition from pure adrenaline as response, to disappointment.

In the third thread, where the intense emotion is internally focused, Paris Hilton was verbally bullied by reference to her menstrual hygiene management. For Paris Hilton, the rule broken by the offender was "You should be treated like - like I was being a friend" (Paris Hilton, 12:163), with "Kindness – respect" (Paris Hilton, 12:165). Paris Hilton reported the two emotional responses of embarrassment and sadness. Her embarrassment was associated with "like nobody like me" (Paris Hilton, 12:48) "And I was all alone" (12:50). While feeling sad was stronger than the embarrassment, both appear to have been "mixed up together" (Paris Hilton, 12:64) which she experienced as a strong, "… stomachache" (Paris Hilton, 12:68). Tina, the second participant in this skein, felt sad which she described as, "Big sad" (Tina, 10:52) making her "Feeling small" (Tina, 10:56), which she felt "In my heart" (Tina, 10:62). This reaction was in response to verbal bullying and being called a 'fucken bitch', which violated a rule that is especially important to Tina; that is, one should be treated "kind" (Tina, 10:124).

The unhappiness experienced by Snoop was in reaction to name calling and was accompanied by the physiological response of crying which Snoop describes as being felt strongly in his heart, "I felt unhappy cause I just don't like people calling me names" (7:13). "It was just really strong, because I was just sitting outside and I was bawling my eyes out" (Snoop, 7:23). His anger, directed at the offenders, was felt "Just in my heart" (Snoop, 7:38). Chair experienced shame "quite embarrassed and confused" (Chair, 5:18), "mainly confusion" (Chair, 5:25), disappointment, and anger. Chair's initial maths mark was the highest that she had achieved in a test, which left her feeling very happy, in the expectation that she would be able to tell her mother. Following her remark, she felt "… shameful because on that day she said I got all correct and then like also disappointment when I found out that I didn't when I did" (Chair, 5:40). Anger followed at an extremely high level, "… quite strong" (Chair, 5:31) as

Chair dealt with the changed mark in front of her peers. As she searched through the possible explanations, she came to the conclusion that her teacher had lied to her, and her anger was directed at her teacher as the perpetrator.

Table 5.9 Seeking social support

Seeking Social Support

From adults

- "Like – just like tell me to stay in" (Willow, 1:56).

  "I told my Mum that they were getting smart and hitting me and I told her what I did" (Snoop, 7:76). "She didn't know –she just called the school and just tell them what happened" (Snoop, 7:82).

- "Yeah I told the deputy principal" (Hemi, 8:74).

- "Um told my Mum" (Hemi, 8:80).

- Told "Teacher" (Tina, 10:72).

From peers and siblings

- "And my brother" (Hemi, 8:82).

- "Oh I talked to my friend yeah" (Charlie 9:50).

- "I told her both (*Narrative and feeling -sic*) and then she just said 'just take it and accept it *and yeah"* (Charlie, 9:56). The result was that in response to her friend's stoical advice, Charlie said, "*That helped* me to calm down and like yeah" (Charlie, 9:62). "*Yeah it became yeah finish*ed" (Charlie, 9:64).

- As a coping strategy Tina told her older sister relaying the narrative and emotive content of her reaction.

- "just stopped hanging out with [Mr. Y] – started hanging out with my um other friend [name]" (Nate, 11:137).

- "Um to go fight with her" (Paris, 12:122), but Paris said "I don't not like hitting people".

- Spoke to her friends, who were largely in her house team, complaining about how she felt about the unfairness and they "co-operated" (Irene, 13:86). They then set a goal to win the shield which they did the following term, "so that got us really, really excited" (Irene, 13:94).

I had a sad feeling that someone stole my bike", reported Hemi (8:40). Initially Hemi said he had a "kind of sadness" (Hemi, 8:44) along with a bit of anger. Further into the interview Hemi was still somewhat ambivalent: "… I don't know I just – (Hemi, 8:40). Hemi indicated that there was only a bit of sadness which was experienced in his chest. A couple of minutes later he indicated that anger came in which was directed outwards towards "the person who took it" (Hemi, 8:62). Hemi's anger, experienced in his chest, was very strong and associated with an embedded cognition, relayed as, "It felt like I was going to rip apart" (Hemi, 8:70). Wanting to cry, followed as an expression of Herbi's sadness at her peers "talking about me and everything and mocking my like appearance and everything" (Herbi, 4:140) so, "I felt left out" (Herbi, 4:144). For Herbi, friends usually provide support but, "Yeah friends don't do that to one another" (Herbi, 4:210). She indicated that the sadness was not as strong as the expression of her anger; nevertheless, "It was really bad cause it wanted me to – it made me feel like I really wanted to cry [yeah] and I don't really cry much so that made it even worse" (Herbi, 4:132).

Finally, Willow, who had been unfairly picked on by a teacher over several issues, swore back at her "Like bad words" (Willow, 1:34). Willow reported "only a little" (Willow, 1:18) sadness felt in her head, "Because I just like had to get used to it and now, I just have to get used to it" (Willow, 1:24). She described her anger as "very strong" (Willow, 1:123), much stronger than that of her sadness response. As we witness the transition of her emotional response to an external one, Willow described her anger as being felt "physical" (Willow, 1:128) and "everywhere" (Willow, 1:125) in her body.

Theme Four: Managing intense emotion, "That helped me to calm" (Charlie, 9:62).

Theme four focuses on all of the managing strategies as consequences of a judgement of unfairness. The main reactions to a judgement of unfairness involve psychological withdrawal from the source of the unfairness, seeking support from peers and adults to cope with the effects of the emotion, and restorative actions which either attempt to restore the behaviours or communications to pre-negative event status, seeking more information or seeking an apology with effect of gaining some restitution via the acknowledgment of guilt for the event deemed unfair.

Theme Four: Subtheme One, Disengagement, "No I just walked off and sat down there" (Snoop, 7.5)

Problem avoidance or psychological withdrawal was identified as an initial reaction to a judgement of unfairness. This theme is present in 9 out of 13 cases (69%); thus, meeting the criteria of 60% for acceptance of the validity for a theme. This theme has two main features: physical withdrawal and psychological withdrawal.

The following two narratives are characterised by physical withdrawal from the scene of the unfairness. Rock and Paris Hilton withdrew to deal with their emotional states. In Rock's

case he withdrew himself from the classroom, "like … you can walk out like cause I am always angry and I just walk off to cool off" (Rock, 6:85). Paris, when she was verbally bullied, "moved away and started crying" (Paris Hilton, 12:76).

The next three participants indicated a more general, unspecified withdrawal from the scene of the unfair incident. When confronted by racist bullying Snoop decided "no I just walked off and sat down there" (Snoop, 7:50). Nate "started hanging out with my … other friend" (Paris Hilton, 11:137). When her friend did not choose her to be in his group, in reaction to being called a gorilla, by a boy, Paris removed herself from the library and "walked into the ICT lab" (Paris 2:47).

The second feature of this theme is embodied by a change of mental state involving psychological distancing, in reaction to confronting unfairness. Three participants withdrew communication from those around them. When she got selected last for a team Herbi "stopped talking to them for a while" (Herbi, 4:158). Chair had her maths mark changed by her teacher and "didn't want to talk to anybody" (Herbi, 4:158). "It really got me quiet for a while" was Irene's (13: 60) reaction to the unfairness of her teacher not giving equal turns at batting in 20/20 cricket. In a variant form of distancing, Charlie "took the blame" (Charlie, 9:46), to short cut the consequences for her group not having the required gear.

Theme Four 4: Subtheme two, Engagement, "Help me" (Snoop, 7:199)

In managing the unfair evening, participants sought social support (See Table 5.9, p. 223) from adults, and to a greater extent from their peers and siblings, in order to give voice to their concerns. Snoop stated, "I told my Mum that they were getting smart and hitting me and I told her what I did" (Snoop, 7:76). In reaction his mother, "She didn't know –she just called the school and just tell them what happened" (Snoop, 7:82). The school principal and

class teacher followed up by talking to Snoop. Snoop's evaluation of telling his mother about the bullying was as follows, "Well by just telling my Mum cause, she like, she could help me out of it" (Snoop, 7:199). Following his bike getting stolen, Hemi "told my Mum" (Hemi, 8:80) and "Yeah I told the deputy principal" (Hemi, 8:74). Tina "Told Teacher" (Tina, 10:72) as a way of seeking social support to deal with verbal bullying.

In addition to telling adults, Hemi told his brother about having his bike stolen "And my brother" (Hemi, 8:82). In terms of dealing with the unfairness, Charlie said "Oh I talked to my friend yeah" (Charlie, 9:50). "I told her both (*Narrative and feeling -sic*) and then she just said "just take it and accept it" (Charlie, 9:56). The result was that in response to her friend's stoical advice Charlie said, "That helped me to calm down and like yeah" (Charlie, 9:62). Therefore, "Yeah it became yeah finished" (Charlie, 9:64). As a coping strategy, Tina told her older sister relaying the narrative and emotive content of her reaction "Yes" (10:196). When abandoned by his old friend, Nate "just stopped hanging out with [Mr. Y] – started hanging out with my um other friend…" (Nate, 11:137). As a coping strategy, Paris Hilton went to play with, and gain the support of, one friend who advised her not to let Michelle bully her. This effectively involved a suggestion, for Paris "… to go fight with her" (Paris Hilton 2:122), but Paris said, "I don't like hitting people" (Paris Hilton, 12:130). She was also feared Michelle hitting her. Paris reported that withdrawing to seek support from a friend is a coping strategy that works for her.

Theme four: Subtheme Three, Engagement, Fix it up, "Say sorry" (Tina, 10:104).

Four strategies were noted in the narratives as having the effect of restoring, at least, to some degree, the harmony that existed before the negative event was judged to be unfair. These strategies are: focus on stopping the occurrence of the behaviour, actions which

effectively restore the status quo, continuing search for meaning for the unfairness by obtaining further information, and seeking an apology which would have the effect of offering some 'compensation' for the unfairness.

The strongest strategy was to stop the occurrence of the behaviour associated with the unfairness, as exemplified by Paris, who, when mocked, said "To stop saying bad things to the girls" (Paris 2:69). Similarly, when the teacher stole his pen, Rock's opinion was that "… the teacher - my teacher wouldn't – oh my teacher shouldn't take my stuff". (Rock, 6:69). When he was bullied, Snoop indicated that "They should just stop it" (Snoop, 7:86) … "And like just be my friends and that" (Snoop, 7:86). For Willow, who was being picked on by a teacher, the preventative action focused on her teacher "Not to have said anything" (Willow, 1:63). All four of these actions would have effectively led to the cessation of the negative event associated with a judgment of unfairness.

The second strategy was to restore the status quo by either the return of an object, or a procedure or alternative strategy. In terms of restorative action all that Hemi initially wanted was "Mhm no just bring my bike back and it'll be fine" (Hemi, 8:104). However, two months later when he heard about the two taking his bike he thought, "… oh I can make them give me a game" (Hemi, 8:174). When asked about the possibility of restorative action, Irene replied with a more nuanced reply, "Ah they'd probably have to give both teams the fair amount of batting or like yeah both so that when it comes to the results, we could be like happy or disappointed, but it was a fair game" (Irene, 13:104). Asked about the possibility of restorative action, Chris indicated a couple of possible actions for the coach, either "By telling us to … not be around while he's teaching a team" (Chris, 3:62) or "he could let us play in his team instead of us playing by ourselves" (Chris, 3:66).

226

Other participants focused on taking the search for meaning for the unfairness into some explanation for the unfairness. In Chair's case, when her teacher changed her mark, "… since she still thinks that the answer was wrong, she could've like explained to me how it was wrong" (Chair, 5: 108). Herbi suggested,

Maybe confronted them and asked why they were talking about me – and telling them that it was not fair on me - that I did nothing wrong to them and ask why they were saying all that stuff about me and maybe we would have sorted it earlier. (Herbi, 4:182)

The final restorative strategy centred on offering an apology and the expression of regretful acknowledgements for the occurrence of the offense. Tina, who had been bullied by Miss X, would need an apology such as "Say sorry" (Tina, 10:104) for the unfairness to be rectified. In consideration of any restorative action required by Nate, Mr. Y would have to apologise "Actually oh you know I'm sorry" (Nate, 11:144).

Summary of the IPA interpretation, processes, and findings

IPA its orientation to an idiographic based interpretation, a phenomenology based on experience, and analysis in the form of the double hermeneutic, has enabled me to arrive at an understanding of a meaning for experienced unfairness. The findings are based on a robust analytical process which I consider giving the findings a significant degree of veracity.

My understandings of the robustness of the IPA interpretation

While the case study of Irene was designed to be a representative example of all 13 cases, in order to counter the sheer volume of material that an analysis of 13 case studies would generate, it primarily presents as an example of the robustness of the IPA processes. One can track Irene's contribution, via extracts, to interpretation throughout the entire process. This representative contribution moves through an initial IPA of her transcript based

on descriptive, linguistic, conceptual processes, into a summary of emergent themes, presented in a narrative format. The summary narrative format is a departure from a standard IPA, but innovation is encouraged by Smith et al. (2009). The narrative format was developed to achieve two goals. Writing the emergent themes into a narrative helped me understand the function of the themes in relation to the whole phenomena of Irene's experience. More importantly, it enabled me to present, to Irene, my understanding of her story and to check its veracity. Asking Irene to read 20 pages of her transcript, based on my initial attempts, and to verify its content would not have been in the best interest of our joint research. The follow up interview with the participants took place some two months after the initial interviews, in the participants' homes during the school holidays. Changes to the script were mainly focused on misunderstandings by the author of relatively minor details, or temporal sequences, rather than substantive detail. Finally, the reader can track Irene's idiographic contribution at the level of superordinate themes, via her emergent thematic contributions.

Part four: Integration of the interpretative findings

My interpretation of Irene's experience, and that of the 12 other participants, generated four themes based on several processes featured at the level of the sub-themes. These processes refer to: an awareness of a stressor; a threefold questioning process; a comparison between what the participants experienced and what the participants believed they had a right to expect or receive from others; an agentic process involving responsibility; an intense, embodied, emotional distress; and methods of mitigating that distress involving engagement and disengagement strategies.

The first process involved the participant perceiving the presence of a stressor, which appeared to initiate a search process with the aim of understanding what was going on. This

second process was characterised by three different types of questioning involving asking why, an active searching for viable explanations via the presence of counterfactuals and presenting a definite hypothesis as the basis of a search for meaning. The third process related to thoughts about behaviour related to possessions, sport, and interpersonal relationships that participants were subjected to, along with an evaluation about what they ought to be receiving. This referred to a comparison between what *is* happening to them with what they *ought* to have experienced.

The fourth process related to the assigning of blame for an experience of unfairness. In all reported cases the offender was the blameworthy person. This process presents as involving agentic elements relating to personal responsibility, controllability, and intent, along with a lack of excuse for their actions. No additional agents were held to be culpable, other than the reported offender. The fifth process, interpreted from the participants' narratives, recounted responses to an evaluation of a breach of a perceived entitlement in the form of emotional distress. The reported distress responses are scaffolded on a morphology encompassing anger, anger moving to sadness, sadness moving to an expression of anger directed at the offender, and sadness. The intensity of the anger is apparent in the number of embedded emotional reactions reported, rather than just the cognitive reporting of an emotional response. How to manage the emotional distress resulting from the evaluations of the behaviour that participants reported is the focus of the sixth and seventh processes. Two related processes appeared to be in play, one associated with engagement in order to do something effective about the level of distress, and the other disengagement which involved mitigation by getting away from the distress. These processes gave rise to the four themes: *Why did she do that to me? It is not fair! Intense emotion and Managing intense emotion.*

These processes are summarised in Figure 8.1 A Heuristic Model for Unfairness (See page, 275)

Chapter summary

The thematic analysis of the diversity data can report on two features not seen in IPA, in the form of the range of stressors and character unfairness. However, IPA can uniquely report some processes which were apparent in the experienced unfairness of participant researchers. These processes form the four reported superordinate themes and the overarching theme of, *it's not fair!*

Chapter 6 will integrate this present IPA analysis of the semi-structured interviews with the findings from Chapter 5 and a survey of the diversity of the phenomenon of an experience of unfairness, interpreted in Chapter 4. Findings in relation to the research methods, related back to the existing literature on unfairness, for this age group will also be discussed.

Chapter 6: Interpretations in relationship to the current literature

Introduction

The function of this Chapter is to draw together the interpreted findings from the qualitative survey of the diversity of unfairness, and those interpretations developed from the semi-structured interview data. This activity is undertaken to review this united phenomenon against both the experienced unfairness literature and broader literature contexts in order to situate my interpretations and knowledge claims.

These interpretations are presented as a discrete but coherent entity, representing my interpreted phenomenon of experience of unfairness. From the qualitative survey, I have drawn material relating to the diversity of experience of unfairness. Features which are a unique contribution from the thematic analysis of the qualitative survey include material relating to the broader range of stressors, 'characterological unfairness', and a full range of reactions in order to deal with emotional distress. From the IPA analysis of the participants' transcript data, there are contributions which are more related to processes, for example, a search for meaning for the cause of unfairness, and a comparison between what is and what ought to be, concerning standards of fairness.

Both sets of analyses present a similar interpretation when featuring the high degree of emotional distress and the unanimity of the blame. Consequently, there are both discrete aspects and overlaps in the interpretative findings, and they need to be situated in the existing research and knowledge to highlight the unique contribution of my interpretation of the phenomenon of experienced unfairness for early adolescents. In order to act on this task I need to be able to feature those sections of my findings which are consistent with the current literature and those which contradict it or question it.

This chapter represents an important step in establishing the veracity of my interpretive knowledge claims to an enriched understanding of the phenomenon of experienced unfairness. I plan to enhance this claim by integrating the survey data with that from the semi-structured interviews. Then I plan to seat these interpretive understands within the current literature at both a specific level and broader one

Part One: Integrated thematic findings, uniqueness and commonalities

This section presents the similarities and differences of my interpretations as an integrated set of interpretative findings. I position them primarily based on the 'deeper' superordinate themes from the IPA analysis, with supplementary material from the qualitative survey.

Unique to the IPA analysis are four Superordinate Themes and associated sub-themes. Super-ordinate theme One is named 'Why did she do that to me?' with an illustrative quote from Willow (1.109) featured as, 'Give me the reason.' This theme has two supporting sub-themes. Sub-theme one is named Stressors and is illustrated by a quote in which Tina is called a "fucken bitch." Sub-theme two is named 'A Search for Meaning' and is highlighted by this quote from Chair: "I was wondering if she could understand the question herself," (Chair, 5: 61).

Superordinate Theme Two is named as "She treats me unfairly," with an illustrating quote using the same words as the title (Willow, 1:89). This super-ordinate Theme has three related sub-themes. Sub-theme one is "What is and what ought to be," which is highlighted with a quote from Chris (3:60) "We are allowed to play on the field – it is not his field." The second sub-theme is Standards of fairness breached. The final sub-theme is "Assigning

Blame," which a quote from Willow expresses as "She blames me for everything" (Willow, 1:85).

Superordinate theme Three is 'Intense emotion' about which Chris (4:127) has this to say: "I just want to get violent sometimes." The last superordinate Theme is named 'Managing Emotion,' which Charlie (Charlie, 9:62) expresses as "That helped me to calm down." This final Superordinate Theme has three sub-themes. The first sub-theme is 'Disengagement' - Snoop: "No I just walked off and sat down" (Snoop, 7: 199). The second sub-theme is 'Engagement,' which Snoop (7:199) expresses as "Help me." The final sub-theme of Superordinate Theme four is named 'Engagement: Fix it up' and is illustrated by Tina's (10:104) comment "Say sorry."

The survey was designed to map the boundaries of the *divergence* of experienced unfairness and the interview analysis, and to contribute material to aid an understanding of the process of arriving at a meaning for lived unfairness. However, the survey did inform the direction of the interview protocol. From the survey came four distinct interpretive findings in the form of a broader range of stressors, a phenomenon of characterological unfairness and a fuller range of strategies for dealing with intense emotion than the IPA analysis from 13 cases could produce distinct features contributed to by the more in-depth richer interview text related to processes. These processes included a search for meaning, a comparison of is with ought, concerning a standard of fairness, emotional distress, and the engagement/disengagement process from distress. The commonalities from the two sources of analyses focus on the standards of fairness breached (except character unfairness), and distress, including the strands involved in feelings of emotional distress: anger, sadness, anger/sadness, and sadness/anger. The different strands of a judgement of unfairness are

united in the four Superordinate Themes. The next section will attempt to unravel the rope of unfairness to situate my findings within the literature.

Part Two: Situating the interpretations in the literature

Introduction

This section will place the four superordinate interpretive findings and their associated sub-themes, against the unfairness literature and broader literature, in terms of establishing their similarities, differences, and contradictions to these bodies of research and conceptual exploration. While I use the four Superordinate themes as organisational units, around which to take my position, these units can range from the level of coding categories, sub-themes theme to superordinate themes when comparing them to the literature.

Superordinate Theme One: Why did she do that to me?

Superordinate Theme One consists of an experience of encountering an event as a stressor, which in turn appears to promote a search for meaning. The recognition or the interpretation of cues, associated with the stressors prompts a search for meaning and the processes associated with the first Superordinate Theme. They constitute the sub-themes of stressors and a questioning process. Unfairness is only one of some possible explanations at this step of seeking meaning. Therefore, the presence of stressors and a questioning process is sufficient but not necessary to assign a meaning of unfairness to this phenomenon.

Sub-theme one: Stressors

This section deals with three issues concerning the current literature on unfairness with a focus on two clusters of empirical findings and one conceptual issue in the form of a developmental context. The fundamental phenomena of the stressors consist of six features which were identified in the earlier coding of the data from the qualitative survey, These

234

centre on social inter-relationships, sport rule violations, and issues with possessions. The particular stressors consist of peer to peer verbal abuse consisting of teasing, mocking, etc., issues over friendships, trying to get one another into trouble, gossiping and getting smart, peer to peer physical aggression, disputes over a sporting rule, arguments with a teacher over the teacher's actions with a student, taking others' possessions; being pushed out of a the possession of a place in a queue, and finally academic cheating.

The potential uniqueness of this finding is that for early adolescents', stressors triggering unfairness are focused on the quality of relationships between their peers and significant adults in their lives, along with environmental conditions and events. Thus, in this context unfairness presents as reflecting a unique socially constructed set of relationships between students and their peers and adults, mainly teachers, who play a role in their lives.

In contrast, unfairness for an earlier age group (Demetriou & Hooper, 2007) is centred on themes of: being made to do things and reactions to this "being pushed around", "made to do things", "missing out", "being left out", and "not getting your turn". These unfair incidents are developmentally what one may expect from this age group of middle childhood of 6 - 11 years (Canter for Disease Control, 2017), where there is more of a concern for physical resources, and a physicality associated with their social environment. The themes of these two studies reflect different contexts: one where the physicality of early childhood is a meta-theme of unfairness, and one of late childhood/early adolescence, where peer relationships are significant sources of unfairness. Both studies use a similar methodology, with a focus on open-ended reporting of any critical incident within the school environment, and they present a potential basis for the comparison of their stressors.

At an older age level, Israelishvili (1997) enquired of grade nine Israeli students about their experiences of unfairness. "Among the various experiences that evoked feelings of injustice, four are relatively more frequently named: "punishments," "mistreatment, or "ignorance from others," "unbalanced judgemental behaviour," and "disappointment with grading system" (Israelishvili, 1997, p. 3). These categories accounted for 53 % of students nominating one of these four categories for feelings of injustice. In Israelophilia's study, there is a focus on injustice as being partly nestled in a matrix of student-organisational relationships, with a focus on the academic and assessment procedures.

The variability of these results (Isrealashvili, 1997; Demetriou & Hooper, 2007) with age groups immediately above and below the age range of my research, and others with university studies (Mikula, 1993), may be attributable to a number of factors including cultural, chronological, and contextual methodologies utilised by enquirers. Additional factors have been noted as possible factors for the variable results. Cowen (1991 & 1994), for example, noted a lack of opportunity to develop either a sense of self-efficacy or empowerment, in these middle and high schools. The overall conclusion must be that approaches to unfairness/injustice based on building the definitive taxonomy for unfairness are salient, more for their variability, than their uniformity. This study contributes a set of event results representing the concerns of early adolescents, to be found in a multi-cultural, lower socio-income suburb of Aotearoa. Thus, the stressor sub-themes reflect a unique socio-cultural context.

The activities that my participants encountered in their narrative are similar to those indicated by Erickson & Erickson (1998). The challenges are three, where relating to peers has to be learned more formally with its own set of rules, in contrast to the free play of the earlier

developmental period. The participants also must master new sets of rules relating to formal sport, and more formally - structured school subjects, along with specialist teachers. As the students grapple with mastering these tasks, we see the consequences of some of their attempts at mastery, resulting in misinterpretations, some of which may result in unfairness.

In summary, the interpretative result from Superordinate Theme One lends support for a distinct, unique set of stressors associated with this intermediate age group. These stressors appear to be sudden and may be associated with a change of emotional state and engender a questioning process.

Sub-theme two, "Give me a reason" (Willow, 1: 109)

The finding for this sub-theme relates to a questioning process identified from the interviews rather than from the survey. All 13 participants commented on a sudden, unexpected event, which either caused, or was associated with, changes in thinking, emotions, and reactions, either in a linear or more complex relationship. The initial process of searching presents as a very open-ended process which, may or may not end in assigning a meaning of unfairness to a stressor.

The analysis from the interviews revealed the presence of questioning about what might have caused the unfairness. In focusing on the role of questioning as a search for meaning, other roles were considered for the questions before opting for the search for meaning. Among the alternative roles considered for the questioning process were the following: does the questioning indicate a lack of understanding on the part of participants, or a lack of a cause, or the inability to accommodate an experience into a new or existing scheme, and consequently one understands; and does it have an emotional, behavioural, or coping function. In considering the evidence at the level of a sub-theme, all of the 13 case

studies had a questioning process which was about a search for meaning, rather than supporting other functions.

The first type of questioning is best characterised as a puzzlement, the second as a process involving a review of potential scenarios (counterfactuals) which might have been the cause for the unfairness, and finally a pursuit of a particular hypothesis in the questioning processing by participants.

Only one of these three types of questioning, that of counterfactual reasoning, has been examined in the recent developmental literature. Counterfactual reasoning "involves a change in some features of the actual world in addition to those required by the truth of the antecedent of the counterfactual, while others are left unchanged" (Woodward, 2011, p. 21). Counterfactual reasoning is reported not to be fully developed until the age of 12, and as showing considerable variation in performance around 10 years old (Rafetseder et al. 2010; Rafetseder et al., 2013). In their Fairness Theory, which hypothesises fairness as accountability, Folger & Cropanzano (2001) view fairness as three modes of responsibility or accountability, namely conduct states of well-being, and principles. Their theory is based on widespread utilisation of counterfactual thinking in evaluating the Would, Could and Should of Fairness Theory. "Fairness theory identifies three counterfactual questions critical for holding another person accountable for a negative outcome: would, could, and should" (Nicklin et al., 2011, p. 128).

Questioning as a process is researched in the language arts arena, but not so well in the domain of social problem - solving. Besides, the role of a questioning process is dominated by the perspective of adults, especially in the role of a teacher in the classroom (e.g., Taboada & Guthrie, 2006). A paper titled "The remedial status of student questioning" (Dillon, 1998)

represents the author's/my perspective on the status of student-generated questioning. The author concludes that:

> most pupils, even in the early grades, have become masters at answering questions. Few students, even by the late-graduate school, have become more than a novice at asking questions. The remedial status of student questioning appears to be its normative state in the past, present and future schooling (Dillon, 1988, p. 208).

Dillon's work still applies to research on the role of self-generated questioning in social problem solving, by children and adolescents.

The research and theoretical contexts in which I am seating my findings have little to say about the role of self-generated questioning in social problem - solving, either directly or in interventions based on these theories. The work of Piaget (1932/1969) indicates that at the level of formal operations, adolescents are capable of abstract, combinative, hypothetical, and deductive thinking, albeit modified contextually and culturally. Although Piagetian research emphasises the role of social experience in adolescent development, it appears that the processing of that experience is conceptualised as an adaption, i.e., adaption is the process of adjusting schemes and experience to maintain equilibrium via accommodation and assimilation. However, the direct role of self-generated questioning does not appear to have been researched. Instead, the focus has been on the role of schemas within the social cognitive development domain.

Social Cognitive Information Processing (SCIP) theories and those of Crick and Dodge (1994, 1996), and Huesmann (1998) with a modification of Crick and Dodge's contribution, have a central role for memory search for scripts to gauge behaviour, especially concerning

aggression. Huesmann revised the Crick and Dodge (1994, 1996) SCIP as applied to aggressive behaviour as a four-step process of social problem solving: (1) evaluation of environmental cues, (2) searching for a script to guide behaviour, (3) evaluating the generated script, and (4) behaving according to the script (Dubow, Huesmann, & Boxer, 2009). In this model step two - script search and retrial are essentially an automated process, once learned. Scripts are mental events that direct behaviour which is automated and can be accessed and retrieved without much effort. The third step of script evaluation appears to be very dependent on the role of the type of question. Dubow, Huesmann, & Boxer, (2009) present this as the child evaluates it for acceptability along three critical criteria: "Is it appropriate to this situation?" (*beliefs*), "Will it achieve the desired outcome?" (*outcome expectancy*), and "Am I able to carry it out?" (*self-efficacy*), Dubow, Huesmann, & Boxer, (2009). The model remains mainly at a theoretical stage, being largely un-researched.

Both Piaget (1932/1969) and Vygotsky (Allahyar & Nazari, 2012) are constructivists and consider that for learning, active developmental, learning, and social interaction is fundamental. However, Piaget emphasises the manipulation of ideas and objects and the confirmation of schemes. For Vygotsky (Allahyar & Nazari, 2012), the interaction of peers and adults is essential in developing verbal cultural exchange. From the perspective of a socio-cultural framework, the role of questioning is significant, as peer and adult interaction is fundamental to cultural transmission and communication. Those students who can benefit from assistance with the questioning are in what Vygotsky (Allahyar & Nazari, 2012) terms the "zone of proximal development". They may benefit in their social problem - solving from scaffolding, characterised by modelling, cues, and prompts.

In the context of the broader evaluation of my interpretations, i.e., SCIP and developmental psychology in Piaget's theory, I have not explicitly researched the role of questioning. Therefore, neither model can shed light on the role students' questioning processes revealed in my interpretations.

What they can support is that early adolescents are at the level of emerging formal operations in their cognitive development. The SCIP model indicates that the questioning process envisaged in my developing heuristic model may indeed have a similar role, at least in the processing of judgments and information processing.

In conclusion, the questions revealed in my interpretation form a bridge between an unexpected stressor and moving into seeking why it may be happening to them. This search involves seeking a standard of fairness which has been breached, an evaluation process between what the participants are experiencing and how they think they ought to be treated, and finally who is to blame for the emerging judgement of experienced unfairness. In terms of a development framework perspective, the socio-cultural model presents as being a better fit for describing the perspectives of the participants.

Superordinate Theme Two: It is not fair!

This superordinate theme is essentially the sufficient element in assigning a meaning of unfairness to the impact of the phenomenon, following a stressor. It consists of three sub-themes: standards of fairness breached; a mechanism for comparing what is being experienced and what should be experience (an is/ought comparison), and finally, a process of blame, termed an attribution of blame for unfairness. Procedurally the Superordinate Theme is presented in the form of three distinct sub-themes and an overall evaluation at the end of the section.

Sub-theme one: Standards of fairness breached

The first sub-theme of 'standard of fairness breached' is made up of six standards of fairness from the qualitative survey: the stealing of possessions (physical, place in a queue, and intellectual property), procedural fairness, physical abuse from peers, verbal abuse from peers, attributing unfairness to offender characteristics, and negative adult interaction. This sub-theme is exceptionally large, and each strand of fairness will be evaluated against the current research for its commonalities and differences, with the interpretative findings. A final, more comprehensive evaluation of my interpretive findings will be undertaken against a criterion of the developmental and social psychology theories. This evaluation is done in order will place my interpretations in the comparative context of more extensive literature.

The amount of data coded to this category is the lowest of the six features of this sub-theme. The content of the sub-theme involves stealing of every - day possessions, academic cheating, and loss of the possession of a place in a queue.

Stealing has been studied as a source of unfairness in a series of studies and a separate single study. Mikula and colleagues undertook the series of studies related to university students, (Mikula, 1986; 1993; Mikula, Patri & Tanzer, 1990, Mikula & Schlamberger, 1985). The single study by Israelishvili, (1997) was with 1st, 7^{th,} and 9th grade students in response to the question, "Did it ever happen to you in school that somebody treated you unfairly or unjustly during school time?" In the 22 types of contexts within which unjust events occur, stealing was placed 13th with university students. In Israelishvili's study (1997) stealing was at 2.2 percentile as an event with his student participants. Aotearoa studies of stealing in at the intermediated school level are few (e.g. Seeto, 1997). The data provided by Seeto places stealing as a common behaviour at 87.4%. The most common item taken was money, and

receiving property that participants knew to be stolen was placed at 31.6%. The marked discrepancy between stealing and being stolen from as the source of stressors resulting in an experience of unfairness, calls for further research. What is different about being the victim of stealing for the participants, as opposed to that of a perpetrator of stealing and unfairness?

The behaviour of queuing is defined in the APA Dictionary of Psychology as, "a file of people who are waiting for some service, commodity, or opportunity. Although the members of the queue are often strangers, who will not meet again, they nevertheless comply with social norms that determine the order in which members will receive service" (VandenBos, 2007, p.764). Queuing in the qualitative survey was used in only one coding category which is associated with the loss of a place in a queue. A year Seven Tongan girl expressed it thus (Participant, 27) "I was waiting in line to go to the tuck shop, and I was almost in front of the line until someone came and pushed me out of the line. I started to get frustrated". Initially, this behaviour was coded as procedural unfairness, but upon iterative reflection the ownership of the space in the queue appeared to have more relevance to the participant as ownership, rather as a breach of the queuing process, as indicated by participant 38's comments, "Taking *my* place in the que (queue)" (Year 7, Tongan girl).

Academic cheating is another behaviour constituting the sub-theme of the taking of personal possessions. Cheating is seen as a 'common' behaviour in the intermediate or middle school, depending on the structure of the school system, as indicated by some researchers (for example, Cizek, 1999). Some surveys have placed the level of self-reporting of cheating at 75% of students and as an increasing phenomenon (Schab, 1991). McCabe (2005, cited in Sisti, 2007) reported plagiarism levels of over 60% for USA high school students. Sisti's study (2007) with high school students established a level of 35 %, for grades 9-12. Finally, in a qualitative

study, Ma et al. (2007) found that with grade 6-8 participants' one-quarter of students admitted cut and paste plagiarism. One of the few high school studies in New Zealand is by Kwok-Wing & Weeks (2009), who put the rate of cheating at >50%. The primary motivation for this misbehaviour appears to be to obtain better academic grades (McCabe, 2001).

In a qualitative study of New Zealand university students' understandings of plagiarism (Adam, Anderson & Spronken-Smith, 2017) concerning institutional discourses, unfairness featured as one of the discourses. The sub-themes featured: lenient and strict, inhibiting learning which was deemed unfair and therefore rendering the university policy unfair, the merit of one's effort as opposed to the unfairness of those cheating, and finally, concerns about the victims of unintentional plagiarism and institutional policy discourses.

Much of the research to date is based on university, college, and high school students. While this code is a minor one of the standards of fairness breached, it does put this phenomenon in a context for its contribution to the levels of standards of fairness breached. Research on stealing, taking a queuing position, cheating or e-plagiarism, plagiarism/cheating and the allocation of resources in general at the level of adolescents is both scarce and not a current area of focus. The study of resource allocation and fairness with children peaked in the 1970-80s, carried out under the influence of the economic metaphor reviewed in Chapter two as 'economic man.' This parallels the interest in the distributive justice component of organisational justice research with adults. At its height, this research activity was influenced by the theoretical influence of Piaget (1932/1969), Kohlberg, & Kramer, (1969), Damon (1988) and Enright et al., (1980). The primary influence of this group of researchers was as a stage and age framework, based on the standards of fairness used to allocate resources. The values in their research focused on equality, equity, and need. As the named research was based on

realist ontology and logical-positive epistemology and methodologies, its method is usually experimental. This method was usually based on vignettes depicting children allocating resources, and a questionnaire developed by Enright et al. (1980). The questionnaire operationalised the previous theoretical and empirical work of the staged developmentalists in allocating according to values of need and equity. Analysis of data was usually based on statistical methods. The allocation process was envisaged as being related to cognitive development. The economic reasoning in allocation decisions was assumed to be based on the self-interest of the rational economic being. This ontology, epistemology, and methodology essentially define fairness as the rational rules concerning sharing, or allocation of often scarce resources. This flourishing of research on distributive justice with young people coincides with that of adults under the rubric of a distributive justice which is part of a more extensive - organisational justice programme embedded in commercial organisations or management studies.

In conclusion, my interpretative research findings of the enquirer highlighted one of the few possibilities of studying the loss of resources from an unfairness perspective. This contrasts with that of fairness as distributive justice research from within an organisational justice framework. My interpretative perspective allows the research to go beyond cognitive reasoning into the subjective perceptions of early adolescents and affective components of unfairness. Taking a student's perspective could contribute to positive psychology of personal resources.

Sporting rule disputes

Sporting disputes as stressors come from one coding category defined as "Direct verbal disputes, or subsequent disputes, over a sporting rule", or to use organisational justice nomenclature, procedural justice.

The procedural component of the organisational justice research literature for children and adolescents, based on a logical positivist framework, is limited. Besides, it is often based on adult standards of procedures, and unlike distributive justice was never a fertile field in educational research, or with children. A breakthrough in procedures is the series of studies undertaken by Thorkildsen (e. g., Thorkildsen, 1989a, 1998b) within a post-positivist framework and a context conceptualised as 'spheres of justice'. However, her main focus was to examine teaching and learning procedures from the perspective of student fairness, not unfairness.

My interpretive findings again present the possibility of opening up a new vein of research from the perspective of unfairness as a personal subjective experience. One possibility of opening up this new orientation is exemplified in the qualitative study by Pilz (1995). With students of 12-14 years, Pilz explored how fair play and violence were articulated. The author argues that violence and unfairness are the result of a win at all costs attribute. The longer that the participants played with a football club, the more they were likely to see intentional fouls as fair play and to internalise the morals of the "fair-foul."

For systems of procedural rules with adults, three researchers (Leventhal, 1980; Greenburg, 1994; Sheppard & Lewicki, 1987) have been used extensively in research on the procedural component of organisational justice. These adult standards have been used in either an unchanged form for positivist research in educational contexts with adolescents, or

246

have been modified in some cases. Research by Thorkildsen (e.g., 1989a) was the first to utilise a qualitative approach to the fairness of teaching and learning procedures. My interpretation contributes an unfairness perspective to rules, along with the lines of the study of violence and unfairness in football where the fairness of the fair-foul has been internalised in players.

Standards relating to student and teacher interaction

This section of a breach of a standard of fairness is between teacher and student and forms the basis of the sub-theme of "negative adult interaction." The coding category is defined as "a perception that a teacher did not act in an appropriate manner," and was interpreted as a result of the thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In the case studies, negative adult interactions are apparent in three cases (Chris, Willow, and Chair). The low number of actual adverse incidents coded to negative adult interaction, or what is termed interactional justice, under the organisational justice metaphor (Colquitt et al., 2001) and interactional unfairness is surprisingly low according to the current literature.

The role of teacher actions deemed as egregious, and resulting in unfairness is prominent in the literature, from both the amount of literature produced and its breadth. For example, Gouveia-Pereira et al., (2003) found that teacher behaviour when examined in the context of relational interactions negatively impacted on the legitimacy of teacher authority.

While quantitative survey findings did not contribute any new findings to the literature in this area, the case studies, in particular, those of Chris, Willow and Chair, are suggestive of some possible lines to pursue in research. To the fore are the concepts of reliability and trust. As Chair reported, (1.89) "they should not be a teacher because teachers need to be like reliable." Willow focused, in contrast on trust when she remembers her primary school teachers as warm, friendly and caring.

The contrast between the two literature situations may be attributable to an experimenter fallacy (Thorkildsen, 1989 a) where a researcher assigns a more significant role to the voice the teachers in unfairness research, rather than to voice of the early adolescent.

Peer-to-peer interactions

This section looks at the breach of a standard of unfairness centred on peer-to-peer relationships. This is the most extensive section of a breach of a standard of unfairness.

The current literature on the breach of a standard of fairness in peer-to-peer interaction is minimal, with the focus on interactional standards or interpersonal treatment between teacher and students. This literature focuses on reactions to the experience of treatment they received from others and is related to concepts such as those related to respect, trust and understanding. From his recent work on interactional justice, Miller et al., (2001) argues that participants' sense of entitlement comes down two broad requirements. The first is interpersonal sensitivity, and the second is accountability. Miller et al., (2001, p. 532) further argue that people have difficulty explaining what they experience as a violation of respect, but they understand when a psychological contract has been violated: "People may not always be able to articulate what their entitlements are in a particular relationship, but they know when a sense of rightness has been violated." In conclusion, this section on a breach of peer-to-peer interactions is an area ripe for further research and is at the heart of giving students their voice.

Character unfairness

The standard of character unfairness was breached in twenty instances in the written reports completed by the study participants. During the coding phase of thematic analysis, this phenomenon was initially termed 'attributing to offender characteristics' and was

subsequently renamed as 'character unfairness.' Both the original coding and the following theme component is defined as "a negative incident of unfairness attributable to an internal aspect of an offender's character,", Participant 41's response illustrates this definition "My brother was jeallous so he started punching me … because of the jellous."

Subsequent analysis of this coding category has challenged me conceptually as has no other component of this project. Part of this conundrum lies in the lack of any literature, against which to explore it, while another resides in the whole phenomenon of experienced unfairness. Methodological scrutiny and conceptual confounding were also considered as possible explanations for character unfairness. The final consideration for character unfairness is as a new thematic finding requiring further exploration.

There is no current literature available, in any domain, which bears any resemblance to this thematic finding. The closest and most relevant might be that of characterological self-blame (Graham, et al., 2006, p. 363) where "For victims, characterological self-blame for victimization and psychological maladjustment were the key mediators, whereas, for aggressors the significant pathway was mainly through perceived unfairness of school rules." This highlights a possible conflation, on the part of participants, between unfairness and blame. It is not inconceivable that early adolescents are conceptually capable of conflating blame and a standard of unfairness by attributing it to a more holistic component of an offender's character. Amongst the other terms for the attribution for character unfairness other, then jealous, were "mean, envy, nasty, hateful, bad, f****wits, and evil."

However, because the texts of the written responses are best described as texting type language or telegraphese, rather than rich text, it was impossible to explore this any further. This style of expression in the English language may be attributable to a variety of factors. The

249

community was very much a bicultural one, with some students speaking a variety of Pasifika languages or Māori at home, and English at school. While this community can be described as lacking in economic resources it does have access to its own wealth of the cultural capital. While there are massive ethnic inequalities in terms of 'resources' and wealth there is considerable overlap across groups, and these differences are by no mean deterministic. The school also has limited access to ESOL (English Speakers of Other Languages) resources. Teachers in the school are not necessary culturally oriented to the participants, being recent immigrants themselves (ERO Report, 2006). Finally, in terms of peer culture, the participants are also acquiring a text script. With all these competing demands the intermediate students had limited proficiency in any one style of discourse, let alone competency in more formal English.

Despite having 21 interview transcripts to explore, there was nothing remotely similar in the interview transcripts to a concept of character unfairness interpreted from the qualitative survey. If focus groups had been in use, it might have been possible to follow up this interesting phenomenon.

Another issue is the possibility of bias or methodological or analytical error on my part in the interpretation of charter unfairness. The trustworthiness of a phenomenon in interpretation is always a potential issue, and that is why it needs to be subject to the possibility of further interpretation. However why this feature as opposed to other thematic components maybe subject to untrustworthiness escapes me. Good scholarship indicates that this phenomenon of character unfairness is worthy of further investigation. Despite all considerations around the trustworthiness of character unfairness, it may just be that this finding does stand alone as an original contribution.

A broader perspective on standards of fairness

My interpretive findings can be summarised as 'a lower level of concern with resources' compared with earlier age groups (Demetriou & Hopper, 2007). Teacher unfairness occurs in my interpretation at a much lower level than in experimenter - determined studies and represents a *debatable* new standard of unfairness which I have called character unfairness. Finally, the dominance of peer-to-peer interaction as the basis for unfairness is the most substantial coding. The focus for a standard of fairness breached in a judgement of unfairness can be summed up as examples of peer-to-peer relationships consisting of teasing, mocking, and issues over friendships, trying to get one another into trouble, gossiping and 'getting smart'.

The rest of this section will attempt to compare the enquirer's interpretive findings against the more extensive literature based on developmental approaches and social psychology. In a similar way to the previous section from a developmental psychology perspective, I will draw on Kohlberg's and Piaget's research models, but adds Gilligan's ethic of care, as this sub-theme focuses on standards of fairness. From Social Information processing, I will draw on the theorising of Crick & Dodge (1994, 1996).

As 'standards of fairness' are a sub-theme and does not stand alone but is an integral part of a whole in arriving at giving meaning to experienced unfairness, it is difficult to compare it, component to component, with other models. However, with this proviso in mind, both Piaget's (1032/1932) and Crick & Dodges' (1994) models are concerned with processing capacity rather than with especially 'moral' content, as with Kohlberg and Kramer (1969) and Gilligan (1982). For Piaget, (1932/1969) once an individual has attained heteronomous morality, then in the remainder of their 'moral' development they elaborate their moral

developmental via their cognitive development. Similarly Crick & Dodges' model does not provide content for decision – making but is more an online processing model. One of the criticisms laid at the door of this model is that it does not make provision for latent or deep structures such as moral values. Consequently, the enquirer's interpretative sub-theme is different in terms of having content in the form of standards with which to compare 'is' with 'ought' in terms of fairness behaviours.

What Kohlberg and the interpretative sub-theme have in common is standards of behaviour, mainly for comparative purposes. For Kohlberg, they are arranged hierarchically but in mine and the participants' contribution, their arrangement is more a situationally - or contextually - related one. What intrigues me more is the absence of an ethic of care, or a phenomenon like it. A study by Einberg et al. (2015) is cited where a sub-theme of unfairness for girls aged 13-16 focussed on the unfairness of the differential use of space by boys. The sub-theme relates to a group of participants whose mean age was 12.18 years, whereas the Einberg et al. study (2015) has an age range of 13-16 years. My interpretive account found no gender difference in the standards of fairness utilised by participants. Other explanations for the lack of gender differences could focus on gender bias in my analysis and interpretation. A final suggestion might be that since both genders played team sports together, stronger gender separation and its related morally differentiated set of behaviours may emerge at a later age in a different context, such as high school.

From a cultural and contextual perspective, standards of fairness are deeply embedded in the socio-cultural realm. What the participants and I have begun to explore is only part of a moral perspective, within a bicultural or multicultural perspective, in the form of individually conceptualised unfairness. What is the negative response of breaching the

value of Vā in Pacifika, or Whanautanga in Māori communities? A socio-cultural perspective of development presents as being suited to these tasks.

Sub-theme three: A basis of comparison – counterfactual thinking

This sub-theme of is/ought comparison is a robust one, as demonstrated by the criteria advocated by Smith et al. (2009). I operationalised this as meeting a presence in at least sixty percent of the thirteen case studies for the existence of a theme, or mega theme. The sub-theme is a means of comparison between what is being experienced by the participants and what they believe they ought to be experiencing and is one of the features assigning meaning to an experience of unfairness.

Part of the process is that it has a vital part in the emerging heuristic model in linking a standard of fairness being breached as determined by a counterfactual comparison. More importantly, perhaps, is that it is positively aligned with the literature review in Chapter Two on this topic. The concept has a reasonable track record going back over a significant period in the literature. Those researchers who have used the is/ought concept include Homans (1961) in his exchanged theory of distributive justice, Just World Belief theories (Lerner, 2003), Walzer (2008) in his spheres of justice book, and Rest & Sabbagh (2009, 2016), in applying this comparison in sub-spheres of justice to education.

This sub-theme's relationship with the broader theoretical literature, selected for this comparison, has various methods for undertaking a comparative evaluation in order to establish which justice or fairness standards are relevant.

The focus for the developmentalists is primarily based on an individual's level of cognitive development. For Piaget (1932/1969) the focus is on pre-operations, concrete and formal operations. Those deemed relevant by Kohlberg and Kramer (1969) are

Preconventional, Conventional and Post-conventional reasoning. In other words, the level of cognitive ability is related to that of moral development. Finally, Damon (1983), as we have seen earlier, expanded on Piaget's developmental model, utilising a more detailed model based on the ages at which children and early adolescents employ the standards of fairness. How the standards of equality, equity, and need, are employed is primarily related to an individual's cognitive development.

The Social Information Processing model of Crick & Dodge (1994, 1996) has a method of comparison in what they term the third step of script 'retrieval and evaluation'. In the evaluation process, the child or adolescent asks three questions: 1) is it appropriate? 2) will it obtain the desired outcome? and 3) is it effective in being able to implement the chosen strategy. Some interventions are based partly on this step of the process to improve these evaluation skills, via consequential thinking, compared with problem-solving skills. In contrast, the composition of the heuristic model being proposed here examines discrepancy between a comparison of what they are experiencing and what they think they ought to be entitled to, i.e. counterfactual reasoning. Thus, the commonality of this interpretation is that of comparison.

The differences lie in this comparison of universal standards of justice developed by research which is based on realist ontology and logical-positivist epistemology. This type of research then utilises an experimental method to develop universal standards of justice. In contrast, the standards interpreted by the enquirer with the participants, lie within the specific sphere of justice. These standards are specific to the requirement of the context in that they reflect the responsiveness to the socio-cultural aspects of experience, or in this case the middle school.

In summary, my interpretations are consistent with literature which is based on a comparison between is and ought and contrasts with a 'universalistic' set of standards. The commonality is that all sources of standards involve a comparison of standards of justice or fairness established via different comparative methodologies.

Sub-theme two: Blame: "She does it on purpose," (Willow, 1: 97)

The evaluation of this sub-theme is presented as an exploration of the combined sub-themes, the differences, and similarities to the existing literature, along with the theoretical implication of the findings.

The results from the qualitative survey give rise to a sub-theme of "it is not fair," in the form of *offender blaming*. The perpetrator of the adverse event is blamed in all seventy-seven instances involving a peer, groups of peers, and teachers. There was no evidence of systemic entities, a superior being, or authoritative entity being held to account for the incident. The analysis of the data, from the semi-structured interviews, via IPA, yielded a sub-theme of a*ttribution of blame*. The codlings of personal responsibility, controllability, intent, and lack of an excuse were to the fore. These presented as both internally and externally homogenous, because of numerous iterations against the data set as a whole.

In summary, the perpetrators who are deemed to be blamed are the same from the two separate sources of the analysis of the coded data. Besides, the richer text from the IPA analysis indicated that the concepts associated with accountability might play a role at arriving at a judgement of responsibility.

The literature reviewed revealed the existence of only two studies on attribution of blame for unfairness (e.g., Mikula, 2003). Mikula carried out five studies, only one of which straddles the age group of early adolescents. With participants aged 12-17 years, with a mean

age of 15 years, Mikula had 44 pairs of close female friends evaluate an incidence of unfairness that they had observed. Of the factors, in Mikula's theory, only intention and lack of justification proved to be significant, but not the amount of violation of an entitlement, personal causation, or control. With the five studies as a whole, the validity of the model was supported by the attributions of causality, intention, and a lack of justification, but not by control of action.

More recent work by Guroglu, et al., (2010) indicated that developing perspective-taking skills in fairness considerations involved in social decision making (dictator game method) are supported by three findings from their work, 1) basic fairness processes are developed before early adolescence, 2) decisions are context dependent and increase in their complexity during adolescence, and 3) intentionality increases across adolescence. Caution must be expressed about generalising findings from a dictator game method and for fairness offers an intention to undertake an act of unfairness. The caution comes from differences of methodology and a neural (brain scans) basis of evidence for the presence of unfairness. While not supporting Mikula's model of an attribution-of-blame model of judgements of injustice (unfairness) the findings from my interpretative analysis indicates that the factors of intentionality, lack of excuse or justification, and causality may play a role in the attribution of blame for experienced unfairness. This is an area of the unfairness literature worthy of further development.

This subtheme differs substantially from the view of the more extensive developmental and psychological literature. Piaget (1932/ 1969), Kohlberg and Kramer (1969), Damon (1988), and Gilligan and Attanucci (1996) do not have attribution for behaviours as a component of their respective theories. Within social information theories the study of the

attribution of hostile intent (De Castro, Orobio, et al., 2002) especially in contexts where the clarity of cues is ambiguous, is the most examined feature of aggression. Thus, the attribution of blame for unfairness (Mikula, 2003) often comes out of some of the same components as the attrition of hostile intent, i.e. attribution theory (Weiner, 2000). In summary, the main commonality is with Crick and Dodge's work (1994, 1996) with an emphasis online processing rather than developmental theories.

Superordinate Theme Three: A Social relational view of emotions

One of the salient features of experience of unfairness is the often-accompanying emotional lament of "It is not fair"! In this theme of the emotional responses to unfairness two features stand out in the form of a nuanced architecture of the emotional content, along with the intensity of the emotional responses.

In the qualitative survey Theme three, emotional distresses, were featured as anger, sadness to anger, anger to sadness, and sadness alone. The anger response was defined in the survey coding as a hostile emotional response directed at others if it was associated with an adverse external event, or associated with frustration, perceived slight, injury, or experienced unfairness.

The sadness to anger response is characterised primarily as a dual negative emotional response moving from an inward focus to an outward focus. Anger to sadness was defined as starting with a focus that is initially an externally focused negative emotion of anger and then moves to an internally self-focused emotional response of sadness. Finally, sadness had some internal responses coded to it, with sadness being the most common description reported. Other descriptors reported for sadness included unhappy, upset, lonely, and unfair. It was

impossible to report on any intensity data from the qualitative survey, as no opportunity was afforded to the participants for doing so.

The analysis of the interviews via IPA, resulting in the theme of intense emotional distress, also produced four strands in the theme of, external anger, external to internal emotion, internally focused emotion, and internal to external emotional focus. With the richer text available from interview transcripts data, the intensity of the emotional responses can be reported on.

In an example of the first strand, Chris reported that he wanted to get angry, "I just want to get violent sometimes," (Chris, 4:150). Herbi reported that anger was experienced in her head, fists, and "sometimes my legs if I want to kick," (Herbi, 130). Rock reported that his anger was like blowing off, "Oh like …I was going to blow", (Rock, 6:69).

In the second strand of external anger transforming to internal emotion featuring sadness, Irene felt her anger as, "I was really angry like I could just run the whole field and like don't stop but like it was just so unfair that I could not even do anything," (Irene, 13.40). Her anger response evolved, "It kind of changed into disappointment when the house shield was announced that they had won and how they had won," (Irene, 13:60).

The third strand is a dual response of internal anger to an external emotion in the form of sadness. Snoop reported that in response to name calling "I felt unhappy cause I don't like people calling me names. It was just really strong because I was baling my eyes out" (Snoop, 7.23). His anger, directed at others, was felt "Just in my heart," (Snoop, 7:38). Hemi reported anger as "I felt like I was going to rip apart" (Hemi, 4: 140).

The final strand reported in the theme is that of intense internal emotion. When feeling sad and embarrassed Paris Hilton reported (12:64), "It was mixed up together," and she experienced this as a strong "stomachache" (Paris Hilton, 12:68). Another participant's response place in the strand was Tina, who reported that she felt sadness as big, "Big sad" (Tina 10:52) leaving her, "feeling small."

The combined findings from the qualitative survey and interviews were both reported as a phenomenon more nuanced than those reported in the current literature. Besides, the more comparatively rich data of the interviews enabled the emotional response to be interpreted as having features of intensity and embodiment. By conceiving of unfairness as an experience, selecting an interpretive orientation to the analysis of the data based on thematic analysis IPA, through a double hermeneutic lens, the feelings of early adolescents can be voiced.

In this current section, I have taken a different track to the bulk of the emotional literature reviewed in Chapter 2. Here, the track is along a social interactionist theorisation; one of emotion. This comes from a different ontological position by which social relations form the necessary context in which emotions are generated, have the intensity or not, possibly affecting fields of action or inaction. This contrasts with the current reviewed literature on emotions which are based on a core of individual cognitive appraisals (e.g., Adams, 1965; Averill-Roper & Rucklidge, 2006; Finkel, 2001). A relational orientation to emotions in unfairness judgements can be understood as patterns of relationships (Burkitt, 2014). I argue they bridge the relationship between power implied in some unfairness judgements and the fields of affect resulting in engaged action or disengaged inaction.

In this section, I have expanded my opening comments on unfairness as a relational, social interactionist, and embodied account of the role of emotion in unfairness judgements. I believe my co-participants are not simply related to external action but are embedded in unfair situations that involve relations between peers or between teachers and peers, cultural and events.

How the participants feel about circumstances will depend on the cultural meanings that give feeling and sense to emotional experience. These cultures are localised and divergent; for example, Vä for the Pasifika students (Reynolds, 2016, 2018) and Manakitanga (Walker, 1996) for Māori students. Vä is a contested term as it varies from island culture to island culture. For Māori, the term Manakitangā can vary according to iwi (tribe) and hapu (extended family). It is not at only at the point of appraisal of unfairness (negative, event, and a breach of a moral standard) that emotions are culturally mediated, but at the start of the generation of emotion that comes from embodied relations and social interactions seated in culture. The specific emotional responses created in unfairness judgements by these affects are dependent on the relation between the study participants and specific unfair context on interaction (Burkitt, 2014). Using Dewey, as an example, Burkitt (2014) pointed out that we not only have a cognitive appraisal of the situation, in which emotions are generated, but we are embodied in the experience of unfairness itself. Our emerging feeling experiences may contain the unfairness evaluation itself and possibly its inception. The unfairness comes not so much from cognitive appraisal or perception, but from the embodied unfairness response, habit, or action.

Emotion, in unfairness, then generates from communication where my study participants respond to the unfair experiences they have from the attitudes others hold

towards them about events, culpability, or ethical standards violated. These standards come from socialisation within Māori or Pacifika cultures which provide the background of social meaning for the interpretations of physical signs of emotions. These may include, as examples, voice pitch, gestures, and bodily stance. These interpretations are not just individual ones but are set in a broader context of social dialogue of the communication of attitudes and evaluations. Evaluation of unfairness and re-evaluations are not only the realm of the individuals but set in a context of collective cultural values around which relations and interactions are positioned.

From the point of a social-relation orientation to emotion in unfairness, consciousness is not perceived as it is within social information processing models (e. g., Crick and Dodge, 1994) which are centred on an individual or personal perception. 'Information' is not of straight forward linear appraisals and accessible to an individual, but is often tentative, ambiguous, and interpreted in terms of social context and possible mutual meanings. In contrast to a social-relations view of emotion, unfairness can be ambiguous, and thinking is interpreted in terms of social and cultural context. As opposed to SIP models, feeling rules are not the main concern here, but the normative standards of Māori and Pasifika cultures. These standards are part of a wider cultural context against which the study participants interpret the unfair-embedded situations, behaviours, and attitudes of others. In conclusion, it is from these perspectives that we reflect on unfair situations, our feelings, impulses, and appraise contextually the actions that will affect others in a preferred manner.

In comparing how the role of emotion is treated in other paradigms, Lev Vygotsky's (Allahyar & Nazari, 2012) sociocultural view of development presents an interesting point of comparison. The primary emphasis in this theory is the social impact on a young person's

261

mind. In this theory of development, four themes are emphasised by Allahyar and Nazari, (2012): activity in social interaction, activity, learning and development, and language as an instrument of self-regulation and contemplation. In particular, the theory focuses on how emotional knowledge is transmitted. Language is critical for thinking, for cultural transmission of emotional knowledge, and for self-regulation. Social interaction provides a context for developing both language and the cultural development of constructed emotion.

In contrast, the developmental (e.g., Piaget, 1932/1969) and social psychology theories have been criticised for their relative lack of focus on emotion. Piaget might have argued that emotion is part of the domain of social experience and does not have to be conceptualised separately. Crick and Dodge (1994, 1996) initially contended that emotions are integral to each step in the process; but, in their revised model, they acknowledged this shortfall by explaining how cognitive and emotive features interact at each step.

In terms of seating the role of emotion component of social relational power, it presents as being too closer to a social-cultural perspective than to either a cognitive development or a social information processing perspective.

In sum, relationships are the ontological starting point in my interpretation of emotion in unfairness. Students act not to provoke or retaliate against other unfair acts but to change their emotional responses. Emotions and feelings associated with unfairness are generated in relational contexts where we are involved in embodied interactions arising from being in social relation to others.

Superordinate Theme Four: Reactions to emotional distress.

This theme of reacting, coping, or restoring equilibrium when confronted with emotional distress and its two sub-themes of engaging and disengaging, is based on some sub-features.

Sub-theme one: Engagement

The engagement sub-theme consists of seeking social support from adults and to a lesser extent from peers, and requests 'to fix it' up via the strategies to stop the behaviour from reoccurring, corrective actions, seeking meaning for the event by obtaining more information, and finally seeking an apology. These findings are taken from my analysis of the interview data utilising an IPA orientation. The reason for selecting this interpretative base for the superordinate theme is that it yielded greater depth to the interpretive findings than those from the qualitative survey analysis.

In contrast, the survey can lend a more comprehensive mapping of the edges of the unfairness phenomenon by contributing a greater range of specific strategies. These include inaction, thinking, behavioural actions, told an offender off, seeking peer social support, and finally, told an adult. The coded coping strategies included: withdrawal, telling, and finally, inaction. The specific restorative coding strategies were seeking the social support of adults, nothing, apology, and restore the original behaviour.

While there was a justifiable argument for building some sub-themes within the Superordinate Theme, four of strategies for dealing with distress ran across reactions, coping, and potential restorative actions, another approach presented as having a stronger claim. As indicated by the IPA analysis, disengagement and engagement proved to be the stronger theme in my interpretation for Superordinate Theme Four.

In the earlier literature review, concepts potentially relating to engagement were raised in the form of coping and apologies. Only one coping study with adults (Finkelstein et al., 2009) was found, but the review on coping did highlight some strategies from the general literature on coping which are more effective than others, such as problem-focused coping.

Sub-theme two: Disengagement

Disengaging consists of the two main constructs of physical and psychological withdrawal, or distancing.

'Critical' research on disengagement focuses on this phenomenon as resistance. Ruglis & Vallee (2016, p. 186) "… re-theorise engagement as being less about the individual and more about the nestedness of the individual and school within an ecology shaped by social unfairness, namely, income inequality". In Aotearoa, Bishop and Berryman (2006) in a study of engaged and disengaged students conceptualised disengagement as a form of resistance to cultural oppression.

In conclusion, engagement for early adolescents in response to unfairness can be seen as a fruitful area for further research. In particular, the engagement sub-theme established that early adolescents use seeking social support, requests to fix up unfairness via the strategies to stop the behaviour from occurring, remedial actions, seeking meaning for the event by obtaining more information, and finally seeking an apology. The disengagement strategies on the other hand focused on physical and psychological withdrawal.

Links between themes and literature

As to the question, where does this project fit into the broader sphere of early adolescent research? The finding of this project as a judgement of accountability for unfairness, set in a particular socio-cultural context and conceived as experience, justice,

264

stands in marked contrast to much of the reviewed literature. This part of the project is based philosophically on relativist ontology and qualitative-interpretive epistemology and methodology. This section has been organised by comparing the work of several prominent researchers.

This project is qualitative, as in the original work of Piaget (1932/1969) but stands in contrast to later research based on Piaget's original conceptualisation but researched within a positivist paradigm. It shares with Piaget's (1932/1969) original work a qualitative interview methodology. Later work based on earlier work of Piaget (1932/1969) particularly that of Damon, (1998) Enright et al. (1980) focused on a developmental stage theory but with a logical within a logical-positivist methodology paradigm. This involved a search for a universal sequence of the ages at which participants allocated resources based on the justice principles of equality, equity and need (Deutsch, 2006). At its most developed it is a logical experimental methodology with Enright et al. (1980) standardised questionnaire which served as the basis for a research programme based on stages for the application of standards of fairness. Enright et al'. (1980) research programme was based on a metaphor of a rational 'economic man', metaphor. While fairness has been conceived as encompassing an emotional component most of the distributive justice research within this methodology is centred on the rational rules governing resource allocations, built on the development of cognitive reasoning. This cognitive reasoning was Piaget's (1932/1969) contribution rather than a moral perspective which has a relative paucity of attention from Piaget in the form of a movement from focus on a heteronomous orientation to a more autonomous one.

What this body of research has in common with my project is the developmental sequence of the ages at which participants may allocate resources, but this sequence is

tempered by socio-cultural factors, indicating that such a sequence is not universal but more pragmatic. Perhaps this can be seen in the variability of the questioning process in a search for an interpretation of meaning for unfairness. I could proffer as a possibility the range of questioning from an open questioning to hypothesis testing through to the use of counterfactuals. This may reflect individual differences, contextual and cultural, influences as well as a life stage developmental influence.

Kohlberg took Piaget's (1932/1969) moral development stages and expanded these into a sequence of justice standards (Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969). Piaget (1932/1969) proposed a moral shift in development from heteronomous to autonomous orientation. Kohlberg developed the autonomous orientation into his six stages of three levels of moral development. My study covers the stage of conventional reasoning comprising stages three and four of Kohlberg. Interpersonal stage three focused on a concern for others, good people and needs, and exchange. Stage four focused on law and order based on a relatively inflexible allocation of ethics, law, and order. These standards have a lot in common with the six standards interpreted by participants in my project (possessions, sport rule disputes, peer-to-peer interactions, and character unfairness), but mine reflects a greater nuanced application than the application of those stages identified by Kohlberg. In contrast to a universalistic application of fairness, or justice standards, it can be posited that the interpretivist approach is much more sensitive to context and situation than the universalistic reasoning proposed by Kohlberg (Kohlberg & Kramer, 1969) all-be-it tempered by situation and culture.

Gilligan's 'ethic of care' (Gilligan & Attanucci, 1996; Gilligan, 1982) is focused on a gender-based 'ethic of care'. In my research, there was no indication of a gender difference, other than in the higher range of social coping strategies employed by the Year 7 girls. The use

of gender orientation, rather than a biologically based one in research, may yield a different interpretation as well as one focus on critical, or feminist, studies which mainly at a focus on power. A focus on female-only research may have yielded a set of results like this of (Einberg et al., 2015) where the girls talk about the boys' domination of space in their school world. This is a significantly under-researched area. Thus, my project undertaken by a male failed to find any differences based on an ethic of care.

The theory of Social Cognitive Information Processing (SCIP) was proposed by Crick and Dodge (1994, 1996). This theory, or model, is conceived of as an online processing theory of successful and unsuccessful social interactions. It consists of some steps where initial incoming information is matched to stored memories in terms of cognition, affective and behavioural dispositions. In the second stage attributes are assigned to a person and following this is a hypotheses-generating stage about the individual is determined, and finally an enactment of the selected strategy to deal with social interaction is undertaken. Aggression is the most common focus for research and in particular attribution of intent for aggression in ambiguous contexts where the behavioural cues are not definite or clear.

My thesis has more in common with the SIP theory than the social-cognitive theories in being conceived of like an online theory where age differences are conceptualised because of increased processing power and integration with age and experience. Both models allow for a role for emotion. Where they differ is in their respective methodologies', this project is an interpretive methodology versus the positivist one of the SIP model. The interpretive model is more holistic bottom up where interpretations are proposed in terms of themes and subthemes versus particular components of the SIP models which are conceived of in terms of step-by-step experimental findings.

Finally, Domain theory (Turiel, 2002) proposes a constructed social world the result of three domains moral, conventional, and social reasoning. This project has been conceived of as in one where only unfairness applies. In contrast, the domain conceived of as moral, in Domain theory, is crowded with critical concepts, where in addition to fairness are the concepts about human welfare, justice, and rights, but not unfairness. As reasoning becomes more differentiated the role of fairness drops away, whereas unfairness is the sole focus of this project.

In conclusion at the paradigmatic level, developmental psychologists focus on norms as stage related, changing over time and social psychologists conceptualise development as more and integrated processing capacity with time. I am positioned to a degree with the information processing orientations of social psychology. The methodologies are different with developmentalists measuring moral judgements and the social psychologists' reasoning. Both have a difference in research goals based on understanding versus preferences. In contrast, an interpretive stance has a focus on understanding interpretation because of the use of doubled hermeneutic and phenomenology. All these models or theories have the commonality of a moral developmental focus.

Part five: A heuristic model of the relationships between themes 1-4

When an adverse event is encountered by early adolescents, factors centred on a change in embodied emotional states may prompt a search for the meaning for the adverse event. Not all events will involve a search for unfairness. This questioning, if activated, seeks answers about the nature of unfairness via a counterfactual process.

A search for a breached standard of justice will involve the areas of possessions, rules, and how a person is treated for the breached standard to be named. Thus, if an offender can

be tied to a negative event, responsibility or blame for the adverse event and a breach of a fairness standard, a judgement of unfairness can take place. This judgement may involve an embodied power component when a dominant culture conflicts with the individual's cultural beliefs. Power works "indirectly more through social relations as a structure of actions that aims to affect a field of possible actions" (Burkitt, 2002, p. 164).

For early adolescents, the consequence of a judgement of unfairness, as revealed by the 13 participants' interviews, may be an intense emotional reaction. Burkitt (2014) argued that this would not be possible if it were not for social relations always being active with emotion. This has to do with emotion being part of the emergent structure of the relational field. Power works to structure *affects* as action or inaction. If the power of action increases in the body then euphoria is likely to be felt and, if not, dysphoria. Anger incites euphoria by the actions of others into a counter action which be dis-engagement and possibly as a protest. Sadness, as dysphoria, may provoke engagement as an ordering of repair of the field of social relations.

In conclusion, antecedents to a judgement of unfairness theoretically involve a counterfactual search for meaning based on a negative event, a person who is held to be culpable for that event, and what ethical standards of fairness have been breached. The consequences of a judgment of unfairness result may come from the social emotional relational effect*s* of withdrawal from the situation, and a request to either peers or adults for some form of help.

A conclusion to Chapter 6

The primary function of this chapter is to place the knowledge claims from the interpretations of Chapters 4 and 5 against the current literature, reviewed in Chapter 2, in order to give my

interpretations a degree of tentative valid knowledge claims. This involved placing the four Superordinate themes in comparison with and contrast to the specific unfairness literature and a more extensive developmental/social psychology literature, relevant to the lived experience of early adolescents. From this exercise, some specific contributions to the literature are claimed in the form of content and processes. Finally, these claims are organised into a heuristic model of unfairness as a judgement of accountability for unfairness. This chapter essentially presents the validity of my claim to give voice to unfairness as a judgement of accountability and consequences of relational power.

The next Chapter, seven presents a critical reinterpretation of the quantitative data from the survey and interviews. The chapter focuses on the mutual conditioning between the neoliberal influenced school culture and student's culturally based beliefs, possibly resulting in four structural injustices.

Chapter 7: What song is the canary singing?

Without a structural understanding of power and domination as a process rather than patterns of distribution, the existence of and nature of domination and oppression cannot be identified" (Young, 1990, p. 33).

Introduction

This chapter is about relational power resulting in structural inequalities with marginalisation as potential outcomes. To support a critical (Mertens, 2014) reinterpretation of unfairness as injustice, I will pull together my analyses of the data to date. This includes a literature now couched in interpretive and critical paradigms. I also include the voicing of the early boundaries of perceived unfairness which arose from the qualitative survey. Voicing unfairness is a process of accountably based on culpability for action and the violation of ethical standards. In this critical case, the ethical violation is largely a violation of relational cultural norms. Finally, this chapter moves to the 'critical' (Mertens, 2014) voicing of early adolescents' concerns as a group expressing injustice, and possible resistance to it, and to marginalisation. These are the consequences of unjust relational power in action!

Chapter Seven is organised around four possible instances of structural inequality which, I argue, are the result of four sets of mutual conditioning between the school and student cultures. The dominant school culture is a neoliberal-influenced one operating through the three processes of performativity, managerialism, and marketisation. The mutual student conditioning, or counterconditioning, from the students is in the form of collective judgements of injustices (collective unfairness) based on the students' unrecognised Māori and Pasifika cultural needs. Four possible structural injustices are the result: structural

injustice one is underachievement; structural injustice two is lateral violence; structural injustice three is lateral violence in the form of the intra-peer; the fourth structural injustice is that of teacher to student bullying; and the final structural is of the schools decline and closure. Each of these structures is discussed in terms of possible outcomes leading to resistance in the form of disengagement from learning and eventually marginalisation.

Re-theorisation: A critical interpretation

In this section, I lay out the basis of my re-theorised critical interpretation, based on Young's structural analysis. This theorisation underpins my following four analyses of structural injustices relating to underachievement, intra-peer bullying as lateral violence, teacher-to-student bullying, and the closure of the Te Aroha School.

Young's theory of structural injustices

For Young (1990), a critical approach to theorising injustice describes inequities by focusing on the structure or a system of relations (for a fuller accounting of Young's model see Chapter 2, Section 4). By structures, Young (2001) is referring to structures which hold back the capacities of young adolescents. In the structure of lateral violence, for example, I will develop a primary account of bullying as lateral violence. Young describes structural inequities as:

> describing a set of relationships among assumptions and stereotypes, institutional policies, individual actions following rules or choosing in self-interest, and collective consequences of these things, which constrain the options of some at the same time as they expand the options of others, (Young, 2001, p. 11).

In order to organise the notion of a systematise concept of structure, Young draws on a metaphor of spatial structure. Students occupy positions in social space, and these positions

stand in definite relation to one another. "The structure consists in the connections among the positions and their relationships, and the way the attributes of positions internally constitute one another through those relationships," (Young, 2001, p. 12). Young's focus is not on, for example, Rawiri Paratini, as a Year 8 student, but on all students occupying a Year 8 social position.

> Basic social structures are made up of defined social positions that condition students' opportunists and future potential. These life chances are constituted by the ways the positions are related to one another to create systematic constraints or opportunities, which reinforce one another like wires in a cage. Structural social groups are constituted through the social organization of labor and production, the organization of desire and sexuality, the institutionalized rules of authority and subordination and the constitution of prestige. Structural social groups are relationally constituted in the sense that one position in structural relations does not exist apart from differentiated relation to other positions, Young (2001, p. 12).

Young warns of the danger of reifying the metaphor of social structures where positions are occupied by passive recipients conditioned from other social positions. To the contrary, these structures only exist as processes of inaction and interaction with other structures. Social structures are relationally constituted positions which make specific resources available to the recipients. Rather than the outcomes of individual actions, the structures are conditioned by the collective socio-historical conditions affecting both intended and unintended action. These conditions may also determine the physical and cultural environments which can condition future actions.

The unintended consequences of the confluence of many actions often produce and reinforce such opportunities and constraints, and these often make their mark on the physical conditions of future actions, as well as on the habits and expectation of actors. This mutually reinforcing process means that the positional relations and the way they condition individual lives are difficult to change (Young, 2001, p. 14-15).

In sum, the causes of structural inequalities lie in the constraints on opportunities and future outcomes because of the confluence of all the conditioning possibilities coming to bear on their social positions. This is not a pre-determined situation for individual students, as resistance is possible and may be positive for some individuals.

Finally, by injustice, I mean a collective concept of a social judgement of unfairness by the students of Te Aroha School. This contrasts with the individual interpretations constituting a phenomenon of unfairness (Goldman and Cropanzano, 2015). Both definitions take into account context in contrast to the decontextualised theorising of positivist research on unfairness. Both the individualised and collective concepts are based on Folger and Cropanzano's (2001) fairness theory (judgements based on a negative event, establishing culpability for the event and the breach of an ethical standard). Both concepts involve having in common, adverse events conditioned by a neoliberal-influenced school culture.

To aid an understanding of my chapter thesis I am going to employ the metaphor of a canary singing it's warning from the inside of a birdcage (Fyre, 1983, cited in Young, 2001, p., 10). The base of the cage is the neoliberal culture of the school from which wires of processes emerge in the form of performativity, managerialism, and marketisation. These processes fuse, via a mutually conditioning process (Young, 2001), with judgements of injustice to form

fused wires of injustice continuing up to the top of the cage. At the top of the cage, the fuse

wires form a top cover of the cage of marginalisation.

In the next section, I will lay out the influences of the neoliberal reforms on the school

culture as processes of performativity, managerialism, and competition.

A school culture influenced by neoliberalism

To fully comprehend the intricacies of the teacher to student and peer to peer

interactions, we need to consider the metaphor and meta-narrative of neoliberalism which

has shaped teaching and learning over the last decades. While neoliberalism is an elusive beast

and there are no definitive definitions (Peck, 2010), I argue that its impact may be made clear

through student voices' showing how it possibly contributes to Māori and Pasifika students'

marginalisation, via unjust, relational social structures (Young, 1990, 2001 & 2006). I will

introduce three interrelated neoliberal technologies in the form of performativity (Ball, 2003),

managerialism (Thrupp, 2006) and competition as the marketisation of schooling (Ball, 2003).

The function and process of ERO reports

The Education Review Office (ERO) in Aotearoa deems itself as "an independent,

external evaluation agency that undertakes reviews of schools," (ERO Te Aroha School, 2005,

p. 18). In defining the function of its reviews, ERO states that:

> ERO follows a set of standard procedures to conduct reviews. The purpose of each
>
> review is to improve educational achievement in schools and provide information to
>
> parents, communities, and the government. Reviews are intended to focus on
>
> student achievement and build on each school's previous review. Reviews are
>
> intended to focus on student achievement and build on each school's self-review
>
> (ERO, Te Aroha School, 2005, p. 18).

275

Finally, ERO's framework for reviewing and reporting is based on three strands "School Specific Priorities – 1) the quality of education and 2) the impact of school policies and practices on student achievement" (ERO Te Aroha School, 2005, p. 18), and 3) how Government policies and other legal requirements are working.

Performativity

The neoliberal reforms have been about implementing processes of performativity and accountability. The core of this climate change is on educational outcomes that can be both measured and quantified (Ball, 2001; Thrupp, 2006). There are three accountability ERO reports (2001, 2005 & 2008), for Te Aroha School that I will draw upon. The report for 2006 was a supplementary assurance audit which is a follow up for noncompliance to government regulations around Māori achievement, teacher registration, the principal's appraisal, overseas students and policy and procedures for dealing with non-custodial parents. Consequently, I draw most to my examples from the ERO Reports for Te Aroha School (2005, 2006).

The reported results for 2005 (ERO, Te Aroha School, 2005) demonstrate the chief function for ERO of reporting solely on student achievement in order "to improve educational achievement in schools; and provide information" for stakeholders in the form of parents, communities and the Government' (p. 16). For example, (ERO, Te Aroha School, 2005):

area-wide reading review of the assessment tools for teaching and learning (asTTle) indicates that although students at Te Aroha Intermediate School are closely aligned to the cluster mean, they are achieving significantly lower than the national mean for Year 7 and 8 students. The school's 2005 Progress and Achievement Tests (PAT) in reading comprehension indicate that 34% of Year 7 and 28% of Year 8 students are

reading more than two years below their chronological ages" (ERO, Te Aroha School, 2005, p.8).

This type of reporting takes a performance perspective on school achievement. It highlights the departure from curriculum levels or National Standards and downplays the distinctiveness of the context. This style of reporting is part of what Slee and Weiner (1998, p. 65) call "bleaching context from their analytic framework." Thrupp (2006) attribute this to New Public Management theory (which I explored in detail in Chapter Two). This management theory places emphasis on one size fits all. The perspective holds that that change is best driven by organisational transformation. In particular, it is characterised by a focus on the 'efficiency' of market service delivery, motivated by targets, and monitored to death. There is a search for explanations of poor student performance concerning a shortfall of sound organisational management and practice couched in the context of managerialism. I will address this neoliberal search for causation in the second theme of managerialism.

Continuing the theme of the measurement of performativity for Māori students the concerns with its measurement accountability technology can be gleaned from the following foci. The ERO report for 2005 (ERO, Te Aroha School, 2005) noted that the school has recently acquired computer systems for its administration. The implication seemed to be that this technological move is good for the collection of student achievement information. However, the rub was that "The principal does not currently present a written analysis of Māori student achievement to the board" Again, while truancy information is collected and compared year by year, "A good deal of information about student attendance is anecdotal" (ERO Te Aroha School, 2005, p.8). This is clearly at variance the focus on measurability of outcomes. While the school has whole-school professional development "there are no specific initiatives in the

school that target the needs of Māori students in particular was not available". (ERO Te Aroha School, 2005, p., 8)

Pasifika students make up 60% of the school population (2005, school roll returns). ERO approved of the action of the school in identifying students ethnically in school records and assessment data. However, it noted disappointedly that "most Pacific students are performing below national norms for their age" (ERO report for Te Aroha School, 2005, p. 9). In further non-compliance, the review noted a lack of "information about the attendance, truancy and suspensions and stand-downs of separate groups of Pacific students" (ERO report for Te Aroha School, 2005, p. 8). Further, on the theme of reporting Pasifika performativity, ERO noted:

> The school has not introduced specific Pacific programmes aimed at improving the educational outcomes for Pacific students. School-wide initiatives such as literacy have been implemented for all ethnic groups within the school. Staffs have not yet participated in professional development aimed at improving strategies for teaching Pacific students and improving the educational outcomes of Pacific students" (ERO report for Te Aroha School, 2005, p 8).

In terms of performativity, while Te Aroha School had 29% of its total roll of Māori, ERO notes that the school had collected data on Māori students and had tracked and compared their achievement in 2003/4. However, it found "there is no clear evidence that this information is used to inform teacher planning" (ERO Te Aroha School, 2005, p 8). This is a significant criticism by ERO leading to a follow-up audit a year later as it was identified as an area of noncompliance to government legislative requirements.

There are references to significant behavioural issues, but these are only reported incidentally when they interfere with performativity:

> Students' learning time is reduced by the time spent on dealing with student behaviour. Although teachers have made progress in managing students' learning, many teachers are continuing to concentrate on behaviour rather than learning. This results in lessons not being well paced and learning time not being optimised. The principal and senior management team should support teachers to affirm appropriate behaviour and to provide students with more regular positive reinforcement. … Teachers need to emphasise behaviour management strategies that affirm appropriate behaviour. Consequently, students will be more likely to demonstrate appropriate behaviour. (ERO Te Aroha School, 2006, p., 8)

In the Board Assurance Statement and Self-Audit Checklist which is completed before ERO undertakes its review indicated the areas of school life that were causing them concern. In 2006 and again in 2008 the BOT identified the following as areas of concern for their school: the emotional safety of students (including prevention of bullying and sexual harassment); the physical safety of students; stand-downs, suspensions, expulsions and exclusions; and, attendance. ERO was not directly interested in these self-identified concerns and level of behavioural issues in themselves, but only as areas of potential threats to performance or compliance (ERO, Aroha School, 2006 & 2008).

How the performativity issues raised by the ERO reports are 'remediated' via the neoliberal managerialist processes is the focus of my next section on managerialism.

Universal managerialism

The pervasiveness of the neoliberal reforms is seen in the implication for teachers in their ways of working. Teachers 'professional' lives are controlled by corporate managerialist technologies. Down, Chadbourne and Hogan (2002, p. 2) argue that this engenders a tension between 'managerialist control and teachers' traditional ways of working and talking about their work.' This type of control is more distant and involves remote monitoring through ERO reports. This testing is through summative assessment for reporting purposes, rather than the use of formative assessment, which teachers use for instruction. Thrupp (2006) argues this distance control is at variance with a more traditional, line management, and bureaucratic orientation of teachers.

Teachers have been involved in several professional development contracts using outside consultants involving considerable costs. A literacy consultant was contracted to review the quality of teaching and learning in reading (ERO, 2006). Following a review of the school's behaviour management strategies, to bring about improvements 'teachers participated in whole-school professional development to improve their behaviour management strategies' (ERO, 2006, p. 7). In 2005 The BOT completed plans for significant property development, 'Classrooms have undergone major upgrades and provide students with conditions that are highly conducive to learning' (ERO, 2005, p. 2). All of these significant expenditures came out of an already-stretched budget.

The goal in the 2005 ERO report was to develop a positive learning environment with the aim of lifting student academic performance. The report, as an example, unidentified areas of good performances including school values and mission statement; teamwork; literacy and numeracy testing; formative assessment needs; support for beginning teachers;

and, finally performance management system. The report then highlighted areas for improvement which included: consultation and planning; initiatives to support Māori and Pacific students; review and analysis of school performance; use of student achievement data: behaviour management; and finally, guidelines and expectations. These are in addition to the need to address those areas where the BOT is non-complaint to government regulations and policy.

These areas of performance management requirements make contributions to what Ball (2001, p. 214) indicate a "new kind of teacher" (2001, p.214). The new kind of super teacher is a multi-tasker of the neoliberal creation balancing performativity responsibilities for student achievement and managing the schools' reputation (Whitty, Power & Hatpin, 1998). Besides, a neoliberal teacher must have managerialist competency, be responsive to stakeholders and parental consumers and comply with "strict requirement for curriculum content and assessment" (Oplatka, Hemsley-Brown & Foskett, 2002).

One of the biggest challenges for a neoliberal-orientated Te Aroha School was that it does not acknowledge diversity. The 2005 ERO report (p. 5) noted that 6 of a generated roll entitlement of teachers were new "The employment in 2003 of six beginning teachers resulted in the principal and senior managers developing a variety of strategies to support them". The assumption appears to be that one size of change management process fits all teaching staff regardless of a schools' different socio-historical context and, more importantly, in the case Te Aroha School, its cultural context.

In the next section, I will briefly look at the influence of competition behind the neoliberal 'technical' process of performativity and marketisation.

Competition

After Ball (2001), I argue that the ERO reports, especially the further decontextualised parent summaries contain information for the public on performativity and accountability and may become marketing information. This information "for consumers within the educational market," Ball (2001, p., 2001) and which full primary schools (Years 1-6) in the Te Aroha suburb would be keen to acquire. This desire is because of their aim to take the education of years 7 - 8 from the intermediate school in a process known as re-capitation. In a market-oriented and neoliberal-oriented school, successful student performance is king. In neoliberal parlance, this can create successful schools through performance objectives and the ERO accountability reports. For example, the 2005 ERO report had as its objective the creation of a positive learning environment. Finally, 'successful' schools are established thought neutral performance objects and performativity to attract parents exercising their consumer choices. The traditional local school was replaced in the reforms of the 1980s reforms by dichotomies of successful school and less successful schools (Thrupp, 2007, 2008). Te Aroha School, like others, was keenly aware of the consequences of being described as a 'failing' school.

In sum, the neoliberal reforms in the case Te Aroha School, mediated by the ERO accountability process, has created a strongly neoliberal school culture. In the next section, I will present the conditioning of this culture on that of my co-researchers. In turn, they mutually categorise some negative school cultural experiences as collectively 'unfair.'

School structural injustices

In this section, I present four structural injustices because of the mutual conditioning between the neoliberal influenced and counter conditioning in a judgement of injustice. The

culturally dominant 'neutral' and universal culture is unresponsive to the students' cultures allowing dominant deficit narratives about students, to creep in.

Structural injustice one, underachievement: The damage is already done

The results from the coding categories indicating possible concerns with learning were indicated by only 6 incidents of cheating or 7.79% of the total. From the analysis of the interview data, there is only one incident of learning which concerns unfairness directed towards a teacher for allegedly altering a maths mark. The ERO report for Te Aroha School, for 2005, indicated that "most Pacific students are performing below national norms for their age" (p. 9). For Māori students, the report noted that "Māori students are identified in teachers' classroom descriptions, but there is no clear evidence that this information is used to inform teacher planning." (p. 8). Finally, from the 2006 ERO report, a year of after the high stakes review of 2005, all that a managerialist change-managed process could achieve was:

> Student achievement continues to be a challenge for trustees, senior managers, and teachers. Achievement information gained from the 2005 Tamaki Achievement Pathway (TAP) area-wide reading review of the Assessment Tools for Teaching and learning (asTTle) indicates that, although students at Te Aroha Intermediate School are closely aligned to the cluster mean, they are achieving significantly below the national mean for Year 7 and 8 students (ERO, 2006, p.2).

What are we to make of these converging lines of evidence coming from the performativity theme of the neoliberal teaching environment? At the group level, why is there so little unfairness evident as a breach of norms relating to learning and assessment? From individual unfairness theorised as Fairness Theory (Cropanzano & Folger, 2001) a requirement for a judgement of accountability for unfairness requires a breach of ethics. This, I would argue

is the result of the inauthentic school learning experiences (Aronson, & Laughter, 2016) taking value out of the game by the intermediate school level and that intermediate schooling experiences reinforce it. This pattern of underachievement can also be attributed to many other factors. We know that students in the Te Aroha suburbs primary schools are not doing any better when ERO reports that the … "School is closely aligned to the cluster mean, they are achieving significantly below the national mean for Year 7 and 8 students" (ERO, 2006, p. 2). The students arrive at intermediate school already alienated by assessment and inauthentic pedagogic schooling experiences. Among the factors that this can be attributed to is standardised high stakes assessment in the form of National Standards (Thrupp, 2017; Thrupp & White, 2013), and inauthentic assessment practices (Aronson & Laughter, 2016; Houghton, 2015; Mahuika, Berryman & Bishop, 2011).

The National Government introduced National Standards. The rationale for its introduction was that so many students were failing (ERO, National 2005) and that those at risk of failing were to be identified and reported on to their communities. Teachers were expected to report on reading, writing and mathematics on a four-point scale of 'well below,' 'below,' 'at' and 'above.' Thrupp (2017, p. 12) argues that:

Nevertheless, the National Standards policy has brought plenty of problems too. The RAINS research highlighted curriculum narrowing towards reading, writing and mathematics and towards assessment activities in these areas. It also noted the reinforcement of a two-tier curriculum through incentivising a tighter concentration on numeracy and literacy in low socio-economic schools, while middle-class schools were still able to retain a somewhat freer primary curriculum. There was an

intensification of staff workloads as well as the positioning and labelling of children as a result of the 4- point scale (Thrupp & White, 2013).

Thrupp (2017) further argues that national standards can work to individualise the problem of underachievement when a more structural approach could give a more nuanced understanding of the issues.

Research on parental engagement has received some coverage in the literature. An ERO National Report (2008b) on parental attitudes to engagement with their local school used focus groups and questions to explore this issue with regards to assessment. Assessment for Māori parents "they expected schools to give honest accurate and useful information about their child's progress and achievement" (ERO, 2008b, p. 2). Besides, "Māori parents said it was difficult to work in partnership when report interviews were rushed and not always well prepared. Some had concerns about not being well informed about when their children had difficulties with learning…" (Education Review Office, National Report, 2008b, p. 2). Pasifika parents also expected "honest reporting about their child's progress and achievement. They also expected to be contacted sooner rather than later when concerns were raised about their children's education" (Education Review Office national report, 2008b, p. 2). High stakes assessment twice a year and in an arcane language barely meet the needs of either Māori or Pasifika parental requirements for engagement on assessment.

Houghton (2015), in an exploration of the relationship between the underachievement of Māori and Pasifika students, draws a relationship between this phenomenon and culturally responsive assessment. He describes current assessment practices as "problematizing the practice of standardised assessment, the measurement of 'success,' and what cultural bodies of knowledge are valued in the development of in the development of assessment"

(Houghton, 2015, p. 1). Based on research that indicates cultural responsiveness requires a cultural identifying process. When each student can see themselves in the processes and structures of the school a sense of belonging within the education system (Carrington & MacArthur, 2012; Nakhid, 2002) can develop. Nakhid believes that Pasifika [and Māori] people in New Zealand are ascribed an identity by the predominantly Pākehā majority through the narrow lens of their shortcomings; low socio-economic status, under-achievement, and Pasifika ethnicity (2002).

Houghton (2015) argues that standardised assessment allows individual school, and international comparisons to be made. However, this is a high stakes summative assessment with infrequent assessments and reporting periods. Drawing on a Bishop et al. 2012 (cited in Houghton, 2015, p.2) paper, he challenges the problematising summative and pedagogy, and the measurement of success. The work of Bishop et al. (2012), and Macfarlane (2015), with Māori students and Nakhid (2002, 2003, 2006) with Pasifika students indicates that what is required to engage students and their families is culturally responsive relationships.

In sum, I have advanced an argument that the dominance of Pākehā oriented assessment and pedagogy over education in Aotearoa acts as a normalising process. This ignores both Māori and Pasifika students and their developmental identifying process by failing to adopt a sociocultural perspective that sees students as individuals in their cultural settings. Students arrive at and leave intermediate school alienated. Based on the converging lines of evidence, presented at the initial part of this section, the Te Aroha students are the alienated before they reach intermediate school.

To return to the birdcage metaphor, the fused double helix of the 'underachievement' as social structure, is the alienation reaction of an encounter between differential relational

powers. A summative assessment wire emerging from the neoliberal base of the cage interacts and has to do with a lack of the recognition of Māori and Pasifika students' respective identities. These two strands become fused as a double helix continuing to the top of the cage as oppression and marginalisation which I have termed "underachievement."

Structural injustice two: The contextualising of bullying as lateral violence

One by-product I witnessed was Māori beating up other Māori. It has been called lateral violence. In other words, colonisation of the mind infected upon us so much that, in order to feel better about ourselves, we need to scorn one another. It is a brilliant colonising tool. Get the colonised to bring themselves down. Genius. (Elder, 2019, p. 15).

Definition

Returning to my analogy of the birdcage in this section I present lateral violence as a type of fused double helix wire in the social structure of the birdcage. From the base of the cage emerges the primary influence of the dominant relational power of a managerialist teaching culture, but one which is also chaotic and overwhelming with behavioural challenges, or concerns (ERO Te Aroha School, 2005). From the inside of the cage emerges the 'conditioned school' lives of the Māori and Pasifika students, the result of little culturally based relational power. Around the cage are many hundreds of such lateral violence wires the result of thousands of mutually reinforcing conditioning incidents of unfairness. These wires are finally fused via the relational emotion power of anger and sadness contributing to lateral violence leading to their marginalisation.

Interpersonal violence is a feature of many cultures around the world (David-Ferdon, & Simon, 2014). Lateral violence is a recently coined term which is described as:

A cluster of behaviours known as lateral violence thought to be prevalent within Aboriginal communities. Lateral violence can occur within oppressed societies and include bullying, gossiping, feuding, shaming, and blaming other members of one's social group as well as having a lack of trust toward other group members (Bombay, Matheson & Anisman, 2014, p. 2).

Lateral violence has its origins in the decolonisation literature from Africa (Fanon, 1967) and Latin America (Freire, 1972). Lateral violence as a research concept is most extensively utilised in nursing studies research to describe a conflict in that profession. Terms used in nursing studies include horizontal violence (Roy, 2007) and eating their young (Stanley, Dulaney & Martin, 2007).

Applying lateral violence to research on the disempowerment of adolescents is a relatively new concept. The First Nations peoples of Canada, Inuit, and Metis communities have talked about how those in positions of powerlessness direct their disaffection toward themselves, each other and those on another similar situation (Derrick, 2006). Three features of lateral violence are identified by Derrick (2006). One, the indigenous people can repeat the coloniser oppression by oppressing others in their community. Two, there is a focus on the negative features of another person or group. Three, group attacks on others are universal.

Having defined lateral and youth violence and from the literature highlights some of its main features, I now move onto my main section on lateral violence. The remainder of the section is structured organisationally as: lateral violence as a pattern; a mutual conditioning process; and some potential consequences.

A pattern of lateral violence

In this section, I lay out a possible position for intra-peer bullying as lateral violence. I base this on the patterning of offending behaviours, interpretations, and judgement of injustice associated with powerlessness.

The negative events or stressors from the qualitative survey give a reasonable indication of the overt features of the pattern of lateral violence, as found within Te Aroha School. The total number of negative events coded to lateral violence is 68. This total represents 88.31% of the total sample (n = 77). Descriptive statistics as Percentages for the negative events are as follows: verbal abuse, 36.36% (n = 28); sporting disputes, 23.37% (n = 18); taking of other possessions, 7.79% (n = 6); pushed out of line, 7.79% (n = 6); and finally, cheating, 7.79% (n = 6). Patterns of bullying behaviours reported in positivist surveys (Green et al., 2013; Lai et al., 2008; Denny et al., 2015) are largely de-contextualised, but similar to that reported by my co-researchers (verbal abuse, stealing, pushing and cheating). For example, Green et al. (2013) reported bullying by type as verbal, social/relational, physical and cyberbullying. If the bullying reported by my co-researchers accounts for 71.4% of the total number of incidents of unfairness, and the rate of response for the qualitative survey is 18.58%, then there is some validity in indicating that bullying may be an issue for Te Aroha School. However, I must caution the reader as this research was never intended to be a survey of bullying behaviours.

A recent TIMS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) study by Mullis et al., (2012) suggested that adolescents in Aotearoa have the highest rates of bullying worldwide. However, other researchers (e.g., Green et al., 2013) suggest that this may be a

function of the types of bullying reported, how they are brought to the attention of school staff and how staff and students perceive them.

The majority (n = 68) of offenders were single students 58.82% (n = 40), but group (2 or more) bullying was still significant at 41.17% (n = 28). The offenders were split between 44.1% (n = 30) from Year 7, and 55.8 %(n = 38) from Year 8. Behaviours like bullying can create roles (bullies to victims) and can influence how others behave in the presence of such victims (victims to bullies). Feelings such as injustice can create what Bowling and Behr (2006) call reciprocation in the presence of the original bullying. Reciprocation may occur in the form of retaliatory behaviours with the aim of getting even. Another part of this reciprocation may involve social learning.

The importance of observation, and modelling of behaviours, and emotional responses in reciprocation of bullying may be because of social learning theory (Bandura & Walters, 1977). Known as reciprocal determinism Bandura posited that the school world and a student's behaviour cause one another. In the context of lateral violence, students may tend to emulate behaviours in retaliation. When the bullying of a student is occurring, a student may also copy the bullying behaviour of others in order to be accepted. According to Bandura the social world of the school (world) and the student (individuals) on the same social level can condition each other's behaviours (reciprocal determinism).

The pattern of offending against the cultural standards of Vä (Reynolds, 2018) for Pasifika students and Tikanga Māori in the case of Māori are shown in the statement of 'it is not fair. In a 'collective' cultural injustice these ethical standards are the third feature of a judgement of unfairness. In Fairness Theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001), the remaining two features are a negative event and establishing culpability for that event. In the pattern of

victims (n = 68), four cultural standards offended against are presented as follows: peer verbal abuse, 45.58% (n = 31); othering, 29. 41%, (n = 20) (attributing internal offender characteristics as the cause for unfairness); not conforming to procedural rules, 14.70% (n = 10); and, stealing from others, 10.29% (n = 7).

The pattern of bullying that I have presented can be interpreted as a pattern of lateral violence based on the behaviour characteristics, offender patterns, cultural ethics offended against and their respective victim's powerlessness. A cluster of behaviours known as lateral violence, "can occur within oppressed societies and include bullying, gossiping, feuding, shaming, and blaming other members of one's social group as well as having a lack of trust toward other group members" (Bombay, Matheson & Anisman, 2014, p. 2).

An interpretation of lateral violence in the school

The pioneering work of Olweus (Olweus & Limber, 2010) brought bullying to the research world. Since that time much of the focus has been on methods to reduce bullying within positivist research. This approach mostly assumes that bullying is a static construct and that the characteristics of an offender can typify it. A deficit discourse (Gergen, 1994) may be constructed on a lack of empathy (Merrell, 2008), self-esteem (Salmivalli, 2001), social perception (Merrell, 2008, ibid), and even evolution (Juvonen, 2005). I argue that the link between deficit discourses and bullying is tenuous at best.

The approach adopted in my work is that bullying is a power tactic (de Certeau, 1984) in relations between student peers. The idea is embedded in relational psychology, rather than an individualised deficit psychology, where causation is sought in power relations between students. Bullying as an outcome of structural or social contexts has been addressed by Iris Marion Young (1990, 2001) as oppressed group behaviours. Her analysis is based on the

idea of oppression as being normatively 'justified' in a mutual dance between the oppressors and oppressed.

In 2005 Walton (2005) issued a challenge to researchers. "I advocate for a broader framework of understanding, one that also provides an analysis of power relations of political, historical and ideological contexts that give rise to environments in which bullying occurs." A number of researchers have adopted power/critical orientations to strengthen empirical conceptualisations of bullying. These include a more comprehensive environmental take on bullying (Balanovic et al., 2016; Walton, 2005), secondary schools (Rasmussen et al., 2015; Sexton, 2012), teachers and students (Macintyre, 2009; Hepburn, 1997), and secondary school students (Ryan & Morgan, 2011), but none at all at the middle school level. This is my challenge.

Some of the consequences of identifying bullying as lateral violence may include the following (1) disruption of the identity of Pasifika students as unsuccessful learners (2) revealing silencing and stigma (3) revealing the long-term effects of normalisation. I will develop these points after I have laid out my third structure of teacher to student bullying.

Structure three: The injustice of teacher bullying

Introduction

'It is not fair' can be the warning of a structural group injustice when the dominant neoliberal culture of Te Aroha School negatively impacts its students' cultural values and is reacted to by students. This is an instance of mutual conditioning by Young's definition. In this section, I argue that this relational dominance can function through the social structure of teacher bullying. This dominance can come at the expense of the lack of recognition of students' cultural values, student safety, ethical issues, and professional standards.

Significantly, teacher bullying may destroy the potential for successful learning relationships between students and teachers. Students, in turn, can condition their teachers by following a judgement of injustice. This may result in a collective cry "It is not fair" as a protest, anger, and effecting fields of relational actions, such as disengagement. Research has indicated that in good student-teacher relationships, the teacher can be a significant determinant of academic success (Hattie, 2012).

Definitions

I will refer to teacher bullying, after Davies (2011), who used a definition consistent with that of a critical perspective as "a repeated pattern of conduct to punish, manipulate, or disparage a student; this behaviour is rooted in a power differential" (p. 8). The main reason for opting for this definition is the prominence given to the role of power along with my perception that this is how my co-researchers construct their concept of bullying. The positivist literature, seeking precision, leaves a variety of definitions in its wake. There are numerous variations on each of the following terms of maltreatment (e.g., Childers, 2009), and abuse (e.g., Brendgen et al., 2006) in the research literature.

A Pattern of teacher bullying

Teacher bullying incidents from my qualitative survey account for only 11.68% (n = 9) from a total of 77 of unfairness events. While this superficially a low number, the impact of teacher bullying on student educational outcomes may be significant due to its hidden nature (McEvoy, 2005).

In the rest of this section, I will present one brief student perspective from the 13 interviews as giving a representative student perspective on teacher bullying as a clash of values causing social structural injustice.

As an example, Chair's story starts with her having sat a summative maths test, in which she achieved her highest marks ever. As a result, she was in a happy mood and looking forward to telling her mother of her success. Chair was the first to sit the test as determined by the alphabetical order of the class roll. Later the same day her teacher remarked the test item, a money problem, which resulted in Chair getting it recorded as incorrect. Three other girls of the same ethnic origin as the teacher and another boy had the same answer of $15.00 and had their answer accepted as being correct. After some consideration chair concluded that her teacher had favoured three girls of the same culture, as well as lying to her. Chair said that she came from a primary school where she had never experience this type of behaviour before. Her understanding is that all teachers need to be reliable and able to be trusted. Chair had concluded that her teacher was not a good teacher, as teachers should not lie, or favour, others. These values appear to have their origin in Chair's family had been confirmed by her experience at primary school.

Values Clash

Literature searches of the relevant databases revealed no studies on the topic of a clash of cultural values at the intermediate school level. However, indirect research from an ERO survey of parental expectations of schools by Education Review Office (2008b) and followed up by Mutch and Collins (2012) may provide some insights.

From an ERO survey (2008b) of Māori and Pasifika parental engagement with schools, the following insights into cultural expectations may be gleaned. When asked what Māori parents expect of schools they responded: "They wanted their children to become confident learners who accepted challenges and maintained their mana," (ERO, 2008b, p. 6). In response to the question of what worked well, the Māori parents responded, "Māori parents wanted

their children to have good learning relationships with their teacher(s). They thought that this was more likely to happen when teachers related well to their students, respecting and acknowledging their cultural identity", (ERO, 2008b, p. 8). On the issue(s) of what made engagement different, Māori parents responded with "Teachers who held negative or deficit views and attitudes about their children were of particular concern to parents. Some parents believed that their children would have to battle these views and attitudes throughout their schooling", (ERO, 2008b, p. 6).

Further, from this survey, Māori parents wanted their children to do well at school, but not at the expensive of their mana. They required teachers to have respect for and acknowledge their children's' culture. Some of the parents expressed concern about the possibility of teachers holding negative views about their childrens' culture and that they might have to battle these throughout their schooling.

In the same survey on some characteristics of parental engagement with schools Pasifika parents were asked what made engagement positive. "They noted that engagement worked best when their child's culture was acknowledged and respected." When asked what made engagement difficult, Pasifika respondents said that … "parents found it hard when the principal or teacher contacted them only when their child did something wrong. This was not made any easier when they saw teachers involved in negative interactions with their children", Education Review Office. (2008b). Like views of Māori parents, Pasifika ones desired from their children teachers' respect and acknowledgment for the values of their respective cultures. Collectively, parents in this survey required cultural responsiveness from their children's teachers.

If these adverse events are viewed as individual incidents of discipline they can be dismissed as such, construction of individualism is in line with the discipline processes inherent within the Te Aroha School. Constructions of disciple do not allow for recognition of disciplinary interactions between teacher and students as bullying. There is both a legal and common-sense presumption that teachers can disciple in the way they do. The justification in Aotearoa comes from the legal concept of in 'loco parentis' (in the place of a parent) where the teacher is assumed to have the rights and responsibilities of a parent while at school. This commonsense assumption is based on the sense/misunderstanding that when disciplining a student, they have the right to behave in that way. This common-sense construction (and generalised use of the legal concept of in loco parentis) has the potential to hide teacher bullying as an abuse of power (Hepburn, 1997).

I argue, after Young (2001), that this structure refers to the relation of the underlying social positions of teacher and student. Social positions are posited as being independent of the individuals occupying those positions. A conditioning process occurs when teachers who are operating in their given role, through the relationally dominant neoliberal educational, move beyond into bullying. Bullying may be disguised by those exercising 'legitimate' teacher powers. The outcome of bullying is both unethical and unprofessional, but may also be culturally unresponsive to their students' needs for safety, respect and positive relations. The actions and interactions of teacher bullying may include negative conditions for students by destroying positive teacher to student relationships, and expectations for them. The outcomes of this structural relationship may contribute to marginalisation in the form of a loss of cultural identity as academically successful Māori and Pasifika students. Positivistic research indicates that quality teacher-student relationships may be the most significant (Hattie, 2012) factor

contributing to the research participants' successful academic outcomes. The negative cultural dominance of neoliberal culture is mutually conditioning. Those in the role of the student are conditioned by teacher bullying into either disengagement or coping by talking to peers. Two methods of coping styles are relatively passive. Student coping even interpreted as passive resistance potentially condition those in the bullying teacher role to continued use of bullying. This exercise of power may continue under the guise of the legitimate use of discipline power (Hepburn, 1997). Thus "The unintended consequences of the confluence of many actions often produce and reinforce such opportunities, and these constraints make their mark on the future condition of future actions, as well as on the habits and expectation of actors" (Young, 2001, p. 15).

The impact of teacher bullying

Discussions of teacher bullying behaviours that may adversely impact students come from positivist academic, social, and psychological research on the topic (O'Connor, 2010; Ray, 2007; Split & Koomen, 2009; Twemlow et al., 2006). Academically, when faced with a teacher's bullying a student's focus is moved from academic tasks into a fight or flight mode. Incidents of bullying may challenge self-perceptions and cognitive processes leading to negative behaviours and potential mental health issues (Brendgen, 2007). "A positive school climate is critical to student motivation and academic success, but the presence of teacher-to-student maltreatment can cause physical, mental, and/or emotional harm to a student" (Childers, 2009, p. 9). Teachers', bullying behaviours can be associated with a learning context which may be incompatible with the best education practice, leaving a student to contend with practices which may be associated with marginalisation (Davies, 2011). Bullying under the hidden guise of legitimate discipline can leave students "subjected to deliberate humiliation that can never serve a legitimate educational purpose" (McEvoy, 2005, p. 141).

Socially, the bullying teacher's classroom can be a negative environment (Brendgen et al., 2007; Davies, 2011). McEvoy (2005) noted a fearful teaching context in which "humans fear shunning and humiliation almost as much (if not more) as we fear physical harm. This means the threat of humiliation can be used as a weapon" (p. 142). Humiliation by a bullying teacher of a student victim is an enormous abuse of power resulting in cultural abuse and is possibly unprofessional and immoral. McEvoy, (2005), argues that there is much anecdotal evidence of teachers' putting down students. Also, there is an issue with those who "do nothing, ignore, or perhaps even enjoy the pain of those who are responding to the bullying" (Twemlow et al., 2006, p. 188). As a result of being hidden from public gaze bullying behaviour by the teacher in the classroom may be a more significant concern than currently recognised.

Psychologically, teacher bullying may be "as significant a source of strain as physical punishment" upon an unsuspecting student (Moon et al., 2009, p. 104). Students who are the victims of teacher bullying may be recipients of negative emotions, creating psychological concerns. These emotions may feature as anger, anxiety, attentional control, and behavioural challenges and may be manifested in later adult life (Moon et al., 2009).

In conclusion, the bullying action of teachers and the consequent withdrawal interactions of students may mutually condition one another. The conditioning bullying actions of teachers, under the guise of legitimate power, can provoke a conditioning withdrawal on the part of students. The withdrawal of students may negatively reinforce teacher bullying thus, ensuring its continuance. This mutually reinforcing conditioning process of negative teacher and student withdrawal and their impact on the individual may be hard to change. Research indicates that positive relationships between teachers and student are

essential to academic success (Hattie, 2012). The lack of a positive teacher-student relationship may contribute to student educational marginalisation.

Implications of bullying: Intra-peer and teacher-to-student bullying

When investigating lateral violence in the indigenous Australian arts sector, I was struck by three key findings. The first was the confirmation by way of confidential disclosures as to how widespread it is. The second was general reluctance to come forward for fear of retribution primarily in the form of further loss of funding. However, the third was a lack of knowledge around the definition of lateral violence and the blatant acts of emotional abuse …   (Cook, 2012, p., 1).

While Cook is commenting on the indigenous art sector in Australia, I am struck by some of the parallels with lateral violence in Te Aroha School. In particular, the impact of lateral violence on young lives with its secretiveness, emotional impact, and potential disruption.

Educational identify disruption

When Bishop and Berrymans' (2006, p. 255) Year 9 and 10 Māori students spoke of how they reacted to teacher unfairness as:

some spoke of retreating into themselves, or drugs, and using selective absenteeism as a mean of escaping from untenable relationships in some particular classrooms. One group told us how they reacted and 'fought back,' signalling to us that they were striving for their self-determination within the situation they saw as manifestly unfair" they were both protesting their loss of identity and attempting to regain it.

For the Māori students in Bishop and Berrymans' (2006) focused on the loss of authentic cultural relationships. While keeping the broader focus on colonisation, they theorised that the ongoing degradation of relationships is deficit theorising (Bishop, 2005). I now will move onto the lack of identity in education for my Pasifika co-researchers.

Nakhid (2003, p. 314) refers to the presence of Pasifika in education as "little more than intrusions into a system which holds a minimal benefit for them rather than as participants in the educational process." The emergence of people of the Pasifika Islands in Aotearoa as Pasifika people can be attributed mainly to the requirement of the labour market from the 1950s until approximately the early 1970s (Ongley, 1996). The Pasifika peoples came to fill labour requirements in labouring and semi-skilled positions. As migrant peoples, they entered an education system that was very Palangi (Pākehā or white) culturally dominant, monoculture and monolingual. As Nakhid (2003) has argued little had changed educationally since the Pasifika people first arrived in Aotearoa.

From a critical perspective what is required for Māori and Pasifika is to be included (Tuafuti & McCaffery, 2005) recognised (Cahill, 2006) and have access to success (Parkhill, 2005) and to do so, they need their identities recognised (Nakhid, 2003). Ferguson and others (Ferguson et al. 2008, p. 26) have referred to the pluralities of identity because:

First, to draw attention to the multiple island nations subsumed within the term "Pasifika" and second, because the term may cause readers to reflect in a more focused way on the expectations placed on students whose parents are immigrants, or second or third generation New Zealanders.

The literature of reports, and the little available research (largely post-graduate) available on Pasifika identity assumes the dominant Palangi cultural viewpoints (Nakhid, 2003). Specifically, this research focuses on a Palangi (European) image as a basis for comparison with those from Pasifika.

Nakhid's (2003) work on the identity-formation processes of Pasifika students used a mediated dialogue technique to question 12 students in later adolescence aged between 16 - 19 years. She also used the mediated dialogue technique with a group of teachers. The main findings indicate that teachers did not consider students' perceptions as the findings did not complement one another. The school formed teacher accounts and they did not consider the students' perspectives. The teachers' lack of considering their Pasifika students' own perspective of their identity response, highlights the clash of value systems. For students, their school identities came not from income or social status, but from their identities as Pasifika people. For teachers, their values determine their views of students, and their parents, and the institutional responses of the school. Nakhid (2003, p 326) summarise this as:

> This is of utmost importance because as it currently exists, it is the schools' perceptions of Pasifika students and the way that the education system interprets the presence of these students that are used to determine the institutional responses to their presence.

The cultural concept of Vä is one of Pacific Island origin which can have some use in explaining and conceptualising relationships in Pasifika-related educational contexts (Reynolds, 2018). Vä is of spiritual origin and is constructed through a joint venture. According to Aiono-Le Tagaloa (2003), the Vä space is always set towards a dynamic equilibrium linking the spiritual with the physical and social realms. The metaphor of a Vä as space is often used

to describe the relational space between people and objects. According to Reynolds (2018, p. 73), Vä is essential to the teacher and student relationships and can be viewed as moving between "closeness/connection and distance/separation." As Pasifika students' identity as successful students depends on closeness and connection, bullying as lateral violence is a disruption to the Vä and consequently to the development of a strong Pasifika successful learner identity.

Silencing and stigma

A culture of silence is common among oppressed peoples according to Freire (1972). Such a culture can be detrimental as it restricts and constrains its affiliates from examining their world critically. Consequently, one of the functions of oppression is to silence indigenous peoples, minorities (Young, 1990) and their communities on sensitive viewpoints. Keeping silent is like a young person crawling under their bed to avoid parental criticism. Sensitive topics can be kept from the dominating, scrutinising, and judging of mainstream media. Thus, a culture of silence can be protective of the individual and group. Others argue that silencing is more about the structural maintenance of power that is obscured by being embedded deep within its structures (Cook, 2012).

Ryan and Morgan (2011), utilising a discourse analysis, explored the social construction of bullying by 24 secondary students in Aotearoa. The student's articulation of their sense-making was constructed as two main themes featuring bullying because of differences and as a form of discipline. These two constructions had "the effect of legitimising the schools' institutional power imbalance" (Ryan & Morgan, 2011, p. 1). Schools in their discipline programmes rely on what the authors call range of normalisation technologies. Students are 'co-opted' into this process as part of the majority view by bullying, a normalising for the

correction of social abnormalities. The second construction of the individualisation of bullying fits in with the first construct. The focus on individual students having to take responsibility for their problem behaviours, legitimises teacher behaviour as 'discipline' and 'not bullying'. A critical perspective involves exposing the elephant in the room. The Te Aroha school students are impacted by the dominant cultural power and its hidden relational contribution to marginalisation.

However, violence appears to be a sensitive issue and there is a reluctant to name the topic in a variety of contexts within Aotearoa. In nursing, "violence is not part of our job" has been referred to by Baby, Glue, and Carlyle (2014). Sexual violence has been reported in the Māori community as a 'sensitive' topic (Cavino, 2016; Pihema et al., 2016), along with suicide (Getz, 2018). The Government launched a violence prevention programme specifically tailored to Pacific Islanders in New Zealand on 7/05/2018 called Atu-Mai. "ACC figures showed that young Pacific people were three times more likely to be exposed to family violence compared with the general population. They made up a disproportionate number of ACC assault claims and their injuries from assault tended to be worse. At the same time, three-quarters of violent or sexual incidents experienced within Pacific families were not formally reported" (Davison, 2018, p. 1). Boulton et al. (2007) report that bullied students' fear of stigmatisation may prevent them from speaking up and seeking counselling.

Once a topic of violence reaches the media and is open to public examination, it can become subject to stigmatisation. This exposure to social or cultural difference can invite stigma to individuals associated with the differences (Link and Phelan, 2001). Labels, when applied to individual students can be correlated with negative characterisation and discriminatory generalisations. Labels can become associated with intergroup power

differences by labelling a separation of 'us from them' (Link & Phelan, 2001). This power has been termed stigma power by Link and Phelan (2014). This power can be hidden in its operation within processes of adolescent bullying, privileging another cultural-social system.

The stigmatisation of individuals can also apply to social concepts (Phelan, Link, & Dovidio, 2008). Once a concept is labelled, then differences can be discerned, and the importance of those differences can be apparent with power reactions (Green et al., 2005). Applying labels to Pasifika and Māori students identifying them with bullying as lateral violence can invite differentiation in mainstream media representations for both Māori (Maydell, 2018) and Pasifika (Loto, et al., 2006).

Long term effects of normalisation

The type of trauma experienced by Māori (people of the land) people in Aotearoa has been referred to as the 'colonisation and historical trauma' (Pihema et al., 2016), 'historical effects of colonisation' (Getz, 2018) and as 'settler colonisation and intergenerational effects of violence', (Cavino, 2016). In North America, it is referred to as historical trauma (Evans-Campbell, 2008).

Colonisation has disputed Māori ways of knowing, understating, and practices (Ministry of Justice, 2001). The dominating colonial culture has resulted in significant changes (Mikaere, 2003; Pihema et al., 2016; Smith, 1999; Walker, 1990; Walker 1996). It has been postulated that the marginalised status of Māori now is a reflection of colonisation (Balazer et al., 2007). This status drives a similar situation for research undertaken by North American, indigenous researchers into the impact of historical trauma. This research group has reported higher levels, relative to North American whites, of trauma, abuse, violence, substance abuse, depression, and PTSD (Balsam et al. 2004; Duran, 2006; Walters, Simoni, & Evans-Campbell,

2002). Historical trauma is argued to be the collective conscious experience of trauma in historical occurrences. The intergenerational nature of trauma located within historical trauma theory has been labelled as pivotal, as a lack of current knowledge and acknowledgment by Pākeha governments has led to the misunderstanding of survivors and they're not being treated (Brave, 2000). This collective historical trauma is beginning to be acknowledged by the government, "Māori are still in grieving mode. A genuine effort must be made toward healing the past before building a future" (Ministry of Justice, 2001, p. iv).

In a 2016 paper, Cavino advanced a theory of violence, specifically as intergenerational sexual violence, as:

> Contextualising interpersonal sexual violation in this context requires a focus on colonisation's impact vis-a-vis the breakdown of systems of social control, changes to family, and shifts in gender relations precipitated through loss of proximity to land and collective/public modes of being, (Cavino, 2016, p.,8).

British colonial mechanisms intended to expedite land settlement included missionary schooling. Land alienation in the 19th and 20th centuries led to population movement and population decline as Māori were forced to migrate from traditional iwi areas. In doing, so relationships with land fractured. This had disastrous impacts on Māori social relations and control. Some indigenous researchers have drawn on the parallels between interpersonal violence in indigenous communities and colonisation (Deer, 2004; Duran, 2006; Smith, 2012). Māori researchers have progressively drawn a link between interpersonal violence and colonial violence (Pihama et al., 2003; Ruwhiu, 2009; Smith, 2012). This group of indigenous researchers has paid attention to the destructive nature of the colonial education system on knowledges associated with interpersonal violence (e.g., Pihama et al., 2016; Smith, 2012).

The pattern of the power imbalance between Māori and colonial administrations is one of dominance and subordination and has persisted because of the colonial heritage. These results have been aided by the education system (Bishop & Glynn, 1999a; Walker, 1990). The education system has greatly economically advantaged Pākehā and impoverished and marginalised Māori. The dominance of Pākehā knowledge has resulted in a monoculturalism and monolingualism. Some commentators and academics attribute the long tail of educational underachievement for Māori to deficit theorising (Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Bishop & Glynn, 1999a). Bishop and Glynn (1999a) summarised this deficit theorising as focusing on a lack of ability, limited resources, lack of cultural appropriateness and at worst a pathology.

Deficit theorising has resulted in a one size fits all education system, ignoring the importance of context, cultural factors, and processes in research. Bishop and Berryman (2006) and others have developed the Te Kotahitanga programme as a culturally responsive, professional development, and a teaching programme which derives from a Kaupapa Māori, culturally relevant, research base.

Having completed this major section on intra-peer and teacher- to -student bullying, lateral bullying, and its impact I now move to my final structure in the death and grieving, or Tangihanga.

Structure injustice four: Tangihanga

In this section of the critical reinterpretation, I argue that the closure of Te Aroha School, announced in 2012, represents a working out of the neoliberal views on competition. Aspects of the ERO reports, along with the neoliberal- oriented Edge Review on the future of schooling in the Te Aroha suburb, were driven by the belief in the infallibility of parental consumer choice as to which school they should send their children. According to Ball (2001,

p. 210), inter-school comparisons and the commodification of knowledge served as 'information for consumers within the education market.' Successful schools are measured through student assessment and audits that give the appearance of being 'neutral.' The neoliberal argument is schools that become 'winner' (Thrupp, 2006) schools by being successful in reaching their performance objectives and students' achievement levels. The argument posits that this success comes through attracting parents via consumer 'choice' (Ball, 2001).

Te Aroha School is not the first Intermediate school to close in the suburbs adjacent to Te Aroha School. In 2003, another intermediate school closed when Minister of education Mallard of the Labour government announced this school with a roll of 37 would be shut "Bell tolls for school left to struggle alone," (Watkins, 2013). This closure can be attributed to either pragmatic reasons or ideological ones. The Labour government of the time was running an education policy still imbued with quasi-market reasoning. From this ideological perspective a falling school roll with 37, at the time of closure, can be seen as a consequence of parental choice. This can be interpreted as a consumer action and therefore according to this ideology the school should close.

It may also be argued if a school is not viable from a practical and financial point of view it should not be kept open. The school site gave the government an opportunity to land-bank it for Treaty of Waitangi (a treaty settlement of grievances between the state and original people of New Zealand) settlements agreements for local Māori iwi (tribe). Finally, in this educational community, local primary principals have long favoured the educational model of a full primary school (Years 1-8) over that of an intermediate school one. In either case, it set

a precedent for school closures within the suburb of Te Aroha School. The story of Te Aroha's role declines and closure is that of a so-called deficit or 'loser' school (Thrupp, 2006).

The history of the schools' roll growth and decline can be partly traced to ERO's attitude toward the school's level of underachievement and other ideological positions. The 2005 ERO report placed the cause for its negative review on inconsistent teaching and learning. At the time of a relatively positive ERO review for 2001, the school roll was at 232 students. By the time of the 2005 ERO review, the roll total had reached 321 students and stayed at this number until 2006, reflecting its resilience as an organisation. The 2008 ERO report noted that:

> the school went through an unsettled period in 2007 when it participated in a Ministry of Education review of the viability of schools in the Te Aroha suburb area. The review process impacted on staff morale and slowed the momentum of positive change within the school (Te Aroha School ERO Report, 2008, p. 2).

ERO noted a decline from 320 students in 2006 to 273 students, in 2008. The uncertainty of review of schooling in the Te Aroha area seems to have had a more significant impact on the school roll than the 2005 report. By 2013, the school roll had fallen to 144; around half of what it had been in 2008. In 2013 it was reported that Education Minister, Anne Tolley announced the closure of Te Aroha School:

> Local primaries applied last year to expand and provide education for students in Years 7 and 8. The wider stakeholder community was asked in April to consider several options for the future of the local schools, including maintaining the status quo, closing Te Aroha Intermediate and putting some full primary schools back to

just Years 1-6. Yesterday, Ms. Tolley said feedback from that public consultation made it clear there was a preference for full primary schools up to Year 8 in Te Aroha suburb (Herald on Sunday, 2012).

In an earlier newspaper article, the principal of Te Aroha School reported that 'a survey last year found 87 percent of parents wanted (Te Aroha school) to stay open (Binning, 2013). The student voice on the schools' closure emerged when:

A delegation of 11- and 12-year-old pleaded with the board of trustees to save the school they loved but to no avail. *Te Aroha* was a struggling school, in a poor neighbourhood, with a falling roll …. Ira, a smart and well-spoken 13-year-old, says I moved from Henderson Intermediate, and I thought I was going to hate it at Te Aroha because of all the new people. However, the first day, there were smiling faces, and I made friends".

Moreover, the teachers help you learn. Intermediate helps you assimilate into college. It is easier to go from intermediate to college than it is to jump straight from primary school. I'm sad, in a way. Knowing that the intermediate will not be there for the younger kids, it is sad (Binning, 2013).

I would argue that the consultation can be interpreted as an ideologically driven one where the broader stakeholder community had more power than the school's community.

The literature on school closure is limited, but it does touch on the impact of closures. Mutch (2017) cites population loss as the main reason followed by ideological reasons for permanent closure (poor performance). The literature on the closing of schools is negative concerning students and teachers. De Witte and Van Klaveren (2014) found no improvement

for Dutch students in their achievement levels when they moved to higher-performing schools after the closure of their poor performing schools. In the USA, Kirshner, Gaertner and Pozzoboni (2014) found, following closure, that student test scores were lower, dropout rates increased, and a range of emotional responses from anger to resentment and indifference were present. Teachers have reported (Riseborough, 1994) being disempowered by the process, deprofessionalised, having anger, and uncertainty at their school's closure. In sum, the literature indicates that 'School closures do not appear to improve student outcomes and can even decrease the performance of disadvantaged and marginalised groups' (Mutch, 2017, p. 79).

The end of inter-school competition, at least in the short term, may come to an end five years after the closure of Te Aroha intermediate School, when:

> Schools are being told that the era of competing for students may soon end, as the new Labour Government plans wide-ranging changes to the education system. Education Minister Chris Hipkins has announced a three-year programme to review the "Tomorrow's Schools" model of competing schools that dates from 1989… (Collins, 2008).

In conclusion, it is early days as I write this chapter in mid-2018, but the emphasis may move from a model of competing schools to sustainable ones.

This now completes the development of my argument for four structures of cultural, relational injustices. The last one of Tangihanga lies outside of direct counter conditioning of an injustice judgement, but I would argue that it is implied.

Responsibility: Liability or social connections

In Chapters 2 and 5, I based my analysis for an understanding of blame for unfairness on Fairness theory (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). The model operates at the level of the individual 'victim' and invokes a process of an injury which causes damage or worsens a situation; discretionary behaviour over which a transgressor has hegemony; and

the breaking of a moral or ethical norm. If all three of these components are present, then individual or group agents, can be held accountable for an unfair event.

At the level of societal structural injustice, the concept of responsibility lies between people by virtue of the social connections and obligations between them. In the first place, the harm comes to people because of the structural social injustice causing marginalisation, or other forms of oppression. The second part arises from the responses of moral agents and how they conceptualise responsibilities arising from the injustice. Young (2006, p. 102) conceptualises her social connection model as "based on social connection as an interpretation of obligations of justice arising from structural social processes."

My contribution to communicative engagement as political action is this dissertation and its dissemination in various media. The Haque Report (2017*), Our Schooling Futures, Stronger Together* commissioned by the Labour (political party) -led coalition government now published, presents an opportunity for communicative engagement by me.

'It is not fair': As resistant emotion

"Instances of unfairness (like instances of injustice and instances of inequity) have clarity and concreteness to them; they typically come with heat and passion, anger and outrage; and they intently press for action or redress," (Finkel, 2001, p. 57)

To briefly return to my analogy, in this last section of this chapter, I present an argument for the final 'fusing' of the double helix via a theory of relational emotion (Burkitt, 2014). The two fusing helixes are composed of the mutual conditioning of the processes of an unresponsive neoliberal culture and that of intra-peer bullying behaviour as a form of lateral violence. There are many hundreds of fused wires making up the structure of the cage.

Moving away from my analogy what does this fusing entail? This link is between unjust judgements enunciated 'collectively' as "it is not fair" and affected action. My theorisation of this takes place through Burkitt's (2014) theory of emotions and social relations. Burkitt's theory is appreciably influenced by Foucault's (cited in Burkitt, 2014, p. 164) conceptualisation of power and Spinoza's (cited in Burkitt, 2014, p. 164) idea of emotion being tied to relational fields and the ensuing actions.

Burkitt's (2012, 2014) position on emotion and social relations stand in contrast to reductionist and individualised theories of emotion. His position is that emotions are involved, are social and are produced by students concerning others. He presents an alternative view of social emotions which are social-historical and culturally contextualised, reflective and fundamental to resisting power. How we look at the world is organised into 'emotional dispositions' (Burkitt, 2014, p. 6). Central to this thesis is a distinction between emotion and feeling in that "all emotions … seem to contain certain types of feelings, but not all emotions are feelings" (Burkitt, 2014, p. 7). His thesis is that affect, emotion and feeling are intertwined.

An emotional complex is made up of interrelated elements. Students script emotional 'narratives' in relation to others and contribute from their emotional dispositions development, within socio-cultural contexts. Student experiences are interactive and developed in relation to their peers and teachers as patterned features involving power. In

students' emotional complexes the role of the body is central to experiencing emotions. Burkitt (2014, p. 52) argues that ''the bodily feeling is not just an expression of a prior emotional state but forms a part of the emotional state itself''.

Consequently, feelings and embodied sensations interact in ways that make sense as more extensive features in time. These features are reflective of the point that emotional experiences occur within relational experiences and can be communicated verbally and nonverbally. Thus, language is part of the embodied communication of emotion. Finally, Burkitt (2012) considers how emotion is shaped by relational power in reflexivity. Here he focuses on employing understanding from students' biographies to interpret an unfair experience.

Moving now to feeling rules and collective forms of resistance to power, I will present my interpretation of Burkitt's (2002; 2014) view of emotions as enabling both individuals and groups to resist domination and control. In this section, I indicate how Burkitt draws on Foucault and Spinoza to apply his theoretical model to relational power. As an excellent example of relational power as 'patterns structuring action' Burkitt quotes (cited in Burkitt, 2014, p.164) Foucault as defining power as:

A total structure of actions brought to bear upon possible actions: it incites, it induces, it seduces, it makes easier or more difficult: in the extreme it constrains or forbids absolutely; it is nevertheless always a way of acting upon an acting subject or acting subjects by virtue of their actions or being capable of action. A set of actions upon other actions.

Burkitt (2014, p. 164) argues that power works through relationships as "a structure of action that aims to affect a field of action." Drawing on Spinoza, Burkitt (2014) states that action would not be possible without emotions. In an interesting article Brown and Stenner (2001) on affect from a Spinozian perspective state that:

> Spinoza's account of the passions completely inverts the Cartesian primacy given to the mind. For Spinoza, the critical task is to formulate an ethics of knowing, which begins with an understanding that body and mind are two attributes of the same substance. Increasing the capacity of the body to both be affected and affect others is how the knowing subject progresses … shows how they sensitize us to a post-cognitive understanding of emotion, (Brown & Stenner, 2001, p. 81).

In the third book of part of his Ethics, Spinoza (Brown & Stenner, 2001), argues that human beings strive (conatus) to preserve their being which may be taken to mean that things try to last as long as they can. We are not only seeking to sustain conatus but to increase it. Spinoza postulates that conatus underlies our emotion (joy, hate, anger and so on). Our mind in states of activity and passivity relate to our emotional states. When we are active, we are under the influence of our nature. When passive we are determined by others, or something else. An individual's power in both mind and body vacillates across time. Spinoza suggests that when feeling an increase in power the emotion of joy arises, and with sadness, the power of conatus is diminished. Spinoza regards these two emotions as basic emotions, and he suggests that all others are variants on these two because of objects that caused them. Emotional responses can be either active or passive dependent on whether an individual is aware of them or not. Understanding then can be transformative!

Students deemed their treatment as unfair when judged against background negative events and for these events from their culture's respective standards of interpersonal treatment. The resulting collective negative emotions were experienced as structures of feeling which give meaning to their unfairness as relational experiences. This emotion is tied to the emerging meaning of a judgement of relational unfairness. A group response is likely to be experienced as euphoria if the power of action in the body is increased. In this way, a judgement relational unfairness and feeling of negative emotion primarily as anger affects a structure of action. To be incited by unfairness the group response must be one of anger by the strategic action of others in order to take retaliative action, counterattack. The collective response of a significant group, some of my co-researchers, was to adopt the strategic action of withdrawal. In doing so, the typical consequence was a continuance of stressors and modelling of the culturally inappropriate behaviours for others to enact. A smaller number of participants experienced unfairness as dysphoric which affected their field of potential action as inaction.

Chapter conclusion

This chapter had the task of articulating the meaning of a collective injustice represented in the utterance of 'it is not fair' within Te Aroha School. My position is that under this utterance lies a culture injustice, partly as the result of educational discourse dominance and also the discourse of cultural unresponsiveness (Aronson & laughter, 2016). The cultures involved are the dominating neoliberal-influenced school culture and those of the Pasifika (Reynolds, 2018), and Māori (Bishop & Berryman, 2006) students of the school. A neoliberal-influenced school culture is imbued with elements of performativity, managerialism, and competition and it impacted the students. Student cultures are embedded in the concept of Vä (Reynolds, 2018) and Tikanga Māori (Bishop & Berryman, 2006). This dominant, powerful

discourse taking on a one size fits all orientation allows deficit narration to enter the dialogue. When students collectively experience a negative cultural event and assigned culpability for that event to an offender and then established a clash with their cultural values, they had, in turn, counter conditioned their teachers via an injustice judgement of "it is not fair" (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). The charged emotion associated with a collective judgement of injustice acts through the relational, emotional complex to affect the students' field of action. Some of these emotional responses are nuanced and multi-layered, but euphoric anger calls for protest in "it is not fair" and disengagement as redress in resisting.

Because of mutually effecting, or conditioning (Young, 2001) four interrelated structural injustices were created in the form of underachievement, intra-peer bullying, teacher bullying as lateral violence, and school closure. With the various structure injustices, I have put forward an argument that each of these structures may be associated with a lack of meaningful educational experience associated with educational marginalisation. Academic underachievement may already establish by the time my co-researchers arrive at intermediate school and it is maintained by culturally-unresponsive assessment. Bullying as lateral violence may be associated with silencing, student identity and the ideological-based competition that led to the Te Aroha School's closure.

These largely unintended consequences I posit, lead to disengagement and protest for some students. These features may be an earlier manifestation of a more alienated secondary school population and the long tail of underachievement within Aotearoa. This outcome summary meets the criteria I established at the end of Chapter Two, Section Four for both a description and explanation of the processes leading to structural injustices, along with a plausible narrative plausible account for its occurrence.

The canary in the cage is singing its big heart out at cultural injustice.

In Chapter 8 the whole project is summarised and evaluated. The empirical results are positioned in the current literature and arguments are advanced for the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the project. Recommendations for future research are made, based on these analyses.

Chapter 8: A musicology of the canary's song

Introduction

The overarching task of my thesis has been to generative new understandings from both an interpretive and a critical perspective, to contribute to the literature of early adolescent understanding. Throughout my thesis, I have referred to this in various ways as enriching the 'voicing' of early adolescents' perspectives on unfairness and injustice. At both the level of individual unfairness and injustice 'voicing' may be hidden by a form of 'research blindness,' the result of adopting a distributive justice paradigm (Young, 1990) along with associated enabling metaphors.

I moved out of this bind by generating new interpretive and structural injustice understandings. At the individual level of experienced unfairness by combing the interpretive findings from both the qualitative survey and the semi-structured interviews, I have interpretive unfairnesses as a judgement of accountability. I further interpreted the intense emotion following judgement and its relation to action. This link indicated the role of power for an individual student might have been hidden by a lack of understanding both processes involved. While an enhanced understanding might be necessary to an individual student, her educators, carers, and peers, I attach greater import to my group findings of injustice at the social level of the school.

At the group level of structural injustice, student voice may be hidden under a normalising, dominant, neoliberal discourse. Power normalises a set of neoliberal organisational values over the students' unrecognised cultural-relational values (Berryman & Eley, 2017; Mead, 2016; Reynolds, 2018). This action is often the consequence of individually unintended (Young, 2001) structural, cultural injustice, which may place students at the margins of the education

system and society within Aotearoa. This has severe implications for a group of students already marginalised, but also for our country in the form of a persistent injustice in the form of long-standing 'longtail' of academic underachievement.

I started this research from a position, that by 'voicing' my co-researchers' interpretations of unfairness, they, and I, might know what unfairness means within the particular context of a 'challenged' school. This process involved an interpretation of unfairness as an experience (Finkel, 2001) and a further 'critical' hermeneutic reinterpretation of the participants' perception of unfairness as structural injustices (Young, 2001). Having arrived at the position that the student participants may be 'voicing' a hidden working out of relational power, as either unfairness or injustice, how can its various meanings and implications be unpacked?

This chapter has the task of bringing together my lines of inquiry (literature review, qualitative survey, interviews, and critical reinterpretation) and looking at implications for further research and policy. The chapter is organised around six undertakings consisting of a brief recap of the main drivers for the project, followed by a summary of the main empirical findings. It is paralleled by a discussion of the findings and how they relate to the literature. The final sections of the chapter focus on the strengths and limitations of the project and recommendations for further research.

Research drivers: Why listen to the canary's song?

My project started out with my perception that the phenomenon of unfairness in a well-resourced, middle-class school might be different from that of unfairness in a school with a student body from an already impoverished background. An initial look at the literature of unfairness indicated it to be couched in scientific methodologies. This positivist research is focused on searching for universal laws for the causes of unfairness at the level of individual

students. It has difficulty explaining contextual differences as it seeks universality. Some researchers, in the 1990s and 2000s, started to take a different theoretical, conceptualisation and epistemological orientation for unfairness (e.g., Thorkildsen, 1989a).

Unfairness conceptualised as a contextualised, socio-historical, and cultural phenomenon, allows for unfairness to be studied in different contexts. This qualitative research came under the sway of work of the philosophy of Walzer (2003). Fairness of practices, for Walzer, is dependent on how social goods distributed in education (or through education) are socially constructed and cannot be separated from specific social contracts. Contracts are particular to the social context in which they are constituted.

In current positivist research, unfairness often sits at one end of a numeric Likert scale or, as a convenience, as a dependent variable offered with little explanation. In an unrelated series of studies, Thorkildsen (1989a) and Evans et al. (2001) explored unfairness as a phenomenon in its own right, defining it as a subjective experience and with emotional features. This shift allows for unfairness to be explored as a subjective experience. However, it raises the question whether unfairness is a distributed feature or process.

Drawing on the work of Iris Marion Young, allowed for a critique of literature treating unfairness as a distribution. Young (2001) put forward an alternative philosophical stance of justice based on recognising group differences. According to Young (1990), the distributive paradigm ignores processes which determine distributions in the first place. She explained oppression because of structural injustice, "Without a structural understanding of power and domination as processes rather than as patterns of distribution, the existence and nature of domination and oppression in these societies cannot be identified" (Young, 1990, p. 33).

On this philosophical and conceptual foundation, I initially explored unfairness as an individual subjective process having outcomes for the individual. These thematic findings, I subsequently reinterpreted from a structural injustice perspective. If I find unfairness as a collective injustice to have possible marginalisation outcomes (both political and social), then this investigation will have been worthwhile.

Contributions to the literature

At the risk of overburdening my canary in the mine as a cliché, I will discuss my findings concerning the existing literature by organising my interpretations around the 'canary's song.' The absence of song reflects the power of the current dominant discourse in the literature in the form of a distributive justice paradigm (Young, 1990). It is a muting process of normalising and reifying unfairness processes as distributive justice; rather than, as relational power processes with its attendant metaphors, philosophies, and methodologies. This is not to deny a legitimate role for a distributive metaphor in another research.

The first tweet, or occasional lament, was heard via an interpretive turn which indicated unfairness as a process of accountability (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). However, in Cock's (2012) opinion, the interpretivist view is the "first and smallest step of abstraction" (p. 104). Finally, the fuller-throated warning of the canary is heard via a critical re-interpretation. This reveals unfairness as a collective injustice, possibly the result of structural inequalities (Young, 1990). The canary's full throat song heralds dangers in a possible association with disengagement and marginalisation.

Finally, as a convenience, I will report on my specific findings under the headings of substantive and specific findings.

Substantive findings

There are three substantive interpretations that I wish to highlight from my research and in/re-interpretations. The first, is that of unfairness as processes of accountability (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001) framed in an interpretive epistemology. The second is the critical re-interpretation of unfairness as collective judgements of injustice in the form of structural inequalities (Young, 1990, 2001). The third is a possible association between structural injustice, around cultural relations, and marginalisation.

The interpretive finding moves the literature to an amplified student voice on individual-experienced un/fairness. These are few and are best highlighted by Thorkildsen (1989) and colleagues, of nearly two decades ago, when a student voice on unfairness was starting to emerge. This work is based on unfairness as contextualised using a qualitative methodology. The analysis of the combined survey and interview data indicated that the process behind an individual judgment of unfairness was one of accountability. This judgement is based on seeking culpability for an adverse event and breach of ethical standards. In this context, the utterance of "it's not fair" may be interpreted as a protest over a perceived loss of relational power. For the participants, the loss of power lies in the violation of their relational values of Pasifika Vā (Reynolds, 2016, 2018) and Tikanga Māori (Mead, 2016).

My finding of a 'collective' structural injustice is part of small critical emergent literature examining unfairness/injustice, within a context of relational power. The studies include Ruglis and Vallee (2016), from a socio-cultural framework, biopolitical power (Ruglis, 2011), and equitable remedies for excessive exclusion (Vallee, 2017). This study represents a further contribution to the field of critical studies, and applied to the lives of my early adolescent co-researchers from a structural injustice perspective (Young, 1990, 2001, 2008).

The final fundamental finding, that I wish to highlight, is the role of structural, relational inequality possibly being associated with marginalisation. The critical reinterpretation produced four possible structural injustices related to relational power.

(1) A structural injustice of educational underachievement was apparent. The students left intermediate school at a similar academic level to that when they arrived. I have interpreted the relative lack of unfairness incidents around academic issues as an indication of schooling having no value academically, because of culturally unresponsive assessment methodologies (Cram et al., 2015; Houghton, 2015). It could be argued that the school is maintaining an already established structure of academic underachievement.

 (2) All incidents of unfairness from the survey and interviews were interpreted as various forms of bullying relating to cultural, relational power. These represent the dominance of the neoliberal power conditioning students' lives through the technical processes of performativity, managerialism, and competition. The dominant discourse of a one size fits all approach to assessment and teaching is culturally unresponsive to student needs. Under this dominance of the neoliberal discourse, deficit narratives may have prevailed in conditioning students. I argued an interpretation of intra-peer student bullying as lateral violence. The students counter-conditioned each other via judgements of injustice, declaring it to be not fair. Their relative powerlessness allowed for the reciprocity of bullying to reoccur.

Teacher bullying also fits into the concept of bullying but has a more direct impact on feedback within the teacher-student learner relationship. Hattie (2012) has identified this relationship as the most significant factor in positivist research on learning outcomes. Although only 9 incidents of teacher bullying were identified out of 77 incidents of unfairness, it may well be 'normalised' as legitimate discipline; hence, would not appear in student discourse. Twemlow

et al. (2006), referred to teacher bullying as a hidden trauma. As lateral violence appears under-reported, it may well be the case that teacher bullying is under-reported. Finally, the power of teacher bullying in negating the development of a positive teacher-learner relationship should not be underestimated. I brought intra-peer and teacher bullying together, arguing the combined effect of which is limiting the development of a positive learning identity by silencing; thereby enabling colonial deficit narratives to continue in an unchallenged manner.

(3) By adopting a social relational theory of power (Burkitt, 2002, 2005, 2014), it may be possible to argue a process of power in the emotion of unfairness or injustice, *affecting* a possible field of action for students. After Spinoza (Brown & Stenner, 2001), Burkitt (1997, 2014,) argued that anger was a euphoric emotion. In turn, I argued that the utterance "It is not fair" may be interpreted as protest and disengagement: as actions of resistance (Bishop & Berryman, 2006).

(4) Finally, a 'critical' examination of the role of competition in the classroom or between schools has little standing in the positivist research world (Adnett & Davis, 2015). However, the school in my research was closed with a negative impact on the students. In a genuine case of neoliberal competition, the school was closed due to a combination of factors including the negative ERO accountability reports, local full primary principals wanting to increase their roles via capitation, and ideological/political issues.

Specific findings

In this section, I examine specific findings rather than, as previously presented, processes. I present these as specific contributions at the micro level of events, judgement of unfairness/injustice, emotional responses, and reactions.

In the positivist literature, the student voice on events causing or related to unfairness is mute, because of the need for statistical power, along with what De Vries and Kohlberg (1987)

324

and (Thorkildsen, 1998a) referred to as an 'experimenter fallacy' where variables are selected by the experimenter. My research joins similar interpretive work on unfairness by a small number of researchers (Demetriou & Hopper, 2007; Thornberg, 2008). In my critical reinterpretation, I conceptualised the students' perception of incidents as adverse events as taking place in a context partly shaped by neoliberal reforms. Associated with these reforms, are the 'technical' processes of performativity, managerialism (as defined in Chapter 2, Section Four), and competition.

Enterprise-based organisational justice (distributive, procedural, interactional, informational) is understood as ethical standards in positivist research. These standards, against which negative educational experiences are judged, are still used (e.g., Kazemi, 2016) in a decontextualised manner. In the interpretative framed survey and interviews, the standards are coming from adverse events and are compared with participants' cultural values. In the case of my co-researchers' experiences, they represent violations of relational standards Vā (Reynolds, 2018) and Tikanga Māori (Mead, 2016).

The role of emotion in the reviewed research on organisational justice is often couched as input and output ratios (Goodman & Friedman, 1971; Homans, 1958); and often determined statistically, resulting in conclusions which show generalised feelings of injustice. In other research orientations, unfairness, as a totally rational process of cognitive judgements, is devoid of emotion (Čiuladienė & Rčelytė, 2016; Damon, 1977). For still others, research emotion is based on cognitive arousal (Schachter & Singer, 1962). In the cognitive arousal theory, emotional experiences are based on appraisals or interpretations which build upon physiological feedback. Unfair perceptions affect emotional experiences (Clayton, 1992; Mikula, 1986, 1987). These studies indicated that anger was the most common affective reaction to unfair perceptions.

Other negative emotions included disappointment, feeling aggrieved, surprise, helpless, depression, envy, sadness, and anxiety.

One of the few examples of an interpretivist approach to unfairness is that by Coker (2007). Theorisation is drawn from organisational justice (Greenburg, 1994), fairness concerns (Rutte & Messick, 1995), caring (Noddings, 1986), and social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1993). Coker's study is mostly devoid of reference to emotion, although some cognitive concepts in her study, like 'caring,' have an implied emotional content.

For the emotional component of the interpretive studies and critical re-interpretation in my inquiry, I drew upon Burkitt's (2014) social relations and emotion. These can operate either at a micro level (individual) or the macro level (group). It enables empirical injury to bridge the divide between a cognitive based judgment of unfairness or injustice, followed by action. Conceptualising "It is not fair" as having a component of power, and emotion theorised socially, makes for a more integrated whole. Thus, a judgement of accountability for either interpreted unfairness or a critically interpreted judgement of structural injustice can flow from a cognitively embedded comparison, through relationally based emotion, to affect a field of student action.

I posit that the emotional components of my study make contributions to both the interpretivist unfairness and critical injustice literature. To my knowledge, my critical reinterpretation of injustice, as reflecting emotional patterns of relational power that structure retaliative (Burkitt, 2014) action, is a first in the critical educational psychology literature.

The process of 'dropping out' in the positivist literature is often theorised as an individual process involving cognitive, affective, and behavioural processes (Gibbs & Poskitt, 2010; Poskitt, 2011). There is, in the interpretivist literature, only one study by Coker (2007) exploring dropping

out from a justice perspective. Her study found that a high lack of perceived caring, on the part of teachers, lead to absenteeism and high frustration. These findings revealed that 'not dropping out' was helped by belief in the value of subsequent educational and job opportunities.

The reactions from re/interpreted study were anger and sadness. Theorised from a critical perspective, disengagement may be interpreted as an act of resistance. My findings interlock with other critical studies, including work by Ruglis (2009), on school as a social determinant of health. Ruglis (2011) theorised her research as biopolitical, drop out, and resistance orientation. Ruglis and Vallee (2016) re-theorised unfairness and school disengagement from a social-ecological frame. My contribution to this small critical literature on disengagement is from a structural inequality perspective.

In sum, my interpretations contribute to opening the research literature possibilities when unfairness is theorised as a process of accountability and as a structural injustice. Specific findings were interpreted from both the interpretivist and critical perspectives, which can contribute to the dominion of adverse events, social judgement of unfairness, and social relational emotion affecting a field of action as resistance in disengaging.

Perceived strengths of the empirical inquiry

This empirical inquiry has been about unpacking the utterance of 'it's not fair'! What I found was not a teenage lament (New Zealand Listener, 2006), but a powder keg of individual unfairness and collective structural injustices. These unfair/unjust findings, in this particular context, are based on roles of power in a neoliberal-influenced school being unresponsive to student needs for authentically based educational experiences. The dominant school culture has conditioned its students via performativity, managerialism, and competition. Students, in turn, counter-conditioned via a judgement of unfairness as accountability and as individual and

collective resistance.   One of the aims of this research was to voice the hidden nature of unfairness/injustice in my co-researcher's lives. This section presents the robust nature of the research under the domains of theorisation, methodology, and knowledge claims.

The theorisation of my research of unfairness as a judgement of accountability of unfairness (Folger & Cropanzano, 1997, 2001) and structural injustice (Young, 1990, 2001, 2006) is distinctive. To my knowledge, both contributions are unique to the literatures of education and critical social psychology. The apparently 'superficial' reading of 'it's not fair' as an individual lament could be dangerous. In the context of Te Aroha School, it reflects a loss, or ongoing loss, of cultural power for both the Māori and Pasifika students. A critical, hermeneutic re-interpretation of "it's not fair" proved not to be a lament, but a warning from the canary in the cage. The warning was of the presence of a culture of relational injustice in the form of four unjust social structures.

Both Folger and Cropanzano (2001) and Young (2001) have conceived of their theorisations as cognitive-justice-sequence- only models. Not allowing a role for an emotional component to a judgement of unfairness/injustice leaves a holistic conception for unfairness/injustice incomplete. Finkel (2001) commented on unfairness/ injustice as,

Instances of unfairness (like instances of injustice and instances of inequity) have a clarity and concreteness to them; and they typically come with heat and passion, anger and outrage; and they insistently press for action or redress. (p. 57)

Therefore, an emotional component is really required. In addition, I contend that an emotional component must link the judgements emotional and action domains as Burkitt (2014) showed. The methodologies for my project have been appropriately selected and innovative. For the

qualitative survey data analysis, I chose a substantially reworked thematic analysis by Braun and Clarke (2006). This version of thematic analysis enabled me to align thematic analysis with the philosophical stance adopted for the IPA data analysis; that is, relativist ontology and interpretive epistemology. The qualitative survey proved appropriate to the task of establishing the variation in the pattern of unfairness in Te Aroha School. IPA is appropriate for dealing with an analysis of data unfairness as a subjective experience. Young's (2001) model of structural analysis enabled me to do a critical analysis of the mutual conditioning between the neoliberal school culture and student counterconditioning. I examined this counterconditioning via Fairness Theory, enabling me to trace the role of structural inequalities in protest, disengagement, and marginalisation.

The ontological and methodological basis, briefly presented above, has enabled me to present a set of knowledge claims. I maintain, although tentative to the time, place, and context, these claims are valid in terms of this project. These claims are for a pattern of variation for unfairness, themes related to unfairness, and four social structural inequities potentially associated with disengagement as protest and marginalisation. These philosophical, methodological, and knowledge claims are the basis of the perceived innovation of my project.

Perceived challenges

Although I have argued, elsewhere, for the concept of a qualitative survey (Jansen, 2010) as an original contribution to the research- methods literature, in hindsight, it has put a limitation on the depth of my interpretations. The concept of a survey was a leftover from an earlier incarnation of a research topic on unfairness. I was encouraged to retain it and eventually found justification for it (Jansen, 2010) within the concept of a qualitative survey for establishing patterns of the diversity of unfairness within the school. It is the survey format that I question as a potential weakness.

Choosing to format the survey as a written one was, in hindsight, a weakness regarding capturing rich qualitative data from my co-researchers. I was influenced by research findings more than the needs of my co-researchers. From research literature, I paid more attention to finding that written responses encourage deeper processing of information. I did use a consultant who may not have had experience of students using English as a second language or language usage in a lower decile school. In any case, I would describe the responses as 'telegraphese' or 'text-like.' I did not find similar issues with student participants' oral language in the semi-structured interviews.

A more productive approach, albeit a conventional approach, would be would have been to use focus groups. The use of focus groups may have yielded greater in-depth data as I also now perceive this format as being more culturally responsive and developmentally appropriate. Both Māori and Pasifika cultural values (Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Mead, 2016; Reynolds, 2018) place a premium on groups, social interaction, and oral traditions. The dynamics of focus groups might have given me insight into how the participants' perceived; thus, helping to shape my conceptual development of unfairness.

As a researcher, I am sociohistorical situated, as are my methodologies. Consequently, I need to critically assess the strategic choices that I make in the process of knowledge generation. I also need to be aware of my own potential biases. In the reflexive orientation that I bring to my critical psychology I need to be aware of how I might exert power. The issues of gender do not emerge as a substantive theme, or sub-theme, at any level of interpretation of unfairness. This is despite my careful attention to any potential hegemony on my part.

However, I am a person of a particular context. That is, a person of privilege in being an older white European or Palangi/Pākehā male member of a middle class, who has a substantial

privilege of tertiary education and career. Whether I missed a theme or whether a gendered perspective emerges more clearly, there is a research opportunity here.

Meanwhile, keeping my curiosity to the fore is a small number of studies where a different gendered narrative is starting to emerge from a female perspective on unfairness. As an example, Einberg et al. (2015) utilised a phenomenological approach to ask six, 13-16 year-old young women about their everyday lives. Among the themes to emerge was school-based unfairness about the differential use of space by boys. The young women ended up having to accommodate the boys' unfair behaviour. The studies cited above seem to focus on young women with a middle adolescent age range (13-16). These studies indicate that this degree of awareness of the gendered perspective on unfairness develops more at the high school level.

Opportunities for further research

In the previous section, I developed an argument on ontological, methodological, and epistemological grounds for claims for the robustness of the completed project. On these grounds I have confidence in offering the following recommendations as areas to develop or explore, as further research opportunities.

- Using the concept of unfairness, either as individual perceived unfairness or at a collective structural inequality, opens the possibility of exploring other contexts where power might be either an individual or group issue for adolescents.

- The utterance of 'It's not fair' will not always have a power differential embedded in its conceptualisation. However, when combined with the process of a judgement of fairness there is scope for developing an e-book as a resource on critical interactions with children and adolescents. This could be a focus either for parenting issues and/or

pedagogy. For example, the role of teachers and power in student voice is starting to gain significant attention in the literature (Nelson, 2018).

- Bullying, a large issue in Aotearoa, is usually examined and interventions planned on the basis of positivist-oriented research recommendations. This research is often focused on deficit characteristics of bullies and their victims. My research suggests that bullying can be conceptualised and explored more holistically within the context of power.

- The conceptualisation of bullying as a form of lateral violence in differential power contexts suggests it might be seen as a useful tool to articulate the voices of members of such groups. Originally conceptualised as a concept for groups impacted by colonisation, research in nursing studies (Brunt, 2019; Murray, 2018; Walrafen et al., 2012) suggests that it might be a useful concept for researching any disempowered contexts.

- The interpretation of characterological unfairness, or as othering in lateral aggression, only appeared in the survey. I critically interpreted this as a feature of lateral violence. This, to my knowledge, has not been reported in either the adolescent or education literature. With the phenomenon's nonappearance in the interview case studies, it may be an area open for further empirical exploration.

- Incorporating theories of emotional social relations (e.g., Burkitt, 2014) into empirical research where power is a feature may be useful. In my research it proved to be particularly useful in linking embedded cognition and emotional complexes *affecting* fields of action.

- From a critical social justice perspective, the finding of unfairness being linked to disengagement and marginalisation is in line with other findings on culturally

unresponsive contexts (Aronson & Laughter, 2016). The last major review of the literature on early and mid-adolescents' disengagement in Aotearoa was positivist in nature (Poskitt & Gibbs, 2010). Since this time, findings from my study and others (Ruglis, 2011; Ruglis, & Vallée, 2016) suggest that disengagement might be better conceptualised and explored as resistance explored within a critical paradigm.

- Unfairness, conceptualised as toxic stress, has been modelled as health unfairness in research with adults (Jackson et al., 2006). There is also a body of positivist research from Italy, suggesting that unfairness in early and later adolescence is associated with negative health outcomes (Santinello et al., 2008; 2011). Linking these two bodies of research is suggested for future exploration.

- The use of IPA was the main methodology for the empirical interpretivist component of my study. It enabled a reasonably rich data set of interpretations to be generated from a study framed in an interpretivist epistemology and conceptualised as a subjective experience. The current IPA literature is bereft of early adolescent experience except for a study by Jordan et al. (2007). Consequently, there is plenty of scope for this methodology with early adolescent experiences.

- Finally, an original contribution of the methodology from this study is that of a qualitative survey. The conceptualisation for the survey came from a paper by Jansen (2010). While, in hindsight, it was perhaps not the best choice for the overall undertaking, it still presents as useful in the right type of study. When used as an adjunct to a more in-depth study it can be suggestive for interview protocols and, more specifically, as a way of checking the variations in the patterns of subjective experiences. For my analysis of the survey data, I selected thematic analysis (Braun &

Clarke, 2006). This enabled me to align the survey analysis with overall ontology and epistemology for the empirical part of the study.

Conclusion: The lyrics of the song indicate that …

The voicing of unfairness serves as a warning as "Theorising power is a key aspect of theorising of student voice" (Nelson, 2018, p. 197). At the individual level, it indicates a judgement of accountability, possibly in response to individual differential relational power. How serious it is taken may depend on the resources to respond to it in an appropriate way. Socially it can also signal a warning. If it occurs in a deprived context it may signal a structural inequality linked to disengagement and marginalisation.

In the Te Aroha School context, with Māori and Pasifika early adolescents, it was screaming a warning of disengagement and marginalisation. The neoliberal educational reforms of the 1980s model were based on the assumptions and beliefs of performativity, managerialism, and competition, which can no longer be justified (Haque, 2018). Unfairnesses as an accountability process, continue to warn of educational marginalisation's contribution to broader marginalisation. We need culturally authentic relational experiences in education (Aronson & Laughter, 2016) and systemic change to support it.

Be warned, "It is not fair," and the canary is singing loudly from its structural cage.

References

Adams, J. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experiential Social Psychology, 2,* 267-299. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60108-2

Adam, L., Anderson, V., & Spronken-Smith, R. (2017). 'It's not fair': Policy discourses and students' understandings of plagiarism in a New Zealand university. *Higher Education, 74*(1), 17-32. doi: 10.1007/s10734-016-0025-9

Adnett, N., & Davies, P. (2002). Education as a Positional Good: Implications for Market-Based Reforms of State Schooling. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *50*(2), 189. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=6745860&site=eds-live

Ainscow, M., Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2006). Inclusion and the standards agenda: negotiating policy pressures in England, *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 10*(4-5), 295-308. doi: 10.1080/13603110500430633

Aiono-Le Tagaloa, F. (2003). *Tapua'i: Samoan worship*. Apia: Malua Printing Press.

Allahyar, N., & Nazari, A. (2012). Potentiality of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory in exploring the role of teacher perceptions, expectations and interaction strategies. *WoPaLP*, *6*, 79-92

Ampy-Thomas, L. A. (2000). *The role of peer support, individual attitudes and stress on aggression in urban African American adolescents.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Commonwealth University, Richmond: VA.

Anae, M. (2010). Research for better Pacific schooling in New Zealand: Teu le va - a Samoan perspective. *MAI Review*, *1*, 1–24. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=51409344&site=eds-live

Aronson, B., & Laughter, J. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education: A synthesis of research across content areas. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(1), 163-206. doi: 10.3102/0034654315582066

Arsenio, W., Gold, J., & Adam, E. (2006). Children's conceptions and displays of moral emotions. In M. Killen, & J. Smetana (Eds.), *Handbook of moral development* (pp. 581-609). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Arsenio, W. F., & Kramer, R. (1992). Victimizers and their victims: Children's conceptions of the mixed emotional consequences of moral transgressions. *Child Development, 63*, 915-927. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1992.tb01671.x 262

Austin, H., & Fitzgerald, R., (2007). Resisting categorisation: An ordinary mother. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 30,* 1 - 36. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2104/aral0736

Averill-Roper, G., & Rucklidge, J. (2006). A comparison of emotions elicited in fair and unfair situations between children with and without behaviour problems. *International Journal of Special Education, 21*(2), 140-158. Retrieved from https//Eric: ed.gov/?id=EJ843613

Avis, J. (2003). Work-Based Knowledge, Evidence-Informed Practice and Education. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 51*(4), 369-389. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1555913

Baby, M., Glue, P., & Carlyle, D. (2014). "Violence is not part of our job": a thematic analysis of psychiatric mental health nurses' experiences of patient assaults from a New Zealand perspective. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, *35*(9), 647–655. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.3109/01612840.2014.892552

Balanovic, J., Stuart, J., & Jeffrey, J. (2018). "Harden up and face reality:" Exploring underlying bullying beliefs in New Zealand*, Journal of School Violence, 17*(1), 46-57, doi: 10.1080/15388220.2016.1208570

Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., & MacRae, S. (2000). Space, Work and the "New Urban Economies." *Journal of Youth Studies*, *3*(3), 279. Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=3807796&site=eds-live

Ball, S., Macrae, S., & Maguire, M. (2013). *Choice, pathways and transitions post-16: New youth, new economies in the global city*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (2001). Performatives and fabrications in the education economy. In D. Gleeson & C. Husbands (Eds.), *The performing schools: Managing, teaching, and learning in a performance culture* (pp. 210-223). London, UK: Routledge Falmer.

Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, *18*(2), 215-228. doi:10.1080/0268093022000043065

Ballard, K. (Ed.). (1999). *Inclusive education: International voices on disability and justice*. London, UK: Psychology Press.

Balsam, K. F., Huang, B., Fieland, K. C., Simoni, J. M. & Walters, K. L. (2004). Culture, trauma, and wellness: A comparison of heterosexual and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and two-spirit Native Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *10*(3), 287–301. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1037/1099-9809.10.3.287

Balzer, R., Haimona, D., Henare, M., & Matchitt, V. (1997*). Māori family violence in Aotearoa.* Wellington, New Zealand: Te Puni Kokiri.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2), 117-148. doi: 10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3

Bandura, A. (1999). Moral Disengagement in the Perpetration of Inhumanities. *Personality & Social Psychology Review (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates)*, *3*(3), 193. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3

Bandura, A. (2002). Selective Moral Disengagement in the Exercise of Moral Agency. *Journal of Moral Education*, *31*(2), 101–19. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ678351&site=eds-live

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1977). *Social learning theory, 1*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Barling, M., & Phillps, J. (1993). Interactional, formal, and distributive justice in the workplace: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 127*(6), 649-656. doi: 10.1080/00223980.1993.9914904

Bazley, P. (2007). *Qualitative data analysis with NVivo.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Beck, A. T. (1976). *Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders.* New York, NY: International Universities Press.

Beck, U. (1997). *The reinvention of politics: rethinking modernity in the global social order*.

Polity Press. Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020

a&AN=aut.b10448524&site=eds-live

Beck, S. R., & Guthrie, C. (2011). Almost Thinking Counterfactually: Children's Understanding

of Close Counterfactuals. *Child Development*, *82*(4), 1189–1198. https://doi-

org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01590.x

Belar, C. D. (2000). Scientist-practitioner ≠ science + practice: Boulder is bolder. *American

Psychologist, 55*(2), 249-250. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.2.248

Bempechat, J., Ronfard, S., & Mirny, A. (2013). "She always gives grades lower than one

deserves": A qualitative study of Russian adolescents' perceptions of fairness in the

classroom. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research, 7*(4), 169-187. Retrieved

from

http://web.b.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid

=7185c36b-3cbb-470a-8815-690c50764266%40sessionmgr104&vid=1&hid=116

Benade, L. (2012). *From technicians to teachers: Ethical teaching in the context of globalised

education reform*. Retrieved from http://www.ebookcentral.proquest.com

Benade, L. (2015). *Teachers' critical reflective practice in the context of twenty-first century learning*. Taylor & Francis. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ir00946a &AN=auck.10292.8335&site=eds-live

Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge.* London, UK: Penguin.

Berk, L. (1997). Child development (4th Ed.). Boston. MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Berninger, V. W., & Chanquoy, L. (2012). What writing is and how it changes across early and middle childhood development. Writing: A mosaic of new perspectives, 65-84. In Grigorenko, Elena L., Elisa Mambrino, and David D. Preiss, (eds). *Writing: A mosaic of new perspectives*. United States of America: Psychology Press. DOI https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203808481

Bernstein, R. J. (1983). *Beyond objectivism and relativism: science, hermeneutics, and praxis*. B. Blackwell. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020 a&AN=aut.b10207624&site=eds-live

Berryman, M., & Eley, E. (2017). Succeeding as Māori: Māori students' views on our stepping

up to the Ka Hikitia challenge. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *52*(1), 93-

107. doi: 10.1007/s40841-017-0076-

Berti, C., Molinari, L., & Speltini, G. (2010). Classroom justice and psychological engagement:

students' and teachers' representations. *Social Psychology of Education*, *13*(4), 541.

Retrieved   from

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=

54618605&site=eds-live

Bies, R., & Moag, J. (1986). Interactional justice: Communication criteria of fairness. In J.

Sheppard, B. H. Lewick, & M. H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiation in*

organizations (pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAII Press.

Billington, T., (2000). Separating, losing and excluding: Narratives of difference. London:

Routledge/Falmer. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203136140

Billington, T., & Williams, T. (2017). The national and international growth in qualitative

research within the field of educational psychology. *Annual Review of Critical*

Psychology 13, 1-12.

Binning, T. (2011). *New Zealand Herald on Sunday*, 2 July, NZE: Auckland.

Bishop, R. (2005). Pathologizing the lived experiences of the indigenous Māori people of Aotearoa/New Zealand. In C. M. Shields, R. Bishop, & A. E. Mazawi (Eds.), *Pathologizing practices: The impact of deficit thinking on education* (pp. 55-84). New York, NY: P. Lang.

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999a). *Culture counts: changing power relations in education*. Dunmore Press. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020a&AN=aut.b10381545&site=eds-live.

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999b). Researching in Māori contexts: An interpretation of participatory consciousness. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *20*(2), 167-182.

Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2006). *Culture speaks: Cultural relationships and classroom learning.* Wellington, New Zealand: Huia.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Peter, M., Clapham, S., & Wearmouth, J. (2012). Professional development, changes in teacher practice and improvements in Indigenous students' educational performance: A case study from New Zealand. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *28*(5), 694–705. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1016/j.tate.2012.02.002

Bobocel, D. R., & Farrell, A. C. (1996). Sex-based promotion decisions and interactional fairness: Investigating the influence of managerial accounts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 81*, 22-35. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.81.1.22.265

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (Eds.). (1998). *From them to us: An international study of inclusion in education*. London, UK: Psychology Press.

Boldizar, J. P., Wilson, K. L., & Deemer, D. K. (1989). Gender, Life Experiences, and Moral Judgment Development: A Process-Oriented Approach. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *57*(2), 229–238. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.229

Bombay, A., Matheson, K., Anisman, H. (2014). Appraisals of Discriminatory Events among Adult Offspring of Indian Residential School Survivors: The Influences of Identity Centrality and Past Perceptions of Discrimination. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, (1),* 75. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1037/a0033352

Bourdieu, P. (1980). *The logic of practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. London, UK: Routledge.

Bowles, Samuel and Gintis, Herbert. 1976. *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*, New York: Basic Books.[Google Scholar]

Brave H., Yellow, H. (1999). Gender Differences in the Historical Trauma Response among the Lakota. *Journal of Health & Social Policy*, *10*(4), 1. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=8677224&site=eds-live

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3,* 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: a practical guide for beginners*. SAGE. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020a&AN=aut.b12878121&site=eds-live

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2014). What can "thematic analysis" offer health and wellbeing researchers? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, *9,* 1-2. doi: 10.3402/qhw.v9.26152

Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Gray, D. (Eds.). (2017). *Collecting qualitative data: A practical guide to textual, media and virtual techniques*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Brendgen, M., Bukowski, W. M., Wanner, B., Vitaro, F., & Tremblay, R. E. (2007). Verbal Abuse by the Teacher During Childhood and Academic, Behavioral, and Emotional Adjustment in Young Adulthood. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *99*(1), 26–38. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsovi&AN=edsovi.00004760.200702000.00003&site=eds-live

Brendgen, M., Vitaro, F., & Wanner, B. (2006). Verbal abuse by the teacher and child adjustment from kindergarten through grade 6. *Pediatrics, 117*, 1585-1598. https://Doi.org: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2008.12.011

Brocki, J. M., & Wearden, A. J. (2006). A critical evaluation of the use of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) in health psychology. *Psychology & Health*, *21,* 1, 87-108. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=s3h&AN=19235834&site=eds-live

Brown, P., & Stenner, P., (2001). Being affected: Spinoza and the psychology of emotion. *International Journal of Group Tensions, 30,* 1. doi: 0047-0732/01/0300-0081$19.50/0

Brunt, B. (2019). Combatting Lateral Violence. *ISNA Bulletin*, *45*(2), 10–15. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ccm&AN =134619481&site=eds-live

Bucciarelli, M., Khemlani, S., & Johnson-Laird, P. N. (2008). The psychology of moral reasoning. *Judgment and Decision making*, *3*(2), 121.

Burkitt, I. (1997). Social relationships and emotions. *Sociology, 31*(1), 37-55. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/42855768

Burkitt, I. (2002). Complex Emotions: Relations, Feelings and Images in Emotional Experience. *The Sociological Review, 50*(2_suppl), 151–167. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2002.tb03596.x

Burkitt, I. (2005) Powerful Emotions: Power, Government and Opposition in the 'War on Terror'. *Sociology, (4),* 679–695. Doi: 10.1177/0038038505056027

Burkitt, I., (2014). *Emotions and social relations*. SAGE. Retrieved from
Http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020
a&AN=aut.b13912987&site=eds-live

Burr, V. (2002). *Gender and social psychology*. New York, USA.: Routledge

Butterworth, G., & Butterworth, S. (2001). *Reforming education: The New Zealand experience,
1984-1996*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press

Cahill, F. (2006). Crossing the road from home to secondary school: A conversation with
Samoan parents. *Waikato Journal of Education 12,* 1*.* doi: 10.15663/wje.v23i2

Campbell, F. A. K. (2008). Exploring internalised ableism using critical race theory. *Disability &
Society,* *23*(2), 151-162. Retrieved from
http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=
31134351&site=eds-live

Caputo, J. D. (2000). *More radical hermeneutics : on not knowing who we are*. Indiana
University Press. Retrieved from
http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020
a&AN=aut.b1077029x&site=eds-live

Caputo, J. D. (2000). *More radical hermeneutics: On not knowing who we are.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Carlo, G., Roesch, S. C., Knight, G. P., & Koller, S. H. (2001). Between-or within-culture variation? Culture group as a moderator of the relations between individual differences and resource allocation preferences. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 22*(6), 559-579 Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edswss&AN=000173310700002&site=eds-live

Carrington, S. B., MacArthur, J., Kearney, A., Kimber, M., Mercer, L., Morton, M., & Rutherford, G. (2012). Towards an inclusive education for all. In *Teaching in inclusive school communities* (pp. 3-38). John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Carson, A., & Banuazizi, A. (2008). "That's not fair" Similarities and differences in justice reasoning between American and Filipino adolescents. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 39*(4), 493-514. doi: 10.1177/00220221083181334 266

Carver, C. S., & Connor-Smith, J. (2010). Personality and Coping. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *61*(1), 679. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=48143633&site=eds-live

Castree, N., Rogers, A., & Kitchen, R. (2013). *A dictionary of human geography*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Cavino, H. M. (2016). Intergenerational sexual violence and Whanau in Aotearoa/New Zealand - pedagogies of contextualisation and transformation. *Sexual Abuse in Australia and New Zealand. An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *7*(1), 4-17. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsihc&AN=edsihc.201458129469255&site=eds-live

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2017). *Child development, young teens (12-14 years old).* Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/ncbddd/childdevelopment/positiveparenting/adolescence.html

Chen, Y. Y., Shek, D. T., & Bu, F. F. (2011). Applications of interpretive and constructionist research methods in adolescent research: Philosophy, principles and examples. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, *23*(2), 129-139.

Childers, S. B. (2009). *A study of students' experiences regarding the phenomenon of teacher-to student maltreatment in grades 1-12.* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). The University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS. Retrieved from http://search: proquest.com/doc view/304940360?accountid=12085

Chory-Assad, R. M. (2002). Classroom justice: Perceptions of fairness as a predictor of student motivation, learning, and aggression. *Communication Quarterly*, *50*(1), 58-77. doi: 10.1080/01463370209385646

Chory, R. M., Horan, S. M., Carton, S. T., & Houser, M. L. (2014). Toward a Further Understanding of Students' Emotional Responses to Classroom Injustice. *Communication Education*, *63*(1), 41. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=92885834&site=eds-live

Chory, R. M., & Paulsel, M. L. (2004). Classroom justice: Student aggression and resistance as reactions to perceived unfairness. *Communication Education*, *53*(3), 253-273. doi: 10.1080/0363452042000265189

Christensen, P., & Prout, A. (2002). Working with ethical symmetry in social research with children. *Childhood*, *9*(4), 477–497. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1177/0907568202009004007

Čiuladienė, G., & Rčelytė, D. (2016). Perceived unfairness in teacher-student conflict situations: Students' point of view. *Polish Journal of Applied Psychology, 14*(1). 49-66. doi: 10.1515/pjap-2015-0049

Cizek, G. J. (1999). *Cheating on tests: How to do it, detect it, and prevent it.* Mahwah, NJ: L.

Erlbaum Associates. Clark, J. (2017). Commentary: from Beeby to Parata - the

continuing problem of inequality of school achievement. *Waikato Journal of Education*

(Online). Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsinz&A

N=edsinz.998946706002837&site=eds-live

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2014). Thematic analysis. In T. Teo (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of critical*

psychology (pp. 1947-1952). New York, NY: Springer.

Clayton, S. D. (1992). The experience of injustice: Some characteristics and correlates. *Social*

Justice Research, *5*(1), 71-91.doi: 10.1007/BF01048378

Cocks, J. (Ed.). (2012). *The oppositional imagination (RLE feminist theory): Feminism, critique*

and political theory. London, UK: Routledge.

Codd, J. (2005) Teachers as 'managed professionals' in the global education industry: The New

Zealand experience, *Educational Review, 57*(2), 193-206, doi:

10.1080/0013191042000308369

Codd, J., Harker, R., & Nash, R. (Eds.), (1990). Education, politics and the economic crisis. In

Political Issues in New Zealand Education (pp. 7-21). Wellington New Zealand

Coffin, J., Larson, A., & Cross, D. (2010). Bullying in an Aboriginal context. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 39*(1), 77-87. Retrieved from https://search-informit-com-au.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/documentSummary;dn=633671068162886;res=IELIND> ISSN: 1326-0111.

Coker, B. E. (2007). *Organizational Justice: Voices from the classroom: Students at risk of dropping out.* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Connecticut, Connecticut, MA. http://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/docview/304630512?accountid=8440

Colnerud, G. (2006). Teacher ethics as a research problem: syntheses achieved and new issues. *Teachers & Teaching*, *12*(3), 365. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=21001291&site=eds-live

Coloski, M. (2002). *An instrument to measure perceptions of organizational justice of middle school students.* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). University of Connecticut, Connecticut, MA. http://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/docview/304795281?accountid=8440

Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 425–445. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425

Cook, S. (2012). Lateral violence is an indigenous arts thing. *Artlink, 32, 2*, 44-45. Retrieved from ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/ dn=771077858346181;res=IELHSS> ISSN: 0727-1239.

Correia, I., & Dalbert, C. (2007). Belief in a just world, justice concerns, and well-being at Portuguese schools. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 22*(4), 421-437. doi: 10.1007/BF03173464

Corcoran, T. (2009) Second Nature, British Journal of Social Psychology, 48(2), pp. 375-388 http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/014466608X349513

Costa, R. E., & Shimp, C. P. (2011). Methods courses and texts in psychology: "textbook science" and "tourist brochures". *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, 31*(1), 25-43. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021575

Cowen L., C. (1991). In Pursuit of Wellness. *American Psychologist*, (4), 404. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1037/0003-066X.46.4.404

Cowen, E. L. (1994). The enhancement of psychological wellness: Challenges and opportunities. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *22*(2), 149–179. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1007/BF02506861

Cox, S., & Kennedy, S. (2008). *Students' achievement as they transition from primary to secondary schooling : report no. 1 on the Students' Transition from Primary to Secondary Schooling Study*. Research and Evaluation Team, Research Division, Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020 a&AN=aut.b11402751&site=eds-live

Cram, F., Kennedy, V., Paipa, K., Pipi, K., & Wehipeihana, N. (2015). Being culturally responsive through kaupapa Māori evaluation. *Continuing the journey to reposition culture and cultural context in evaluation theory and practice*, 289-31

Crane, T. (2006). Brentano's concept of intentional inexistence. In M. Textor (Ed.), *The Austrian contribution to analytic philosophy* (pp. 28-43). London, UK: Routledge.

Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1994). A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*(1), 74-101. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.115.1.74

Crick, N. & Kenneth A. Dodge. (1996). Social Information-Processing Mechanisms in Reactive and Proactive Aggression. *Child Development*, *67*(3), 993. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.2307/1131875

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Cropanzano, R., & Folger, R. S. (1989). Referent cognitions and task decision autonomy: Beyond equity theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*(2), 293-299. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.74.2.293

Cropanzano, R., & Greenberg, J. (1997). Progress in organizational justice: Tunneling through the maze. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *12*, 317-372.

Cropanzano, R., Paddock, L., Rupp, D. E., Bagger, J., & Baldwin, A. (2008). How regulatory focus impacts the process-by-outcome interaction for perceived fairness and emotions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 105*(1), 36-51. doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.06.003

Cross, W., & Cross, T. B. (2008). Theory research and models. In S. Quintana, & G. McKown (Eds.) *Handbook of race and racism in the developing child* (pp. 154-181)*. City, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons. retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=45309768&site=eds-live

Cruz, H., Torre, M., Javier, F., & Papa, M. (2016). Exploring fairness and justice: Meanings, relationships, and values. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education, 6,* 2, 20-28.

Dalbert, C., & Stoeber, J. (2005). The belief in a just world and distress at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, *8*(2), 123-135. doi: 10.1007/s11218-005-1835-2

Damon, W. (1975). Early conceptions of positive justice as related to the development of logical operations. *Child Development, 46*(2), 301-312. doi: 10.2307/1128122

Damon, W. (1977).*The social world of the child*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Damon, W. (1980). Patterns of change in children's social reasoning: A two-year longitudinal study. *Child Development, 51*(4), 1010-1017. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.ep12334286

Damon, W. (1988). *The moral child: Nurturing children's natural moral growth.* New York, NY: Free Press.

David-Ferdon, C., Simon, T. R., & National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, D. D. of V. P. (2014). *Preventing Youth Violence: Opportunities for Action*. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN= ED556347&site=eds-live

Davies, S. W. (2011). *Teacher bullies: A factorial analysis of perceptions of teachers' bullying behaviors* (Order No. 3469327). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (892720401). Retrieved from http://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/docview/892720401?accountid=8440

Davies, B., & Bansel, P. (2007). Neoliberalism and education. International journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 20, 3, 247-259. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN= 28723573&site=eds-live

Davison, J. (2018). Government launches $6m violence prevention programme for Pacific Islanders. *New Zealand Herald Online,* 5 July, 2018 2:00pm.

Debusschere, M., & Van Avermaet, E. (1984). Compromising between equity and equality: The effects of situational ambiguity and computational complexity. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 14*(3), 323-333. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420140307

De Castro, Orobio, et al. (2002). Hostile Attribution of Intent and Aggressive Behavior: A Meta-Analysis. *Child Development, 73,* 3, 916–934. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3696259.

de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life* (S. Randell, Trans.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

DeLuca, S. C. (2000). *Finding meaning places for healing, toward a vigilant subjectivity in the practice of a nurse educator.* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Quebec: Canada.

Demetriou, H., & Hopper, B. (2007). "Some things are fair, some things are not fair, and some things are not, not fair": Young children's experiences of 'unfairness' in school. In D. Thiessen, & A. Cook-Sather (Eds.), *International handbook of student experience in*

elementary and secondary school (pp. 32-44). Dordrecht, Germany: Springer. https://Doi: 10.1007/1-4020-3367-2_7

Denny, S., Peterson, E. R., Stuart, J., Utter, J., Bullen, P., Fleming, T., … Milfont, T. (2015). Bystander Intervention, Bullying, and Victimization: A Multilevel Analysis of New Zealand High Schools. *Journal of School Violence*, *14*(3), 245. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=102320055&site=eds-live

Denzin, N. K. (1998). The new ethnography. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *27*(3), 405-415. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=2345356&site=eds-live

Deer, S. (2004). Toward an indigenous jurisprudence of rape. *Kan. JL & Pub. Pol'y*, *14*, 121.

Derrick, J. (2006). *Lateral violence*. Four Winds Wellness and Education Centre. British Columbia, Canada. Retrieved from http://www.4windswellness.ca/

Deutsch, M. (1983). Current social psychological perspectives on justice. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 13*, 305-319. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420130308

Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive justice: A social-psychological perspective.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Deutsch, M. (2006). A framework for thinking about oppression and its change. *Social Justice Research*, *19*(1), 7-41. doi: 10.1007/s11211-006-9998-3

Deverson, T., & Kennedy, G. (2005). *The New Zealand Oxford dictionary.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Devine, N. (2004). *Education and public choice: A critical account of the invisible hand in education*. Westport, CT: Prager Publishers. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020 a&AN=aut.b11924378&site=eds-live>.

Dewey, J. (1990). *John Dewey the later works, 1925-1953* (vol. 16). Carbondale, IL: SIU Press. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, *23*(1), 144. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN= 10085619&site=eds-live

De Witte, K., & Van Klaveren, C. (2014). The influence of closing poor performing primary schools on the educational attainment of students. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 30*(4), 290-307. doi 10.1080/13803611.2014.940979

Dillon, J. T. (1988). The remedial status of student questioning. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *20*(3), 197-210. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1080/0022027880200301

Dobbs, T. (2007). What do children tell us about physical punishment as a risk factor for child abuse? *Social policy journal of New Zealand, 30*, 145-162. Retrieved from: http://ndhadeliver.natlib.govt.nz/delivery/DeliveryManagerServlet?dps_pid=FL16668 35

Dodge K. A. (1986). A social information processing model of social competence in children. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), *The Minnesota symposium on child psychology* (vol. 18; pp. 77-125). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Douglas, R., & Callan. L. (1993). *Unfinished business*. Auckland: Random House New Zealand, 1993.

Down. B., Chadbourne, R., & Hogan, C. (2000). How are teachers managing performance management? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 28*(3)*,* 213-223. doi: 10.1080/713650694

Dowling, M. (2004). Hermeneutics: An exploration. *Nurse Practitioner, 11,* 4, 30-39. https://dx.doi.org/10.7748/nr20004.07.11.4.30.c6213

Dubow, E. F., Huesmann, L. R., & Boxer, P. (2009). A Social-Cognitive-Ecological Framework for Understanding the Impact of Exposure to Persistent Ethnic-Political Violence on Children's Psychosocial Adjustment. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *12* (2), 113. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1007/s10567-009-0050-7

Dyson, A. (2005). Philosophy, politics and economics? The story of inclusive education in England. In D. Mitchell (Ed.), *Contextualising inclusive education: Evaluating old and new international perspectives* (pp.62-75). London, UK: Routledge.

Eatough, V., Smith, J., & Shaw, R. (2008). Woman anger and aggression: An interpretive phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Personal Violence, 23*(12), 1767-1799. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=35126992&site=eds-live

Eckberg, D., & Hill, L. (1979). The Paradigm Concept and Sociology: A Critical Review. *American Sociological Review, 44*(6), 925-937. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2094717

Education Review Office, (2005). *Te Aroha Intermediate School Report*. Wellington: New Zealand.

Education Review Office, (2006). *Te Aroha Intermediate School Report*. Wellington: New Zealand.

Education Review Office, (2008a). *Te Aroha Intermediate School Report*. Wellington: New Zealand.

Education Review Office. (2008b). Partners in learning: Schools' engagement with parents, whānau, and communities. Wellington, NZ.

Einberg, E. L., Lidell, E., & Clausson, E. K. (2015). Awareness of demands and unfairness and the importance of connectedness and security: Teenage girls' lived experiences of their everyday lives. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being, 10*(1), 66-73. doi: 10.3402/qhw.v10.27653

Eisenberg, N., Miller, P. A., Shell, R., McNally, S., & & Shea, C. (1991). Prosocial development in adolescence: A longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology, 27*, 849-857. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.27.5.849

Elder, H., (2019). Weekly column. *The Dominion Weekend.*

Ellis, A. (1962). *Reason and emotion in psychotherapy*. Secaucus, NJ: Carol Publishing Group.

Elovainio, M., Pietikäinen, M., Luopa, P., Kivimäki, M., Ferrie, J.E., Jokela, J., … Virtanen, M. (2011). Organizational justice at school and its associations with pupils' psychosocial school environment, health, and wellbeing. *Social Science and Medicine, 73*(12), 1675-1682. doi: /10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.09.025

Enright, R. D., Franklin, C. C., & Manheim, L. A. (1980). Children's distributive justice reasoning: A standardized and objective scale. *Developmental Psychology, 16*(3), 193-202. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.16.3.193 . 272

Epstude, K., & Roese, N. J. (2008). The Functional Theory of Counterfactual Thinking. *Personality & Social Psychology Review (Sage Publications Inc.)*, *12*(2), 168. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=31948028&site=eds-live

Erikson, E. H., & Erikson, J. M. (1998). *The life cycle completed* (extended version). New York, NY: WW Norton & Company.

Education Review Office (2008b). *Partners in Learning: Parents' Voices*. Wellington: New Zealand. ISBN 978-0-478-32892-9 (PDF)

Evans-Campbell, T. (2008). Historical trauma in American Indian/Native Alaska communities: A multilevel framework for exploring impacts on individuals, families, and communities. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *23*(3), 316–338. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1177/0886260507312290

Evans, I. M., Galyer, K. T., & Smith, K. J. (2001). Children's perceptions of unfair reward and punishment. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 162*(2), 212-227. doi: 10.1080/00221320109597962

Evans, I. M., Heriot, S. A., & Friedman, A. G. (2002). A behavioural pattern of irritability, hostility and inhibited empathy in children. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 7*(2), 211-224. doi: 10.1177/1359104502007002008

Evans, I., Salisbury, C., Palombaro, M., & Goldberg, J. (1994). Children's Perception of Fairness in Classroom and Interpersonal Situations Involving Peers with Severe Disabilities. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, *19*(4), 326. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edo&AN=ejs33945056&site=eds-live

Evans-Campbell, T. (2008). Historical trauma in American Indian/Native Alaska communities: A multilevel framework for exploring impacts on individuals, families, and communities. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *23*(3), 316–338. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1177/0886260507312290

Fairburn-Dunlop, P. (2015). Culturally safe spaces for Pacific education journeys from the periphery to the centre. *New Zealand Sociology, 30*(4), 199-209. Availability: <https://search-informit-com-u.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/documentSummary;dn=800383410346051;res=IELHSS> ISSN: 0112-921X.

Fan, R. F., & Chan, S. (1999). Students' experience of just and unjust experiences in school. *Educational and Child Psychology, 16*(4), 32-50.

Fanon, F. (1965). *A Dying Colonialism*. New York: Grove Press.

Fancy, H. (2006). Measures of success. *New Zealand Management*, *53*(11), 38-41. ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=anh&AN=23453128&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Farber, M. (1943). *The foundation of phenomenology.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Farrell, A. D., Ampy, L. A., & Meyer, A. L. (1998). Identification and assessment of problematic interpersonal situations for urban adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 27*(3), 293-305. doi: 10.1207/s15374424jccp27036

Fayden, T. (2015). *Getting beyond the deficit myth*. New York, NY: Routledge. eBook ISBN 9781317258063. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315634111

Ferguson, P. B., Gorinski, R., Samu, T. W., & Mara, D. L. (2008). *Literature review on the experiences of Pasifika learners in the classroom*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020 a&AN=aut.b11361505&site=eds-live

Fforde, C., Bamblett, L., Lovett, R., Gorringe, S., & Fogarty, B. (2013). Discourse, deficit and identity: Aboriginality, the race paradigm and the language of representation in contemporary Australia. *Media International Australia,* 149, 162-173. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1177/1329878X1314900117#

Finkel, N. J. (2001). *Not fair! The typology of commonsense unfairness.* Washington DC, WA: American Psychology Association. Retrieved from

http://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020a&AN=aut.b1392042x&site=eds-live

Finkel, N. J., & Sales, B. D. (2000). But it's not fair! Commonsense notions of unfairness. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law, 6*(4), 898-952. doi: 10.1037/1076-8971.6.4.898.273

Finkelstein, R., Minibas-Poussard, J., & Bastounis, M. (2009). The Moderating Role of Seeking Social Support on Coping Styles and Perceptions of Organizational Justice: A Study with French and Turkish Students. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, *37*(6), 845–862. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=s3h&AN=44531944&site=eds-live

Finlayson, J. G. (2005). Habermas: A very short introduction. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. doi: 10.1093/actrade/9780192840950.001.0001

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Fletcher, J., Parkhill, F., Fa'afoi, A., Taleni, L. T., O'Regan, B. (2009). Pasifika students: Teachers and parents voice their perceptions of what provides supports and barriers to Pasifika

students' achievement in literacy and learning, *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(1), 24-33. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2008.06.002

Flint, N. (2007). *Undergraduate university student's perceptions of the fairness of educational assessment: A grounded theory study.* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). University of South Australia, Adelaide, Australia.

Folger, R. (1992). On wanting what we do not have. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 13*(1), 123-133. doi: 10.1207/s15324834basp1301_10

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). *Organizational justice and human resource management.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452225777 274

Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 89-118). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Forst, R. (2007). Radical justice: On Iris Marion Young's critique of the "distributive paradigm." *Constellations: An International Journal of Critical & Democratic Theory*, *14*(2), 260-265. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1111/j.1467-8675.2007.00437.x

Foucault, M. (1978). The Subject and Power, *Critical Inquiry 8, 4,* 777-795. https://doi.org/10.1086/448181

Foucault, M. (1982). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Franklin, C. (1998). Distinctions between social constructionism and cognitive constructivism: Practice applications. In C. Franklin & P. S. Nurius (Eds.), *Constructivism in Practice: Methods and Challenges*, 57-94. Milwaukee, WI: Families International.

Frederickson, N., & Simmonds, E. (2008). Special needs, relationship type and distributive justice norms in early childhood and later years of middle childhood. *Social Development, 17*(4), 1057-1072. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00477.x

Freeman, T., & Peck, E. (2010). *Culture made flesh: discourse, performativity, and materiality.* In *Culture and Climate in Health Care Organizations* (pp. 31-41). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 1968. Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Herder.

Frydenberg, E. (1997). *Adolescent coping: Theoretical and research perspectives.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Frydenberg, E., & Lewis, R. (1996). Social issues: What concerns young people and how they cope? *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 2*(3), 271-283. doi: 10.1207/s15327949pac0203_7

Frydenberg, E., & Lewis, R. (Eds.). (2002). The Coping Scale for Adults: correlates of productive and non-productive coping. *Australian Educational and Developmental Psychologist*, *19*(1). Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsaed&AN=rmitplus127834&site=eds-live

Gardiner, M. E. (1991). The dialogics of critique: M.M. Bakhtin and the theory of ideology. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsble&AN=edsble.280423&site=eds-live

Gergen, K. J. (2009). *Realities and relationships: Soundings in social construction*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gergen, K. J. (1994). Realities and relationships: Soundings in social construction. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Geronimus, A. T., Hicken, M., Keene, D., & Bound, J. (2006). "Weathering" and Age Patterns of Allostatic Load Scores among Blacks and Whites in the United States. *American*

Journal   of   Public   Health,   *96*(5),   826–833.   https://doi-
org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.2105/AJPH.2004.060749

Geronimus, A. (2001). Understanding and eliminating racial inequalities in womens' health in

the United States: The role of the weathering concept. *Journal of the American Medical*

Women's Association, 56, 133-136.

Getz, P. (2018). Māori suicide rates - the high cost of historical trauma. *Kai Tiaki Nursing New*

Zealand,   *24*(8),   11-13.   Retrieved   from   http:

//search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ccm&AN=132

015243&site=eds-live

Gibbs, R., & Poskitt, J. (2010). *Student engagement in the middle school years of schooling*

(Year 7-10): A literature review. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=

63284630&site=eds-live.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C., & Attanucci, J. (Eds.). (1996). The moral principle of care. In *Introducing*

psychological research (pp. 240-245). London, UK: Macmillan Education.

Gillis, A., & Jackson, W. (2002). *Research for nurses: Methods and interpretation.* Philadelphia,

PA: FA Davis Company.

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: changing power relations in education*. Dunmore

Press. Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020

a&AN=aut.b10381545&site=eds-live

Goldman, B., & Cropanzano, R. (2015). "Justice" and "fairness" are not the same thing. *Journal*

of Organizational Behavior, *36*(2), 313-318. https://doi-

org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1002/job.1956

Goodman, P., & Friedman, A. (1971). An examination of Adams' theory of inequity.

Administrative Science Quarterly, 16(3), 271-288. doi: 10.2307/2391900

Gottfredson, G. D., Gottfredson, D. C., Payne, A. A., & Gottfredson, N. C. (2005). School Climate

Predictors of School Disorder: Results from a National Study of Delinquency Prevention

in Schools. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency, 42*(4), 412. Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=

18795142&site=eds-live

Gouveia-Pereira, M., Vala, J., Palmonari, A., & Rubini, M. (2003). School experience, relational

justice and legitimation of institutional authorities. *European Journal of Psychology of*

Education, *18*(3), 309-332. Retrieved from http://web.a.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid =74a6e16f-fc27-4ef1-8d07-480eb7f29745%40sessionmgr4010&vid=1&hid=4109.

Government of New Zealand. (2018). *Budget policy statement.* New Zealand Treasury Wellington, New Zealand.

Graham, S., Bellmore, A. M., & Mize, J. (2006). Peer victimization, aggression, and their co-occurrence in middle school: Pathways to adjustment problems. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 34*(3), 349-364. doi: 10.1007/s10802-006-9030-2

Grant, B. M., & Giddings, L. S. (2002). Making sense of methodologies: A paradigm framework for the novice researcher. *Contemporary Nurse: A Journal for the Australian Nursing Profession, 13*(1), 10-28. doi:10.5172/conu.13.1.10

Green, J., & Britten, N. (1998). Qualitative research and evidence-based medicine. *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)*, *316*(7139), 1230–1232. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cmedm& AN=9583929&site=eds-live

Green, S., Davis, C., Karshmer, E., Marsh, P., & Straight, B. (2005). Living stigma: The impact of labeling, stereotyping, separation, status loss, and discrimination in the lives of

individuals with disabilities and their families. *Sociological Inquiry*, *75*(2), 197-215. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2005.00119.x

Green, V. A., Harcourt, S., Mattioni, L., & Prior, T. (2013). *Bullying in New Zealand schools: A final report.* Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University of Wellington, School of Educational Psychology and Pedagogy. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1111/j.1475-682X.2005.00119.x

Greenberg, G., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). *Advance in organizational justice.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Greenberg, J. (1994). Using socially fair treatment to promote acceptance of a work site smoking ban. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 72*(2), 288-297. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.2.288.

Gregory, A., & Thompson, A. (2010). African American high school students and variability in behavior across classrooms. *Journal of Community Psychology, 38*(3), 386-402. Doi: 10.1002/jcop.20370

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2008). Narrative ethnography. In S N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Handbook of emergent methods* (pp. 241-264). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Güroğlu, B., van den Bos, W., Rombouts, S. A., & Crone, E. A. (2010). Unfair? It depends: Neural correlates of fairness in social context. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *5*(4), 414-423. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1093/scan/nsq013

Han, G., & Park, B. (1995). Children's choice in conflict: Application of the theory of individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26*(3), 298-331.

Haque, B., (2018). *Our Schooling Futures: Stronger Together. Whiria Ngā Kura Tūātinitini. Report by the Tomorrow's Schools Independent Taskforce*. Retrieved from www.education.govt.nz. ISBN 978-1-77669-517-1 (ONLINE)

Harris, A. (Ed.). (2009). Distributed leadership: What we know. In *Distributed leadership* (pp. 11-21). Dordrecht, Germany: Springer.

Harris, P. L. (1997). On realizing what might have happened instead. *Polish Quarterly of Developmental Psychology, 3,* 161–176.

Harris, R., Tobias, M., Jeffreys, M., Waldegrave, K., Karlsen, S., & Nazroo, J. (2006). Effects of self-reported racial discrimination and deprivation on Maaori health and inequalities in New Zealand. *The Lancet, 367*(9527), 2005-2009.

Hattie, J. (2003). Teachers make a difference: What is the research evidence? Paper presented at the Building Teacher Quality: What does the research tell us ACER Research Conference, Melbourne, Australia. Retrieved fromhttp://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference_2003/4/

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020a&AN=aut.b12636526&site=eds-live

Heidegger, M. (1962/1996). *Being and time: A translation of Sein und Zeit*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hepburn, A. (1997). Teachers and secondary school bullying: A postmodern discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, *8*(1), 27-48. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926597008001003

Hoggart, R. (1957). *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-Class Life.* London: Chatto and Windus.

Holloway, I. (2008). *A - Z of qualitative research in nursing and healthcare*. London, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology, 62*, 597-606. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2772990

Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behaviour, its elementary forms.* New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Houghton, C. (2015). Underachievement of Māori and Pasifika learners and culturally responsive assessment. *Journal of Initial Teacher Inquiry,* 1. http://hdl.handle.net/10092/11437

Houston, M. B., & Bettencourt, L. A. (1999). But that's not fair! An exploratory study of student perceptions of instructor fairness. *Journal of Marketing Education, 21*(2), 84-96. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0273475399212002

Hoy, D. C. (1991). Is hermeneutics ethnocentric? In D. Hiley, J. Bohman, & R. Shusterman (Eds*.*), *The interpretive turn: Philosophy, science, culture* (pp. 155-175). Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press. Cornell University Press. Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020 a&AN=aut.b10303571&site=eds-live

Hubbard, J. A. (2001). Emotion Expression Processes in Children's Peer Interaction: The Role of Peer Rejection, Aggression, and Gender. *Child Development*, *72*(5), 1426. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN= 5548953&site=eds-live

Huesmann, L. R. (1998). *The role of social information processing and cognitive schema in the acquisition and maintenance of habitual aggressive behavior*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Huesmann, L. R., Dubow, E. F., & Boxer, P. (2009). Continuity of Aggression From Childhood to Early Adulthood as a Predictor of Life Outcomes: Implications for the Adolescent-Limited and Life-Course-Persistent Models. *Aggressive Behaviour*, *35*(2), 136–149. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1002/ab.20300

Hume, D. (1978). *A treatise of human nature.* Oxford: University Press.

Israelishvili, M. (1997). Situational determinants of school students' feelings of injustice. *Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 31*(4), 283-293. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/42869209.

Jackson, B., Kubzansky, L. D., & Wright, R. J. (2006). Linking perceived unfairness to physical health: The perceived unfairness model. *Review of General Psychology*, *10*(1), 21-40. Cornell University Press. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020 a&AN=aut.b10303571&site=eds-live

Jansen, H. (2010). The logic of qualitative survey research and its position in the field of social research methods. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *11*(2), 1-21. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=tr ue&db=sih&AN=58650744&site=eds-live

Jonker, J., & Pennink, B. (2010). *The essence of research methodology: A concise guide for master and PhD students in management science*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Jordan, A. L., Eccleston, C., & Osborn, M. (2007). Being a parent of the adolescent with complex chronic pain: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *European Journal of Pain*, *11*(1), 49-49. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1016/j.ejpain.2005.12.012

Juvonen, J. (2005). Myths and facts about bullying in schools. *Behavioral Health Management, 25*(2), 236-40.

Kahneman, D., Knetsch, J. L., & Thaler, R. H. (1990). Experimental tests of the endowment effect and the Coase theorem. *Journal of Political Economy*, *98*(6), 1325-1348. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.2937761&site=eds-live

Kazemi, A. (2016). Examining the interplay of justice perceptions, motivation, and school achievement among secondary school students. *Social Justice Research*, *29*(1), 103-118. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1007/s11211-016-0261-2

Kearney, R. (2003). *Strangers, gods and monsters. Interpreting otherness*. London, UK: Routledge.

Kennedy, G., & Deverson, T. (2005). *The Oxford New Zealand dictionary.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=anh&AN=HOB087694338904&site=eds-live

Kenneth W., M., Barbara A., G., Scott W., R., & Duane M., I. (2008). How Effective Are School Bullying Intervention Programs? A Meta-Analysis of Intervention Research. *School Psychology Quarterly*, (1), 26. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1037/1045-3830.23.1.26

Kincheloe, J. L., McLaren, P., & Steinberg, S. R. (2011). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 163-177). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kirshner, B., Gaertner, M., & Pozzoboni, K. (2010). Tracing Transitions: The Effect of High School Closure on Displaced Students. *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis*, *32*(3), 407. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=54488979&site=eds-live

Koch, T. (1995). Interpretive approaches in nursing research: the influence of Husserl and Heidegger. *Journal of Advance Nursing, 21*(5), 827-835. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2648.1995.21050827.

Kohlberg, L., & Kramer, R. (1969). Continuities and discontinuities in childhood and adult moral development. *Human Development*, *12*(2), 93-120.

Kupa, K. (2009). Te Vaka Atafaga: A Tokelau assessment model for supporting holistic mental health practice with Tokelau people in Aotearoa, New Zealand. *Pacific health dialog*, *15*(1), 156-16. Google Scholar

Kupchik, A., & Ellis, N. (2008). School discipline and security: Fair for all students? *Youth & Society,* 39(4), 549-574. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1177/0044118X07301956

Kuperminc, G. P., Leadbeater, B. J., & Blatt, S. J. (2001). School social climate and individual differences in vulnerability to psychopathology among middle school students. *Journal of School Psychology, 39,* 141-159. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1016/S0022-4405(01)00059-0

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Kwok-Wing, L., & Weeks, J. (2007). High school students' understanding of e-plagiarism: Some New Zealand observations*. Computers in New Zealand Schools: Learning, Teaching, Technology, 21*(1), 1-15

Ladd, H. F., & Fiske, E. B. (2003). Does competition improve teaching and learning? Evidence from New Zealand*. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 25*(1), 97-112. doi: 10.3102/01623737025001095

Lai, T., & Kao, G. (2018). Hit, robbed, and put down (but not bullied): Underreporting of bullying by minority and male students. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, *47*(3), 619-635. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1007/s10964-017-0748-7

Lakatos, I. (1978). *The methodology of scientific research programmes: Philosophical papers, 1.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lakhoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lambert, N., & Miller, A. (2010). The temporal stability and predictive validity of pupils' causal attribution for difficult classroom behaviour. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*(4), 599-622. doi: 10.1348/000709910X486628

Landridge, D. (2007). *Phenomenological research: Theory, research and method.* Harlow, UK: Pearson Prentice Hall. https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508405057473

Larkin, M., Eatough, V., & Osborn, M. (2011). Interpretative phenomenological analysis and embodied, active, situated cognition. *Theory & Psychology*, *21*(3), 318 http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=61766406&site=eds-live

Larkin, R., Shaw, P., & Flowers, P. (2019) Multiperspectival designs and processes in interpretative phenomenological analysis research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 16*(2), 182-198. doi: 10.1080/14780887.2018.1540655

LaRocque, N. (2005). *School zoning: Locking kids out or letting them in?* Paper presented at Conference at Copthorne Hotel, Wellington, New Zealand. http://www.educationforum.org.nz/documents/speeches/wr100205.pdf

Larson, R. C. (1987). OR forum—perspectives on queues: Social justice and the psychology of queueing. *Operations Research, 35*(6), 895-905 doi: 10.1287/opre.35.6.895

Lawrence, D. (2011). "What can I do about Māori underachievement?" Critical reflections from a non-Māori participant in Te Kotahitanga [online]. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*, *3*, 32-38. Retrieved from https://search-informit-com-au.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/documentSummary;dn=690551843224036;res=IELHSS>   ISSN: 0110-6376.

Lawson, M. A., & Lawson, H. A. (2013). New conceptual frameworks for student engagement research, policy, and practice. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(3), 432-479. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654313480891

Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaption.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lazarus, R. S. (1993). Coping theory and research: Past, present, and future. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 55*(3), 234-247. Retrieved from http://journals.lww.com/psychosomaticmedicine/Citation/1993/05000/Coping_theory_and_research__past,_present,_and.2.aspx.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, R. S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping.* New York, NY: Springer.

Leman, P., Kellar, M., Takezawa, M., & Gummerum. (2009). Children's and adolescents' decision about stealing money. *Social Development, 18*(3), 711-727. doi: 10,1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00486.x

Lenzi, M., Vieno, A., Gini, G., Pozzoli, T., Pastore, M., Santinello, M., & Elgar, F. (2013). Perceived teacher unfairness, instrumental goals, and bullying behavior in early adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(10), 1834-1849. doi: 10.1177/0886260513511694

Lerner, M. (1980). *Belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion.* New York, NY: Plenium Press.

Lerner, M. (2003). The justice motive: Where they found it, how they lost it, and why they may not find it again. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7*, 388-399. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0704_10

Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange* (pp. 27-55). Boston, MA: Springer.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Lind, E., & Tyler, T. (1988). *The social psychology of social justice.* New York, NY: Plenum.

Link, B., & Phelan, J. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *27*, 363. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN= 5163028&site=eds-live

Link, B., & Phelan, J. (2014). Stigma power. *Social Science & Medicine, 103,* 24-32. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2013.07.03

Loto, R., Hodgetts, D., Chamberlain, K., Nikora, L., Karapu, R., Barnett, A. (2006). Pasifika in the news: The portrayal of Pacific peoples in the New Zealand press. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology 16,* 100-118. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN= 19934038&site=eds-live

Lourie, M., & Rata, E. (2014). A critique of the role of culture in Māori education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 35*(1), 19-36. doi: 10.1080/01425692.2012.736184

Ma, H., Karri, R., & Chittipeddi, K. (2004). The paradox of managerial tyranny. *Business Horizons, 4,* 33-40. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1016/S0007-6813(04)00046-1

Macfarlane, A. H. (2015). Restlessness, resoluteness and reason: looking back at 50 years of Maori education. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 50*(2), 177-193. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsinz&AN=edsinz.998625103602837&site=eds-live

Macpherson, C., Bedford, R., & Spoonley, P. (2000). Fact of Fable? The Consequences of Migration for Educational Achievement and Labor Market Participation. *The Contemporary Pacific 12*(1), 57-82. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1353/cp.2000.0024

MacNaughton, G., & Hughes, P. (2007). Teaching respect for cultural diversity in Australian early childhood programs: A challenge for professional learning. *Journal of early childhood research*, *5*(2), 189-204. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1177/1476718X07076729

Mahuika, R., Berryman, M., & Bishop, R. (2011). Issues of Culture and Assessment in New Zealand Education Pertaining to Māori students. *Assessment Matters, 3,* 183-198. hip://search-informit-com-

au.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/doucmentSummary;dn=516054067390993; res=IELHSS> ISSN: 1176-7839.

Mansfield, K. C. (2014). How listening to student voices informs and strengthens social justice research and practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *50*(3), 392-430. htttp://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN =96792803&site=eds-live

Marshall, M. (2004). *Examining school climate: Defining factors and educational influences*. Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University. Retrieved from http//education.gsu.edu/school safety/

Marshall, S., Adams, G., & Ryan, B. (2001). Distributive justice reasoning in families. *Journal of Family Issues, 22*(1), 107-123. doi: 10.1177/0192513oi022001005

Martin, M. M., Stanley, K. M., Dulaney, P., & Pehrson, K. M. (2008). Perspectives in Psychiatric Consultation Liaison Nursing: The Role of the Psychiatric Consultation Liaison Nurse in Evidence-Based Approaches to Lateral Violence in Nursing. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, *44*(1),58. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN= 28024849&site=eds-live

Mason, M. (2010). Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung*, *11*(3) http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edselc&AN=edselc.2-52.0-77957319670&site=eds-live

Matheson, K., Bombay, A., Haslam, A., & Anisman B., (2016) Indigenous identity transformations: The pivotal role of student-to-student abuse in Indian residential schools*. Transcultural Psychiatry, 53(5),* 551-573 doi: 10.1177/1363461516664471

Matthews, H., Limb, M., & Taylor, M. (1999). Young people's participation and representation in society. *Geoforum*, *30*(2), 135-144. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edswss&AN=000081072300003&site=eds-live

Maxwell, J. A. (2008). Designing a qualitative study. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of applied social research methods* (pp.214-253). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

May, S., & Sleeter, C. E. (Eds.). (2010). Introduction. Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis*. Critical Multiculturalism: Theory and Praxis* (1-16). New York, NY: Routledge.

Maydell, E. (2018). 'It just seemed like your normal domestic violence': Ethnic stereotypes in

print media coverage of child abuse in New Zealand. *Media, Culture & Society, 40*(5)*,*

707-724. https://Doi.org: 10.1177/0163443717737610

McCarthy, S. M. (2007). *John Dewey and the philosophy and practice of hope.* Chicago, IL:

University of Illinois Press.

McEvoy, A. (2005) Teachers who bully students: Patterns and policy implications. In *Teachers*

who bully students. Presentation to the Conference on Persistently Safe Schools–

Philadelphia (September 11–14. 2005). 2005. The national conference of the Hamilton

Fish Institute on school and community violence, Philadelphia, PA.

McGillivray, A. (2011)*. Te Aroha Intermediate to close.* Retrieved from I.

stuff.co.nz/Auckland/local-news /5744554

McGuillicuddy-De Lisi, A., De Lisi, R., & Van Gulik, K. (2008). The effects of grade level, context,

and family type on male and female adolescents' distributive justice reasoning. *Journal*

of Adolescence, 31, 107-124. doi: 10,1016/j.adolescence.2007.05.003 285

McIntosh, M., & Morse, M. (2015). Situating and Constructing Diversity in Semi-Structured

Interviews. *Global Qualitative Nursing Research*. 1-12. https://doi-

org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1177/2333393615597674

McIntyre, E. (2009) Teacher discourse on lesbian, gay and bisexual pupils in Scottish schools. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 25*(4)*,* 301-314. doi: 10.1080/02667360903315115

McKenzie, D. (1999). The clouded trail: Ten years of public education post-Picot. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 34*(1), 8-17.

McParland, J. L., Eccleston, C., Osborn, M., & Hezseltine, L. (2011). It's not fair: An interpretative phenomenological analysis of discourses of justice and fairness in chronic pain. *Health*, *15*(5), 459-474. https://doi.org/ 10.1177/1363459310383593

Mead, H. M. (2016). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values* (Rev. ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Publishers.

Merolla, A. J. (2008). Communicating forgiveness in friendships and dating relationships. *Communication Studies*, *59*(2), 114-131. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1080/10510970802062428

Merrell, K. W., Gueldner, B. A., Ross, S. W., & Isava, D. M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23*(1), 126-42. doi: 10.1037/1045-3830.23.1.26

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and Implementation*. San

    Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Mertens, D. M. (2014). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating*

    diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Messiou, K. (2002), Marginalisation in primary schools: Listening to children's voices*. Support*

    for Learning, 17, 117-121. doi: 10.1111/1467-9604.00249

Messiou, K. (2012). Collaborating with children in exploring marginalisation: An approach to

    inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16*(12), 1311-1322.

    doi: 10.1080/13603116.2011.572188

Mikaere, A. (2003). *The balance destroyed: The consequences for Māori women of the*

    colonisation of tikanga Māori (Doctoral dissertation, Published jointly by the

    International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education and A. Mikaere).

Mikaere, A. (2003). *The balance destroyed: The consequences for Māori women of the colonisation of tikanga Māori*. Auckland, New Zealand: International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education.

Mikula G. (1986). The experience of injustice. In. H. W. Bierhoff, R. L. Cohen, & J. Greenberg (Eds.), *Justice in social relations. Critical issues in social justice* (pp. 103-123)*. Boston, MA: Springer.

Mikula, G. (1987). Exploring the experience of injustice. In G. R. Semin & B. Krahe (Eds.), *Issues in contemporary German social psychology* (pp.74-96). London, UK: Sage.

Mikula, G. (1990). What people regard as unjust: Types and structures of everyday experiences of injustice. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 20*(2), 133-149. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420200205.

Mikula, G. (1993). On the experience of injustice. *European Review of Social Psychology, 4*(1), 223-244. doi: 10.1080/14792779343000077

Mikula, G. (2003). Testing an attribution-of-blame model of judgments of injustice. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(6), 793-811. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.184.

Mikula, G., Petri, B., & Tanzer, N. (1990). What people regard as unjust: Types and structures of everyday experiences of injustice. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 2*, 133-149. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=12122036&site=eds-live

Mikula, G., Semin, G. R., & Krahé, B. (1987). Exploring the experience of injustice. In G. R. Semin & B. Krahe (Eds.), *Issues in Contemporary German Social Psychology* (74-96).Berlin: Germany, Springer.

Mila-Schaaf, K., Robinson, E., Schaaf, D., Denny, S., & Watson, P. D. (2008). A health profile of Pacific youth: Findings of Youth2000. A national secondary school youth health survey. *Auckland, New Zealand: The University of Auckland*.

Miller, A., Fergusson, E., & Moore, E. (2000). Pupils' causal attributions for difficult classroom behaviour. *European Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*(1), 85-96. doi: 10.1348/000709900157985

Miller, A., Ferguson, E., & Moore, E. (2001). Parents' and pupils' causal attributions for difficult classroom behaviour. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*(1), 27-40. doi: 10.1348/000709902158757

Miller, D. T. (2001). Disrespect and the experience of Injustice. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*(1), 527-553. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.527

Ministry of Justice. (2001). *He hinātore ki te ao Māori: A glimpse into the Māori world.* Wellington, New Zealand.

Molinari, L., Speltini, G., & Passini, S. (2013). Do perceptions of being treated fairly increase students' outcomes? Teacher–student interactions and classroom justice in Italian adolescents. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 19*(1), 58-76. doi: 10.1080/13803611.2012.748254.

Moon, B., Hays, K., & Blurton, D. (2009). General strain theory, key strains, and deviance. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 37*(1), 98-106. doi:10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2008.12.011

Morgan, D. L. (2007). Paradigms Lost and Pragmatism Regained: Methodological Implications of Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, *1*(1), 48–76. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1177/2345678906292462

Morehouse, R. E. (2012). *Beginning interpretative inquiry: A step-by-step approach to research and evaluation*. United States of America: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203818244

Morse, J. M. (2015). "Data Were Saturated . . .." *Qualitative Health Research*, *25*(5), 587. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=101862964&site=eds-live

Mottet, I. V., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., & Arora, A. (2012). *TIMSS 2011 international results in mathematics*. *International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Routledge

Mottet, T. P., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (2006). *Handbook of instructional communication : rhetorical and relational perspectives*. Pearson/Allyn & Bacon. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020 a&AN=aut.b11012432&site=eds-live

Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., Arora, A., Boston College, T. & P. I. S. C., & International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. (2012). *TIMSS 2011 International Results in Mathematics*. *International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement*. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true &db=eric&AN=ED544554&site=eds-live

Murray, A. (2018). Helping the Healers: Identifying and Halting Lateral Violence in Nursing. *Kentucky Nurse*, *66*(2), 11–13. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ccm&AN =128716069&site=eds-live

Mutch, C. (2013). *Doing educational research* (2nd ed.). Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.

Mutch, C. (2017). Winners and losers: School closures in post-earthquake Canterbury and the dissolution of community. *Waikato Journal of Education*, *22*(1), 73-95. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.15663/wje.v22i1.543

Mutch, C., & Collins, S. (2012). Partners in Learning: Schools' Engagement With Parents, Families, and Communities in New Zealand. *School Community Journal*, *22*(1), 167. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edo&AN=77393013&site=eds-live

Mahuika, R., Berryman, M., & Bishop, R., (2011), Issues of culture and assessment in New Zealand education pertaining to Māori students [online]. Assessment Matters, 3, 183-198. Availability: <https://search-informit-com-au.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/documentSummary;dn=516054067390993;res=IELHSS> ISSN: 1176-7839.

Nairn, K. M., Higgins, J., & Sligo, J. (2012). *Children of Rogernomics: A neoliberal generation leaves school*. Dunedin, New Zealand: Otago University Press.

Nairn, K., & Smith, A. (2002). Secondary school students' experiences of bullying at school and their suggestions for dealing with it. *Children Issues: Journal of the Children's Issues Centre,* *6*(1), 16.http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsihc&AN=edsihc.366100026494279&site=eds-live

Nairn, K., Higgins, J., & Sligo, J., (2012) *Children of Rogernomics: a neoliberal generation leaves school.* Dunedin: Otago University Press.

Nakhid, C. (2002). *Who do you say I am? –Explaining the marginalized status Pasifika students' academic achievement by examining the conflict between institutional perceptions and the 'Identifying Process'*. Paper presented at the Comparative and International Education Conference, Sydney, Australia. www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED470512

Nakhid, C. (2003). "Intercultural" perceptions, academic achievement, and the identifying process of PI students in NZ schools*. The Journal of Negro Education, 72*(3) 279.

Nakhid, C. (2006). Comparing Pasifika students' perceptions of their schooling with the perceptions of non-Pasifika teachers using the 'mediated dialogue' as a research methodology. *Journal of Educational Studies, 38*(2), 207–226.

Nelson, E. (2018). Teachers and power in student voice: 'Finger on the pulse, not children under the thumb'. In R Bourke, & J. Loveridge (Eds.), *Radical collegiality through student voice* (pp. 197-216). Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org /10.1007/078-981-13-1858-0_1

New Zealand Statistics, (2016). Retrieved from https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=new+zealand+census+data+2013

Nicholson, T. (2000). *Reading the writing on the wall: Debates, challenges, and opportunities in the teaching of reading*. Palmerston, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Nicklin, J. M., Greenbaum, R., McNall, L. A., Folger, R., & Williams, K. J. (2011). The importance of contextual variables when judging fairness: An examination of counterfactual thoughts and fairness theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 114*(2), 127-141. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2010.10.007

Nind, M., & Todd, L. (2011). Prospects for educational research. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, *34*(1), 1. Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=60122713&site=eds-live

Nisan, M. (1984). Distributive Justice and Social Norms. *Child Development*, *55*(3), 1020. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=12427057&site=eds-live

Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people: A caring alternative to character education*. Teachers College Press: VT.

Nomm, N. R. (2000). Accountability in social science research: Issues and debates. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Norman, G. 2004. "Editorial - Beyond PBL". *Advances in Health Sciences Education* 9 (4):   257-260. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10459-004-5539-8.

Nortvedt, P. (2001). Needs, closeness and responsibilities. An inquiry into some rival moral considerations in nursing care. *Nursing Philosophy, 2*(2), 112-121.

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsovi&A
N=edsovi.00131050.200107000.00003&site=eds-live

O'Connor, E. (2010). Teacher-child relationships as dynamic systems. *Journal Of School Psychology*, *48*(3), 187–218. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1016/j.jsp.2010.01.001

Ohbuchi, K., & Sato, K. (1994). Children's reactions to mitigating accounts: Apologies, excuses, and intentionality of harm. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 134*(1), 5-17. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1994.9710877

O'Kane, C. (2008). The development of participatory techniques: Facilitating children's views about decisions which affect them. In P. Christensen & A. James (Eds.), *Research with children: Perspectives and Practices* (2nd ed.; pp. 141-171). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Oldmeadow, H. (1997). Delivering the last blade of grass: Aspects of the bodhisattva ideal in the Mahāyāna. *Asian Philosophy, 7*(3), 181-205. doi: 10.1080/09552369708575462

Olssen, M., & Peters, M. (2005). 'Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: from the free market to knowledge capitalism', *Journal of Education Policy*, *20*: 3, 313 - 345. DOI: 10.1080/02680930500108718

Olssen, M., Codd, J., & O'Neill, A. M. (2004). *Education policy: Globalization, citizenship and democracy.* Doi: 10.4135/9781446221501.

Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2010). Bullying in school: Evaluation and dissemination of the Olweus bullying prevention program. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 80,* 124-134. doi: 10.1111/j.1939-0025.2010.01015.

Oplatka, I., Foskett, N., & Hemsley–Brown, J. (2002). Educational marketisation and the head's psychological well–being: A speculative conceptualisation. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 50*(4), 419-441. doi: 10.1111/1467-8527.t01-2-00212

Ongley, P. (1996) "Immigration, employment and ethnic relations" in P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson and D. Pearson (eds.) *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, Dunmore Press, Palmerston North.

Paciello, M., Fida, R., Tramontano, C., Lupinetti, C., & Caprara, G. V. (2008). Stability and Change of Moral Disengagement and Its Impact on Aggression and Violence in Late Adolescence. *Child Development*, *79*(5), 1288. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.27563553&site=eds-live

Parkhill, F., Fletcher, J., & Fa'afoi, A. (2005). What makes for success? Current literacy practices and the impact of family and community on Pasifika students' literacy learning. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 40(1&2), 61–84.

Peck, J. (2010). *Constructions of neoliberal reason*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020 a&AN=aut.b16398609&site=eds-live

Hardman, J. (2003). Critical Applied Linguistics: A Critical Introduction (Book). *Language & Education: An International Journal*, *17*(4), 303–305. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN= 11382732&site=eds-live

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics : a critical introduction*. L. Erlbaum. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020 a&AN=aut.b22425792&site=eds-live

Pere, R. (1988) 'Te Wheke: Whaia te Maramatanga me te Aroha.' In S. Middleton (ed.), *Women and Education in Aotearoa*. Wellington: Allen and Unwin

Phelan, J. C., Link, B. G., & Dovidio, J. F. (2008). Stigma and prejudice: One animal or two? *Social Science and Medicine, 67*(3), 358-367. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.03.022

Phelan, J. C., Link, B. G., & Dovidio, J. F. (2008). Stigma and prejudice: one animal or two? *Social Science & Medicine (1982)*, *67*(3), 358–367. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.03.022

Piaget, J. (1932/1969). *The moral judgement of the child.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (1947). Diagnosis of mental operations and theory of the intelligence. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 51*(3), 401*.*

Pihama, L., Te Nana, R., Cameron, N., Smith, C., Reid, J., & Southey, K. (2016). Māori cultural definitions of sexual violence. *Sexual Abuse in Australia and New Zealand*, *7*(1), 43. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsnzc&AN=201551294325546&site=eds-live

Pilz, G. A. (1995). Performance sport: Education in fair play? (Some empirical and theoretical remarks). *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *30*(3-4), 391-418. doi:10.1177/101269029503000310

Pomeroy, E. (1999). The teacher-student relationship in secondary school: Insights from excluded students. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 20*(4), 465-482. doi: 10.1080/01425699995218

Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: A primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*(2), 126. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsovi&AN=edsovi.00001192.200504000.00002&site=eds-live

Poskitt, J. (2011). New Zealand intermediate school student insights about engagement in learning. *Australian Journal of Middle Schooling, 11*(2), 11. http://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=63284630&site=eds-live.

Powell, C., & Arriola, K. J. (2003). Relationship between psychosocial factors and academic achievement among African American students. *The Journal of Educational Research, 96*(3), 175-181. doi: 10.1080/00220670309598805.

Prasad, P. (2005). *Crafting qualitative research: Working in the postpositivists traditions*. Armonk, NY: ME Sharpe.

Prilleltensky, I. (2012). Wellness as fairness. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 49*(1), 1-21. doi: 10.1007/s10464-011-9448-8

Prilleltensky, I., & Nelson, G. (2002). Doing Psychology Critically: Making a Difference in Diverse Settings. London, UK: Macmillan International Higher Education.

Pringle, J., Drummond, J., McLafferty, E., & Hendry, C. (2011). Interpretative phenomenological analysis: a discussion and critique. *Nurse Researcher*, *18*(3), 20. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN= 60081044&site=eds-live

Punch, K. F., & Oancea, A. (2014). *Introduction to research methods in education*. Sage. ISBN 978-1-44626073-9

Rafetseder, E., Cristi-Vargas, R., & Perner, J. (n.d.). Counterfactual reasoning: Developing a sense of "nearest possible world." *Child Development*, *81*(1), 376–389. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01401.

Rafetseder, E., Schwitalla, M., & Perner, J. (2013). Counterfactual reasoning: From childhood to adulthood. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 114(*3), 389-404. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1016/j.jecp.2012.10.010

Ramazanoglu, C., & Holland, J. (2002). *Feminist methodology: Challenges and choices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rasmussen, M. L., Sanjakdar, F., Allen, L., Quinlivan, K., & Bromdal, A. (2017). Homophobia, transphobia, young people and the question of responsibility. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *38*(1), 30–42. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1080/01596306.2015.1104850

Rawls, J. (1958). Justice as fairness. *The Philosophical Review*, *290,* 164-194.

Rawls, J. (2009). *A theory of justice.* Harvard, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ray, D. (2007). Two counseling interventions to reduce teacher-child relationship stress. *Professional School Counseling, 10*(4), 428-440. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/42732581

Ray, D. (2008). *A socio-historical examination of race, gender, and class in single-parent African American mothers of delinquent youth*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA.

Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012). Jingle, jangle, and conceptual haziness: Evolution and future directions of the engagement construct. In *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 3-19). Springer, Boston, MA.

Resh, N., & Sabbagh, C. (2009). Justice in teaching. In L. J. Saha & A. G. Dworkin (Eds.), *International handbook of research on teachers and teaching* (pp. 669-682). Boston, MA: Springer.

Resh, N., & Sabbagh, C. (2016). Justice and education. In C. Sabbagh, & M. Schmitt (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice theory and research* (pp. 333-349). Boston, MA: Springer.

Reynolds, D., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2000). The processes of school effectiveness. In *The international handbook of school effectiveness research* (pp. 134-159). London, UK: Falmer.

Reynolds, M. (2016). Relating to Va. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 12*(2), 190-202. https://doi.org/10.20507/AlterNative.2016.12.2.7

Reynolds, M. (2018). Caring for classroom relationality in Pasifika education: A space-based understanding. *Waikato Journal of Education*, *23*(1), 71-84. https://Doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.15663/wje.v23i1.575

Rigby, K., & Bagshaw, D. (2003). Prospects of adolescent students collaborating with teachers in addressing issues of bullying and conflict in schools. *Educational Psychology, 23*(5), 535-546. DOI: 10.1080/0144341032000123787

Ripski, M. B., & Gregory, A. (2009). Unfair, unsafe, and unwelcome: Do high school students' perceptions of unfairness, hostility, and victimization in school predict engagement

and achievement? *Journal of School Violence, 8*(4), 335-375. <u>doi: 10.1080/15388220903132755</u>

Riseborough, G. (1994). Teachers' careers and comprehensive school closure: Policy and professionalism in practice. *British Educational Research Journal, 20*(1), 85-104. Retrieved from <u>http://www.jstor.org/stable/1500865</u>

Riseborough., G. (1994). Teachers' Careers and Comprehensive School Closure: Policy and Professionalism in Practice. *British Educational Research Journal*, *20*(1), 85. Retrieved from <u>http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&AN=edsjsr.1500865&site=eds-live</u>

Riseborough, S., Demarco, R., & Griffin, M. (2009). The effect of oppressed group behaviours on the culture of the nursing workplace: A review of evidence and interventions for change. *Journal of Nursing Management, 17*, 288-293. <u>doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2834.2008.00959.x</u>

Roese, N. J. (1997). Counterfactual thinking. *Psychological Bulletin, 121*(1), 133-148 <u>doi: 0033-2909/97/$3.00</u>

Roese, N. J., & Morrison, M. (2009). The psychology of counterfactual thinking. *Historical Social Research*, *34*(2), 16-26. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=37135627&site=eds-live

Ronan, W., & Latham, G. (1974). The reliability and validity of the critical incident technique: A closer look. *Studies in Personnel Psychology, 6*(1), 53-64. doi: 10.1037/h0042025

Rose, R., & Shelvin, M. (2005). *Encouraging questions and raising voices*. Paper Presented at the Inclusive and Supportive Education Congress (ISEC) International Special Education Conference, 1-4 August, 2005. Glasgow: Scotland.

Rosen, A. L., & Zlotnik, J. L. (2001). Demographics and reality: The "disconnect" in social work education. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work, 36*(3-4), 81-97.

Roy, J. (2007). Horizontal Violence. *Advances for Nurses*, *3*, 1, 44-48.

Roy, A. (2014). Aboriginal worldviews and epidemiological survey methodology: Overcoming incongruence. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches, 81*(1)*,* 117-128. doi: 10.5172/mra.2014.8.1.117

Royzman, E. B., Leeman, R. F., & Baron, J. (2009). Unsentimental ethics: Towards a content-specific account of the moral–conventional distinction. *Cognition, 112*(1), 159-174. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2009.04.004

Rubin, R. M., & Hubbard, J. A. (2003). Children's verbalizations and cheating behavior during game playing: The role of sociometric status, aggression, and gender. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 31*(1), 65-78. doi: 10.1023/A:1021773316251. 291

Ruwhiu, L. (2009) Indigenous issues in Aotearoa New Zealand, in M. Connolly and L. Harms (eds.), *Social Work: Contexts and Practice*, 2nd ed., Melbourne: Oxford

Ruglis, J. (2009). *Death of a dropout: (Re) theorising school dropout and schooling as a social determinant of health*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). City University of New York, New York, NY. http://search.proquest.com/docview/304861728?=12339 ProQuest Dissertations & Theses (PQDT) database

Ruglis, J. (2011). Mapping the biopolitics of school dropout and youth resistance. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *24*(5), 627–637. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1080/09518398.2011.600268

Ruglis, J., & Vallée, D. (2016). Student disengagement as/and unfairness: Re-reading schools through photos. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies (JCEPS)*, *14*(2), 66-78. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=124481338&site=eds-live

Rutte, C. G., & Messick, D. M. (1995). An integrated model of perceived unfairness in organizations. *Social Justice Research*, *8*(3), 239-261. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1007/BF02334810

Ryan, A., & Morgan, M. (2011). Bullying in secondary schools: Through a discursive lens. *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, *6*(1-2), 1-14. DOI: 10.1080/1177083X.2011.562905

Ryan, A., & Morgan, M. (2011). Bullying in secondary schools: An analysis of discursive positioning. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *(1),* 23. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsihs&AN=edsihs.956034417245209&site=eds-live

Sabbagh, C., & Resh, N. (2016). Unfolding justice research in the realm of education. *Social Justice Research*, 5, 1-13. doi: 10.1007/s11211-016-0262-

Sabbagh, C., Resh, N., Mor, M., & Vanhuysse, P. (2006). Spheres of justice within schools: Reflections and evidence on the distribution of educational goods. *Social Psychology of Education, 9*, 97-118. Doi: 10.1007/s11218-005-3319-9

Salmivalli, C. (2001). Peer-led intervention campaign against school bullying: who considered it useful, who benefited? *Educational Research*, *43*(3), 263–278. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edswss&AN=000172189500003&site=eds-live

Samdal, O., Nutbeam, D., Wold, B., & Kansas, L. (1998). Achieving health and educational goals through schools - a study of the importance of the school climate and the students' satisfaction with school. *Health Education Research Theory and Practice, 13*(3), 383-397.

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=4500760&site=eds-live

Spilt, J., Koomen, H., & Thijs, J. (2011). Teacher Wellbeing: The Importance of Teacher-Student Relationships. *Educational Psychology Review*, *23*(4), 457. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=67222819&site=eds-live

Sanches, C., Gouveia-Pereia, M., & Carugati, F. (2012). Justice judgements, school failure, and adolescent deviant behaviour. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(4), 606-621. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8279.2011. 02048.x

Sanders, M. L. (2015). *The experience of mothers who are raising adopted children with the diagnosis of reactive attachment disorder: A case study* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation) Capella University: Minneapolis. United States of America.

Sanfey, A. (2007). Social decision making: Insights from game theory and neuroscience. *Science, 318*, 598-602. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1126/science.1142996

Santinello, M., Vieno, A., & Di Vogli, R. (2008). Primary headache in Italian early adolescents: The role of perceived teacher unfairness. *Headache, 49*, 366-374. doi: 10.1111/j.1526-4610.2008.01208.x

Santinello, M., Vieno, A., & De Vogli, R. (2011). Bullying in Italian schools: The role of perceived teacher unfairness. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 26*(2), 235-246. doi: 10.1007/s10212-010-0050-5.

Schab, F. (1991). Schooling without learning: Thirty years of cheating in high school. *Adolescence*, *26*(104), 839. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edselc&AN=edselc.2-52.0-0026296879&site=eds-live

Schachter, S., & Singer, J. (1962). Cognitive, social, and physiological determinants of emotional state. *Psychological review*, *69*(5), 379. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1037/h0046234

Seeto, J. E. (1997). *Adolescent stealing: A study of the causal factors for and prevalence of stealing in New Zealand intermediate school students.* (Unpublished Master's thesis). Massey University, Palmerston, New Zealand.

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sen**,** A.K**.** (1985) *Commodities and Capabilities.* Amsterdam: North Holland.

Sexton, S., (2012). Queer Otago secondary students' views of their schooling environment. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47,* 1. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsihs&AN=edsihs.671410095551731&site=eds-live

Segura S, Fernandez-Berrocal P, Byrne RMJ (2002). Temporal and causal order effects in thinking about what might have been. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology: Section A*. 2002;55(4):1295-1305. doi:10.1080/02724980244000125

Sharpe, G. W. B. (2011). *Behind the closed door: Exploring teacher bullying and abuse of students, characteristics of the teacher, and impact*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation), University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/915644362?accountid=12085

Sharpe, H. (2016). Conceptualizing 'fair play': A review of the literature. *European Physical Education Review, 9*(2), 163-184. doi: 10.1177/1356336X03009002003

Sheppard, B. H., & Lewicki, R. J. (1987). Toward general principles of managerial fairness. *Social Justice Research*, *1*(2), 161-176. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=57574864&site=eds-live

Shipman, K., Zeman, J., Neisin, A., & Fitzgerald, M. (2003). Children's strategies for displaying anger and sadness: What works with whom? *Merrill - Palmer Quarterly, 48*(1), 100-120. doi: 10.1353/mpq.2003.0006

Sion, A. (2003). *Phenomenology: Basic knowledge on appearance*. Geneva, Switzerland: Avi Sion.

Siope, A. (2011). The schooling experiences of Pasifika students. *Set*: *Research Information for Teachers, 3*, 10-16. Retrieved from https://search-informit-com-au.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/documentSummary;dn=690365513511454;res=IELHSS> ISSN: 0110-6376.

Sisti, D. A. (2007). How do high school students justify internet plagiarism? *Ethics & Behavior*, *17*(3), 215-231. Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=26989622&site=eds-live

Skarlicki, D. P., & Folger, R. (1997). Retaliation in the workplace: The roles of distributive, procedural, and interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*(3), 119-434. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1037/0021-9010.82.3.434

Skinner, E. A., Edge, K., Altman, J., & Sherwood, H. (2003). Searching for the Structure of Coping: A Review and Critique of Category Systems for Classifying Ways of Coping. *Psychological Bulletin*, *129*(2), 216. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1037/0033-2909.129.2.216

Skinner, E., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. (2007). The development of coping. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 119-144. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=57204406&site=eds-live

Skitka, L. (2009). Exploring the "lost and found" of justice theory and research. *Social Justice Research, 22*(1), 98-116. doi: 10.1007/s11211-009-0089-0

Skitka, L. J., Bauman, C. W., & Mullen, E. (2008). Morality and justice: An expanded theoretical perspective and empirical review. In K. A. Hedgvedt & J. Clay-Warner (Eds.), *Advances in Group Processes* (vol. 25; pp.1–27). Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Ltd.

Retrieved from http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/full/10.1016/S0882-6145%2808%2925001-0.

Skitka, L. J., & Crosby, F. J. (2003). Trends in the social psychological study of justice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7*(4), 282-285. doi: 10.1207/S15327957PSPR0704_01

Skitka, L. J., & Wisneski, D. C. (2011). Moral conviction and emotion. *Emotion Review*, *3*(3), 328-330. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=62030426&site=eds-live.

Slee, R., & Weiner, G. (2001). Education reform and reconstruction as a challenge to research genres: Reconsidering school effectiveness research and inclusive schooling. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 12*(1), 83-98. doi: 10.1076/sesi.12.1.83.346

Smelt, S. (1998). Today's schools: Governance and quality. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand,11.R*etrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020a&AN=aut.b10327216&site=eds-live>.

Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonising methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. London, UK: Zed Books.

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: research and indigenous peoples*. Otago University Press. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cat05020a&AN=aut.b13028893&site=eds-live

Smith, L. T. (2001). *A civilising mission: Perceptions and representations of the Native Schools system*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University Press.

Smith, C. E., Chen, D., & Harris, P. L. (2010). When the happy victimizer says sorry: Children's understanding of apology and emotion. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 28*(4), 727-746. doi: 10.1348/026151009X475343

Smith, E., & Gorard, S. (2012). "Teachers are kind to those who have good marks": A study of Japanese young peoples' views of fairness and equity in schools. *Compare, 42*(1), 27-46. doi: 10.1080/03057925.2011.629073 294

Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2003). Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis. In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Methods* (pp. 53-80). London: Sage.

Smith, H., & Thomas, S. P. (2000). Violent and nonviolent girls: Contrasting perceptions of anger experiences, school, and relationships. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 21*(5), 547-575. doi: 10.1080/01612840050044285

Smith, J. A. (1996). Beyond the divide between cognition and discourse: Using interpretative phenomenological analysis in health psychology. *Psychology & Health, 11*(2), 261-271. doi: 10.1080/08870449608400256

Smith, J. A. (2007). Hermeneutics, human sciences and health: Linking theory and practice. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being, 2*(1), 3-11. doi: 10.1080/17482620601016120

Smith, J. A. (2008). *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods.* Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications.

Smith, J., Flowers, P., & Larken, M. (2009). *Interpretative phenomenological analysis: Theory, method, and research.* London, UK: Sage.

Smith, J. A., Jarman, M., & Osborn, M. (1999). *Doing interpretative phenomenological analysis in quantitative health: theories and methods.* London, UK: Sage Publication.

Spiller, L. (2013). *Teachers' misunderstandings that affect the learning of their Pasifika students.* (Unpublished Master's thesis)*.* University of Victoria, Wellington, New Zealand.

Spoonley, P., Pearson, D. G., & Macpherson, C. (Eds.). (1996). *Nga Patai: Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa, New Zealand*. Dunmore Press.

Statistics New Zealand. (2013). *2013 census QuickStats about Māori.*   Retrieved from http://www.stats.govt.nz

Stuart, M. (2003). Moral issues in sport: The child's perspective. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 74*(4) , 445-454. doi: 10.1080/02701367.2003.10609114

Stuhr, J. J. (2000). Introduction to John Dewey. *Pragmatism and classical American philosophy*, 431-443.

Swaffer, T., & Hollin, C. R. (1997). Adolescents' experiences of anger in a residential setting. *Journal of Adolescence, 20*(5), 567-575. doi: 10.1006/jado.1997.0110

Szklarski, A. (2007). Conflict experience: A phenomenological study among young people in Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 51*(4), 369-383. doi: 10.1080/00313830701485478 295

Taboada, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (2006). Contributions of student questioning and prior knowledge to construction of knowledge from reading information text. *Journal of Literacy Research*, *38*(1), 1-35. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1207/s15548430jlr3801_1

Tai, F. (I998). *Justice perceptions in relation to academic motivation, academic achievement, evaluations of teaching staff and school life, and delinquent behaviour.* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation), University of Hong Kong: Hong Kong.

Tanielu, R., & Johnson, A. (2013). *More than churches, rugby & festivals*. *A report on the state of Pasifika people in New Zealand.* Auckland, New Zealand: The Salvation Army Social Policy and Parliamentary Unit.

Tata, J. (1999). Grade distributions, grading procedures, and students' evaluations of instructors: A justice perspective. *The Journal of Psychology, 133*(3), 263-271. doi: 10.1080/00223989909599739

Thomson, N. (2007). Justice in the home: Children's and adolescents' perceptions of the fair distribution of household chores. *Journal of Moral Education, 36*(1), 19-36. doi: 1080/030572406011185448

Thorkildsen, T. (1989a). Pluralism in children's reasoning about social justice. *Child Development*, *60*(4), 965-972. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.2307/1131036

Thorkildsen, T. (1989b). Justice in the classroom: The student's view*. Child Development, 60*(2), 323-334*.* https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.2307/1130979

Thorkildsen, T. (1991). Defining social goods and distributing them fairly: The development of conceptions of fair testing practices. *Child Development, 64*(2), 852-862. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624. 1991.tb01574.x

Thorkildsen, T. (1993). Those who can, tutor: High-ability students' conceptions of fair ways to organize learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(1), 182-190. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsovi&AN=edsovi.00004760.199303000.00017&site=eds-live

Thorkildsen, T., Nolen, S. B., & Fournier, J. (1994). What is fair? Children's critiques of practices that influence motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *86*(4), 475. https://doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1037/0022-0663.86.4.475

Thorkildsen, T., Sodonis, A., & White-McNulty, L. (2004). Epistemology and adolescents' conceptions of procedural justice in school. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(2), 347-359. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.96.2347

Thorkildsen, T., & White-McNulty. (2002). Developing conception of fair contest procedures and the understanding of skill and luck. *Journal of Psychology, 94*(2), 316-326. doi-org.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/10.1037/0022-0663.94.2.316

Thornberg, R. (2007). 'It's not fair!'—voicing pupils' criticisms of school rules. *Children and Society, 22*, 418-208. doi: 10.1111/j.1099-0860.2007.00121.x

Thornberg, R. (2008). School children's reasoning about school rules. *Research Papers in Education, 23*(1), 37-52. doi: 10.1080/02671520701651029

Thrupp, Martin. (1996). *The school mix effect*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.

Thrupp, M. (2007). Education's "inconvenient truth": Persistent middle-class advantage. *Waikato Journal of Education*, *13*, 253-272. Retrieved from http://ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=anh&AN=33979650&site=eds-live

Thrupp, M. (2008). Education's 'inconvenient truth': Part two - The middle classes have too many friends in education*. New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work, 5*(1), 54-62.

Thrupp, M. (2015). Poor performers or just plain poor: Assumptions in the neo-liberal account of school failure. *Waikato Journal of Education (2382-0373)*, 169–181.

Thrupp, M. (2017). New Zealand's National Standards policy: How should we view it a decade on? *Teachers and Curriculum, 17*(1), 11-15. https://doi.org/10.15663/tandc.v17i1.171

Thrupp, M., & White, M. (2013). *Research, analysis, and insight into National Standards (RAINS) project. Final report: National standards and the damage done*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZEI.

Tuafuti, P., & McCaffery, J. (2005). Family and Community Empowerment through Bilingual Education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education & Bilingualism*, *8*(5), 480. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=18426171&site=eds-live

Turiel, E. (2002). *The culture of morality: Social development, context, and conflict*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Twemlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., Sacco, F. C., & Brethour, J. R. (2006). Teachers who bully 179 students: A hidden trauma. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 52(3)*, 187-198. doi: 10.1177/0020764006067234

Vaillant, G. E., & Vaillant, C. O. (1990). Determinants and Consequences of Creativity in a Cohort of Gifted Women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *14*(4), 607. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=8646113&site=eds-live

Vallee, D. (2017). Student engagement and inclusive education: reframing student engagement. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *21*(9), 920. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN=124481338&site=eds-live

Vallée, D., & Ruglis, J. (2017) Student Disengagement in English-Speaking Montréal, Educational Studies, *53:3*, 285-314, DOI: 10.1080/00131946.2017.1303494

Vanden Bos, G. R. (2007). *APA dictionary of psychology*. Washington DC, WA: American Psychological Association. Johnston, J. (2007). APA Dictionary of Psychology. *Library Journal*, *132*(1), 144. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=23793249&site=eds-live

Vandiver, T. (2001). Children's social competence, academic competence, and aggressiveness as related to ability to make judgments of fairness. *Psychological Reports*, *89*(1), 111-121. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cmedm&AN=11729530&site=eds-live

Vannatta, R. (1996). Risk factors related to suicidal behavior among male and female adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 25*(2), 149-160. doi: 10.1007/BF01537341

Vassallo, B. (2008). Classroom climate as perceived by Maltese and non-Maltese pupils in Malta. *Malta Review of Educational Research, 6*(1), 80-97.

Verkuyten, M., & Brug, P. (2003). Educational performance and psychological disengagement among ethnic-minority and Dutch adolescents. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 164*(2), 189-200. doi: 10.1080/00221320309597977

Verkuyten, M., & Kinket, B. (1997). Preadolescents' understanding of ethnic discrimination. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 158*(1), 97-112. doi: 10.1080/00221329709596655

Verkuyten, M., & Thijs, J. (2002). Racist victimization among children in The Netherlands: The effect of ethnic group and school. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 25*(2), 310-331. doi: 10.1080/01419870120109502

Vieno, A., Gini, G., & Santinello, M. (2011). Different forms of bullying and their association to smoking and drinking behavior in Italian adolescents. *Journal of School Health, 81*(7), 293-399. doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2011. 00607.x

Vieno, A., Lenzi, M., Santinello, M., & Scacchi, L. (2013). Sense of community, unfairness, and psychosomatic symptoms: A multilevel analysis of Italian schools. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 53*(1), 142-145. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2013.02.019

Willig, J.W. (2007). Foundations of qualitative research: Interpretive and critical approaches. London : Sage. ISBN-13: 978-1412927413

Volk, A. A., Camilleri, J. A., Dane, A. V., & Marini, Z. A. (2012). Is adolescent bullying an evolutionary adaptation? *Aggressive behavior*, *38*(3), 222-238. doi: 10.1177/0013124507304487

Vygotsky, L. S., & Kozulin, A. (1986)*. Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wahyuni, D. (2012). The Research Design Maze: Understanding Paradigms, Cases, Methods and Methodologies. *Journal of Applied Management Accounting Research*, *10*(1), 69–80. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=76405928&site=eds-live

Walker, R. (1990). *Ka whawhai tonu matou – Struggle without end.* Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.

Walker, R. (1996). *Nga pepa a Ranginui: The Walker papers*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin.

Walrafen, N., Brewer, M. K., & Mulvenon, C. (2012). Sadly caught up in the moment: An exploration of horizontal violence. *Nursing Economics*, *30*(1), 6-15. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edselc&AN=edselc.2-52.0-84860625132&site=eds-live

Walters, K. L., Simoni, J. M., & Evans-Campbell, T. (2002). Substance use among American Indians and Alaska natives: incorporating culture in an "indigenist" stress-coping paradigm. *Public Health Reports (Washington, D.C.: 1974)*, *117 Suppl 1*, S104–S117. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=cmedm&AN=12435834&site=eds-live

Walton, W. (2005). The notion of bullying through the lens of Foucault and critical theory. *The Journal of Educational Thought (JET) / Revue de la Pensée Educative, 39*(1), 55-73. Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&A
N=edsjsr.23767482&site=eds-live

Walzer, M., (1995). The Politics of Rescue. *Social Research*, *62*(1), 53. Retrieved from

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&A
N=edsjsr.40971076&site=eds-live

Walzer, M. (2008). *Spheres of justice: A defense of pluralism and equality*. Princeton, NJ: Basic

books.

Wylie, C., Hodgen, E., & Ferral, H., Thompson, J., (2006). *Contributions of early childhood*

education to age-14 performance. Evidence from the longitudinal Competent Children,

Competent Learners' study. New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Wellington: New Zealand.

Wylie C., Hodgen E. (2012) Trajectories and Patterns of Student Engagement: Evidence from

a Longitudinal Study. In: Christenson S., Reschly A., Wylie C. (eds) Handbook of

Research on Student Engagement.

Wylie, C., (2012). *Secondary schools in 2012. Main findings from the NZCER national survey.*

New Zealand Council for Educational Research. Wellington: New Zealand.

Weiner, B. (2000). Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Theories of Motivation from an

Attributional Perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, *12*(1), 1.

http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&A
N=edsjsr.23363504&site=eds-live

Wheeler, M. (2018). Heidegger. In J. Zalta (Ed.), *Winter* (pp. 1-55). Stanford, CA: Stanford
University. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2018/entries/heidegger/

Whitted, K. S., & Dupper, D. R. (2008). Do teachers bully students? *Education and Urban
Society, 40*(3), 329-341. doi: 10.1177/0013124507304487

Williams, A. (2013). Critical educational psychology: Fostering emancipatory potential within
the therapeutic project. *Power and Education, 5*(3), 304-317.

Williams, A. J., Billington, T., Corcoran, T., & Goodley, D. (Eds.). (2016). *Critical Educational
Psychology*. London, UK: John Wiley & Sons.

Williams, C. L., & Heikes, E. J. (1993). The importance of researcher's gender in the in-depth
interview: Evidence from two case studies of male nurses. *Gender & Society*, *7*(2), 280-
291.
http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsjsr&A
N=edsjsr.189582&site=eds-live

Williams, P. (2008). *Mahayana Buddhism: The doctrinal foundations*. Routledge.

Williams, R. (1958) *Culture and Society,* London: Chatto and Windus.

Williams, R. (2011). Culture is ordinary (1958). *Cultural theory: An anthology*, 53-59.

Willig, C. (2008) Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology: Adventure in Theory and Method, 2nd ed. Buckingham: Open University Press. Google Scholar

Willig, C. (2013). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology*. London, UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

Wilson, G. S., Pritchard, M. E., & Revalee, B. (2005). Individual differences in adolescent health symptoms: The effects of gender and coping. *Journal of Adolescence, 28*(3), 369-379. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2004.08.004

Woodward, J. (2011). Psychological studies of causal and counterfactual reasoning. *Understanding counterfactuals, understanding causation. Issues in philosophy and psychology*, 16-53. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edb&AN= 15113557&site=eds-live

Wylie C. & Hodgen E. (2012) Trajectories and Patterns of Student Engagement: Evidence from a Longitudinal Study. In: *Christenson S., Reschly A., Wylie C. (eds) Handbook of Research on Student Engagement*. Springer, Boston, MA

Wylie, C., Thompson, C. J., & Lythe, C. (2001). *Competent children at 10: Families, early education, and schools.* Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Yamaguchi, T. (2009). *Fairness, forgiveness and grudge-holding: Experimental studies with primary school children in New Zealand*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation), Massey University: Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Yardley, L. (2000). Dilemmas in qualitative health research. *Psychology and Health*, *15*(2), 215-228.

Yi, C.-C., Wu, C.-I., Chang, Y.-H., & Chang, M.-Y. (2009). The psychological well-being of Taiwanese youth. *International Sociology, 24*(3), 397-429. doi: 10.1177/0268580909102914

Young, I., M., (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Young, I. M. (2001) Equality of whom? Social groups and judgments of injustice. *Journal of Political Philosophy, 9*(1) 1-18. doi: 10.1111/1467-9760.00115

Young, I. M. (2006). Responsibility and global justice: A social connection model. *Social Philosophy and Policy*, *23*(1), 102-130. doi: 10.1017/S0265052506060043

Iris Marion Young (2006) Education in the Context of Structural Injustice: A symposium response, *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38,* 1, 93-103, DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2006. 00177.x

Zemke-White, K. (2001). Rap music and Pacific identity in Aotearoa: Popular music and the politics of opposition. *Tangata o te moana nui: The evolving identities of Pacific peoples in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, 228-42.

Zerillo, C., & Osterman, K. F. (2011). Teacher perceptions of teacher bullying. *Improving Schools, 14(3)*, 239-257. doi: 10.1177/1365480211419586

Appendices

Appendix A: Research Communications

Student information and assent form for the survey

Parental information sheet and permission form for the survey

Student information and assent form for the interview

Parental information sheet and permission form for the intern view

Thank you for completing this form – I am asking your parents to sign their sheets too.

This form will be kept for a period six years.

Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Thank you,

Brian Moreton

It's not fair:
teenagers' understanding of feelings, actions and coping with unfairness

Information sheet and assent form for adolescents taking part in research on unfairness

Invitation to join me in research on unfairness

AUT UNIVERSITY
TE WĀNANGA ARONUI O TAMAKI MAKAU RAU

What you can expect of me:

- You can leave at any time.

- You do not have to tell me what you don't want me to know.

- I will keep your stuff to myself

- I will tell you what I find out about unfairness.

- I will use a number instead of your name when I put all of the stories together to find out about unfairness.

- I will keep your story or talk locked up.

- I will have to tell your principal and parents if you tell me about something that is either harmful to yourself or others, or is unlawful.

About me, the researcher:

I am a part-time student at AUT University.

I am doing this research for my studies.

I have been a teacher for twenty years.

What the research is about:

I want to find out more about unfairness. We say, "It's not fair" quite a lot, but we don't know much about it. Think about the last time you felt that something was unfair. Did you know why you felt that way?

Why am I doing this?

I think that if we know more about unfairness, it will help both you and your teachers to better understand what kids feel is unfair. It might help you to get on better with your mates. It might also help your teachers to find ways to better help you deal with it.

What am I asking you to do?

Write about unfairness by answering 5 questions.

How long will it take?

The survey will take about 10 minutes to fill in.

Consent form to participate in the research project **It's not fair: Early adolescent boys' and girls' perceptions and judgments of unfairness**

If you approve of your girl or boy participating in this research project, please sign this form, cut off and return in the stamped envelope.

- I have read this pamphlet and give permission for my son or daughter to participate.

- I have been able to ask questions and have them answered by e-mailing the researcher at brian.moreton@xtra.co.nz

- I know I can withdraw my girl or boy from this research project at any point.

I give permission for my girl or boy to take part in the research under the conditions given in the pamphlet.

Signature: _____

Name (please print): _____

Date: _____

Relationship to boy _____
(Mother, Father, Guardian)

At the completion of the research project, a summary of the findings will be sent directly to all boys or girls involved in the research project and to their parents or guardians.

About the researcher

- My name is Brian Moreton.

- I was a teacher for 20 years.

- I am now an educational psychologist.

- I am a Doctoral student with AUT university

- My project will be supervised by Associate Professor Nesta Devine

What should I do if I have any concerns about the research?

- Any concerns regarding the nature of this research should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor who can be contacted at nesta.devine@aut.ac.nz

- Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary, AUTEC, Madeline Banda, madeline.banda@aut.ac.nz, Tel: 912 9999, ext 8044 .

Your boy or girl is asked to help in research to find out about unfairness

It's not fair: Early adolescent boys' and girls' perceptions and judgments of unfairness

SURVEY

Information Sheet and Permission Form for Parents and Guardians

AUT UNIVERSITY
TE WĀNANGA ARONUI O TAMAKI MAKAU RAU

This form will be kept for a period of six years.

What are the aims of the study?

Instances of unfairness can be felt deeply and lead to action. However, little is known about how early adolescent boys and girls experience unfairness, why such judgments are made and how some teenagers cope with it.

Why are we doing this?

A better understanding of unfairness will contribute to the development of effective educational and parenting programmes and this will lead to decreasing instances of unfairness.

It will also help girls and boys cope better with these unfair experiences when they do occur.

What will my boy or girl do in the research?

Fill out a written survey of five questions.

How much time will it take?

If your son or daughter takes part in the survey, it will take 10 minutes.

What can you expect from the researcher?

You are under no obligation to accept the invitation. If you agree to your boy or girl taking part, your child will have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question

- withdraw from the study at any time

- ask any questions about the study at any time during the participation

- confidentiality

- receive a summary of the results

- know that if your daughter or son tells me anything illegal, or plans harm to himself or others, I will tell you and the principal.

What will happen to the information?

The accounts of the survey will only be used for the purposes of this research topic.

The survey form will be kept in a locked cabinet.

The Survey will be kept locked at AUT for six years, then securely destroyed.

Information not identifiable with your girl or boy may be presented at meetings, and published with possible extensive quotes from the interviews, so that the information may be of use to others.

How is the information protected to ensure confidentiality?

A code number will be used instead of a name in order to keep strict confidentiality and the information will be securely locked up at all times.

If you have any comments about the research or thoughts that you think may be of use, please feel free to write it below. Use another piece of paper if you want more space.

440

Thank you for completing this form – I am asking your parents to sign their sheets too.

This form will be kept for a period six years.

Name _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Thank you,

Brian Moreton

It's not fair:
teenagers' understanding of feelings, actions and coping with unfairness

Information sheet and assent form for adolescents taking part in research on unfairness

Invitation to join me in research on unfairness

AUT
UNIVERSITY
TE WĀNANGA ARONUI O TAMAKI MAKAU RAU

What you can expect of me:

• You can leave at any time.

• You do not have to tell me what you don't want me to know.

• I will keep your stuff to myself.

• I will tell you what I find out about unfairness.

• I will turn off the recorder any time you want me to.

• I will use a number instead of your name when I put all of the stories together to find out about unfairness.

• I will keep your story or talk locked up.

• I will have to tell your principal and parents if you tell me about something that is either harmful to yourself or others, or is unlawful.

About me, the researcher:

I am a part-time student at AUT University.

I am doing this research for my studies.

I have been a teacher for twenty years.

What the research is about:

I want to find out more about unfairness. We say, "It's not fair"quite a lot, but we don't know much about it. Think about the last time you felt that something was unfair. Did you know why you felt that way?

Why am I doing this?

I think that if we know more about unfairness, it will help both you and your teachers to better understand what kids feel is unfair. It might help you to get on better with your mates. It might also help your teachers to find ways to better help you deal with it.

What am I asking you to do?

I am looking to talk in-depth to 15 kids who had a strong feeling or action about the unfairness, and audio-tape my talk with each of the kids.

How long will it take?

The recording will take about forty minutes.

Consent form to participate in the research project **It's not fair: Early adolescent boys' + girls' perceptions and judgments of unfairness**

If you approve of your girl or boy participating in this research project, please sign this form, cut off and return in the stamped envelope

- I have read this pamphlet and give permission for my son or daughter to participate.

- I have been able to ask questions and have them answered by e-mailing the researcher at brian.moreton@xtra.co.nz

- I know that I can withdraw my girl or boy from this research project at any point.

_____

I give permission for my girl or boy to take part in the research under the conditions given in the pamphlet.

Signature: _____

Name (please print): _____

Date: _____

Relationship to student _____
                   (Mother, Father, Guardian)

At the completion of the research project, a summary of the findings will be sent directly to all boys or girls involved in the research project and to their parents or guardians.

About the researcher

- My name is Brian Moreton.

- I was a teacher for twenty years

- I am now a educational psychologist

- I am a Doctoral student with AUT university

- My project will be supervised by Associate Professor Nesta Devine

What should I do if I have any concerns about the research?

- Any concerns regarding the nature of this research should be notified in the first instance to the Project Supervisor who can be contacted at nesta.devine@aut. ac.nz

- Concerns regarding the conduct of the research should be notified to the Executive Secretary, AUTEC, Madeline Banda, madeline.banda@aut.ac.nz, Tel: 912 9999, ext 8044 .

Approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee, on 12 April 2010. AUTEC Reference number 09/132.

Your boy or girl is asked to help in research to find out about unfairness

It's not fair: Early adolescent boys' and girls' perceptions and judgments of unfairness

Information Sheet and Permission Form for Parents and Guardians

This form will be kept for a period of six years.

What are the aims of the study?

Instances of unfairness can be felt deeply and lead to action. However, little is known about how early adolescent boys and girls experience unfairness, why such judgments are made and how some teenagers cope with it.

Why are we doing this?

A better understanding of unfairness will contribute to the development of effective educational and parenting programmes and this will lead to decreasing instances of unfairness.

It will also help girls and boys cope better with these unfair experiences when they do occur.

What will my boy or girl do in the research?

I am interested in talking to and audio recording 15 students who feel their unfairness deeply.

How much time will it take?

If your son or daughter takes part in the interview, it will take forty minutes.

What can you expect from the researcher?

You are under no obligation to accept the invitation. If you agree to your boy or girl taking part, your child will have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question

- withdraw from the study at any time

- ask any questions about the study at any time during the participation

- confidentiality

- receive a summary of the results

- ask for the audiotape to be turned off at any time during the session

- to know that if your daughter or son tells me anything illegal, or plans harm to themselves or others, I will tell you and the principal.

What will happen to the information?

The accounts of the interviews from the tape recordings (transcripts), will only be used for the purposes of this research topic.

The transcripts will be kept in a locked cabinet. The audio recordings will be deleted after analysis.

The tape transcripts will be kept locked at AUT for six years, then securely destroyed.

Information not identifiable with your girl or boy may be presented at meetings, and published with possible extensive quotes from the interviews, so that the information may be of use to others.

How is the information protected to ensure confidentiality?

A code number will be used instead of a name in order to keep strict confidentiality and the information will be securely locked up at all times.

If you have any comments about the research or thoughts that you think may be of use. please feel free to write it below. Use another piece of paper if you want more space.

442

Research survey form and demographic information

	Participant Number:

Name: .... **Room**: ......

Class: Y7 Y8 **Sex:** Female Male

Date of birth: *....../ ...... /* 199...... 200 ....

Which primary school did you come from? ....

Put a circle around the answers which best described you.

Ethnicity: Māori Tongan Samoan Cook Island European Chinese Korean

Other ....

Is your mother living at home?   Yes   No

Is your father living at home?   Yes   No

Number of children in the family? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7+

Number of brothers?   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7+

Number of sisters?   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7+

What is your place in the family?   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7+

How many best friends do you have at school? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 7+

How do you think you are getting on with your school work?
1 (Good) 2   3 (ok) 4   5 (bad)

How do you behave at school?   1 (Good) 2   3 (ok) 4   5 (bad)

Introduction

Most young people have experienced an **unfair** event in their daily life at some time but not

everyone thinks, feels, and reacts to unfairness in the same way. In this research, I am interested

in what girls and boys mean, when they say, "**ITS NOT FAIR**!"

I am going to ask you to think about, and then write on something unfair that has happened to

you or another person, which would lead you to say that the event was unfair?

Try to think about something or someone that was unfair to you or your friends, teacher or other

people in your school. Describe how you were **thinking**, what you **felt,** and how you **reacted**, and

coped with the unfairness.

Notice that I am more interested in how you experienced the unfairness rather than the story.

Please follow the researcher's directions in filling in this sheet.

1   What was the event about?

2   What did you think caused the unfairness?

3   How did you feel about it? (Name your feelings)

4   Circle how strong each of your feelings was?

…………………..   1 (low) 2   3   5 middle 6   7   8   9   10 (high)

…………………. 1 (low) 2   3   5 middle 6   7   8   9   10 (high)

………………….. 1 (low)   2   3   5 middle 6   7   8   9   10 (high)

5   What did you do about the unfairness? (What you think or do?)

6   How did you deal with it?

7   What would need to happen to make the event fair again?

8   Who or what do you blame for the unfairness and why?

9   Do you wish to add anything else about your incident of unfairness

Would you be willing to be interviewed and tape recorded about your experience of a judgment of unfairness in more detail? I would like to interview 21 students on this matter. If

you are willing to be considered as one of the 21, then please circle Yes or No below, and I will

be in touch with you.

Please circle   **Yes**   **No**

Thank you,

Brian Moreton

Interview protocol: Deciding how something is unfair.

1.   Go over the young person's right and responsibilities.

2.   Tell me a little about the story of your unfair event……

3.

*   Who

*   What

*   When

*   Where

4.   Was the event good or bad/loss for you?

*   What did you …… by the event happening to you?

*   What did you consider in deciding it was a …. for you?

*   What or who did you compare it to?

*   How important was the …... for you?

*   Was the event expected or unexpected?

*   How would it have been if there had been no unfairness?

*   What did the ……. mean for you?

5.   How did you make sense of it? (interpreting the event)

- Who or what action started the event (caused)?

- Who or what action do you think was responsible (responsibility)?

- Did they know what they were doing? (awareness)

- Could they have stopped it? (volition)

- Did they intend to do it? (intention)

- Did they have an excuse for it? (mitigation)

- Who or what do you blame for the event (blameworthy)?

- What did for mean for you?

6.   What was the cause of the unfairness? (naming of the rule broken)

- Distributive- equality, equity or need

- Procedural-bias, consistency, accuracy, representativeness, ethical, + reasonableness

and timeliness

- Interactional-respect, dignity, kindness, politeness and honesty

- Informational

- Moral-would, should, ought

- Where did the rule/norm come from-culture, family, religion, you?

- What did deciding that it was unfair mean to you?

7.   Affective reaction

- What mood were you in before the event?

- What did you feel because of the unfair event?

- Can you describe how you felt it?

- Where did you feel it?

- How strong was it?

- What did it mean to you?

8   How did you react?

- Thinking?

- Acting?

- Do nothing?

- What was important in helping you decide what to do?

- What did the … mean to you?

9 How did you deal with it (time passes)

- Same as in the reaction?

- Thinking (changing/inputs)?

- Acting (changing/inputs)?

- Do nothing?

- What was important in helping you decide what to do?

- What did the … mean to you as a way of dealing with it?

9 What would have been needed to make the event fair?

- Thinking?

- The offender acting or doing?

- You acting…..?

- Do nothing?

- What was important in helping you decide what to do?

- What did the … mean to you?

10. What does the deciding that something is unfair mean to you? How important is it to you?

Anything to add to any of your responses?

Many thanks.

Debrief- ok etc

Master list of summary themes

All incidents cited by the participants saw their incident as negative often

highlighting the violation of a psychological contract

"She's like always growling me and blaming things on me for no reason",

(Willow, 1:6).

"Oh the ball kept on going and Mr. X. told us to go somewhere else like on the

courts", (Chris, 3:16).

"and then when it came to picking the teams both teams picked me last – like the

last team picked last, (Herbi, 4:101).

"first she marked it correct – and then later on she marked it uncorrect", (Chair, 5:06).

 "The teachers are not allowed to take stuff off from students unless it's theirs",

(The Rock, 6:52).

 "I was just waiting out on the field for everybody and they were like all swearing at me", (Snoop, 7:1(

"Someone stole my bike and I thought that was unfair", (Hemi, 8:1).

"And um well me and this other girl we told our teacher that um this girl didn't bring the red colourin
– (Charlie, 9:15)

"Being bullied", (Tina, 10:1) by being called, "Rude names", (Tina, 10:26).

"No-one really let me. And I felt like really disappointed in everyone – (Nat, 11:1).

"she called me names", (Paris, 12:18).

and then my house got to bat only once (Irene, 13:2).

Rule of standard of fairness behaviour broken.

Distributive rule

"The teachers are not allowed to take stuff off from students unless it's theirs", (Rock, 6:52)

"Someone stole my bike and I thought that was unfair", (Hemi, 8:1).

Procedural rule

"and then my house got to bat only once so of course we lost because we didn't get

as much turns as the other house so that wasn't fair", (Paris, 14:2).

"Oh we were like – um – oh yeah we were saying it's not even fair because we're

allowed to play on the field – it's not his field (Chris, 3:60).

Interactional rule

Teacher

"That she treats me unfairly to other kids" (Willow, 1:89).

"like reliable cause I know that they wouldn't do that", (5:170),

It should've been equal", (9:) ..."I thought that it was unfair because me and

my friend got the blame for it but it was actually that girl's fault", (Charlie, 9:20).

Peers

"they're meant to be there for one another and not back stabbing each other" (4:212).

"Ah they could just like be nice to me – just to stop bullying me – stop hitting me

(Snoop-Dog, 7:132)

"kind", (Tina, 10:124)

"he was supposed to have like choosed me cause we were all friends" (Nat. 11:64).

You should be treated like - like I was being a friend", (12:163), with "Kindness –

respect", (Paris, 12:165).

An attribution of blame, of the perpetrator by the "target" characterised by

the responsibility, Intentionality, and a lack of excuses

"Like when I'm at school she's like-I'm the board and she's like-if she gets angry-she blames everythir on me" (Willow, 1:85) , "She does it on purpose", (Willow, 1:97).

Blame "Mr …", (3:78), "Oh um so it doesn't interrupt his game", Chris,3:90).

"I think it was Emmeline because she was the one that asked me why I was captain" (Herbi 4:186).

"I think she did it because it was the way she said it to me", (Herbi, 4:196) .. "Like she

 sounded really demanding and serious – like why are you captain – like in that voice,

so I knew she was saying it on purpose", (Herbi, 4:198). no excuse for Emmeline's actions "Hhm n she   didn't", (Herbi, 4:186).

"Um so you think she gets the blame 100% for that? "Yeah", (Chair, 5:156). "Yeah she did it

on purpose" (Chair, 5:150). No excuse for her teacher's action "I don't think so" (Chair, 5:154).

"so do you think she was to blame for that", (Rock, 6:176) … "Yes", (Rock, 6:177).

 Rock allowed that there was a possible excuse "Oh she thought she – oh she thought

that she left it somewhere", (6:179) and "thinking that you had stolen the pen", (6:182).

Which, "Um kind of excuses her", (6:185). Rock concedes that it only excuses her a little

by laughing "Kind of – but not too much otherwise your anger would have been down wouldn't it?,

(Rock, 6:186). "[Laughs]", (Rock, 6:187). "Well cause that was the first time a teacher took

stuff off me", (Rock, 6:193).

the blame was attributed to the whole class group of 27. Snoop indicated that they did it on

purpose; intended to do it, and that there was no excuse for the experience "Yeah",

(Snoop-Dog, 7: 164; 166: and 215).

The two boys were blamed by Hemi because they intended to do it, did it on purpose

"Ah I think (Hemi, 8:132), and had no excuses for their action in stealing his bike. (Hemi,)

From Charlie's perspective the girl had no excuses for not bringing the experimental requirements ar
with regard to her intentionality, "I don't know", (Charlie 9:108) "Until that girl brang food colourir
and then she stopped nagging us," (Charlie, 9:37). Thus, intent is implied in the ongoing nagging ar
she also had no excuses for her decisions.

had intended to do the bullying "Yes", (Tina, 10:168). "I think – I think", (Tina, 10:166) and there w
no excuse for verbally abusing Tina "Trying to make trouble", (Tina, 10:170)

Nat focused on Mr. Y, "Probably the one Person", (Nat, 11:41). In addition there was no excuse for l
actions, "No", (11:46) and he could have avoided the action if had wanted to, "Yeah" (Nat, 11:49).

According to Paris, Michelle is responsible for the unfairness, "Yes." (Paris, 12:178). Michelle has
take most of the blame because she treats a lot of people this way. "Most…" (Paris, 12:187), of th
bullying herself and is therefore held by Paris to be doing it intentionally, "Paris' is shaking her head
agreement", (Paris, 12:180). Paris indicates that there are no excuses for what Michelle did to h
"Paris' is shaking her head in agreement", (Paris, 12:180).

Irene held the teacher responsible, "Yeah", (13:150), no excuses for her action, "Not that I know of" (Irene, 13:152), Irene she did it intentionally, "probably", (Irene, 13:154).

Consequences to a judgement of unfairness

Affective response

External

"Oh quite angry" (Chris, 3:22). Felt like a fighter who "get beaten up and they feel angry" (Chris, 3:32) "I just want to get violent sometimes" (Chris 4:127) "and then I got confused as well as i was getting angry" (Chris 4:150).

"Oh Strong" (Rock, 6:46), "Oh like um I was going to blow", (Snoop, 48).

Shifting emotional focus: External to internal focus

"I was really angry like I could just run the whole field and like don't stop", (Irene 13 :?).

"Um it kind of changed into disappointment/jealous when the house shield was announced

that they had won and how they won" (Irene, 13:60)

Internal focus

"I felt frustrated – me and my friend felt frustrated cause the teacher took it out on us", (Charli 9:22).

"Big sad", (Tina, 10:52) making her "Feeling small", (Tina, 10:56). She felt uncomfortable about the possibility of telling the offenders how she felt, as well as, being a little "Worried" (Tina, 10:216) th Miss X might do the bullying again.

"Embarrassment" …sad (Paris: 12:44) like nobody like me", (Paris, 12:48) "And I was all alone", (Par 12:50) "It was mixed up together" (Paris, 64).

Internal to external

"Um shameful because on that day she said I got all correct and then like also disappointment whe I found out that I didn't when I did" (Chair, 5:40) "quite embarrassed and confused" (5:18 disappointment, confusion, "mainly confusion" (5:25) and anger.

"A little bit", (Chair, 5:98).

"I felt unhappy and angry" (Snoop, 7:15). "It came in at the same time", (Snoop, 7:29)."It was ju really strong cause I was just sitting outside and I was bawling my eyes out", (Snoopy, 7:23). (perpetrators) "No just a bit scared", (Snoop, 7:17).

I had a sad feeling that someone stole my bike", (Hemi, 8:40).

Anger "the person who took it", (Hemi, 8:62). "It felt like I was going to rip apart", (Hemi, 8:70).

Wanting to cry followed as an expression of Herbii's sadness, "I felt left out" (Herbi 3:144).

sadness wasn't as strong as the expression of her anger, never- the -less "It was really

bad cause it wanted me to – it made me feel like I really wanted to cry [yeah] and

I don't really cry much so that made it even worse" (Herbi, 4:132).

Sad "only a little" (Willow, 1:18) sad "Because I just like had to get used to it-and now I just have
get used to it" (Willow, 1:24). Anger as "very strong" (1:123) being much stronger than that of sadnes

Coping strategies to deal with unfairness

Change of behaviour.

"Tried to be – I was trying to be good to try and get back into his sports teams" (Chris 3: 44).

Withdrawal

"just stayed quiet for the rest of the day" (Herbi, 4:172), Withdrawal "I let it go because it like-
happened already so I put it behind me cause the past" (Herbi 4:182).

"Um I didn't want to talk to anybody" (Chair, :)"Writing just yeah – and didn't listen to anybody if th
were talking" (Chair 5:86).

"Hanging out by myself", (Rock, 6:141)

Seeking social support

Adult

"Like – just like tell me to stay in" (Willow, 1:56).

"I told my Mum that they were getting smart and hitting me and I told her what I did", (Snoop-Dc
7:76). "She didn't know –she just called the school and just tell them what happened", (Snoop-Dc
7:82)

"Yeah I told the deputy principal", (Hemi, 8:74) "Um told my Mum", (Hemi, 8:80).

Told "Teacher", (Tina, 10:72).

Seeking social support from peers and siblings

"And my brother", (Hemi, 8:82).

"Oh I talked to my friend yeah", (Charlie 9:50).

"I told her both (Narrative and feeling -sic) and then she just said 'just take it and accept it'

457

and yeah", (Charlie, 9:56). The result was that in response to her friend's stoical advice

Charlie said, "That helped me to calm down and like yeah", (Charlie, 9:62).

"Yeah it became yeah finished", (Charlie, 9:64).

"just stopped hanging out with [Mr. Y] – started hanging out with my um other friend [name]", (Nat 11:137).

"Um to go fight with her", (Paris, 12:122), but Paris said "I don't not like hitting people", Spoke to h friends, who were largely in her house team, complaining about how she felt about the unfairness an they "co-operated", (Irene, 13:86). They then set a goal to win the shield which they did the followin term, "so that got us really, really excited", (Irene, 13:94).

Restorative action

Restore the original event or stop the behaviour causing it.

"Ah they'd probably have to give both teams fair amounts of batting", (Irene 13:104).

"Yeah – going for so long", (Paris 12:140).

"like you can be in my group", (Nat 11:143).

"Mhm no, just bring our bike back and it'll be fine" (Hemi 8:108).

"Um – oh I can make them give me a game (electronic)", (Hemi 8:174).

"They could just stop it", (7:86)… "and like just be my friends and that ", (Snoop 7:88).

"Stop calling me that", (Chair 5:103).

"Not to have said anything", (Willow 1:63).

"Maybe confronted them and ask them why were they talking about me – and telling

them that it wasn't fair on me - that I did nothing wrong to them and ask them why were they sayin all that stuff about me and maybe we would have sorted it out earlier"

(Herbi, 4:182).

"Oh um he could let us play in his team instead of us playing by ourselves"

(Chris,3:66) or "By telling us to um not be around while he's teaching a team," (Chris, 3:62)

Apology

Tina, 10. "Say sorry", (Tina 10:104).

The Rock 6. "Sorry for taking your pens", (The Rock 6:165).

Case study emergent theme summaries

Case study emergent theme summaries

Case study one: Willow

Background/Contextual information

Willow (all participants chose their own nom de plume), the first participant to be interviewed, is a descendent of the Dinka people, on her mother's side, who came to New Zealand as refugees from what is now the country of South Sudan. Her father is a man of European descent. Willow is aged 11 years and 11 months. Her mother lives at home but her father is not resident in the family home. There are three children in the family with Willow as the second oldest. Her only bother is the oldest in the family and she has one younger sister. Willow has a large circle of more than 7 friends. While she indicates that her experience of learning is the same as others, her experience of behaviour challenges is below that of others. She has a pattern of getting into trouble with her class teacher and being sent to the Deputy Principal.

Willow's experience of unfairness: Treating me differently to others for talking.

Willow has conflicted with her Year 7 class teacher for the larger part of the year in which she was interviewed. Her experience of this negative event indicates that her teacher "my teacher" (1:2) is the instigator of the unfairness that she encounters. She says has been treated differentially to that of her peers as "she's like always growling me and blaming things on me for no reason and always sending me to Miss (Deputy Principal)" (1:6) and for "talking and like not doing my work" (1:12)". In relaying her unfairness experience Willow uses the word

"always" (1:12) repeatedly which indicates both the widespread and ongoing nature of how she is being unfairly treated by her class teacher.

Willow sees herself as being blamed for responding to conversations that she herself did not initiate "I just reply" (1:71). For Willow to not respond to a peer conversation appears to violate a peer group norm that you must talk back to someone who has started a conversation with you "And like people talk to me so I reply but then I get in trouble" (1:73). For Willow the blame lies with the one who initiated the conversation. As she didn't initiate the conversation it is unfair that she gets treated differently and blamed for the talking "Cause people are always talking to me" (1:69). Not initiating the talking Willow sees herself as being exonerated and consequently her teacher as treating her differentially and therefore as being unfair toward her. In summary, the unfairness that Willow experiences is that she is being blamed unfairly for stems from that situation where she sees herself as being treated differently and not as others are "That she treats me unfairly to other kids" (1:89).

According to Willow the blame for the teacher's action lies directly with her teacher. Her attribution for the unfairness is three-fold. The teacher's behaviour pattern has been in place over a long period of time and is extensive, as evident the use of the term "always" (1:6 &1:12). Willow sees herself as a being targeted "Like when I'm at school she's like-I'm the target and she's like-if she gets angry-she blames everything on me" (1:85) The teacher's behaviour is situationally related, whereby if there is another teacher in the classroom then her teacher is kind to her "if Mr X or Miss Y is in class, she's like all kind" (1:85). Consequently, Willow lays the responsibility and blame with her teacher even though she is unable to give a rationale for her class teacher's action.

In response to her teacher's comment about the nature of her talking, Willow reacted by swearing at her teacher, using what she describes as "bad words" (1:34). Willow was very reluctant to describe the actual words she used and that she did not make eye contact with her teacher as she swore at her "Like bad words" (1:34) The swearing is described as pay back "Like this is payback (1: 40)" and deliberate as Willow was fully aware that she would get into trouble for the swearing "and like it will get me in trouble" (1: 40).

Willow's affective response to the unfairness was twofold; she initially responded by reporting a "only a little" (1:18) sadness in reaction to not being able to do anything about her treatment "Because I just like had to get used to it-and now I just have to get used to it" (1:24). In effect, Willow was powerless to do anything about it. Later in the interview Willow described her anger as the reaction to this instance of unfairness. She describes the anger as "very strong" (1:123) being much stronger than that of sadness. Willow described the anger as being felt "physical" (1:128) and "everywhere" (1:125) in her body. Thus, her sadness has a longer self-internal focus while her anger is directed externally toward her teacher in response to this particular incident. Willow received an after-school detention and had to write a "sometimes she makes me write like a sorry letter – like she's always like growling me" (1:60). In interview Willow indicted that she was not remorseful for swearing at her teacher as "Like this is payback" (1:41) for the ongoing pattern of unfairness.

In response to being asked about the possibly of restoring the incident to a state of fairness Willow indicated that the only action possible was "Not to have said anything" (1:63) as "Never – if like I explain all day like – she won't' do anything" (1:65).

Case study three: Paris

Background/Contextual information

The second participant to be interviewed was Paris. She is a Year 8, female student, aged 13 Irene years and four months, and is of Māori heritage. She comes from a large family of seven children, comprising 4 brothers and two sisters and is positioned number 4, by birth order within her family. She lives at home with both of her parents. At school Paris has a large circle of friends and her perception of her schoolwork is that she is doing 'ok', but that she is doing better with her behaviour.

Case three: Chris

Background/Contextual information

At the time of the interview Chris was 11 years and 11 months of age and in Year 7. Chris lives close to his intermediate school and attended a nearby primary school which contributes most of its students to his intermediate school. He has both of his parents living at home and he is of Tongan descent. Chris comes from a large family of over 7 sisters and 8 brothers with his birth position in the family being that of number 8. In terms of academic achievement Chris rates himself in the top third and rates himself as average in his behaviour. Chris is very sport oriented; especially participating in team sports, and represents his school in rugby league, touch and rugby. He has 2 close friends who also play in the same school teams. Sport is the centre of Chris' school life.

Chris: being unfairly sent off the field by Mr. X

Chris' story starts after school when he and his friends were playing an unnamed team game on the main sports field, at the side of the school. Close to this game, on the same sports field Mr X, one of Chris' team coaches, was taking a team practice, or coaching session "… he told us

to go away because we were too much" (3:16). During these two parallel activities some team members kicked a few balls 'accidentally' into the path of Mr. X's team "oh the ball kept on going and Mr. X. told us to go somewhere else like on the courts" (3:16). Mr. X reacted by suggesting they go away and play somewhere else. Consequently, they went to the courts where they set up a game of league. As he yelled at them Mr. X told them that they would never be on his team again, and then only if they were good, might he change his mind and "he told us to um never be on his team ever again yeah" (3:16).

In the interview Chris mentions three points, or scenarios, referred to in the psychological literature as counterfactual thinking, that have allowed him to imagine, speculate, or theorise how the unfair event and its effects might have turned out differently. These scenarios have implications in establishing both a judgement of unfairness and in allocating responsibility, and - or, blame for the negative event. In the first scenario "Oh we were like – um – oh yeah we were saying it's not even fair because we're allowed to play on the field – it's not his field (3:60)". Chris and his friends have a clear understanding that the school students are allowed to play on any of the fields after school.

In the second possibility that, Mr. X rather than yelling at them Mr. X and could have invited Chris and his mates to play against the team he was coaching. In the third scenario Mr. X could have directed them to play on another part of the school field rather than play close to his team "Yeah that our field was big enough to share" (3:92).

In response to arriving at a judgement of unfairness to being sent off the field, Chris developed a negative, external emotional response, directed at Mr. X in the form of anger "Oh quite angry" (3:22). The angry response was rated as medium by Chris and he described this as being experienced in his mind. While Chris explained this via the metaphor of a fighter who "get

beaten up and they feel angry" (3:32). The anger lasted until the dismissed group re-established themselves on the courts to play a game of touch. Both the medium strength of Chris' emotional reaction and the lack of any negative behavioural reactions may have been constrained, or modified, by Chris wanting to stay on Mr. X's team "tried to be - I was trying to be good to try and get back into his sports teams" (3: 44).

Chris reports two coping measures that were undoubtedly constrained by his wanting to stay on Mr. X's team. In the first strategy Chris was trying to be good. Specifically, he was trying not to be naughty, getting off the field quickly and keeping off, and listening carefully for further instructions "Tried to be – I was trying to be good to try and get back into his sports teams" (3: 44). The second strategy was one of seeking group support, by talking about the unfairness of Mr. X's action toward them, with his mates. "Oh we were like- um –oh yeah we were saying it's not even fair because we're allowed to play on the field - it's not his field" (3:60).

Asked about the possibility of restorative action Chris indicated that a number of actions were possible: either telling them not to be around when he's teaching a team, or let them play against his team "By telling us to um not be around while he's teaching a team" (3:62)… "Oh um he could let us play in his team instead of us playing by ourselves" (3:66). Mr. X is deemed to have been unfair in his action of sending the group off the field. It was deemed to be 'accident' by Chris as they didn't do it on purpose, Mr X had other possibilities of acting as indicted by Chris' consideration of the 3 counterfactuals. Mr X is both deemed responsible and blamed by Chris for the judgement of unfairness.

Case four: Herbii

Herbi is a Year 8, female student, who lives close to her intermediate school and attended one of the main contributing primary schools, feeding students to her intermediate school. She is of Pakeha (New Zealand European) descent. Both of Herbie's parents live at home with her family, which Herbi indicted consists of two sisters and two brothers, with herself as the youngest of the siblings. She reported that she has an extensive web of over 7, best friends. Her experience of both her schoolwork and behaviour is at the upper, positive, end of the experience. Herbii reports that she is involved in and good at several sports, including rugby league, rugby, touch and athletics. Herbies' narrative of unfairness relates to an incident at rugby practice in the winter term of the year of her interview.

Herbi Context

Herbii is fervent about her rugby playing, "like I love playing rugby" (4:154). This game is a team ball game and is effectively the national winter sport of New Zealand/Aotearoa. The negative incident leading to an experience of unfairness took place, in about the sixth practice of the season, when her teacher/coach called for volunteers for the captaincy "Miss [name] told one of us to be a captain, so I volunteered to be a captain" (4:101). Led by Emmeline and Herbii's other friends, Herbii was eventually bullied out of her volunteering to be captain "and then like everyone was saying that is, that I shouldn't be a captain – and like I was asking why I shouldn't be a captain – and they were saying you're only a good team player" 4:101).

The bullying took the form of negative peer comment direct at Herbii, whispering behind her back, menacing looks along with being socially rejected. The comments that Herbii has relayed included "she told me that they were saying that I'm like nothing but a white piece of trash and everything-and that made me feel emotional (4:109). In addition, much of the negative comment was in the form of whispering, "o cause they kept like whispering things about me"

(4:101). The group, including Emmeline, were also directing menacing looks at Herbii in order to intimidate her out of the captaincy, "kept looking at me giving me that why are you captain look – because this other girl named Emmeline wanted to be captain" (4:101). At this juncture she surrendered the captaincy to Emmeline. Finally, Herbii was socially rejected by being chosen last for the two practice teams and ironically ended up on Emmeline's team "and then when it came to picking the teams both teams picked me last – like the last team picked last – and then like those people in that team they were like oh – and I was like oh this pretty unfair', (4:101).

Herbii felt many aspects of the negative incident as unfair, "Mhm it felt like – I'm not sure like – it was like my first time feeling it was that unfair that I felt emotional" (4:200). The violation of the norm that Emmeline settle on as the cause of her unfair experience was "Yeah friends don't do that to one another" (4:210) … "they're meant to be there for one another and not backstabbing each other and saying stuff like that" (4:212).

While the actual narrative consists largely of group behaviours Herbii laid the individual responsibility, for the cause of the unfairness, at Emmeline's door. The attribution of blame came from an interpretation of several Emmeline's behaviours. In the first instance she said "I think it was Emmeline because she was the one that asked me why I was captain" (4:186). Then she involved the other girls "Yeah I think she started it because after I said like – after she asked me she went to the girls and told them and was saying like all this other stuff, (4:188). Another line of 'evidence' for Herbii saying that Emmeline did it on purpose, emerges from this comment "I think she did it because it was the way she said it to me", (4:196) .. "Like she sounded really demanding and serious – like why are you captain – like in that voice, so I knew she was saying it on purpose", (4:198). Herbii is sure that there was no excuse for Emmeline's actions "Hhm

466

no, she didn't", (4:186). In a more general sense Herbii directed the following comment to the group as a whole, "it was like unfair because I did nothing to them but they just started talking about me like that", (4:112).

When asked about the possibility of restorative actions she made the following observation, "Maybe confronted them and asked why they were talking about me – and telling them that it wasn't fair on me - that I did nothing wrong to them and ask why they were saying all that stuff about me and maybe we would have sorted it earlier" (4:182). She noted later that " oh yeah we are still good friends"(4:205).

Herbii's reactions to the negative incident include emotional, behavioural and cognitive reactions. Before the incident Herbii describes her emotional experience as being "- like, before all of that even started, I was happy like really happy cause like I love playing rugby" (4:154). Herbii described her emotional reactions as experiencing uncomfortableness, sadness, anger, and confusion.

After volunteering as captain her friends made comments about her ability to undertake the role "so cause they were kept whispering things about me and kept looking at me giving me that why are you captain look" (4:101). This resulted in her feeling uncomfortable and stepping down as captain.

Anger presents as Herbii's strongest emotional response to the unfairness experience "I just want to get violent sometimes" (4:127). This response was experienced in her head and fists and "sometimes my legs if I want to kick" (4:130). This negative external response was directed at Emmeline for orchestrating the group response towards Herbii. The strength of Herbii's anger can be seen in the degree of her friends' reactions to her behaviours "and I was really

angry and they were like whoa what's your problem – when I'm angry I take it out on the whoever's talking to me.

Parallel to the expression of anger was a state of confusion "and then I got confused as well as I was getting angry" (4:150). Herbii was confused about "like why they just start talking about me lie that – I just kept feeling confused" (4: 148).

Wanting to cry followed as an expression of Herbii's sadness, at their "talking about me and everything and mocking my like appearance and everything" (4:140) so, "I felt left out" (4:144). She indicated that the sadness wasn't as strong as the expression of her anger, never- the -less "It was really bad cause it wanted me to – it made me feel like I really wanted to cry [yeah] and I don't really cry much so that made it even worse" (4:132).

Herbii's behavioural reactions to her unfairness experience focused on taking it out on rugby and in particular on a social withdrawal process. Herbii reported that "and like I was getting turned off rugby a bit and then I got really angry and I took it out on rugby and I hurt one of the girls by accident when I tackled her too hard and she like whacked her head on the ground really hard that it bounced twice" (4:101). The main behavioural reaction reported by Herbii was to withdrawal social contact "I just stopped talking to them for a while" (4:158). The main reason for this action articulated by Herbii was "I became quieter [yeah] and like I just didn't being in their team [yeah] cause I know that they would have kept stabbing me like that" (3:166). This had the added advantage of allowing her to concentrate on rugby "I still wanted to play rugby and all but I just didn't want to get involved with them" (4:170).

Cognition

Herbii reported that she dealt with the unfairness by continuing the withdrawal for a day "just stayed quiet for the rest of the day" (4:172) and then leaving it, "I let it go because it like- it happened already so I put it behind me cause it's the past" (4:182). In addition, "And they said sorry to me after that [so yeah], (4:184).

Case five: Chair

Background

Chair is a female, Year 8, student of European ethnic extraction, who lives at home with both of her parents. She is twelve years of age. Her siblings consist of a younger sister and an older brother. She has two best friends at school. Chair sees herself as experiencing higher levels of academic achievement and standards of behaviour.

Chair has her maths marks changed but three girls don't: "... teacher she favours the other girls the rest of the class cause they're the same culture as her" (5:1).

Chair's story starts with her having sat a summative, maths test, in which she achieved her highest ever marks "I was feeling happy cause I'd never got that high in a test before" (5:116). As a result, she was in a very positive mood and looking forward to telling her mother of her success. Chair was the first to sit the test as determined by the alphabetical order of the class roll. Later, the same day, her teacher remarked a test item, a money problem, which resulted in Chair and another boy getting the particular item recorded, as incorrect "my unfairness is that my teacher she favours the other girls and the rest cause they the same culture as her" (5:02) . However, three other girls of the Samoan origin, and who got the same answer of $15.00, had their answer accepted as being correct, "Um she marked it uncorrect but first she marked it correct – and then later on she marked it uncorrect", (5:06). After some

469

consideration Chair concluded that her teacher had favoured three girls of her Samoan culture, as well as lying to her. Chair came from a primary school where she had never experienced this type of teacher behaviour before. Her understanding of a good teacher is that all teachers need to be both, "like reliable cause I know that they wouldn't do that", (5:170), able to be trustworthy. Chair had come to conclusion that her teacher was not a good teacher, as teachers should not lie, or favour others. These values appear to have their origin in Chair's family and to have been confirmed by her experience while at primary school. In summary, her teacher was not a good teacher because she lied about the correctness of the mark in such a way as to show favouritism toward three girls of her own culture. By doing these things she had shown her unreliability and lack trustworthiness, and demonstrated that she was not a good teacher, as Chair had previously experienced. As a violation of this rule Chair deemed her teacher's actions to be unfair.

The responsibility for the breaking of the norm of being a reliable teacher is directed at Chair's teacher. An attribution of blame is laid clearly upon her because she is responsible for the action and therefore to be blamed for the unfair state. "Um so you think she gets the blame 100% for that? Yeah", (5:156). Chair sees the action as being carried out intentionally and therefore on purpose "Yeah she did it on purpose" (5:150). Finally, there is no excuse for her teacher's action "I don't think so" (5:154), in changing her maths mark, which she did on purpose in order to advantage three girls of her own culture. In terms of restorative actions with the possibility of righting the unfairness Chair indicated that "Um since she still thinks that the answer was wrong she could've like explained to me how it was wrong" (5: 108). While Chair concedes it might have helped reduce the feeling of confusion, in her view it would not have reduced either the shame/embarrassment, or the anger. Consequently, she is of the opinion that, providing an

explanation, will not be of much help in reducing the overall emotional impact of the Chair's unfairness experience.

Chair reported emotional, behavioural and cognitive reactions to her experience of unfairness as a result of her teacher's behaviours. Chair experienced shame/embarrassment "quite embarrassed and confused" (5:18), disappointment, confusion, "mainly confusion" (5:25) and anger. Chair's initial maths mark is the highest that she had achieved, which had left her feeling very happy, in the expectation that she would be able to tell her mother. Following her remark, shame/embarrassment "Um shameful because on that day she said I got all correct and then like also disappointment when I found out that I didn't when I did" (5:40), follows at a very high level as she deals with the changed mark in front of her peers. Disappointment follows at not being able to tell her mother of her achievement and confusion follows, parallel to the humiliation, as she searches for a reason as to why her teacher has acted in this unfair way. As she searches through the possible explanations she comes to the conclusion that her teacher has lied to her, and is angry, but at a low level which is directed at her teacher.

Chair's cognitive reactions focus on seeking an explanation as to why her teacher has acted this way "That like she shouldn't be doing that as a teacher yeah" (5:194). Three counterfactuals are explored in her search for an understanding. In the first place Chair postulates if the teacher's calculator, is in fact, working "Like or her calculator isn't working properly" (5:64). Next she explores the possibility of the teacher herself not understanding the maths problem "Um like I was wondering if she could like understand the question herself" (5:62). Thirdly, she asks herself if she had marked it properly "I was wondering if she marked it properly and then" (5:104) and finally "then I know she was lying" (5:104) to advantage the three girl students of Samoan ethnicity. Chair settled on the lying counterfactual "they all got them correct with the

same answer" (5:138), as a result of none of the other explanations fitting the previous pattern of favouritism, "Cause she's like usually picking on other people like if they're Tongan or European" (5:130)… "cause they have - share the same culture" (5:136).

Chair's final area of reaction was behavioural where she engaged in social withdrawal by getting on with her work, especially when writing. This tactic reduced the possibility of social interaction and consequently inducing shame/embarrassment, which had been Chairs predominant affective response "Um I didn't want to talk to anybody" (5:48). She indicates that it also helped reduce the level of moral anger directed at her teacher "I didn't feel like so much anger then" (5:94). Chair also reports that she continued the work focused strategy, as a method of coping, "Writing just yeah – and didn't listen to anybody if they were talking" (5:86).

Case 6: The Rock

Background/context

"The teachers are not allowed to take stuff off from students unless it's theirs", (6:52) /

She said that um – she said that um maybe I was the one stealing stuff from the classroom", (6:210.)

The year before the interview, when Rock was in Year Seven, he encountered an incident involving his class teacher who accused him of stealing. His teacher possessed a distinctive orange pen with blue ink, as did Rock, and accused him of stealing it. She took possession of his pencil case and took the pen out of his pencil case. This action resulted in Rock walking out of his classroom in anger.

The first rule that Rock appears to have experienced, as being broken, is that "teachers are not allowed to take stuff from students unless it's theirs", (6:52). The second rule relates to the teacher drawing a false conclusion from her comment that he not only took the pen but that he was therefore responsible for other stealing, that had been going on, in their classroom, "She said um – she said that um maybe I was the one stealing stuff from the classroom", (6:210). A consideration by Rock of alternative scenario confirms for him that she *should* have act in seizing his property the way she did. Rock had envisioned that she "oh I thought that she would take all of our pens out [whole class] and have them checked", (6:99). Therefore, rock had considered a scenario around the incident that enabled him to conclude that she *should* have acted in a different way moral way. Of course, the connection between actual and the counterfactual is only summarised by the interpreter and is therefore only provisional.

With the second moral rule violated, in contrast to the counterfactual, explored by Rock when "oh I was thinking that she would think that I was one of the stealers", (6:173) …"It was the fact that she was thinking the idea that Vincent's a stealer – well she's jumping isn't she.." (6:174) … "Yes", (6:174). Thus, Rock's teacher is jumping to conclusions without any substantial evidence when she says it and Rock thinks she's thinking it. In conclusion, Rock has spoken of two counterfactuals which indirectly present evidence that his teacher should not have violated these two moral standards.

With the issue of responsibility for the taking of Rocks pen, his teacher was directly blamed by Rock for the taking of his pen and pencil case "so do you think she was to blame for that", (6:176) … "Yes", (6:177). Rock allowed that there was a possible excuse "Oh she thought she – oh she thought that she left it somewhere", (6:179) and "thinking that you had stolen the pen", (6:182). Which, "Um kind of excuses her", (6:185). Rock concedes that it only excuses her a little

by laughing "Kind of – but not too much otherwise your anger would have been down wouldn't it?, (6:186). "[Laughs]", (6:187). In addition, the action was a big thing according to Rock because "Well cause that was the first time a teacher took stuff off me", (6:193). When asked about the utility of restorative action in returning the event to a fair state, Rock initially said that his teacher should not have taken his stuff or "Um think before she checks", (6:157); he did concede that a verbal apology could restore the event to that of the status quo.

Rock's reactions to the unfair experience included anger, withdrawal, and consideration of alternative behaviours. Anger was very much to the fore for Rock and at a very high level "strong", (6:77). Rock describes this as like blowing off, "Oh like um I was going to blow", (6:69). Rocks anger is compounded by a sensitivity of his, "Oh um I sometimes do that when people stare at me getting into trouble", (6:81) … "I'd be in class and um people tease me", (6:89). Consequently, Rock will walk off to withdraw from the possibility of people laughing at him, "Um – like um you can walk out like cause I'm always angry and I just walk off to cool off", (6:85). If this happened, Rock would be angrier, engaging in, "Oh punching the wall, kicking, chucking the desk", (6:93). As a result of utilising these strategies rock was able to cool down substantially within half an hour. This was continued by rock at lunchtime by, "Hanging out by myself", (6:141). In addition, Rock had cognitions about punching his teacher but in order not to this was added incentive to walk off. Following these individual strategies Rock was removed to another room by a number of teachers as part of a formal anger plan. In the room he was spoken to by a teacher that he related to, in a therapeutic interview, focusing on what went well and what he could be improved the next time that he had an anger episode.

Case seven: Snoop-Dog

Background/context

Snoop-dog chose his pseudonym, based on a wresting character, from a television programme that he has an intense interest in. He is interested in most sports but with particular interests in wresting and touch football (a modified version of rugby league). He is a Year 8 student, aged 12 and 11 months, who will be finishing intermediated school, in a week or less, and then going onto one of the local high schools in the following year. Snoop is of Pakeha, or European New Zealand, ethnicity. Snoop only arrived at this school at the beginning of Year 8 and has had difficulty fitting into an already established Year 8 cohort. In his short education career he has a history of school changes, with this current one, as his fifth placement. As Snoop put it in response to the question "Have you been bullied before?", he responded, "Yeah I've been – that's why we always move to school, after school, after school", (7:190).

Snoop lives with both of his parents, in a local Housing New Zealand (state provided and subsidised rental accommodation) house. He has two older male siblings, already at high school and a young sister enrolled at a contributing primary school. Snoop indicates that he has one close friend at school. His experience of academic success is that he is well below an average achievement level and that he comes to the attention of school authorities for behavioural issues; largely as a victim in reported incidents. As a result Snoop indicates that his behavioural experience is at a lower level than that of most of his peers.

Context, Snoop – Dog: Racially discriminated against by being bullied by his peers.

The Year 8s have a compulsory sports period on a Monday afternoon and Snoop indicates that before the incident "Oh I was feeling really happy" (7:104) ... "Like we were going to play sport and see if we - if my team could win" (7:107). "After arriving on the field the a negative incident took place as described by Snoop,

"On Monday afternoon we got to go out and play some sports and I was just waiting out on the field for everybody and they were like all swearing at me and that. And then the teacher heard them and then she just told all of us to get inside – so we all walk inside – and then like they're just like getting smart to me – bullying me – hitting me and that. So then I go to get all angry and I just walked out and I was just sitting outside cooling off and just waited for the bell to ring and just went home.

From snoop's perspective "I was just standing there waiting for all of them – and then they were just swearing at me for no reason", (7: 98). The bullying that Snoop was subjected to as outline about consisted of verbal abuse and being hit on the head. The content of the verbal abuse included Snoop was being called a derogatory name about his body and along with racial slurs, "They were calling me fathead and then they were getting smart cause like I'm the only white person in the class and they were like calling me white trash and white shit and all of that", (7:116). The physical aggression consisted of being hit on the head with an open hand. Snoop refers to the behaviours that he was subjected to repeated bullying in a number of schools, "the one word would be bullying – that all", (7:184) and he indicates that most incidents of bullying that he had been subjected to were "Just as the same time", (7:194). For Snoop the norm that presents as being infringed is that, "Ah all of it cause I just didn't like it", (7:130) … "Ah they could just like be nice to me – just to stop bullying me – stop hitting me stop- being smart to me", (7:132). This viewpoint only emerged after two or three rounds of questioning of the content of what constituted an experience of unfairness for Snoop. In terms of restorative measures Snoop indicated that, "They should just stop it", (7:86) … "And like just be my friends and that", (7:86). This perspective indicates the importance of stopping that bullying and replacing it with being nice, which specifically focuses on being friendships.

476

While responsibility for the bullying of Snoop was laid with three immediate offenders the blame for the pattern of bullying was attributed to the class. Responsibility for the creation of an experience of unfairness was placed on a group of three students and one girl. The girl was not named by Snoop, as said that he couldn't remember her name, "I don' know the name", (7: 146). She was deemed to responsible as snoop indicated she started the bullying; others followed her example and that she did the bullying most often. Despite this assignment of responsibility, the blame was attributed to the whole class group of 27. Snoop indicated that they did it on purpose; intended to do it, and that there was no excuse for the experience "Yeah", (7: 164; 166: and 215). In summary, Snoop was subjected to a repeated pattern of bullying involving the behaviours of physical aggression and racial verbal abuse. While these behaviours may have something to do with Snoop being bullied as an ethic minority in his class, they clearly infringe the rule that peers should be nice to one another.

Reaction to Snoop's experience of unfairness focused on affective, cognitive and behavioural factors. The emotive reactions to the fore were unhappiness, anger and feeling scared. The unhappiness experienced was more specifically in reaction to the name calling and was accompanied by the physiological response of crying which snoop describes as being felt strongly in his heart. Anger emerged parallel to the unhappiness and again was experienced strongly, in his heart. Finally, Snoop reported feeling a little scared, "No just a bit scared", (7:17). This is not surprising given the number of peers involved in the bullying, that is, the physical aggression, and the intensity and duration of these daily behaviours, "just stop bullying me – stop hitting me - stop being smart to me",(7:132). To both cool down and evade the bullying, Snoop said that "No I just walked off and sat down there (on a bench outside the classroom)",

(7:50). He added that he thought it took him a long time to calm down. Snoop's strategy to cope, or deal, with his unfairness was to enlist his mother's help when he got home, "I told my Mum that they were getting smart and hitting me and I told her what I did", (7:76). In reaction his mother, "She didn't know –she just called the school and just tell them what happened", (7:82). The school principal and class teacher followed up by talking to Snoop. Snoops evaluation of telling his mother about the bullying was as follows, "Well be just telling my Mum cause, she like, she could help me out of it", (7:199). His only cognitive reaction was to think about, "Just – I was going to try to say to them stop calling me that", (7:56). They could just stop it.

Case 8: Hemi

Background

Hemi is a Year 7 male, student, of Māori ethnicity, who lives with his mother in a rental property. While Hemi's father is absent from the family home he still plays an active role in his son's life, especially around sport. Hemi has five siblings, three brothers and two sisters, with his birth position being that of number three in the family. He has three close friends in the same Year 7 class. Academically Hemi sees his experience of achievement as below the average of that of his peers. Behaviourally, Hemi perception of where fits is just above the average of his peers and he has pride in not getting into much "trouble".

Context: "Someone stole my bike and I thought that was unfair", (8:1).

Hemi's own story sets the scene around having his bike stolen, "Well a couple of months ago someone stole my bike and I thought that was unfair", (8:4) … "from the bike shed at the back

of the school", (8:6) … " there was a padlock on it" (8:8) … "Oh I checked to see if my bike was there, after school cause I mostly ride it back home", (8:12) … "Until I found out it was gone", (8:14).

Hemi had a strong attachment to his bike as it was of a particular make with a blue and silver frame, which had significance for him as it purchased by his father as a birthday present. In addition, the bike enabled Hemi to get to and from home to school quickly and was one of the few bikes that the children in this school owned. Thus, the theft of Hemi's bike was both sudden and was a significant loss for him.

When discussing the rule, which was broken to cause the unfairness, Hemi was adamant that it was, "stolen", (8:107). About three weeks after the bike was stolen Hemi learned form a peer that two other peers may have stolen his bike, "Cause they saw my – they saw them break the lock", (8:112). Hemi supports the veracity of the witness and agrees that it is strong evidence of the two boys' culpability, "Both", (8:124). The two boys "Ah – I've got a clear idea – ah it might have been x or y", (8:114), were blamed by Hemi because they intended to do it, did it on purpose "Ah I think so" (8:132), and had no excuses for their action in stealing his bike. Hemi did not report this information to the school authorities as he thought it was too late to be of any use. In terms of restorative action all that Hemi initially wanted was "Mhm no, just bring my bike back and it'll be fine", (8:104) but when he heard about the two taking his bike, he thought they could, "Um – oh I can make them give me a game", (8:174).

Hemi reports affective to his experience of unfairness. Initially Hemi said a "kind of sadness", (8:44) along with a bit of anger. Further into the interview Hemi was still somewhat ambivalent as "Um I don't know I just – I had a sad feeling that someone stole my bike", (8:40). Hemi

479

indicates that there was only a bit of sadness which was experienced in his chest. A couple of minutes later he indicated that anger came in which was directed towards, "the person who took it", (8:62). Hemi's anger, experienced in his chest was strong and associated with an embedded cognition, relayed as, "It felt like I was going to rip apart", (8:70). Later when Hemi found out about two boys who may have taken his bike, he was angry again, but not as strong as his initial feeling of anger.

Hemi's coping reaction was to report the loss of his bike to the Deputy Principal, "Yeah I told the deputy principal", (8:74) who after school gave him a lift home in her car. When he got home he told his mother, as a coping strategy, "Um told my Mum", (8:80), along with his brother, "And my brother", (8:82). Hemi appears to have been largely using adults to give voice to his concern about his loss.

Case 9: Charlie

Backstory

Charlie's experience of life at school is particularly positive, seeing herself as high in both academic and behaviour domains. She is in Year 8 and is a young woman of Tongan descent. Charlie lives with her both of her parents, in the family home, along with her siblings consisting of two brothers, who are significantly older than herself. Her friends are two Year 8 girls from the same class as Charlie.

Context

The background to Charlie's narrative of unfairness is well summarised in the following two extracts form Charlie's semi-structured interview with the co-researcher, "Well um this was this year - it was when we had our science projects um – we got into three - um a group of three

and each student in the um group was assigned to get some – oh each student was assigned to get equipment for an experiment which was this cup of lava",(9:2) … "And um well me and this other girl we told our teacher that um this girl didn't bring the red colouring – oh the red food colouring – and then our teacher she gave us the blame for not bringing the um – for not bringing the red food colouring – but it was actually that girl's fault and me and my friend got in trouble for it – it wasn't really fair", (9:15).

Prior to this negative event Charlie was feeling well and the event came about unexpectedly. The rule which was broken at the heart of the Charlie's unfairness depends on the perspective taken. Charlie's teacher blames the whole group seeing the provision of equipment for the science fair, as a group responsibility. Charlie disagrees with this perspective seeing it as an individual responsibility, "It should've been equal", (9:) … "I thought that it was unfair because me and my friend got the blame for it but it was actually that girl's fault", (9:20). Thus, there are differences in the rules seen as being broken by the girl in not having provided the red food colouring. This is a group verses the individual responsibility as the basis of the Charlie's unfairness experience. The teacher's perspective prevails, due to role, and power differentials.

In the process of assigning blame for the negative event, Charlie was initially ambivalent about who bore the brunt of the blame. After iterative questioning Charlie's decided to assign the blame to both the teacher and the third girl of the group, who did not bring the red food colouring, needed to simulate the erupting volcano. From Charlie's perspective the girl had no excuses for not bringing the experimental requirements and about her intentionality, "I don't know", (9:108). In the case of Charlie's teacher, she was to clearly to blame as, "Until that girl brang food colouring and then she stopped nagging us," (9:37). Thus, intent is implied in the ongoing nagging and she also had no excuses for her decisions. Form a restorative action

481

perspective Charlie didn't see how her teacher was able to do anything to put her unfairness right as, "Um nothing really cause she knew that we all were assigned equipment to bring", (9:66).

In reaction to this event Charlie felt frustrated "It was just a little thing", (9:26). This was in response to her teacher's actions "I felt frustrated – me and my friend felt frustrated cause the teacher took it out on us", (9:22). As this action went on for a week "It was a little, but then it got bigger and gradually got bigger", (9:32). She described her frustration as experienced in, "My head – it's real – not very good" (9:40). Finally, Charlie said it reached the level of, "I'm not sure if I'm allowed to say this but I just felt like punching something…" (9:30). Charlie described only one cognitive reaction, "I didn't really do anything – I just took the blame…" (9:46).

In terms of dealing with the unfairness Charlie said, "Oh I talked to my friend yeah", (9:50). "I told her both (*Narrative and feeling -sic*) and then she just said, 'just take it and accept it' and yeah", (9:56). The result was that in response to her friend's stoical advice Charlie said, "That helped me to calm down and like yeah", (9:62). Consequently, "Yeah it became yeah finished", (9:64).

Case 10: Tina

Backstory

Tina is a young woman of Cook Island extraction, who is a second-generation New Zealander. Her parents come to New Zealand in the 1990s looking for work and education for their future children. Tina is short for her age and is very shy. She came across in the interview as a girl who is gentle, polite, and extremely well-mannered. Tina is twelve years of age and has a twin sister, whom she is remarkably close to. There are a total of 6 siblings in the family, consisting of 1

brother and 4 sisters. The twins are 4th in birth order and Tina in the younger of the twins. The children have both parents living in the family home. Tina indicates that she 5 best friends. Her experience of her school behaviour is at the lower end of reported achievement, but she is at the opposite end of continuum in terms of behaviour.

Context

Tina and her twin sister were out walking together in the school grounds when they encountered "Miss X", (10:22) and three of her female companions. Tina was reluctant to describe the four as a full group, "Mhm like a group", (10:10), possibly because of the dominance of Miss X. Tina described her mood as they were walking as one of happiness "Happy", (10: 174). At this point Tina said that she was verbally bullied, "Being bullied", (10:1) by being called, "Rude names", (10:26). Her sister was also verbally bullied but was called by different names. Tina indicted that she had encountered this scenario, which had "happened before", (10:40), once or twice. From her perspective Tina is not sure if she was single out, or if it was a random act of bullying, "They just said that for no reason", (10:36). Thus, she had encountered a sudden, negative event, which altered her affective disposition.

The verbal bullying by Miss X violated a rule that is particularly important to Tina, that is, one should be treated with kindness "kind", (10:124). This is reported by Tina to be a very salient value in her family and was very apparent in the semi-structured interview with Tina. According to Tina, Miss X was responsible for causing the unfairness, as at this time she was the only who said it "just one girl", (10:114).

The attribution that Tina offered was that Miss X was trying to make trouble and that she has an innate tendency to do this. So therefore, Miss X, from Tina's perspective was not in a position

to offer an explanation, there was no excuse for the verbal bullying of Tina and that she had intended to do the bullying "Yes", (10:168). Thus, there is a rule "people have a right to be treated kindly" that had been violated and there is attribution of blame laid against Miss X as she is responsible, intended to do it "I think – I think", (10:166) and there was no excuse for verbally abusing Tina "Trying to make trouble", (10:170). Finally, in order to hold out the possibility of restorative action, Tina said that Miss X would need to say "Say sorry", (10:104) for the unfairness to be rectified.

Tina's reaction to her experience of unfairness was primarily an emotive one. Tina felt sad which she described as big, "Big sad", (10:52) making her "Feeling small", (10:56), which she experienced in her "In my heart", (10:62). The incident had taken place less than a week ago and the resulting sadness had lasted for two days. She felt uncomfortable about the possibility of telling the offenders how she felt, as well as being a little "Worried" (10:216) that Miss X might do the bullying again. As she had been taught in her previous schools and by her parents Tina informed a member of staff about the bullying, "Teacher", (10:72). As a cognitive reaction Tina had considered telling Miss X to "Stop doing that", (10:96) but felt uncomfortable "I was thinking uncomfortable", (10:90) about doing so and the thought never resulted in a behavioural action. As a coping strategy Tina told her older sister relaying the narrative and emotive content of her reaction, "Yes" (10:196).

Case 11: Nat

Backstory

Nat is a Year 7, male student, of European origin, who is 11 years and 10 months of age. Nat attended a contributory school, before enrolling in his Intermediate school. His mother is Nat's

immediate carer parent, with his father living elsewhere. There are 3 brothers in the Nat's family with him being the youngest. Nat reports that he has 5 best friends at school. While Nat's sees himself as average in his school subject achievement, his experience of his behaviour is better than average.

Context

The following narrative, by Nat, gives a synopsis of his experience of unfairness with a group of Year 7 peers from his class.

"Um it was about Term 2 - in the middle of it - and um our teacher she told us to get into groups of like 4 or 5 and then everyone like got into groups but no-one wanted to pick me and I asked but they all said no. And I asked my teacher and she just said join a group but no-one really let me. And I felt like really disappointed in everyone – and um I just thought you know - I was pretty angry" (11:1).

Nat indicated that his experience of unfairness was associated with a feeling of "Oh I just really thought of it as a loss you know", (11:5). Nat had an expectation that "I – you know – I thought everyone would be my friends and stuff but you know – I thought wrong", (12:7). Nat indicated further that "It means like you know you've got to really know like whose your friend", (12:9). If there had been no unfairness Nat thought that he would have been chosen and that he would have had a good time. Because of being excluded and cut off from his friend resulted in a significant feeling of loss when realising that he didn't have many friends.

Mr. Y had violated an important rule that from Nat's experience had been an important part of their friendship, "Oh you know it was unfair cause like you know he didn't like actually choose me cause like he was supposed to have like choosed [sic] me cause we were all friends and like

you know and I always let him be in my groups and he didn't let be in my group – oh his group", (11:64).

According to Nat it was, "Oh just something I think was understood", (11:66) and consequently, "Oh you know he's just been ignoring me", (11:70). His friend compounded the situation by ignoring Nat and only commenting "Just said we don't want you", (11:78).

"Um you know because like um we were obviously really good friends and like you know I'll always like give him lunch when he didn't have any. I'd always like treat him good [mhm] let him be in my groups with everyone like that um you know he just didn't choose me – no reason", (11:80).

The rule emerging form the discussion with Nat was that friends share experiences and by breaking this fundamental rule Mr. X was disrespecting their friendship. Thus, the psychological contract, underpinning Nat's friendship with Mr. X, was violated.

In attributing blame, for the refusal of Mr. Y to let Nat into the group, Nat initially focused on the whole group. Upon further reflection and or as result of the questioning, Nat focused on Mr Y, "Probably the one Person", (11:41). In addition, there was no excuse for his actions, "No", (11:46) and he could have avoided the action if had wanted to, "Yeah" (11:49).

In response to the end of his friendship with Mr. Y, Nat experienced affective, cognitive, and behavioural reactions. Feelings of disappointment, anger, loss and sadness were expressed by Nat. Before the rejection Nat was thinking that he and Mr. Y would be in one group and he would be confident and happy. Anger arrived first, which according to Nat was not too strong. The anger was direct at 'him' (Mr. Y) and his group for not standing up for Nat. The anger subsided first. Nat was not able to describe any further characteristics of his anger. The

486

disappointment, the level of which Nat described as being in the middle, only lasted a short time beyond the anger. On two occasions Nat uses loss and sadness in addition to supplement the term disappointment. Nat reported one cognitive reaction where "I just thought you know like oh if they won't choose me you know – I just go to my other mates", (11:125). Nat's one coping reaction, parallel to his affective reactions, was to, "… just stopped hanging out with [Mr. Y] – started hanging out with my um other friend [name]", (11:137).

In consideration of any restorative action required by Nat, of Mr. Y, he would have to both apologise, "Actually oh you know I'm sorry, like you can be in my group" (11:144) and offer to have Nat in his group.

Case 12: Paris

Backstory

Paris is a young woman of Cook Island descent and is in Year 8. She lives with her immediate family surrounded by other extended family in separate households. Both of Paris' parents live in the family home and are employed in full time work, in the surrounding suburbs. She has four siblings all of whom are girls, with Paris being the oldest. Paris has one very close friend, with whom she spends most of her out of class, school time and out of school leisure time.

Paris indicted that her experience of school behaviour is very good and she very rarely comes to the attention of senior management, for discipline issues. Academically, Paris reports that she is in the middle area of achievement.

Context

Paris is a very tall girl, of a solid build who, has been teased a lot about her weight since she has started school. She is noticeably quiet and gentle speaking in such exceptionally soft voice that the listener often must ask her to speak up. She presents as a truly kind girl, who values her Cook island culture and values. Because of all the bullying Paris is going to do her high school years in the Cook Islands. "Better cause there's more family around me [yeah] who can protect me", (12:193).

Paris has been verbally bullied by Michelle, a fellow classmate of hers, since the age of five when they started together at the same contributing primary school. Out of this pattern she chose to tell the story of one very hurtful incident. ..

"I went to ask a friend um about all the answer [mhm] and the friend – um a girl across of her – across from her said to go away – and I said I wasn't doing anything wrong – and then she called me names", (12:18) … "She called me um period smell and womens' things," (12:20).

After a series of questions focused on refining the term for the incident Paris and when asked if there was a particular reason why she chose the term bullying she replied, "Yes, cause I've been bullied ever since", (12:38) … primary school.

According to Michelle it was the "Sort of hurtress", (12:167) of the words that caused the unfairness. The rule broken by Michelle was "You should be treated like - like I was being a friend", (12:163), with "Kindness – respect", (12:165). Paris expanded on this to include having a positive relationship with Michelle they would be "Um whispering", (12:155) together, rather than making personal comments openly, and treating each other "Um like a brother or sister – aunty" (12:159).

According to Paris, Michelle is responsible for the unfairness, "Yes." (12:178). Michelle has to take most of the blame because she treats a lot of people this way. When bullying Michelle draws in two of her own peers but does "Most…" (12:187), of the bullying herself and is therefore held by Paris to be doing it intentionally, "Paris' is shaking her head in agreement", (12:180). Paris indicates that there are no excuses for what Michelle did to her "Paris' is shaking her head in agreement", (12:180). As the negative event experienced by Paris involves a broken rule, along with a blaming process, she has named it as being unfair.

Paris reported three reactions to her experience of unfairness. This involved the two emotional responses of embarrassment and sadness, thoughts of hating Michelle and a behavioural response, involving her withdrawing from the unfair experience. Her embarrassment was associated with "like nobody like me", (12:48) "And I was all alone", (12:50). While feeling sad was stronger than the embarrassment both appear to have been "it was mixed up together" (12:64) when experienced as a strong, "um stomach ache", (12:68). It took Paris a whole day to calm down. Following the incident Paris moved away and started to cry. This action enabled her to get away from having to hear the verbal abuse. Paris' thinking response was focused on the theme of, "Like um I hated her so much that I wanted to hit her", (12:80). However, no actions followed her cognitions as she was then was constrained by the thought of, "No cause I'm scared of what will happen", (12:84).

As a coping strategy Paris went to play and gain the support of one friend who advised her not to let Michelle bully her. This effectively involved a suggestion, for Paris to "Um to go fight with her", (12:122), but Paris said "I don't not like hitting people", (12:130) she also was sacred of Michelle hitting her. Paris reports that withdrawal to seek support, from a friend, is a coping strategy that works for her.

489

When asked about the possibility of a restorative strategy Paris says that it is not possible, "Yeah – going on for so long", (12:140).   As a consequence of this bullying Paris is going to do her high school years in the Cook Islands. "Better cause there's more family around me [yeah] who can protect me", (12:193).

Case 13: Irene

Back-story

In interview Irene presents as a young woman of considerable intelligence, personality and sporting achievement. Irene is a young woman of Tongan ethnicity, aged 13 Irene years and 3 months at the time of interview, who is New Zealand born. She is about to leave intermediate school and start secondary school next year. Unlike most of her peers Irene is going to a school in the central CBD of the city, rather to one of the secondary schools which her intermediate school contributes.

Both of Irene's' parents live in the family home. There are 7 siblings, all of whom are still at home, with Irene being number 3 in the birth order of 3 males and 4 female siblings. Irene has an extensive circle of seven plus best friends. Academically and behaviourally, Irene sees herself at the top end of achievement.

Context

Irene is a highly active sportsperson who likes playing team games which include rugby, league, netball, and cricket. She reported feeling happy before the negative event as her team was winning on points and they were on their way to getting the house shield for the term. Iren elaborated further at one point, "Um I was actually excited cause um I think we had pretty good players in our team and ah I was being a bit cocky so um yeah and um when the game started,

I was really pumped cause our team started getting the lead", (13:64 The following extract is an overview of the negative event Irene reported as being unfair,

"Um every Friday our school has house sports, and it was my house versus another house - and we were playing non-stop cricket and um the opposition got to bat twice - and then my house got to bat only once so of course we lost because we didn't get as much turns as the other house so that wasn't fair", (13:2).

The teacher referee stopped the game of 20/20 cricket 15 minutes early, before Irene's had finished their allocated batting time allowing their rival team to win. Irene thought they could do the remaining 10 overs, (a cluster of 6 bowling attempts per over) in 15 minutes. Consequently, the teacher broke a procedural rule relating to the playing of 20:20 Cricket. Irene held the teacher responsible, "Yeah", (13:150), with her having no excuses for her action, "No that I know of", (13:152), and that according to Irene she did it intentionally, "probably", (13:154). Irene's reasoning for the blaming process ran as follows, "that was her house that we were [mhm] and they were um – we were close – they were coming second [mhm] and we were coming first [mhm] so um I think she got a bit too competitive", (13:156). In addition, "She actually stopped the game and ah she took us to assemble under the awning but it was like 15 minutes before games that actually stopped" (13:146).

In response to the teacher's action Irene emotionally, "Um I felt really angry cause um my house was in a lead of um winning – so get to win the house shield and um we kind of lost that week because of that game [mhm] and it ended up that house actually won – our opposition – and ah I felt really, really angry but I didn't want to tell anyone", (13:20). Her anger was experienced as surge of energy, in her chest, such that she could run the length of the field and keep on going, but paradoxically she could not do anything as it was so unfair. As Irene has a very

competitive streak, she also felt a little jealous of the other team's win and a lot of disappointed, which led to Irene being quiet for a while, that her team didn't keep their lead in house points. Irene was thinking of complaining but, "Um I was – I really, really wanted to complain at that time so that we could get our fair chance but um I was a bit shy that the kids might go oh she's just being like [mhm] yeah", (13:74).

As a coping measure Irene spoke to her friends, who were largely in her house team, complaining about how she felt about the unfairness and they "co-operated", (13:86). They then set a goal to win the shield which they did the following term, "so that got us really, really excited", (13:94).

When asked about the possibility of restorative action Irene replied that, "Ah they'd probably have to give both teams the fair amount of batting or [mhm] like yeah [mhm] both so that when it comes to the results, we could be like happy or disappointed, but it was a fair game" (13:104).