

**Investigating the Use of Social Justice Principles to Inform
Culturally Responsive Leadership in Two Catholic Secondary
Schools**

Verna-Lee Oliver

A dissertation submitted to Auckland University of Technology in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Educational leadership (MEdL).

Faculty of Culture & Society

August 2018

Abstract

The aim of the research study was to investigate the use of social justice principles to inform culturally responsive leadership in two Catholic secondary schools. The study examines the experiences, perceptions and understandings of leaders of cultural responsiveness, Heads of Departments and senior Religious Education teachers, in two Catholic secondary schools in Auckland, who are members of the cultural responsive school teams, lead social justice programmes and initiate the school strategies regarding this topic. The rationale for this investigation was influenced by my personal experiences as a South African Catholic mixed-race woman, my passion for teaching young people from diverse backgrounds and cultures, and my interest in the educational publications about cultural responsiveness and social justice.

Although research has been carried out on culturally responsive leadership and social justice, not nearly enough research has looked at social justice from a Catholic education position and using principles of social justice to inform culturally responsive leadership in Catholic schools. Owing to financial difficulties in the private Catholic school system, Catholic schools in New Zealand were integrated into the state education system. This makes it even more challenging for educational leaders in Catholic schools, as they navigate between Catholic education requirements and professional requirements from the Ministry of Education. With regards to culturally responsive leadership, it was my personal perspective that because Catholic education values are derived from gospel values, leaders should inevitably be culturally responsive. My reasoning is twofold, firstly, Catholic schools teach social justice in Religious Education classes, and social justice forms part of the school values, and secondly, Jesus, who is our example, was socially just and culturally responsive. I wanted to investigate why Catholic schools were still having to run professional development sessions for leaders and staff around cultural responsiveness, were still endeavouring to form culturally responsive leadership teams and were finding it challenging to get all staff working together to become culturally responsive leaders. This is when I looked at social justice at the Catholic secondary school where I teach and began to investigate the principles of social justice and whether they could inform culturally responsive leadership.

A qualitative methodology was used for this study. Mini focus group discussions were held with eight leaders from two different Catholic secondary schools in Auckland. The findings were examined and presented by themes in relation to the principles of social justice that could inform culturally responsive leadership. The data revealed that there is

a knowledge deficiency around social justice principles, as social justice in these schools was focussed on the act of charity, which connects to goodness, and not to utilising the principles to inform culturally responsive leadership. The data also accentuated the significance of authentic relationships with teachers, students and the wider school community.

Recommendations that came out of this investigation, shows that the principles of social justice, namely; redistribution, recognition and participation, and the capability approach, if understood by all, could be a possible approach to culturally responsive leadership in these Catholic schools. It is also recommended that this will need to be a whole school initiative if it is to succeed, and must incorporate all staff, leaders, students and the multicultural community the school serves. Not only must leaders and staff know their students, they must also understand their own personal lens, created through their personal experiences, beliefs, values and cultures.

Acknowledgements

I am appreciative to so many people for all the encouragement, faith and support I received during my academic journey. The MOE and TeachNZ provided me with a 16-week study award to complete this dissertation, but this 16 weeks break also rejuvenated me and provided the rest I required to reignite my passion for teaching and leading. To Louise Moore, the school principal, the school Leadership team and Trustees, thank you for firstly supporting my application for leave, and secondly, for supporting me through these stressful two years.

Thank you to the eight participants from the two schools who so openly and trustfully participated in this research, you were all amazing, and you taught me so much through the sharing of your personal experiences, beliefs and values.

Acknowledgement and a huge thank you must go to my principal supervisor, Dr. Ruth Boyask for her expertise and patience throughout this journey. You taught me so much in this time and I have such respect for what you do. Thanks also to Howard Youngs, Alison Smith and Andres Santamaria for starting me on this journey and getting me over so many hurdles along the way. Also, to Ms S. Redwood for transcribing the focus group discussion, and for all the extra help and support.

I must also thank the most important people in my life, my husband Ricky and son Gabriel. You two were my cheerleaders and my rock. Thank you for all the times you had to go to MOTAT for me to work on this dissertation. I really appreciate it. To my extended family and friends, you are all amazing. Thanks for all the prayers.

Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	4
Chapter 1:	
Introduction	6
Chapter 2:	
Literature Review	11
Introduction	11
Cultural responsive leadership	12
Social Justice	14
Chapter 3:	
Methodology	25
Epistemology and ontology	26
Qualitative research	27
Data Collection	29
Data Analysis	31
Ethics	34
Chapter 4:	
Findings	36
Chapter 5:	
Discussion	45
Limitations	53
Chapter 6:	
Conclusion	55
References	57

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 (except where explicitly defined in the acknowledgements), nor material which to a substantial extent has been submitted for the award of any other degree or diploma of a university or other institution of higher learning.

Name: Verna-lee Ann Oliver

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "V. Oliver". The signature is written in black ink on a white background.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Growing up Catholic and mixed race in Apartheid South Africa, I have experienced discrimination from both my school leaders and my teachers. Desmond Tutu, the Archbishop of Cape Town, coined the term ‘Rainbow Nation’, to define the multiculturalism of the people. The native cultures associate this term with hopefulness and an optimistic future. New Zealand today could adopt this term to define the culturally varied people who live in this beautiful country, existing collectively and amicably together.

Universal waves of people, ideas, values, beliefs and experiences are changing the environments of schools around the world, and in New Zealand, as it becomes increasingly multicultural, and this has repercussions for educational leaders of the 21st century (Lumby & Morrison, 2010). Matters relating to equal opportunity, equity, and access that influence the development of sidelined and underprivileged students in education organisations (Brooks, 2010; Del Val & Normore, 2008; Selwyn, Gorard, & Williams, 2001) need to be addressed. Educational leaders in New Zealand secondary schools face challenges that include focusing on working together as a community to advance learning and societal results for all scholars (Ministry of Education, 2008). This focus has led to the drive from the Ministry of Education, for leaders in New Zealand schools to be culturally responsive. Educational leaders in New Zealand face challenges that include a progressively more multicultural blend of young people, ratifying the principles of The Treaty of Waitangi, and sustained educational, socio-economic and political inequalities that are present between diverse cultural groups within the educational environment. An equitable education system that is fair and inclusive, so that all students reach their full potential, is needed. For this research, equality and equity have two different meanings. Equality, in this research, refers to equal treatment and giving equal opportunities to all students. Equity is fairness, and in this research, this relates to giving people according to their needs, not in equal measure, but what each one needs to achieve at an excellence level.

One way to do this is by educational leaders striving to lead culturally responsive schools and to aspire to be socially just leaders in the increasingly multicultural schools they are leading. Catholic schools in New Zealand are guided by gospel values and aspire to be socially just. This research looks at two Catholic schools in Auckland and seeks to

investigate whether the use of social justice principles can inform culturally responsive leadership in Catholic schools. Leadership with a strong sense of social justice is essential in providing more equitable opportunities for multicultural communities, especially those that are marginalised and disadvantaged (Clarkin-Phillips, 2017).

The New Zealand Ministry of Education sees culturally responsive leadership to bridge the achievement gap between Māori and Pākehā cultures.

The curriculum is non-sexist, non-racist, and non-discriminatory; it ensures that student identities, languages, abilities, and talents are recognised and affirmed and that their learning needs are addressed (Ministry of Education, 2007, p. 9).

For educational leaders to be equitable, they need to go beyond just focussing on Māori and Pasifika achievement, but on the achievement and growth of all students. According to the Educational Review Office (ERO) for 2016-2018, the drive for leaders of cultural responsiveness in secondary schools is for equity and excellence for all students. Through fairness and social justice, the value of equity can be realised (Ministry of Education, 2007). If achieved, all students will be valued and their ethnic understandings, traditions and beliefs, will be respected and included into teaching and learning (Williams, 2016). The social and academic results of all students need to be cultivated by educational leaders and teachers, to provide all students with the skill needed to for involvement in a multicultural and global world (Capper, 1993).

Cultural responsiveness is not merely a few lessons in cultural awareness, or a few cultural performances, but rather needs to address the widespread student disengagement in learning. Students need to gain understanding, abilities, and approaches that prepare them for life in a multicultural world. To work in this newly diverse student body, Principals are forming cultural responsive cooperate learning groups in the hopes of finding approaches that will make a difference and increase results for all students. Cultural diversity is identified as a guiding principle in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007), and it states that the curriculum respects and hold in high regard, the antiquities and ethnicities of all and these are important in improving educational outcomes.

Catholic primary and secondary schools in New Zealand are there to complete the Church's mission (NZCEO, 2002). Schools offer a Catholic Faith setting that empowers young people to cultivate attitudes, knowledge and skills needed to become dynamic and devoted members of the Faith Community, and to contribute positively to the global community (NZCEO, 2002). All Catholic schools has a Special Catholic Character

which is the foundation on which the entire school curriculum is delivered. This Catholic Character is vital to everything that happens in the school, or on behalf of the school, and its community (NZCEO, 2002). The directive for Catholic education is to be socially just. This directive has come through the Catholic Church, as it was role modelled by Jesus, as the example for a truly culturally responsive and socially just leader. This is strongly influenced by guiding gospel values that are essential for Catholic schools. The values include, the search for excellence, inclusive education, social justice and a culture of love that enables all to love God, themselves and others thus respecting the rights, freedom and inherent worth of all people (NZCEO, 2002). This suggests a multicultural view on social justice and culturally responsive leadership and is where this research begins as it focusses on principles that can inform culturally responsive leadership in Catholic schools.

The research on social justice and the practice of social justice in education follows the idea of supporting deprived and marginalised groups in society. It promotes opportunities and equity to guarantee full participation in the life of society, predominantly for those who have been omitted based on race or culture, gender, age, physical or mental disabilities, education, socio-economic status, or other characteristics of a group (Lee & Hipolito-Delgado, 2007). The coming together of different cultures to form new and diverse identities that continues to change aligns cultural responsive leadership directly with social justice. Social justice research supports rectifying the injustices suffered by the underprivileged in our societies and this study endeavors to discover if social justice practices could be a means to support inclusive environments, equity and improved learning for students from diverse experiences.

The research questions underpinning this study are:

1. What is social justice and what does it look like in Catholic schools in New Zealand?
2. What does cultural responsiveness mean for schools and school leaders in New Zealand?
3. In what ways can the principles of social justice inform culturally responsive leadership in Catholic schools in New Zealand?

This focus of this study is on the social justice principles of redistribution; recognition and partnership; and the capability approach (Fraser, 2000), to inform culturally responsive leadership in two Catholic secondary schools. These principles of social

justice are important to build inclusivity, equity, a sense of belonging, celebrating diversity, and to improve academic and social outcomes for all students.

I will be reviewing, in chapter two, academic literature around culturally responsive leadership, social justice and its place in Catholic schools, and the three identified principles of social justice that may inform culturally responsive leadership in Catholic schools. Chapter three of this research will discuss the methodology applied and chapter four will evaluate the results from the two focus group sessions and attempt to link these findings to the literature around this topic. These findings will formulate the discussion in chapter five, while chapter six will connect all the research together in the conclusion.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

The prospect for a legitimately recognized multiculturalism in New Zealand was overlooked when Sir Paul Reeves stated the reality of two, not many peoples (Olssen, 2001). This research moves beyond this bicultural lens to a multicultural lens that entitles all students to an equitable education that allows them all to achieve to their full potential.

A huge and ever-increasing body of literature has investigated cultural responsiveness and its impact on learning outcomes (Gooden & Dantley, 2012; Jean-Marie, 2008; Khalifa, 2012; Santamaria & Santamaria, 2012; Tillman, 2008). Culturally responsive leadership in New Zealand, has focused especially on narrowing the achievement gap between Māori and Pākehā students. However, there is another issue that educational leaders need to address and that is the increasingly multicultural schools they are leading. For this reason, socially just educational leaders, need to move beyond focussing on specific groups of student achievement but on the achievement of all students, regardless of their ethnicities and backgrounds. The argument here is that leaders and teachers need to ascertain the need of individual students, to equip them with resources needed to reach their full potential. This means that leaders and teachers need to really know the students they are teaching, beliefs, values, experiences, backgrounds and other characteristics, to understand what is needed for the student to succeed. Culturally responsive leadership is not merely a few lessons in cultural awareness, but rather needs to address the widespread disengagement in learning for all students. All students need to obtain knowledge, abilities, and attitudes that equip them for a global and local world.

The research and practice of social justice in education follows the idea that it is there to support the disadvantaged and the side-lined in society (Fraser, 2000; Santamaria & Santamaria, 2012; Young, 2014). Research around social justice supports rectifying the injustices of the underprivileged. This research seeks to discover whether the social justice principles of redistribution, recognition and participation, and the drive to give students the capacity to pursue a better life for themselves (Fraser, 2000), can support comprehensive environments, impartiality and enhance education for students from varied backgrounds. The amalgamation of different cultures to form new and diverse, continuously altering identities, aligns culturally responsive leadership directly with social justice (Capper, 1993).

This research will investigate and explore the existing body of literature pertaining to the social justice principles of redistribution of resources, recognition and participation and the capability approach (Fraser, 2000), in the hope of implementing these practices to inform culturally responsive practices which create inclusive, equitable and just schooling for all students.

Culturally responsive leadership

Even with the universal understandings that develop from, Indigenous and culturally varied students resources of information (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992), understanding (Bishop, 1996), and meeting students' rudimentary needs before instruction (Duncan-Andrade, 2009; Maslow, 1943), large numbers of marginalised students throughout the world experience educational inequities. These inequities originate from poor academic performance, which results in a lack of knowledge, reduced welfare, and lives loaded with greater inequities (Mansfield, 2014). Santamaria's (2012) work around applied critical leadership in education explores a leadership ideal that rises from critical concept and critical pedagogic traditions that alters current educational practices. Applied critical leadership and transformational leadership advocates leadership responsibilities that encourage inclusivity, equity and cultural responsiveness (Santamaría & Santamaría, 2012).

Culturally responsive leadership must begin from the notion of learning, unlearning and relearning, as laid out in He Kākano, (Ministry of Education, 2013). This means educational leaders must examine the significance of knowing and accepting their own capabilities and values to ensure they, the leader, and the institutions they lead, are culturally responsive, fair and inclusive. To achieve greater equity, culturally responsive teaching and leading should be in such a way that enables all students across differences to succeed to their full potential and be engaged at a profound level more of the time (Ministry of Education, 2007). There is a need for self-reflection by educational leaders, examining of their individual understandings and ideals, and being sensitive to the understandings, values, beliefs and capabilities of all who they influence (Coleman, 2012). Physical inequalities in society also impede equitable outcomes in education and in life (Nieto, 2004).

It is imperative for leaders to be receptive to cultural, gender, sexual, and religious diversity within the schools and communities that are led by them (Blackmore, 2006). Culturally responsive leadership, consequently, is about understanding and managing the

ethnic, linguistic and socio-economic requirements of all students, staff and the school community. Therefore, educational leaders are to examine the degree to which the school is involved in leading multiplicity. They must endeavor to manage multiculturalism with organisational objectives, strive to embrace the full school community and transform leadership by destroying power structures (Blackmore, 2006). To develop greater equity, build national pride, inquire into organisational and ethnic inequality and how privilege and power works, a “system of social justice that provides principles that will inform policy and practice”, is needed (Blackmore, 2006, p.193). Culturally responsive leadership may result in socially just and equitable results, especially where discrepancies are present (Gooden & Dantley, 2012; Horsford, 2011; Jean-Marie, 2008; Khalifa, 2012; Santamaría, 2014a; Tillman, 2008).

Leaders must transform from leadership as management to educational leadership that embraces cultural responsiveness and social justice, for inclusive human development and social advancement to make a difference. Dimmock and Walker (2005), states that educational leadership encompasses the transforming of collective vision into actuality, stressing the significance of collaboration, integrating ways of knowing or cultural nature and coherent thinking in problem solving, where power and influence are shared within a group.

The three principles of partnership, protection and participation, as specified in the New Zealand curriculum, have been unpacked by culturally responsive educational leaders, in a view to understand and apply these in their schools. Ministry documents states that recognising and celebrating culture matters to the development of young people and that schools are obliged to respect and value all cultures of all the people in this country (Ministry of Education, 2012).

Researchers of cultural responsiveness agree that the objectives of educational leaders include reducing prejudice and discrimination against oppressed groups, and aiming for equal access and equity in the distribution of power and social justice for all (Banks, 2007; Sleeter, 1996; Sleeter & Grant, 2003).

In this study the view is that culturally responsive leadership should address the unique learning and cultural needs of all students, build authentic relationships and promote a school climate of equity and inclusivity. Through this the culturally responsive leader will redistribute resources according to need, to ensure success for all, recognise the diversity of the school and promote pride in identity to create a sense of belonging, and through

student, staff and community voice, build full participation in students' education and lives in society. This will highlight the skills that students need to grow their capability to create a better life for themselves.

Social Justice

For this researcher, social justice and being socially just goes deeper than just our interactions and actions with and for people. It is knowing and sharing ourselves, our experiences, our culture, our identities with others, and allowing them to do the same. It means reflecting on our personal lens and opening ourselves to relearning new ways of seeing and doing things that is culturally responsive. It means moving away from the act of charity, to truly understanding social justice, and committing to leading, to ensure success for all students from all cultural backgrounds.

Reflection is a vital component of developing principles of and for social justice (Shields, 2004). Unless educational leaders in Catholic schools really reflect on social justice, they will not become mindful to the injustices, along with the educational practices, in their schools and their school communities. Through reflection, leaders will recognise the significance of relationships and relationship building to guarantee their schools are culturally responsive to the needs of students, staff and the communities they serve. Therefore, student voice is vital as a way for them to express their needs, and if this is disregarded, it becomes an issue of social justice (McNae, 2010). It is also important to recognise the socio-economic needs of the school community. By committing to actions of social justice like shared decision making, creating authentic relationships, and leading by the principles of social justice, educational leaders in Catholic schools can eradicate repressive practices (McNae, 2010).

The social justice principles that underpin this research study are, distribution and redistribution of material to allow all students to reach their full potential; recognition of identity and difference in order to create a sense of belonging for all in the school community; full participation from the school community in the life of the school; and giving students the capabilities to pursue a better life for themselves (Fraser, 2000). It was important that the participants understood this and that these principles of social justice need to work together to inform culturally responsive leadership.

There are many understandings of social justice (Shoho, Merchant & Lugg, 2005), and the available literature, Bankston, (2010); Fraser, (2008); Sen, (2009); and Young, (2014), on this topic states that it supports the deprived and marginalised in the world.

Rawls, the Harvard philosopher, defined justice as fairness. Many researchers (Sen, 2009; Fraser, 2008; Young, 2014), use his work as a point of reference. Rawls' (2001) contract theory emphasises two main principles; political equality and the restricting of social and economic disparities. He did not see social justice as relating to people, but institutions, and therefore, a society that acquires an unbiased parity of opportunity, does not consider the natural skill and proficiency that some people have (Fraser, 2008). The underprivileged will still get a bad deal with regards to social and economic opportunities, and individual thought and values would not be considered (Sen, 2009). Bankston (2010) debates that these concepts are concerned primarily with redistributing goods and resources to the underprivileged but not offered as compassion or state interest. Bankston (2010), saw Rawls' (2001) *A Theory of Justice*, almost entirely concerned with distribution, therefore social justice in this sense is seen as distributive justice. On the other hand, Sandel (1982) contends that Rawls (2001) shows a form of social justice that is stripped of all social foundations. In Sandel's (1982) opinion, Rawls' (2001) error is considering people as detached from the ideals that create purpose and morality and from all social connections to each other (Sandel, 1982). Rawls (2001) overlooks the importance of relationships to people.

Fraser (2008) perceives social justice as requiring social arrangements that make it probable for all to participate and contribute on an equal basis in social life; she calls this participatory parity (Fraser, 2008). This is important for secondary schools, to give students a voice for them to own their learning and take charge of their lives. Social justice for Fraser (2008) was primarily seen as two dimensions, recognition and redistribution, and then, later, a third dimension was added, representation. All three intertwine, equally influence, and reinforce each other but none is reducible to the other (Fraser, 2008). Fraser (2008) uses the motto, "no redistribution (economic), or recognition (social) without representation (political)", (p. 282). Her reasoning for the change from the two-dimensional view was globalisation and how it had altered the way the world considered social justice. Social justice can no longer be observed only in territorial states (Rawls, 2001), because cosmopolitan corporations, universal currency, the international mass media and the internet control the world. For this reason, Fraser (2008) disagrees with Rawls' (2001) definition that social justice has an ethical nature and political institutions; and that there is no universal people and no basis for global redistributive justice (Rawls, 2001). As people move from one political institution to another, through immigration, Fraser (2008) advocates for a global world and a global social justice.

Sen (2009), the Indian philosopher, leans more with Fraser (2008) on a globalised world. Social justice is about people and policy is measured against policy not against an ideal as proposed by Rawls (2001). For Sen (2012), the reader is to scrutinise their personal practices and partialities with the eye of the unbiased observer. Practices of inequality should be re-evaluated in the light of what is experienced elsewhere, even in other countries around the world (Sen, 2012). The emphasis should not be on ideals and just institutions (Rawls, 2001), but on contributing through reasoning in the pursuit of justice and reviewing the nature of the lives that people can lead. Both Bankston (2010) and Sen (2009) regard personal values as essential and therefore campaign for open-minded critical scrutiny of beliefs and values.

To be culturally responsive, educational leadership must be socially just and Sen (2009) investigates how this happens through open-minded reasoning, the nature of the lives that people lead and global justice (Sen, 2009). Sen is concerned with justice in relation to people and their humanity and connectedness. Like Fraser (2000) and Young (2014), Sen believes in an approach that focusses on what is truly happening, how people's lives are now, and on how social recognitions can be enhanced. Young states that we are defined by how others identify us, and others see us in relation to groups that are already connected to specific characteristics, stereotypes, and standards (Young, 2014). Where we come from and what we look like and our culture, already generates our identity for others even if we do not agree (Young, 2014). To be socially just then, educational leaders need to acknowledge that we are all different, but it is that difference and that diversity, that makes people beautiful. Regardless of whether people belong to oppressed groups, their group identifications are often important to them and they feel a kinship for others in the group (Young, 2014). Fraser & Honneth (2008) agree that social justice is a matter of cultural devaluation of a status group's culture. To restore the socio-economic injustices requires economic confining, and to remedy the cultural devaluation requires a cultural or representational change (Fraser, & Honneth, 2008).

Social justice for these authors refers to the social, economic and political parity for all, especially the disenfranchised in society. This research agrees with this definition but takes it further by seeing social justice in education as not just equality, but equity for all in the school community. This cannot just be the role of the culturally responsive leader of the school, as the entire school community are leaders in different capacities and therefore need to be socially just and culturally responsive.

Majority of researchers in this field of study agree that society should represent oppressed and disadvantaged groups, and to do this, redistribution of land and resources is needed (Sen, 2009; Bankston, 2010; Fraser, 2000; Young, 2014). The problem that this causes is the dispute over power and how to share it. Which practices from the group can be accepted as belonging to that social group in relation to their difference, and which must be part of the communal (Olssen, 2001)? Young (2014) goes on to state that most subordinate groups suffer injustices from both maldistribution and misrecognition. In contrast, Fraser (2000) sees free enterprise, greed and globalization as contributing to economic inequality. This is a move away from redistribution, making issues of recognition marginalize and displace people (Fraser, 2000). She goes on to state that recognition struggles are happening in a quicker and global media period, and these serve not to endorse respectful interaction within growing multicultural situations (Fraser, 2000).

Fraser states that for the distributive aspect, the comparable injustice is maldistribution, in which economic structures, property administrations or labour markets deny players of the resources needed for full participation (Fraser, 2000). The recognition aspect relates to status subordination, imbedded in established patterns of cultural value; the distributive aspect, in contrast, corresponds to economic subordination, imbedded in physical features of the economic system (Fraser, 2000). Fraser (2000) looks at the identity model and suggests that identity politics is motivated to shift struggles for redistribution. The identity model treats misrecognition as a freestanding cultural injury. Distributive injustice is ignored, and the focus is on efforts to change culture. Due to this, Fraser has proposed an alternative approach that treats recognition as a question of social status, where recognition is not group-specific identity but the status of individual group members as full partners in social interaction (Fraser, 2000).

Fraser (2000) goes on to state that the status model may not be perfect, but it gives possibilities to disadvantaged groups of people depending on their need. Participatory equality is not only hindered by established forms of ethnic value, but also through people lacking the necessary resources to interact with others as partners (Fraser, 2000). Unlike the identity model, then, the status model understands social justice as encompassing two methodically diverse scopes: a dimension of recognition, which concerns the properties of institutionalized meanings and norms on the proportional standing of social players; and a dimension of distribution, which involves the distribution of throwaway resources to social players (Fraser, 2000).

By circumventing the identity model, it becomes possible to diminish, if not fully dissipate, the dangerous tendency to reify collective identities (Fraser, 2000). In the seventies and eighties, struggles for the 'recognition of difference' seemed connected to a promise of freedom, which was connected to the promise of redistribution of wealth and power (Fraser, 2000). Similarly, Young (2014) also claims that cultural recognition is tied to claims about resources and the distribution of power (Young, 2014). When people are recognised they feel valued and visible. When not recognising peoples' difference, they become invisible and this in turn leads to them not getting what they need to succeed, and not participating fully in their lives.

Rights for the recognition of difference now drive many of the world's social conflicts, including the struggle around multiculturalism (Fraser, 2000). There is a shift from redistribution to issues of recognition, and identity and culture is now linked to economic inequality (Fraser, 2000). Some recognition politics represent genuine answers to severe injustices that cannot be cured by redistribution alone (Fraser, 2000).

When others give us the recognition we need, we develop a sense of self. To be deprived of recognition or to be misrecognized, is to suffer both a distortion of one's relation to one's self and an injury to one's identity (Fraser, 2000). Not being recognised by the powerful cultural group, drives the misrecognised group to adopt negative self- images and hinders them from building pride in their cultural identities (Fraser, 2000). When these deprived groups develop a strong personal culture, they are recognised and develop an authentic relationship with each other and with themselves (Fraser, 2000).

For Fraser (2008), recognition as a question of social status supports an incorporation of struggles for recognition with struggles for redistribution. Fraser (2008) explains this as 'allowing for a range of possibilities depending on what precisely the subordinated parties need to be able to participate as peers in social life' (p. 137). When these groups are not included and their voices ignored, the group is treated as inferior and subordinate to the dominant group (Fraser, 2000). When we are denied recognition, we become deprived of the position of a full partner in social interaction (Fraser, 2000). This can be because of established patterns of cultural value that make people as relatively unworthy of respect or esteem (Fraser, 2000). Church leaders of New Zealand, in their social justice statement (1993) agree that fairness in the operation of government and church structures must empower all peoples to have a voice and participate in the life of society.

According to Iris Young, injustice refers to two forms of incapacitating constraints, oppression and domination (Young, 2014). While these constraints include distributive patterns, they also involve matters that cannot easily be modified to the logic of distribution; decision-making procedures, division of labour, and culture (Young, 2014). Social justice requires institutions that promote reproduction of and respect for group differences without oppression. This is not the doing away of differences (Young, 2014) as every group has differences cutting across it. Young's model therefore allows each group to maintain self-sufficiency, and decision-making bodies and procedures provide for group representation.

The author rejects a nonconformist contract model of society for group identity that is understood in interpersonal terms, generated through social processes. According to Young (2014), group reality and identity is then unsolidified and changeable over time. Domination, states Young (2014), consists in the institutional environments that impede people from participating equally in decisions and processes that manage and form their actions. Oppression lies in complete institutional processes that prevents people from communicating their feelings or viewpoints on social life to others. This notion of oppression has shifted from the traditional practice of the exercise of domination by a ruling group, to oppression and injustices some people suffer because of everyday practices of a kind-hearted liberal society (Young, 2014). Most substandard groups suffer from both maldistribution and misrecognition in forms where neither of these injustices is an indirect effect of the other, but where both are essential (Fraser & Honneth, 2008). Fraser and Honneth (2008) go on to say that recognition is a matter of justice and not a matter of goodness.

Another significant approach is an obligation to equal partnerships across ethnic, religious, and gender lines. This awareness of difference requires an understanding that each of us plays a role, in how power and social identity is shown and indorsed in society. People are not disconnected from the societies in which they live even if they are removed from the societies (Young, 2014). This relates to people's capacity to pursue a good life. Once they are recognised for who they are and what their need is, they will then receive the resources they need to pursue a good life for themselves.

It means exercising social compassion and encouraging people to acknowledge that we live in a changing, damaged and fragile world; to pursue innovative solutions; to respond to instantaneous need; to enable people to attain their own goals; to strengthen people of all ages; to build better neighbourhoods; and to move from 'charity' to transformation

(Christchurch Methodist Mission, 2007). The Australian Human Rights Commission (2012) refers to the capability approach as recognising and acting upon the power that we have for positive change.

Sen (2012) agrees but goes further by stressing that we need to focus on what is happening, including how people's lives are going. In direct contrast with Rawls's (2001) idea on social justice. Sen (2012) believes that the bigger picture must extend beyond the institute and include the actual lives that people are able to lead. He is for the here and now, even as it is influenced by all factors, including the institutions that are there, and the impact they have on people's lives (Sen, 2012). This focuses on the freedoms, including capabilities, that people enjoy, and it demands positive help from the state, the institutions and society. It is therefore an important social commitment (Sen, 2012). To access capabilities to reverse injustice is imperative (McNae, 2010). Educational leaders in Catholic schools must access their own capabilities to transform established arrangements and structures toward redistribution, recognition and participation, and growing students who have the capabilities to improve their lives (McNae, 2010). Students must be given informed opportunities that include having options to make choices about the direction they want their lives to take. These opportunities must be seen in terms of capability which will permit educational leaders to differentiate correctly between firstly, whether a student is able to do things they see as worth doing, and secondly, whether the student owns the means or tools or consents to pursue what they would like to do (Sen, 2005).

Likewise, Young (2012) believes that justice should refer not only to distribution, but also to the institutional circumstances essential for the growth and application of individual capacities and shared communication and cooperation. For schools to succeed in this regard, educational leaders, staff and the entire school community must develop a united consistency in becoming culturally responsive and socially just. She makes an important point when she states that all oppressed people suffer some insecurity in their ability to develop and exercise their capacities and express their needs, thoughts and feelings, even though groups are not oppressed to the same extent or in the same way (Young, 2014). Fraser and Honneth agree with Young when they state that misrecognition is an institutionalised relation of subordination. They go on to state that justice allows all members of society to interact with one another as peers (Fraser & Honneth, 2008). People's real need must be engaged, and pathways of change must be set in motion, that make more fundamental reforms possible over time (Fraser, & Honneth, 2008). Most

researchers agree that everyone has the same right to expect and want social regard under fair conditions of equality of opportunity.

Sen emphasises the important role played by impartial reasoning in deciding the suitable social choices needed for the enhancement of justice (Jambhrunkar, 2012). Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon in his 2013 address in the UN News called for all people who want to build a better world, to intensify their efforts to accomplish an inclusive, equitable and sustainable development path that is founded on discussion, transparency and social justice (Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, 2013).

Educational leadership for social justice is one answer to inclusive and equitable education (Santamaria, L 2014; Santamaria & Santamaria, & Singh, 2017). Some researchers have endorsed leadership for social justice as an approach to managing multicultural challenges in education (Astin & Leland, 1991; McKenzie et al., 2008; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003). One common idea of social justice in education is that it openly recognizes the inconsistencies in social opportunities, resources, and long-term outcomes among marginalized groups (Fraser, 2000). This links in to the idea that a culturally responsive leader will also be a socially just leader. 'Leading in socially just ways involves addressing and eliminating marginalisation in schools and inequities in educational opportunities and outcomes' (Furman, 2012, p.194). For Lee (2002), this means promoting access and equity to guarantee full participation in the life of a society.

For well-known Brazilian educator Freire (2006), education is the key to ratifying social justice (Freire 2006). Freire sees education as providing paths for students to achieve freedom, academically and physically (Freire, 2006). Education plays a key role in protecting the current situation, especially with regards to power, and this needs to be confronted and altered (Freire and Faundez, 1989). Unfortunately, most educational environments construct patterns of inequality, ultimately supporting and reinforcing domination (Freire, 2006). Theoharis (2004) agrees and states that one barrier to addressing social justice is that of 'internalised oppression' (p.6), that refers to existing structures and systems that provides benefits for certain communities or individuals, and the unwillingness to change the current situation. The knowing, who students are, and then the acting on this information, improves their capacity to take advantage of all opportunities given to them in education.

Social justice education needs leaders that will change established arrangements and systems toward redistribution, recognition and participation and inclusion as they aspire

to create equity through changing outdated discourses and conditions (McNae, 2014). A strong link exists between social justice and achievement and this is strongly influenced by a sense of identity, pride in one's own language and culture and access to resources needed to succeed (Ministry of Education, 2008). The importance of changing power relations and building situations where everyone participates in accomplishing and creating knowledge, and student voice is respected and included in their learning is emphasised in Bishop and Glynn's (1999) research. Researchers Archard, (2013); Mansfield, (2013); McNae, (2010); Mitra, (2003) and Saunders, (2005) agree that if students have ownership of their own learning, they become active agents of change. Through student voice, students are being recognised as full partners in their learning and this lead to authentic learning where students will develop the capabilities to improve their lives.

Although there is available literature around the social justice principles of redistribution, recognition and participation and giving students the capacity to pursue a better life for themselves (Fraser, 2000), it has not been completely explored in education and has focused primarily on disadvantaged and marginalised learners' achievement (Keddie, 2012). Keddie (2012) goes on to state that teachers in New Zealand are dedicated to supporting equitable education. Jean-Marie, Normore & Brooks, (2009) states that leaders have responsibilities that go beyond managerial policy and procedures. Equitable schooling and education cannot be achieved without being socially just. It takes courage to be a culturally responsive educational leader as the status quo needs to be challenged if change is to happen (Chiu & Walker, 2007).

A moral imperative defining equity work in schools is needed to shape the way leaders and teachers understand and approach marginalised students (Keddie, 2012). According to Stevenson (2007), leaders need the skill and courage to communicate values that promote equity and inclusion, for the entire school community. Keddie (2012) supports Fraser's(2000) view that if disadvantage is seen as an economic issue, redistributing material and human resources should be prioritised. If it is seen as cultural blockades, then increased recognition and valuing should be prioritised, and if seen as a political issue, then representative measures such as equitable representation and student voice should be prioritised.

Keddie (2012) continues that fashioning culturally inclusive and pertinent learning conditions, that connect to knowledge specific to marginalised groups, is seen to support greater participation, motivation and achievement for students from these groups and all

other groups. When students feel that they belong, they are open to sharing experiences, their identities and themselves with others. This assists them to develop but also opens their minds to new learning. Social justice should focus on equity and social inclusion for all groups of students. All students, even the ones who are achieving at a high standard and those who come from a higher socio-economic bracket, should feel included and be treated with equity.

To value all cultures, especially the non-dominant or marginalised cultures, reflects recognition justice to disturb the powerful social designs that produce inequitable status orders (Fraser, 2008). Evidence shows that this valuing increases marginalised, and all students' schooling participation, enthusiasm and results (Bishop, 2003; Sleeter, 2005). On the other hand, deficit understandings of all students, especially marginalised students, show poor academic achievement is accredited to culture (Antrop-Gonzalez & De Jesus, 2006).

Catholic schools are called to be socially just. Throughout history and within scripture the Church has always emphasized the need for social justice. God's plan for us has always been for every human being to live full and abundant lives. Genesis (2.18-20) tells us that we were not created to be alone, but to share life with others (New International Bible, 2011). We are social and relational beings. It is through our interactions with others that we grow and flourish. Catholic schools are constantly seeking to establish a culture of inclusivity so that opportunities for all people to get involved, to contribute and to be heard are provided.

Catholic school values are founded on gospel values and follow the example of Jesus as a servant leader. Consequently, the social justice principles of redistribution, recognition and participation and the capability approach should be observable in Catholic education. Yet, students from disadvantaged and privileged groups in Catholic schools still achieve on very different levels. Rather than pursuing to exemplify the gospel values in the culture of the people, Catholic schools have often silenced vital culture, including religious content, through the requirement of a European Christianity (Beech, 2010). Māori and other deprived cultures knowledge, beliefs and understandings are still seen as inferior, Berryman and Bateman, (2008), and this causes these groups to deny their identities if from a mixed heritage, or fight for recognition (Beech, 2010). In the increasingly multicultural Catholic schools in New Zealand, most cultures are searching for the same unity and the same feeling of being valued and recognised. In following gospel values, most Catholic school leaders and staff view social justice as teaching students the

importance of acts of charity and outreach programmes. This is all well and good, however, charity and outreach programmes are not the principles of social justice that will inform culturally responsive leadership and create real change. Charity forms part of social justice but the social justice principles of redistribution, recognition and participation, and giving people the means to better their own lives, is what is needed for change. Connecting to what was earlier stated by Fraser and Honneth (2008), recognition must be regarded as justice and not goodness. This is true for redistribution, recognition and participation, and the capability approach. For most Catholic schools, social justice is a matter of goodness and kindness.

Beech's (2010) work, in the Caritas Social Justice Series, discusses enriching society through the respect for one another's uniqueness and shared human dignity (Beech, 2010). This aligns itself to relationship building in culturally responsive leadership, as well as leading with social justice, and, the principles of redistribution, recognition and participation and developing young people who are capable and have the skills to better their lives.

Chapter 3 Methodology

This chapter shows an outline of the methodological approach that best suited my research question, and sub questions. The major objective of this study was to investigate the use of social justice principles to inform culturally responsive leadership in two Catholic schools.

This investigation will follow a qualitative research design within an interpretive paradigm. I will attempt to clarify the suitability of the method used and the reasoning behind using focus group as data collection. Berkes (2004) states that the link between people's perceptions, experiences and their socio-cultural situation is critical to understanding culturally responsive leadership, decision-making and social justice. Most people develop their ideas, beliefs and interpretations from their immediate surroundings, cultural backgrounds, traditions, experiences and observed knowledge (Berkes, 2004). Focus group discussion consists of four principal steps, that comprise; (1) research design, (2) data collection, (3) analysis and (4) reporting of results (Morgan et al., 1998).

The research goal was supported by the following sub questions:

1. What were the understandings around culturally responsive leadership and what were the leaders doing towards developing culturally responsive practices at the school?
2. What does social justice look like at the school?
3. Are the principles of social justice, i.e. redistribution, recognition and participation, and giving the capabilities to pursue a better life, able to inform approaches to culturally responsive leadership?

The criteria for selecting the participants to contribute to this study was based on the leadership role that they held in their respective schools. This led to a mini focus group being conducted as there was a small potential pool of participants and the research design required that the topic be discussed in a group. The focus groups comprised of individuals with a high level of expertise (Hague, 2002). The mini focus group allowed me to assemble a small group of four participants per group (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005).

Leaders who took on the role of leading cultural responsiveness and social justice in the schools were approached to participate in the research. In both schools these comprised of both senior leaders, Heads of Departments and senior staff. Prompts were used as an aid for question 9 to direct participants' thinking towards the specific principles of social justice, that is; redistribution, recognition and participation, and the capability approach,

that was guiding this research study. Article references were also searched for additional relevant publications.

Epistemology and ontology

This research aligned itself to an interpretive epistemological positioning, where the research study aimed to investigate participants' individual assumptions, experiences, values and beliefs of how they led and viewed cultural responsiveness and social justice in their schools. The decision to tackle this topic came from my personal experiences as a mixed race South African woman, who was and still is a member of a marginalised group, during the Apartheid. I hope to be a socially just, culturally responsive leader who strives to recognise and value all people. I am a product of Catholic education and am now teaching in a Catholic school. My perception of social justice and my personal understanding of this concept originated from my Catholic upbringing and the reason for this study was because my perceptions and understandings around this topic had been altered and yet I perceived Catholic education on this topic had not changed. I had always believed that social justice and cultural responsiveness worked hand in hand and that educational leaders who were socially just were then also culturally responsive. These were the reasons for this research investigation. Bryman (2008) sees the research design process being influenced by the researcher's values. The data was produced through working directly with my participants who assisted me in formulating ideas around this topic (Cohen et al., 2011).

Bryman (2001) considered the interpretivism as an ontological position where social phenomena and their meanings were frequently changed and reviewed through social interaction. My epistemological and ontological positioning of the topic rejected absolute facts and suggested that facts were based on perceptions driven by human interest (Bryman, 2001). Interpretivist studies in education could be seen as those studies undertaken by educators to enhance their teaching (Humphrey, 2013). Interpretivism supported the ontological position of social constructivism.

In this study, I used the interpretivist view as this allowed me to develop insights into the situation and explore perspectives and shared meanings around the developing and growing of cultural responsiveness, and the understanding and use of the social justice principles to drive this (Wellington, 2015). Growing from multiculturalism and the global world we live in, the interpretivist view guiding this research, was relevant for my investigation as it arose from a humanistic and broad way of understanding the social

world (Newby, 2010). It was appropriate in this view to collate and hypothesise the accounts of those who lead and manage and the accounts of those who follow Gunter & Ribbins, (2003), as this permitted the researcher to get a deeper understanding and draw more informed conclusions, exposed through data about people (Somekh & Lewin, 2011). I was genuinely excited to hear the accounts and perceptions of the contributors around the subject matter.

My aim was not only to explore my personal understandings and beliefs around cultural responsiveness and social justice, but also to investigate the principles of redistribution, recognition and participation and the capability approach to inform culturally responsive leadership in Catholic schools. The findings and results of this research study was never planned to be accurate for all Catholic schools in New Zealand, because this knowledge could only be true at the time of constructing the research (Hartas 2010).

Qualitative research

This research required a qualitative research design as knowledge was constructed from the diverse realities and experiences of individual middle managers and leaders of cultural responsiveness in two Catholic schools. Qualitative research aligned to my epistemology as it collected evidence of the authentic lived experiences of the participants and the important ideas became evident through the data (Mutch, 2005). It also allowed us to build a relationship of trust. Through this trust relationship, I acknowledged that people subscribed to different views, and this exposed these relationships and emotions, as genuine sources of information that makes sense of the world (Newby, 2010).

Qualitative research was located within the interpretivist approach as it looked to understand social experiences by using participants' insights (Neuman, 2003). My research used a qualitative approach by giving a detailed understanding of meanings, actions, attitudes, intentions and behaviours of participants (Cohen et al., 2011). According to Mutch (2005), the purpose of qualitative research was to expose the authenticity of research participants by collecting meaningful accounts of a topic to help others understand it.

My position in this qualitative study was that of an active participant as defined by Adler and Adler (1987). This placed us all within the learning process, as it led to reflection on actions and decisions made individually and as a school. The technique of sampling that was the most suitable for my research was purposive sampling, as I wanted participants

that would help inform my research. Both schools are Catholic, and both are of relatively the same ethnic make-up.

School A

Ethnic Composition	Maōri	8%
	Pākehā	1%
	Tongan	16%
	Samoan	66%
	Cook Islands Māori	4%
	Other	6%
	School Roll	989 (February 2018)
Socio-Economic Decile	1C	

ERO Review (2016)

School B

Ethnic Composition	Maōri	13%
	Pākehā	1%
	Tongan	35%
	Samoan	29%
	Cook Islands Māori	8%
	Niue	8%
	Asian	3%
	Other	3%
	School Roll	236 (February 2018)
Socio-Economic Decile	2E	

ERO Review (2016)

School A had Samoan students as the largest group with Tongan students as the second largest. School B had Tongan students as the largest group with Samoan students as the second largest. Both schools are at similar socio-economic decile ratings. This investigation was applicable and relevant to Catholic leaders' understanding around social justice and the possibility of social justice principles informing culturally responsive leadership.

Data Collection

There are a few methods that can be used to collect data during a focus group discussion (Stewart, Shamdasani, & Rook, 2007). Data for this research was collected using a Dictaphone to record the conversations, note-taking and observation. Data was also collected from publicly available documents obtained from the Ministry of Education and from the schools, and scholarly articles and journals on the topic of cultural responsiveness and social justice. The triangulation of data between these three sources allowed me to test possible inequalities between espoused theories and theories in practice. These many data sources were valuable during the process of analysis and increased legitimacy of the findings through triangulation. I chose methods that would aim to fashion a safe and collaborative environment where everyone's views and opinions are respected.

It was important for me to run a mock session to trial the questions. Conducting the mock session allowed me to receive beneficial responses to the questions and on my role as the interviewer (Bryman, 2008). I held a mock session in the school break with three of my colleagues who are middle leaders and members of the cultural responsive leadership team. Because of the mock session, I reduced the number of questions I had, and separated question nine into the three principles of social justice. I realised that I needed to clarify each of the principles of social justice that this study was looking at, in greater detail. The informal pilot focus group session highlighted the fact that participants were unclear as to the understanding of these specific principles of social justice pertaining to this study. For this reason, the following definitions were used: redistribution in this research is viewed as firstly ensuring every student has the material resources necessary for academic success regardless of socio-economic positions. Secondly, redistribution is seen as ensuring every student has the social cognitive skills needed to interact with others on an equal level. Recognition for this research is recognising the identities and unique experiences of every student, building student pride in who they are, and allowing them to belong, to their identity, to the school and to humanity. This will give them a sense of representation and enable them to participate fully in their learning and interact with others as peers. The capability approach in this research is that school leaders and teachers assist every student in growing their self-efficacy as well as other specific skills needed for them to succeed in their education, as well as having the capabilities to succeed outside of school and better their lives.

To minimise interruptions, the final sessions were conducted in private meeting rooms and at a time that allowed the participants to feel safe and comfortable (Coleman, 2012). To encourage participants to develop their thoughts and opinions, there were moments of silence and gentle encouragement was used (Hobson & Townsend, 2010). Throughout the individual group sessions, I requested clarification when needed. After each session, participants had the opportunity to contribute further to the discussions around culturally responsive practices and social justice, while in the session (Hinds, 2000). To guarantee the records were a true account of what my participants discussed, the sessions were recorded on a Dictaphone. The Dictaphone was given to my transcriber. This data provided insight into how the participants acted upon their beliefs about social justice in education and cultural responsiveness in practice.

Through interacting with these leaders in the focus group sessions, I realised that there were various truths around the practices, experiences and challenges in leading cultural responsiveness and social justice (Creswell, 2012). These group interviews allowed me to access the views of several people at the same time. The main objective was to gather data through the interaction of the group. This data then formulated answers to the questions I had set out (Rosenthal, 2016). The size of the groups were four individuals each and I found this easy to manage (Briggs, 2012). From the six types of questions identified by Rosenthal (2016), this research focus group questions placed emphasis on “experience or behaviour questions, opinion or value questions and knowledge questions” (p.510). Initially I imagined that each focus group session would not be longer than forty minutes. However, the sessions ran for an hour and a half each.

Cultural responsiveness in schools is strongly driven by the Ministry and forms part of the principles stated in the New Zealand Curriculum. As a secondary source of data collection, I have been critically studying and analysing existing Ministry of Education documents and scholarly articles and books on social justice and cultural responsiveness. This is also a drive for the Education Review Office for 2017-2018.

It is expected that schools have set strategic goals around this topic, and these are available to the public. I collected these from the schools and this deepened knowledge as well as individual understanding around the expectations for the school community. In unpacking the school and Ministry documents around my research topic it made it possible for me to understand what was happening and if the practices of social justice could be used to further inform cultural responsive leadership in the schools.

Lastly, I critically analysed, compared and evaluated scholarly articles, journals and books around the topics of social justice, and the principles of redistribution, recognition and participation, and the capability approach, to inform culturally responsive leadership. In the literature review, I addressed the social, economic and political influences on cultural responsiveness and social justice practice of leaders in the two Catholic secondary schools by studying Ministry of Education documents, school documents and scholarly publications around the effects of the topic to reform education in New Zealand.

Data Analysis

Wellington (2015) states that, “the main intellectual tool is comparison” (p.277). The method of comparing in analysis permitted the researcher to form categories, code and note the similarities and differences of the data and allowed the research to draw conclusions. Focus group discussion usually produces both qualitative and observational data where analyses can be demanding. Morgan (1988) recommends the use of content and analytical techniques (ethnographic analysis), that relates to the logical description of people and culture, beliefs, experiences, traditions, habits and differences, shared or not, to analyse data from a focus group discussion. Content analysis enables an organised coding of data into categories, for this research coding was completed according to themes, to discover patterns not noticeable by simply listening to the tapes or reading the transcripts (Yin, 1989). Ethnographic analysis, on the other hand, is strictly qualitative, drawing largely on direct quotes from the group discussion.

For this reason, the process is not systematic and relies on the researcher’s ability to label the material into themes, and still preserving the integrity and accounting for the perspective of the focus group. Ethnographic analysis does allow for a comprehensive interpretative explanation of the everyday social practices of communication, talk and action taking place within the focus group, which can be useful in some instances (Krippendorff, 2012).

Analysis of qualitative data according to Cohen, et al (2011), involved arranging, accounting for and explaining data by making sense of participants’ explanations of the situation, while observing patterns and themes. Because data collection and interpretation are inescapably combined, my individual views may have unfairly affected the choice of data denoted and the interpretation placed on it (Cohen et al., 2011). Hence, my preliminary decision involved careful consideration of how I was going to approach my

data analysis and present the data, while still ensuring validity and trustworthiness throughout the process. Miles (1994), stated that qualitative data should be analysed in firstly data reduction, which is selecting and summarising of the data, qualitative then data display, where the data is organized and sorted into a visual form making it easy to interpret and draw conclusions, and finally, conclusion drawing, which is revising and studying the themes and giving meaning to the data. Wellington (2015) stated that there must be detailed analysis and the data must be presented as “fairly, clearly, coherently and attractively as possible” (p. 265). Another important aspect of qualitative data analysis was coding. This involved tagging and labeling against great and small pieces of information, to accredit meaning to them and to register them for further use (Briggs et al., 2012).

To start with, I developed and applied themes (codes) that linked into my aim for the research. I used the following techniques to identify common patterns and responses of the focus group participants in relation to my identified codes:

- *Word and phrase repetitions* – scanning primary data for words and phrases most commonly used by respondents, as well as, words and phrases used with unusual emotions
- *Primary and secondary data comparisons* – comparing the findings of the focus group with the existing material and the findings of my literature review and discussing differences between them
- *Search for missing information* – I investigated which parts of the issue were not mentioned by participants, although I expected them to be mentioned or the participants avoided mentioning them.

I then summarised the data and linked my research findings to my research aims and objectives. When I completed the data analysis I used significant quotations from the transcript to highlight major themes within my findings and possible contradictions. The appropriate interview data was organised to offer a shared response, which allowed patterns, relationships and comparisons, to be easily investigated (Cohen et al., 2011).

Transcribing the focus group data became the first step of the analysis. This served as a basis for further analysis as I took into consideration that the transcript would not necessarily mirror the entire character of the discussions but would give me the content relating to my research aim. I found a quiet and private space directly after the group

session and listened to the session, wrote down some of the non-verbal communications and gestures that were evident in the session. These were important to me as I wanted to be an active participant in the focus group but would also have to pay attention to the non-verbal communications as an active observer. I supplemented the transcript with some additional observational data that I obtained during the interviews. I then analysed the discussion and created a summary of the conclusions that were drawn. These were combined and contrasted between the two schools as well as against the school and Ministry documents and scholarly articles around the identified themes.

The focus group analysis will not only be on what is said, but how it is said will be just as important. One way of sifting through the volume of data that will be obtained from this group interview, will be to return to the research questions. By this, data can be broken up into manageable units and each unit can then be matched to a research question (Wellington, 2015). These units can also be linked to the identified themes. It is also suggested in the research literature to keep a memo or journal as this will assist at the time of analysis and when beginning the process of drawing conclusions to the research questions. To assess the documents, Scott, (1990), as cited in Briggs et al., (2012) states that there are four steps, authenticity, credibility, representativeness and meaning that needs considering. The researcher must determine if the document is the original or if it is a copy. If it is a copy, it may have missing texts or texts that are illegible. The documents must then be checked for accuracy, with regards to facts and whether it reports the true feelings of the author. The selected documents must also be representative of the contemporary environment and it is important to be able to interpret the documents by understanding and knowing definitions of key words, phrases and concepts.

In my analysing of the documents, I am hoping to identify themes and interpret them to develop the investigation (Briggs et al., 2012). As this is secondary data, I must work within the categories that are already decided by the individuals or institutions Briggs et al., (2012), and these documents are not alterable and the context from where they originated needs to be considered when analyzing (Wellington, 2015). The first step is to conduct an in-depth examination of the documents collected. The frequencies for each of the codes for all the variables been studied, must be printed out. By doing this I may find that some of these are unable to be analysed (Briggs et al., 2012). At the final stage, I will summarise the data and link my research findings to my research aims and objectives.

Ethics

I was granted Ethics clearance procedures by the AUT Ethics Committee (AUTECH) which gave contributors the assurance that the data would remain true to source, secure and only used for the intended purpose i.e. my research (O'Toole & Beckett, 2013). The success of the focus group session relies on the social relationship of all parties and it requires a balance between concern for the acquisition of knowledge and ethical respect (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009).

The importance of the researcher being consistent is highlighted by Creswell (2009). I introduced myself before the session began, and participants could ask me any questions about myself or this study. This set them at ease and made them feel safe. During the session I actively listened without interruption and acknowledged all responses from all the participants. I explained that I was there to gain insight into their perceptions, experiences and practice around social justice and cultural responsiveness in their school.

As my research is on cultural responsiveness, I endeavoured to be open and socially and culturally sensitive, as well as committed to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. I abided by the AUTECH Ethics principles, guidelines and procedures. All participants were selected on informed and voluntary consent and I respected their rights of privacy and confidentiality. I was above board and truthful and took every precaution to avoid any conflict of interest. The venue for the Focus Group meetings were at the participants' schools in Auckland. Concerning preserving anonymity, I will work according to a school name e.g. Group A, and not names of participants or schools. I will not only adhere to the AUTECH Ethics principles but also will be true to my personal values and principles and will come from a place of servant leadership and treat the participants in the way I would like to be treated.

Since interested participants communicated directly with me if they wished to participate in the study, there was no intimidation or harassment from me as the researcher. At the beginning of the interview, I was transparent and truthful about my research and its aims, and the benefits to myself and to the participants. Participants did not need to answer any questions they found difficult, and they had the option to terminate the interview at any stage or withdraw up to ten days after data collection had taken place. It was vital to the ethics process to avoid deception.

Creating a positive relationship with the participants, was made easier by the fact that there were no obvious power relationships between us because we were all leaders. In

addition, to reassure people to speak freely, it was imperative that I promoted and maintained a culture of trust, transparency and confidentiality over the course of the research (O'Toole & Beckett, 2013). The data was only discussed with my supervisor and the taped recordings with the transcriber, who signed a confidentiality form.

Chapter 4: Findings

This chapter has been presented in a narrative format, which allowed me to capture participants' perceptions and understandings around how they led and what is visible in their respective Catholic schools regarding culturally responsive leadership and social justice. The findings captured key quotes from the participants to emphasise the key points relating to the aim of this research, which is the principles of social justice to inform culturally responsive leadership, and the themes that guide this research.

The three themes are guided by the following sub questions;

1. What were the participants' understandings around cultural responsive leadership?
2. What does social justice look like at the schools?
3. Are the principles of social justice (redistribution, recognition and participation and the passing on of capabilities) able to inform approaches to cultural responsive leadership?

The themes are analysed within the context of the literature review. The method used to report the themes is thematic analysis (Braun & Clark, 2006), which is a flexible method used to report the experience, meaning, and reality of the participants. This analysis is appropriate to the research as it involves producing and investigating the participants understanding within a framework of multicultural education informed by social justice principles.

The themes identified are:

- ***Culturally Responsive Leadership:*** Individual participants understanding of culturally responsive leadership and how this is visible in their respective schools
- ***Social Justice:*** Individual participants understanding of social justice and the role it plays in their respective schools
- ***Social justice principles to inform culturally responsive leadership:*** Social justice principles of redistribution, recognition and participation and the capability approach informing their practice of cultural responsiveness.

The themes that run through this research were developed by selecting relevant discussion information and quotations from participants' experiences and perceptions (Creswell, 2014). These were then placed under the matching theme and then discussed in relation to the existing literature around culturally responsive leadership and social justice.

The participants in School A was the Assistant Principal Student Services, the Whanau Dean of Māori students and a male and female senior Religious Education (RE) teacher. In School B, participants consisted of the Cultural Responsive Coordinator, an Attendance Officer, an Academic Dean, and the Head of English (HOD). Apart from middle leadership responsibilities, all eight participants across the two schools also had teaching commitments within their school.

Participants' understandings of culturally responsive leadership highlighted the importance of creating a school environment that responded to the cultural makeup of all students. As the Whanau Dean, School A stated:

The word inclusiveness is very important, as it is the duty of the school leaders to make everyone feel that they belong (Whanau Dean, School A).

It was important for this participant to make the connections between the different ethnicities and the different school cultures to make teaching relevant and specific to the students. The RE teachers (School A) agreed and saw the importance of using the students' prior knowledge and their cultural experiences as part of the lessons.

All the different cultural communities have different ways of addressing things that are good and not so good in their communities, so cultural connectedness needs to be strong (Male senior RE teacher, School A).

The female senior RE teacher (School A) made us aware of the difference between Catholic culture and school ethnic culture. This was significant to me as the researcher, as this research is on Catholic schools, and the shared values and practices of the Catholic culture is sometimes in conflict with the way the Ministry of Education views cultural responsiveness. Catholicism sees gospel values driving cultural responsiveness while the Ministry of Education sees ethnicity driving cultural responsiveness, particularly Māori and Pacific Islanders. The Cultural Responsive Coordinator (School B) saw this as leadership that considers and responds to the cultural diversity within an organisation, in this case, the school. Both the HOD of English (School B) and the Attendance Officer (School B) agreed and went on to state that it was also being mindful of the requirements of the students and that they are all unique and therefore their situations are unique as well. The Academic Dean (School B) looked at the leadership aspect and wanted to clarify that all staff are leaders in their own little corners and it was not just senior management, but everyone, who needs to be thinking about cultural responsiveness. All the participants from School A agreed that it was their role to take care of every person's dignity even if other school leaders and staff were not fully aware of the culture of the person, and that this connected strongly to the culture of the human being, which in turn connects to social

justice leadership. Supplementary factors, such as, where students were born, and how they learnt, were also important for these participants and they needed to be considered by all teachers. It also went beyond their actual ethnic background; to the culture of the society in which they live. The Whanau Dean (School A) saw barriers of culturally responsive leadership as trying to squeeze ethnically diverse students, and in this case, predominantly Pasifika and Māori students, into a western version of Catholicism, disregarding who they were. There was also a huge crossover between the mixed-race students evident in the school, and Māori-Samoan and Māori-Tongan students will more than likely choose their Samoan and Tongan heritage above the Māori heritage. In fact, School B participants also found that there was a negative connotation attached to being Māori, and the Cultural Responsive Coordinator (School B) saw a real difference between a New Zealand born Samoan, Tongan, and Niuean to island born students of the same culture.

The Whanau Dean (School A) stated that even though there was a culturally responsive professional learning group (PLG) in School A, nothing noticeable had changed in all classrooms, and with all teachers, that had real impact on all students. School A participated in Polyfest, a secondary school cultural festival, and both School A and School B had strong Kapa Haka groups that allowed students to engage in their own culture through performance. Assemblies and school masses also gave students the opportunity to use their own languages and share their culture. However, participants from School A agreed that things seemed additive instead of imbedded in the life of the school. It came down to an individual preference as opposed to an institution-wide approach. Interestingly, both the Deputy Principal (School A) and the Cultural Responsive Coordinator (School B) were, with a team of teachers, constructing school wide initiatives that they hoped will bring about positive change in their respective schools. The Cultural Responsive Coordinator from School B stated that the cultural practices visible in the school at the moment were; cultural groups, restorative conversations, and the Positive Behaviour for Learning (PB4L) programme. The Academic Dean (School B) saw the importance of a diverse staff as role models for the students. This was a strong point and it made me reflect on the staff diversity in the school where I teach and, on the relationships that students build with teachers from different cultures and backgrounds.

When discussing how these leaders from both schools influence other staff in terms of cultural responsiveness, the Whanau Dean (School A) saw raising the profile of Māori a

focus for 2018. Powhiri, Māori language week, getting staff to pronounce words correctly and ensuring that processes and procedures were followed properly with tikanga, was seen as important by both schools. All eight participants agreed that there was no specific school policy around these activities, so it relied heavily on individual staff to manage and drive these school initiatives. The other three participants in School A agreed that the Whanau Dean (School A) had worked tirelessly at moving cultural responsiveness, especially of Māori students, away from mere tokenism. School A is working on reviewing the school documents to cultivate and extend Māori students pride in their culture. The senior RE teacher (School A) noticed an increase in the Māori roll at the school. Interestingly, although discussing cultural responsiveness and social justice from a multicultural and equity lens (as introduced by the researcher), participants from both schools referred only to Māori and Pasifika students, and the expectations from the Ministry of Education regarding these cultural groups. Both schools had students from other cultures, even though these students were in the minority. School A had a drive to acknowledge Māori in the school and saw this as the start to acknowledging the multicultural aspect of the school. The Whanau Dean (School A) stated that in order to achieve success, at being a culturally responsive school that celebrates and acknowledges all students, they must start by addressing and rectifying the bi-cultural issue first. The female senior RE teacher (School A) saw a lack of knowledge about New Zealand history as contributing to students from mixed heritages choosing the one heritage above the Māori heritage.

To be knowledgeable about their tikanga it is important to know their history. Once students know where they come from and who they are, and are encouraged to celebrate and share their heritage, it strengthens their contribution to society, as they understand the roots of the country (female senior RE teacher, School A).

School A also stated that Pasifika staff did not take kindly when they were referred to as a homogenous group, as by the Ministry of Education, and it often leans towards the more dominant Pasifika group, which in this case was the Samoan group. The feeling they had was that they were being marginalised within the Pasifika marginalised group. These participants felt that to lead cultural responsiveness, they must live it, so that other staff are led by example.

It is a Western mind-set and approach that the colour lines are not seen, and in that way it's like saying they do not exist (female senior RE teacher, School A).

The Attendance Officer from School B stated that student welfare was important and keeping all staff in the loop regarding the wellbeing of students and what is occurring in

the students' lives at any given moment, will impact teaching and learning. Staff will therefore be influenced in terms of being culturally responsive. The HOD of English (School B) agreed and added that the Attendance Officer (School B) also sent out a weekly engagement report where the subject teachers commented on the progress of the students. This was sent home to the parents. As a relatively small school, this was not too difficult to do, but it did rely on staff knowing their students. This engagement report, reported specifically on the students learning, however, if something outside of school affected a student's learning then the engagement report was a way for parents and staff to bring the issue that has affected the student's learning, to the fore.

When the participants discussed how their cultural responsive practices improved teaching and learning, all eight participants from both schools stated that at times, it did, but at times, it did not. The Whanau Dean (School A) saw culturally responsive practices, such as Kapa Haka, to get past difficult behaviour after which learning could occur.

If students are approached in a way that aligns with the values and cultural practice, will result in the student making progress in the subject (Whanau Dean, School A).

Relationship building was important, especially the building of authentic relationships rather than cultural lip service. Participants from School A also felt that there were so many things going on in the lives of their students that added to their learning difficulties.

They need to be built up and learn to build themselves first before they are open to learning (male senior RE teacher, School A).

Participants from School B felt that content should relate to and connect to the lives of the students. The Academic Dean (School B) saw attendance as a huge barrier to teaching and learning and the engagement report of School B highlighted this for parents. The Attendance Officer (School B) stated that if students did not have the correct equipment, they are sent to the Learning and Behaviour team and withdrawn from the class. This stop them from disrupting the learning of the other students.

It's letting teachers know that their room is for learning, and those disrupting the learning, or those not ready for the learning, you know are not ready. And they shouldn't be in there and bring down others (Attendance Officer, School B).

The HOD of English (School B) saw cultural responsiveness happening in the choosing of the texts students study. The Cultural Responsive Coordinator felt that even though the school is Catholic, staff respected all religions. Both the Cultural Responsive Coordinator and the Academic Dean (School B) discussed the fact that the school was small, so students would be taught by most of the teachers in their five-year schooling, and so

relationship building was important to the staff. Mixed-race students at School A and School B tended to affiliate more with their Samoan and Tongan heritage, rather than their Māori heritage. Participants also agreed that cultural displacement needed to be understood and addressed.

There are second and third generation mixed race students who although ethnically belong to a group, have no idea what it means to be an islander or anything about the group they belong to. They may be that group by blood but seem to have no idea what it means culturally. There is a need to be culturally responsive to them too (female senior RE teacher, School A).

Participants from School A felt that this was a great need and schools were not meeting this need. The female senior RE teacher (School A) stated that if staff were only culturally responsive towards one particular group, they would miss many of the students who did not associate themselves in that group because they did not know the language and cultural processes. The Cultural Responsive Coordinator (School B) did state that staff buy in was a barrier for the school to be truly culturally responsive regardless of the size of the school. This participant stated that leaders needed to clear misconceptions, stereotyping and deficit theorising in their schools. Two other barriers that came out in discussion was lack of support from the community and staff turnover.

The Whanau Dean in School A stated that social justice meant that everyone was treated fairly. The rest of the participants from School A agreed and the Assistant Principal of student services (School A) summed up social justice to mean fairness, treating all as equals. The female senior RE teacher (School A) saw social justice as accepting that there were bad things in the communities like inequality, low pay, huge unemployment and health issues, but that everyone was to take responsibility for preparing the next generation for higher and better things.

And the way to do that is through education now and, um, it's still in, and this is what I feel my responsibility is to instil in the boys a sense of responsibility that when they finish school, not only will they have a good job but that they are contributing, positively, to their communities (female senior RE teacher, School A).

The Whanau Dean (School A) reference to social justice was the life of Jesus in the way that he considered the poor, and the responsibility falling back on the community to look after them. The HOD of English (School B) and the Attendance Officer (School B) saw social justice as equal opportunities for everybody.

Concerning social justice practices visible or present in the school, the male senior RE teacher (School A) spoke of a service programme that every student is expected to do but only about 50% of the students do it.

The point of this programme was to try to get them to do things outside of their school and community. It exposed them to the injustices of the world and sometimes they could see that their situation was not as bad as they thought, and that other people needed more help (male senior RE teacher, School A).

Both schools had recently completed the restorative justice professional development and were beginning to use what they had learnt, to run restorative sessions in school to work on relationships of, students and students, and students and staff. The Whanau Dean (School A) stated that the school did look after the students who were in need and tried to make their lives as normal as possible by helping when it was needed. This participant also stated that all staff did not necessarily do this. The Assistant Principal (School A) saw the students taking more of a lead in giving back and this reflected in the behaviour of the students outside of school when they had their uniforms on. The Attendance Officer (School B) stated that the school did participate in Caritas, the Catholic Bishops' agency for justice, peace and development, and has a Young Vinnies group. Students learnt about social justice in the Religious Education classroom, however, it was around out-reach and service to those who have suffered due to natural disasters or war. When asked what social justice looked like in the classroom, the Academic Dean (School B) stated,

Our management systems are about everyone, it's everyone's classroom. Everyone is entitled to learning, the finest learning opportunities possible, so no one student is allowed to take over the class (Academic Dean, School B).

The Attendance Officer stated that social justice was incorporated in the school values and students were encouraged to do the right thing. This involved taking care of the environment and each other.

All our processes, all of the consequences, all of the rewards are the same for every student (The Cultural Responsive Coordinator, School B).

Participants considered the social justice practices of redistribution, recognition and participation and giving people the capabilities to pursue a better life for themselves, in their schools. The Whanau Dean (School A) saw redistribution of resources as referring to people sharing their learning experiences with others, to motivate and drive them. The school leaders invited previous students who have been successful, to come back and talk to the current students.

Students sharing their life lessons with current students who are a bit rough now (Whanau Dean, School A).

The Attendance Officer (School B) saw the school systems of redistribution there to assist those students who did not have the correct equipment for learning. The Learning and Behaviour team (School B) would contact parents to inform them on what their child needed for learning and assisted in creating payment plans.

If it's a real hardship case, I'll know about it, not ask too many questions and just give them the equipment needed (Attendance Officer, School B).

School B recognised that students needed to prepare for a global world and so offered Te Reo and Mandarin as languages students can study at school. Even though School B is predominantly Samoan and Tongan, the school did not offer any Pasifika languages.

Concerning recognition, participants agreed that the school was predominantly Samoan and there was a lot of recognition of Samoan culture, and some Tongan, but not other minority cultures. The Assistant Principal (School A) however, stated that there was recognition of Māori culture and identity on some platforms, especially the reporting to the Ministry and the Kapa Haka group, but it was not a holistic practice where everyone was recognised. The Cultural Responsive Coordinator (School B) saw the careers teacher as recognising whom the students are by directing them in their career paths. The female senior RE teacher (School A) talked about setting high expectations for all students in the class. However, the school streamed students according to academic ability, and students in the lower stream already knew that the expectations for them were low and so they performed according to those expectations.

Participation in School A was the idea of students taking part in extracurricular activities and participating in community events. However, in general, there was not much connection to the community. Both schools commented on students seeming to be disengaged in most of their classes.

Where they are participating in their learning, they have a good relationship with the teacher (Assistant Principal, School A).

School B saw all their students as full and active participants' in school life, participating in sport, and other activities offered at school.

About giving students the capabilities to pursue a better life, the female senior RE teacher (School A) stated that students needed to be equipped for 21st century expectations. The Whanau Dean (School A) agreed and stated that the important thing to consider was relevance.

Students disengage when they cannot see the relevance to their lives (Whanau Dean, School A).

Participants noted that it was not just technology that made learning relevant, but also the teacher. The Assistant Principal (School A) added that teachers dragged students who were disengaged through the course, resulting in students not meeting course deadlines. This participant stated that this was not giving students the capabilities to pursue a better life for themselves as this was encouraging poor work ethic. The Attendance Officer (School B) saw the capabilities passed on to the student and parents when the student enrolls in the school.

When the student is enrolled, the entire family is enrolled, and in this way, parents are given ownership and control over their child's learning and growth (Attendance Officer, School B).

The Cultural Responsive Coordinator (School B) saw the school co-ordinator doing a lot in terms of giving students work experience, organising licences and giving students opportunities to better their lives.

The Assistant principal believed that the first step to these social justice principles informing cultural responsiveness was the principle of recognition.

With most of the students, it is recognising their culture, their identity, their language, and then things like participation will grow (Assistant Principal, School A).

The Assistant Principal (School A) went on to state that there was still a huge amount of work needed in giving the students capabilities to better themselves and their lives. The Whanau Dean (School A) agreed and saw students as missing many skills that could set them up for bettering their lives. The female senior RE teacher (School A) stated that perhaps because the students came from a low socio-economic area, they were developing a handout mentality.

Perhaps needed to see that others were worse off and then they would understand that they had something to give and this would lead to redistribution of resources (female senior RE teacher, School A).

After studying the publicly available documents from both schools, there is no explicit mentioning of cultural responsiveness or social justice. School A's document under goal 4, does state that the school provides opportunities for parents and families to engage in their child's education, and recognises and gives expression to the Treaty of Waitangi. School B's document states that the Catholic culture and ethos are at the heart of all the school does.

Chapter 5: Discussion

This study set out with the aim of investigating whether the social justice principles of redistribution, recognition and participation, and the drive to give students the capacity to pursue a better life for themselves, is a possible approach to inform culturally responsive leadership in Catholic schools. What was not surprising for me was that all eight participants saw social justice as treating everyone equally, students participating in outreach and charity programs and ensuring all students did have the correct resources for learning. With regards to social justice, although almost all eight of the participants agreed that it means fairness, which links to the research of Rawls (2001), as well as (Young, 2014), the onus was placed on students to show how socially just they are through their acts of charity. The idea of social justice and leaders being socially just, was left to individual leaders and staff in both School A and School B.

The three fundamental themes identified in the findings that influenced culturally responsive leadership were: what was the understanding of culturally responsive leadership, social justice and what did these look like in the two Catholic schools that participated in this research. We also looked at social justice principles that may inform culturally responsive leadership.

The leaders in this study had varied responses and views as they had different leadership, pastoral and teaching roles. The findings stressed the importance of what each individual leader did on a day-to-day basis, and scrutinized their personal actions and understandings in relation to culturally responsive leadership and social justice (Nieto, 2000).

These findings suggested that although these two Catholic schools are essentially socially just at the distributive and redistributive approach, what seemed to be lacking in both schools was consistency across all staff and leaders, professional development around the principles of recognition, participation and capability approach to social justice, and agreed upon processes and procedures, by all in the school community, on how these principles of social justice would be used to inform culturally responsive leadership

The findings suggested that the participants in this study had good intentions concerning being culturally responsive leaders. However, their actual practices were very different and while the leaders were dedicated ideologically to cultural responsive practices, it was not endorsed to the same extent throughout the school and was an individual undertaking, and not a full school initiative. To some extent, the participants blamed parents and

students for a lack of perceived cultural identity, not acknowledging that this process is challenging even for someone with a strong sense of cultural heritage.

But then you have those who may be second or third generation who have no understanding of what it means to be an islander. And that happens a lot, even by parents. They may be by blood, but they have no idea what it means culturally. (Whanau Dean, School A).

The concept of culture was often discussed as ethnic identity, heritage, language, Kapa Haka and Catholic culture. This seemed to give a vague and narrow understanding of culturally responsive leadership. There was no acknowledgment of culture as referring to ideologies, atmosphere, behaviours and attitudes, which include positive and flexible growth mindset (Dweck, 2017) cultivated in the classroom, as classroom culture facilitated by the teacher (Rohan, 2017). Culturally responsive leadership was often related to closing the academic gap between Māori, Pasifika and Pākehā students. However, culturally responsive leadership is more than just related to academics, making a conscious effort to really build authentic relationships with every student in the classroom, sharing experiences, beliefs and culture is just as important (Nieto, 1996). It is interesting to note that even though the questions do not specifically ask about Māori and Pasifika students exclusively, the participants in this study referred to these groups when discussing culturally responsive leadership practices, and only when prompted, mentioned other students at the school. It was made clear at the beginning of the session that this research was looking beyond biculturalism.

In some instances, culturally responsive leadership practices have been confused with actions that students should take in knowing their own identities or responding to peers or parents' cultural identities. The concern for me as the researcher was that these leaders did not acknowledge the actions that leaders take to ensure equity in a student-centred classroom (OECD, 2012). There was a notable gap in understanding of culturally responsive leadership, regardless of participants teaching and leading experience or engagement in prior culturally responsive leadership preparation. It did seem that in both schools, culturally responsive leadership was ensuring students participated in cultural activities rather than building pride in identity and a sense of belonging through shared experiences, traditions, values and beliefs (Nieto, 2000). As there are only twenty-five teachers in School B, they appeared to be more of a cohesive force through understanding the school processes and procedures regarding where to send students who needed learning resources. However, even in School B participants reported on inconsistencies regarding authentic relationship building and shared experiences in all classrooms.

All the leaders in the investigation understood and acknowledged the importance of knowing and respecting their students' language and cultural values. Although a knowledge of cultural capital was important, a key finding indicated that it was essential for leaders of cultural responsiveness to go beyond superficial level relationships and the ethnicity of the student, but to get to know the depth of the individual. The findings determined that middle leaders' understandings and experiences of culturally responsive practice was positioned on forming relationships and effective communication. The findings overlap with research by Tamiti (2011) who believed leaders should ensure leadership is about people and relationships (Coleman, 2012). More specifically, the leaders in the inquiry established respectful learning relationships with students through understanding the whole student and their learning needs. Authenticating evidence indicated that relationships were an essential element of culturally responsive practice (Alton-Lee, 2003; Bishop & Berryman, 2010; Ford, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Siope, 2013; Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 1995).

All eight leaders believed it was important to identify, reflect and respond to students and their community, but how they enacted this varied between participants. The findings concluded that these leaders had their students' best interests at heart, were reflective about their practice, open minded, and willing to connect with students to engage them, and eventually improve their achievement. This aligned with the literature that recommends that culturally responsive practice involved improving student achievement and outcomes (Alton-Lee, 2003; Bishop & Berryman, 2010; Samu, 2006). The school leaders agreed it was imperative that both senior leaders and their entire school took responsibility to ensure school-wide culturally responsive practices were in place. Although these leaders worked hard to ensure their leadership practices were culturally responsive, and were driven to influence their colleagues' actions, they felt the responsibility was on senior leaders and the principal to implement and role-model initiatives.

Though the schools and the leaders understood the importance of and were working on their obligations to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, participants felt that there was still much work to be done to ensure a deeper understating of biculturalism and then multiculturalism. Te Tiriti o Waitangi acknowledges Māori as the indigenous peoples of New Zealand, and there are three broad principles that underpin it: partnership, participation and protection (Ministry of Education, 2012). Yet, the findings implied that aspects of these principles, partnership and participation, were not implemented effectively in both schools. The

findings suggested that if the school did not get the bicultural aspect right, then working in a diverse classroom with multicultural students would almost be impossible.

The leaders experienced pressure, particularly around the challenges faced with other staff members buy-in, because they felt obliged to uphold relationships with colleagues, at the same time as improving student achievement. Participants believed they were answerable for addressing these challenges through learning conversations and communicating effectively with their colleagues, if not, there would be negative consequences for students and their families. This finding aligned with literature that proposes culturally responsive leaders are responsible for ensuring teachers are, and remain, culturally responsive (Gurr, 2014; Khalifa, Gooden & Davis, 2016; Nelson, 2007; Robinson & Timperley, 2007).

Social justice according to (Cribb & Gewirtz, 2003; Woods, 2012; Woods & Roberts, 2013) is defined in a fourfold scheme as the reducing or eradication of unfair inequalities in socio-economic resources (distributive justice); participation in decisions (participative justice); respect for identity and beliefs (cultural justice), and opportunities for learning and personal development (developmental justice). This links in to Nancy Fraser's (2008) philosophy on social justice and her thoughts on distributive justice, recognition of identity and culture, parity of participation and the capability approach.

The findings of this research suggested that culturally responsive leaders in the two Catholic schools viewed social justice as the act of charity, mobilising students to give back to their community, through participating in outreach programmes like Forty Hour Famine, Caritas programmes that send assistance (financial and material) to communities suffering from natural disasters and war and taking care of the poor and homeless. This connected to the guiding gospel values and Special Character of the two Catholic schools. These two Catholic schools also ensured that everyone was treated equally and there were equal academic and behavioural expectations placed on all students. The findings suggested that the two schools did ensure that all students were equipped with the resources needed to succeed, and leaders tried to redistribute resources according to the need of the students. The onus however was still on parents to eventually supply the resources their children needed. There is a gap in this thinking, as this put the responsibility on the students to participate in outreach initiatives and give back to society. However, there are no programmes in place where students were working at assisting other students in the school who lacked access to resources (financial and other) needed for success. According to Nancy Fraser (2008), to have an adequate understanding

of social justice, the dimensions of recognition and redistribution must form part of social justice and should be developed in an integrated approach that encompassed and harmonised both dimensions. The participants in this research were open to all staff professional development around building young people who can recognise the importance of their identity and be proud of who they were, and understood, developed and shared the necessary skills students could use to build their capabilities and better their lives. To be culturally responsive leaders who encouraged teachers to incorporate students' cultural values, beliefs and experiences in teaching, made learning authentic (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Understanding these social justice principles should inform the culturally responsive leadership of the participants and support them in exploring how the attitudes, practices and policies of culturally responsive leaders can create inclusive schooling environments, that strive for equity and excellence for all students from ethnically and culturally diverse backgrounds (Ford 2013; Johnson, 2014; Madhlangobe & Stephen, 2012; Santamaria & Santamaria, 2015).

It seemed that the RE course instructed students regarding social justice, from a position of giving to the less fortunate. This is a part of social justice as it linked into the literature (Fraser, 2008; Sen, 2009; Young, 2014; Bankston, 2010) that social justice was there to support the deprived and disregarded in society, as well as the way to being perfect (Matthew 19:21) according to the words of Jesus (New International Version, 2011). This is only one interpretation of social justice, but according to this research, I would like to move social justice away from acts of charity that become somewhat self-serving, as students can get leadership roles from participating in these initiatives. Leaders, it seems, see themselves as being socially just by treating all as equals. This links into the gospel teaching as (Genesis 1:27) states that we are all made in the image and likeness of God (New International Version, 2011). This research would like to move beyond treating everyone as equals, to becoming leaders who are equitable.

Redistribution is a focus on wealth, income or other social goods (Fraser, 2008). This research also incorporates capabilities as a social good. This is one area, which this research found, that the two Catholic schools that participated, did very well. The findings suggested that school leaders and staff regularly assisted students by providing them with material or economic resources as needed, for their success. If there was a known hardship in the family, the school mobilised and assisted as needed. Unfortunately, if the school did not know about the hardship, it could slip through the cracks.

Cultural responsive leaders recognise the importance of distribution and redistribution of resources; however, this did not automatically result in leadership practices that promoted social justice for students outside of the classroom (Woods & Roberts, 2016). According to Fraser (2008), recognition is the valuing of unrecognised identities and practices. The findings show that participants realise the importance of recognising the identity of all students and building relational trust, and that this has the capacity to break down barriers between students and teachers, and ultimately improve teaching and learning. However, this was not a school initiative and only some culturally responsive leaders and staff were taking the resourcefulness to build a positive learning culture by recognising the cultures, experiences and beliefs of all their students. Recognition is a matter of justice because, as Fraser (2001, 2008) suggests, when people are not recognised and valued, they are denied status of full partnership. Fraser goes on to state that people can either be recognised as equal social status and therefore full participants in their lives or suffer from status subordination through misrecognition (2008). Everyone has an equal right to pursue social esteem under equitable conditions and equal opportunities. This allows integration of recognition with redistribution (Fraser, 2008). The findings show that some staff in the two schools were perceived to be unwilling to change their practices and were unaware of the different cultural backgrounds in their classrooms. This shows that they are unwilling to move out of their comfort zones, critically reflect on their own stereotypes and assumptions, and share their experiences with their students (Blair, 2002). A number of participants saw it as imperative to have school-wide culturally responsive practices in place. These needed to be driven and role modelled by the senior leadership team. It was essential for all staff and leaders to acknowledge cultural identity and that equal treatment did not always lead to equality of outcomes (Henderson, 2013).

The findings suggested that there were only a few examples of partnership between the school, Māori and Pasifika students, other cultural students, their families and their communities. Māori students in both schools did not want to be recognised as Māori; perhaps this was due to the on-going marginalisation of Māori. Participants from School A felt that regardless of whether Māori students were achieving well at secondary school, they were placed into a marginalised group of underachievers. Māori participation was at a low level and was a direct consequence of the failure of schooling to deliver achievement to Māori (Ministry of Education, 2008). Some Māori students were able to embrace their Māori identities and choose their own paths, participating in Māori society and culture, but many students were isolated from their Māori society (Smith, 2006). The

findings suggested a growing group of mixed-race students who choose to affiliate with one culture or heritage over the other. This made it challenging for leaders to collaborate with and build relational trust with all students, as they perceived students as affiliating to the culture the leaders considered as the dominant culture. This hindered students from fully immersing themselves in the life of the school and in their own learning.

Being aware of the local community and understanding and relating to the needs and interests of the students and their whanau improves student and community relationships and engagement in the school and in their learning (Waniganayake et al. (2012). This relates to the importance of cultural and ethnic recognition which in turn will build pride in self and identity (Bishop & Berryman, 2010; Blair, 2002; Gay, 2002; Ford, 2013; Santamaria & Santamaria, 2012). Doing this would lead to equal participation which allowed everyone to interact with one another as peers. Having no knowledge, or very little knowledge of students, suggests that the kind of inequalities that should be eradicated are the same ones that hinder people from participating equally in society, or in this case, in the school. Woods (2012) sees importance in leaders building a sense of belonging and self-worth in a community that leads to the formation of a democratic community. There was no discussion of student voice concerning recognition and participation and this was a missed opportunity, as student voice has a positive impact on both personal growth and the enjoyment of education. Concerning actual student participation and voice, it was noted that in both schools, the less confident students had fewer opportunities to lead than their more confident, academic peers did.

The discussion regarding the different school ethos used at Special Character schools was very interesting and questioned why Westernised Catholicism was the unifying or standard version followed by New Zealand schools. This leads to cultural recognition and participation in conflict with the culture of the Westernised church. Cultural justice links with feeling valued and being respected which leads to the experience of belonging. When everyone in the school and the school community have a sense of belonging, then all cultures are recognised and celebrated, and everyone participates fully in the life of the school and in growing the school community.

The findings suggest that although all students have opportunities to succeed, the level varies according to a student's motivations, interests, how staff and leaders respond to them, their networks within the school, maturity towards self-efficacy, and perceptions of status among other things.

Both schools acknowledged their careers department in working with all students to create pathways to assist students in their future paths. However, the skills or capabilities students need to pursue a better life do not only come from knowing or assuming the direction they will take when they leave school. This shows a huge gap in the schools as only some staff and leaders are growing the capabilities of all students daily, in all social interactions. What are the skills that students needed to assist them in bettering their future in this multicultural, global society? Perhaps when developing the course materials teachers could be encouraged to incorporate skills that go beyond achieving credits. Skills such as public speaking, pride in one's heritage, self-confidence, self-motivation, a growth mind-set, creativity, student agency, critical thinking, managing time and managing stress need to be explicit and need to be taught. Culturally responsive leaders, and this should be every member of the staff, need to be aware of the students, give them a genuine voice and responsibilities that empower them to succeed beyond the classroom.

A few authors (Bishop & Berryman, 2010; Ford, 2013; Weinstein, Thomlinson-Clarke & Curran, 2004) highlight that creating a caring environment is essential, and the findings showed that both schools did work towards creating a culture of care. The findings did show that the leaders who participated in this research perceived that most of the members of the school did this, but not all the members in the school. One important way to assist students in developing and growing their capabilities was for all leaders to involve students, families and communities in culturally appropriate behaviours (Blair, 2002; Khalifa et al., 2016; Santamaria, 2014b; Santamaria & Santamaria, 2015; Stevenson, 2007). Honouring all members of the community and including voices and perspectives of staff, parents, community members and stakeholders drives students to improve their lives (Santamaria, 2014a).

Evaluating the findings has accentuated the fact that culturally responsive leadership was a complex matter. It was a challenge; however, it was important for leaders to be both bicultural and multicultural, have shared Catholic and cultural values, and reflect, respect and build relational trust in their Catholic school sector. Cultural responsive leadership is not merely possessing knowledge and skills but is related to having personal attributes connected to values and beliefs about working in a multicultural school. The findings implied that personal, relational and school viewpoints were all compulsory for culturally responsive leadership to be effective and the principles of redistribution, recognition and partnership, and the capability approach, would inform culturally responsive leadership practices for Catholic schools.

Limitations

The primary limitations of this study include the fact that there was only one focus group session conducted with each school and a small number of participants involved in each focus group session, the research methodology and the positioning and predisposition of the researcher. For this study student and teacher voice is missing. A 360-degree approach which collects student, teachers and leaders' voices, would have given me more content and ethnographic analysis on which to base my findings and conclusions.

Since this study was qualitative in nature, the results can only be reduced to a general form of theory. One methodological limitation was not collecting data from students and from classroom teachers. Instead, this study looked at culturally responsive leaders and Middle Managers responses to and perceptions of cultural responsiveness and social justice. This meant that no data was collected on student and classroom teachers' experiences of social justice and cultural responsiveness and its practices in the school. Holding sessions with these two groups would have provided valuable information on this topic as their perceptions and realities would probably have differed from those who lead the initiatives.

Through my own personal lens, I brought my experiences, beliefs and opinions to the design of this research and the facilitation of the focus group sessions. My interest in culturally responsive leadership and social justice may have slanted my interpreting of participants' perceptions to get results that favoured my take on the topic. My personal experiences and beliefs were made explicit during the sessions and in conversations with participants. These experiences and beliefs are also implicitly present throughout the study. A researcher with a different lens, identity and educational philosophy would perhaps obtain different results. While these limitations exist in this study, the results are still able to offer some meaningful insights about equitable cultural responsive leadership and social justice principles to inform this leadership.

This study is also significant because of the changing face of the New Zealand classroom. This research provides some ideas around social justice practices that could inform cultural responsive leadership. It moves beyond biculturalism and looks at all students and what they need to succeed in this global world. It will be good to see how much more multicultural schools in New Zealand become and research could track this. Research could also investigate ways or initiatives that could be applied to Catholic schools to build the social justice principles of redistribution, recognition and participation, and the capability approach. This research looked at Catholic schools in New Zealand, but this

could also be applied to all schools. Continued research in culturally responsive leadership and social justice will provide more opportunities for helping teachers create equitable classrooms.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

In this investigation, the aim was to ascertain whether social justice principles could inform culturally responsive leadership. This research study considered the multicultural reality within two Catholic schools in Auckland New Zealand.

The findings in this research were affected by the educational, pastoral and teaching roles of the participating leaders, and found that culturally responsive leadership is influenced by the personal lens of the leader, the relational confidence of the leader and school policies and procedures. The research findings also aligned with literature around culturally responsive leadership and social justice. The findings also revealed new understandings and learning around these topics. This research has acknowledged the importance of individual leaders and the role they play in developing and growing culturally responsive practices and leadership in their schools. This research also emphasised the importance of redistribution, recognition and participation, and the capability approach (Fraser, 2000), as principles of social justice that can influence culturally responsive leadership and practices in the two Catholic schools.

These findings suggest that in general, the culturally responsive leaders in both these schools, see the building of relationships in the entire school community, as paramount to the success of culturally responsive leadership and schools. The inter relationships between the school and the local community is important to acknowledge the values of all groups and the identity of individuals (Billot, J, 2008). This links to Young's (2014) idea of social groups in society and that although each of those groups are different for various reasons; they are still the same, as belonging to the human family (Young, 2014). This is the central message of Catholic schools and social justice. Mana connects to this message as it is the essence of being human and taking pride in who you are. It is to do with the sacredness of relationships, Tapu, humanity to humanity, humanity to the land, the environment, the universe. It is the essence of being culturally responsive and socially just.

The discoveries of this study support the idea that knowing your own personal lens, valuing differences instead of disregarding them, encouraging and celebrating diverse points of view and influences in decision making and action taking, and being sensitive from the position of power in dealing with all people, leads to authentic culturally responsive leadership. The knowledge and understanding around the unique bicultural heritage of this country, also contributes to effective culturally responsive leadership in

New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 2012). This style of leadership values people and their differences, and assimilates their cultural experiences, values, histories and perspectives into teaching and learning. The gospel of Jesus Christ speaks all languages and respects and embraces all cultures and all people. This should be our example.

Taken together, the results of this research suggest that to develop social justice principles to enhance culturally responsive leadership, it is important to address inequities which are embedded in the daily processes of the school. The question to ask is; to what degree does the culture of the school make explicit and espouse values that endorse culturally responsive leadership, social justice and shared values? This means adding to the fundamental values an explicit and comprehensive origin of social justice that includes the principles of redistribution, recognition and participation, and the capability approach, as well as fighting the effects of all injustices in the school (Woods, & Roberts, 2016). Another question that these two Catholic schools may ask is whether the daily processes around social justice are leading the school to become an inclusive and equitable environment where students can better their own lives as well as the lives of their community.

This research study is based on a small sample of participants, and using a 360-degree approach (students, staff and leaders) may alter or confirm the results. Although this study is based on a small sample of participants, the findings suggest that this may be something all Catholic and secular educational leaders in New Zealand could consider addressing the growing multicultural student population in their schools. It will be interesting to compare experiences of all individuals within the school community.

References

- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1987). *Qualitative Research Methods: Membership roles in field research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781412984973
- Aleman, E. (2009). Leveraging conflict for social justice: How 'leadable' moments can transform school culture. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 12(4), 1-16. Sage Journals.
- Alton-Lee, A. (2003). *Best evidence synthesis: Quality teaching for diverse students in schooling*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Antrop-González, R. and De Jesus, A. (2006). Toward a Theory of Critical Care in Urban Small School Reform: Examining Structures and Pedagogies of Caring in Two Latino Community-Based Schools. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19,409-433.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09518390600773148>
- Australian Human Rights Commission, (2012). *Human Rights Education and Training*..
<https://www.humanrights.govt.au/>
- Astin, H. S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J.A., & McGee, C.A. (Eds.). (2001). *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education*. San Francisco. CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Banks, J.A. (2007). *Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bankston, C.L. (2010). Social justice: Cultural origins of a perspective and a theory. *The Independent Review*, 15 (2),168-179.
- Beech, L. (2010). In the presence of all peoples: Celebrating cultural diversity. *Caritas Social Justice Series, 10*. The Print Room.
- Berkes, F. (2004). Rethinking community-based conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 18, 621–630.
- Berryman, M., & Bateman, S. (2008). Effective bicultural leadership: A way to restore harmony at school and avoid suspension.
- Billot, J. (2008). Increasing ethnocultural diversity in New Zealand: Implications for school leadership. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, 23(2),87-98.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: changing power relations in education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Bishop, A. R. (2002). Introduction to Special Section on Maori Culture and Education. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 8, 3-4.
- Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2010). Te Kotahitanga: Culturally responsive professional development for teachers. *Teacher Development*,14(2),173-187.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2010.494497>
- Blackmore, J. (2006). Deconstructing diversity discourses in the field of educational management and ladership. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34(2), 181-199. Sage Journals.

- Blair, M. (2002). Effective school leadership: The multi-ethnic context. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(2),179-191.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101, DOI: [10.1191/1478088706qp063oa](https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa)
- Brooks, J.S., & Miles, M. (2006). From scientific management to social justice...and back again? Pedagogical shifts in the study and practice of educational leadership. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership*, 10(21).
- Brooks, J. S. (2008). Introduction part one: What can social justice educators learn from the social sciences? In I. Bogotch, F. Beachum, J. Blount, J. Brooks, & F. English (Eds.), *Radicalizing Educational Leadership: Dimensions of Social Justice*,1-10. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Brooks, J.S. (2010). Educational leadership and globalization: Literacy for a global perspective. *Educational Policy*.
- Bryman, A. (2001). The nature of qualitative research. *Social Research Methods*, 365-399. Oxford University Press
- Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Capper, C. (1993). *Educational Administration in a Pluralistic Society*. Albany, NY: SUNY.
- Carnicelli, S., & Boluk, K. (2017). The promotion of social justice: Service learning for transformative education. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education*, 21, 126-134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2017.01.003>
- Catholic Office of Education. (2008). Catholic Character: Examples of Good Practice in New Zealand Catholic Schools and Colleges. Wellington, NZ.
- Christchurch Methodist Mission, (2007). Cycles of Hope. Spices Paper and Clarity Press. <https://www.mmsi.org.nz>
- Chui, M., & Walker, A. (2007). Leadership for social justice in Hong Kong schools: Addressing mechanisms of inequality. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 45(6),724-739.
- Clarkin-Phillips, J. (2017). When the odds are stacked against: Leadership decisions that shift the odds. In R. McNae, M. Morrison, & R. Notman (Eds.), *Educational Leadership in Aotearoa New Zealand: Issues of Context and Social justice*,105-117. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Coleman, M. (2012). Leadership and Diversity. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 40(5), 592-609. doi: 10.1177/1741143212451174
- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. (2012). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cribb, A., & Gewirtz, S. (2003). Towards a sociology of just practices. *Social justice, education and identity*, 15. Routledge.
- Dantley, M., & Tillman, L. (2010). Social Justice and Moral Transformative Leadership. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for Social Justice: Making Revolutions in Education* (2nd ed.), 16-29. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Davidson, C., & Tolich, M. (1999). *Social Science Research in New Zealand: Many Paths to Understanding*. Auckland, NZ: Pearson Education New Zealand Limited.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other Peoples' Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Del Val, R.E., & Normore, A.H. (2008). Leadership for social justice: Bridging the digital divide. *International Journal of Urban Educational Leadership*, 2, 1-15. Available [Online]: http://www.uc.edu/urbanleadership/current_issues.htm
- Dimmock, C., & Walker, A. (2005). *Educational Leadership: Culture and Diversity*. London, England: Sage.
- Duncan-Andrade, J. (2009). Note to Educators: Hope required when growing roses in concrete. *Harvard Educational Review*, 70(2).
- Dweck, C. (2017). *Mindset: changing the way you think to fulfil your potential*. Constable & Robinson Ltd.
- Fitzgerald, T. (2000). Middle managers in secondary schools: Who are they and what do they need to know. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Administration*, 15(4), 71-75.
- Ford, T. (2013). Applying culturally responsive practices: Implications for mainstream education. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 18(2), 25-36.
- Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on "Postsocialist" Condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking Recognition. *New Left Review* 3, 107-120.
- Fraser, N. (2001). Recognition without ethics? Theory, Culture & Society. *New Left Review*.
- Fraser, N. (2008). Reframing Justice in a Globalising World in K. Olsen (Ed). *Adding Insult to Injury: Nancy Fraser Debates her Critics*, 273-291.
- Fraser, N., & Honneth, A. (2003). *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. London: Verso.
- Freire, P., Faundez, A., & Coates, T. (1989). *Learning to question: A pedagogy of liberation*. Continuum
- Freire, P. (1997). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum Publishing Co.
- Freire, P. (2006). Cultural action and conscientization. *International Education for the Millennium: Toward Access, Equity, and Quality*. 55-74.

- Furman, G. (2012). Social justice leadership as praxis: Developing capacities through preparation programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 47-76.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G. (2000). The importance of multicultural education. *Educational Leadership*, 61(4).
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116.
- Gooden, M. A. (2005). The role of an African American principal in an urban information technology high school. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 10(4), 630-650.
- Gooden, M., & Dantley, M. (2012). Centering race in a framework for leadership preparation. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 7, 237-253.
- Gunter, H., & Ribbins, P. (2003). The field of educational leadership: Studying maps and mapping studies. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 51(3), 254-281.
- Gunter, H. M. (2006). Educational leadership and the challenge of diversity. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 34 (2), 257-268.
- Gurr, D. (2014). Successful school leadership across contexts and cultures. *Leading and Managing*, 20(2), 75-88.
- Hague, P. (2002). *Market Research*, 3rd ed. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Hartas, D. (Ed.). (2010). *Educational Research and Inquiry: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. London, England: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Hayek, F. (1976). The Mirage of Social Justice. *Law, Legislation, and Liberty*, 2.
- Henderson, L. (2013). Māori potential: Barriers to creating culturally-responsive learning environments in Aotearoa/New Zealand: *Te timatanga o te ara – kei whea te ara? Kairaranga*, 14(2), 10-16.
- Hinds, D. (2000). Research instruments. In D. Wilkinson (Ed.), *The Researcher's Toolkit: The Complete Guide to Practitioner Research*, 41-54. London, England: Routledge Falmer.
- Hobson, A.J., & Townsend, A. (2010). Interviewing as educational research method(s). In D. Hartas (Ed.), *Educational Research and Inquiry: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 110-127. London, England: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Horsford, S. (2010). *New Perspectives in Educational Leadership. Exploring social, political and community contexts and meaning*. Education Management. Peter Lang Publishing Inc., New York: NY
- Horsford, S.D. (2011). *Learning in a Burning House: Educational Inequality, Ideology, and (Dis) integration*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Humphrey, C. (2013). A paradigmatic map of professional education research. *Social work education*, 32(1), 3-16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2011.643863>
- Jean-Marie, G. (2008). Leadership for social justice: An agenda for 21st century schools. *The Educational Forum*, 72(4), 340-54.

- Jean-Marie, G., Normore, A. H., & Brooks, J. S. (2009). Leadership for social justice: Preparing 21st century school leaders for a new social order. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 4(1), 1-31. doi:10.1177/194277510900400102
- Johnson, L. (2007) Rethinking successful school leadership in challenging U.S. schools: Culturally responsive practices in school-community relationships. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 35(3), 49-57.
- Johnson, L. (2014). Culturally responsive leadership for community empowerment. *Multicultural Education Review*, 6(2), 145-170. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2014.11102915>
- Kamberelis, G., & Dimitriadis, G. (2005). Focus groups: Strategic articulations of pedagogy, politics, and inquiry. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed., 887–907. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Keddie, A. (2012). Schooling and social justice through the lenses of Nancy Fraser. 53(3), 263-279.
- Khalifa, M. (2012). A re-new-ed paradigm in successful urban school leadership principal as community leader. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48, 424–467. doi:10.1177/0013161X11432922
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. 2nd edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Krippendorff, K. (2012). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*, 3rd ed. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications Inc
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1163320>
- Lee, J. (2002). Racial and ethnic achievement gap trends: Reversing the progress towards equity? *Educational Researcher* 31 (1), 3-12.
- Lee, C.C. & Hipolito - Delgado, C. (2007). Counselors as agents of social justice. In C.C. Lee (Ed.). *Counseling for Social Justice* (pp. xiii - xxviii). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Lomotey, K. (1987). Black principals for Black students: Some preliminary observations. *Urban Education* 22 (2), 173-181.
- Lomotey, K. (1989). *Cultural Diversity in the School: Implications for Principals*, 73(521), 81-88. Sage Journals. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F019263658907352116>
- Lumby, J., & Morrison, M (2010). Leadership and diversity: theory and research. 3-17. Published online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632430903509717>
- Madhlangobe, L., & Gordon, S. P. (2012). Culturally responsive leadership in a diverse school: A case study of a high school leader. *NASSP Bulletin*, 96(3), 177-202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636512450909>
- Mansfield, K. (2014). How Listening to Student Voices Informs and Strengthens Social Justice Research and Practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50 (3), 392-430. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13505288>

- Mansfield, K. (2013). I love these girls-I was these girls: Women Leading for Social Justice in a Single-sex Public School. *Journal of School Leadership*, 23(4), 640-663.
- Marshall, C., & Oliva, M. (2006). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Maslow, A. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.
- May, S., & Sleeter, C. E. (Eds.). (2010). *Critical multiculturalism: Theory and praxis*. New York: Routledge.
- McGee, J. (2001). Reflection of an alternative school administrator. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 82(8), 588-591.
- McKenzie, K. B., Christman, D. E., Hernandez, F., Fierro, E., Capper, C. A., Dantley, M., Scheurich, J. J. (2008). From the field: A proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44, 111–138. doi:10.1177/0013161X07309470
- McNae, R. M. (2010). A global perspective of social justice: A new lens for analysis. *The 28th Annual University Council for Educational Administration Convention*.
- McNae, R. M. (2014). School leadership for social justice in Aotearoa, New Zealand. In *BELMAS Annual Conference*. Stratford Upon Avon.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). The New Zealand Curriculum online. <https://www.nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz>
- Ministry of Education. (2008). *Ka Hikitia: Managing for success: The Māori education strategy 2008-2012*. Wellington: NZ.
- Ministry of Education. (2012). The New Zealand Curriculum Update: Treaty of Waitangi Principle. Retrieved from: http://www.nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/curriculum_updates.
- Ministry of Education. (2013). He Kākano. Te Awe O Nga Toroa. Retrieved from <http://hekakano.tki.org.nz>
- Mitra, D. L. (2003). Student voice in school reform: Reframing student-teacher relationships. *McGill Journal of Education*, 38(2), 289-304.
- Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141.
- Morgan, D. L. (1988). *Focus group as qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Morgan, D. L., Krueger, R. A., & King, J. A. (1998). *The focus group kit*. Vols.1–6. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Murakami Ramalho, E., Nunez, A. H., & Cuero, K. (2010). Pedagogy for equity: Teaching in a Hispanic-serving institution. *Innovative Higher Education*, 35(3), 177-190. Springer Netherlands.
- Mutch, C. (2005). *Doing Education Research: A Practitioner's Guide to Getting Started*. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Neuman, W. (2003). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

- Newby, P. (2010). *Research Methods for Education*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education.
- New International Bible, (2011). <https://www.biblestudytools.com>
- New Zealand Catholic Education Office, (NZCEO), (2002). Wellington New Zealand: NZ
- Nieto, S. (1996). *Affirming Diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman.
- Normore, A.H. (Ed.). (2008). *Leadership for Social Justice: Promoting Equity and Excellence through Inquiry and Reflective practice*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- NZCEO, (2002). *The Philosophy of Catholic Schools*. Catholic Education Office. Christchurch, New Zealand: NZ
- OECD (2012), *Equity and Quality in Education: Supporting Disadvantaged Students and Schools*, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264130852-en>
- Olssen, M. (2001). Citizenship and Education: from Alfred Marshall to Iris Marion Young, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 33(1), 77-94, DOI: [10.1111/j.1469-5812.2001.tb00255.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2001.tb00255.x)
- O'Toole, J., & Beckett, D. (2013). *Educational Research: Creative Thinking and Doing* (2nd ed.). Melbourne, VIC: Oxford University Press.
- Rawls, J. (2001). *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Rohan, T. (2017). *Teaching for positive behaviour: Supporting engagement, participation, and learning*. The New Zealand Ministry of Education.
- Rosenthal, L. (2016). Incorporating intersectionality into psychology: An opportunity to promote social justice and equity. *American Psychological Association*, 71(6), 474-485. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0040323>
- Samu, T. W. (2006). The 'pasifika umbrella' and quality teaching: Understanding and responding to the diverse realities within. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 12, 35-49.
- Sandel, M. (1982). *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Santamaria, L.J., & Santamaria, A.P. (2012). *Applied critical leadership in education: Choosing change*. New York, NY: Routledge Books.
- Santamaria, L. (2013). Critical change for the greater good. *Educational Administration Quarterly*.
- Santamaria, L. J. (2014a). Critical change for the greater good: Multicultural perceptions in educational leadership toward social justice and equity. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50(3), 347-391.

- Santamaría, L. J. (2014b). Critical change for the greater good: Multicultural dimensions of educational leadership toward social justice and educational equity. *Education Administration Quarterly (EAQ)*, 50(3), 347391.
- Santamaría, L. J., & Santamaría, A. P. (2015). Countering educational injustice with applied critical leadership: Culturally responsive practices promoting sustainable change. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 17(1). PKP Publishing Services. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X13505287>
- Santamaria, L., Santamaria, A., & Singh, G. (2017). One against the grain. *International Journal of Educational Management*.
- Scheurich, J.J. and Skrla, L. (2003). *Leadership for equity and excellence: Creating high-achievement classrooms, schools, and districts*. Corwin Press, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, (2013). Message from UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon. World day of social justice. *World Telecommunication and Information Society Day*. <https://www.itu.int/en/wtisd/Pages/2013-ki-moon>
- Sen, A. (2005). Human rights and capabilities. *Journal of Human Development*, 6(2). Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Sen, A. (2009). *The Idea of Justice*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Sen, A. (2012). Values and Justice. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 19(2): 101-108. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Selwyn, N., Gorard, S., Williams, S. (2001). Digital divide or digital opportunity? The role of technology, in overcoming social exclusion in US education. *Educational Policy* 21301 (15)
- Shoho, A.M. (2005). Social Justice: Seeking a common language. In F.W. English (Ed.). *The Sage Handbook of Educational Leadership: Advances in Theory, Research, and Practice*, 47-67.
- Shoho, A. R., Merchant, B. M. & Lugg, C. A. (2005). Social justice: Seeking a common language. In F. W. English (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of educational leadership: Advances in theory, research, and practice*, 47-67. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Siope, A. (2013). A culturally responsive pedagogy of relations': Coming to understand. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 18(2), 37-49.
- Sleeter, C.E. (1996). Multicultural Education and Empowerment. In C.E. Sleeter (Ed.), *Empowerment through multicultural education B2-Empowerment through multicultural education*, 1-23. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sleeter, C., & Grant, C. (2003). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons
- Sleeter, C. E. (2005). *Multicultural education as social activism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Somekh, B., & Lewin, C. (2011). *Theory and methods in social research* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stevenson, H. (2007) 'A case study in leading schools for social justice: when morals and markets collide'. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 45(6), 769–81.

- Stewart, D. W., Shamdasani, P. N., & Rook, D. W. (2007). *Focus Groups: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Tamati, A. (2011). Te mana tangata: Leadership stories. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, 26(2), 69-74.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ)*, 43(2), 221-258.
- Tillman, L. (2003). From rhetoric to reality? Educational administration and the lack of racial and ethnic diversity with the profession. *UCEA Review* 45 (3), 1-4.
- Tillman, L. C. (2007). Transformative Leadership for Social Justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 16.
- Valadez, J., & Mirci, P. (2015). Educating for social justice: Drawing from Catholic social teaching. *Journal of Catholic Education*, 19(1). Wellington: NZ.
- Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(1), 20-32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487102053001003>
- Walker, A. & Dimmock, C. (2005). Leading the multiethnic school: Research evidence on successful practice. *The Educational Forum*, 69, 291-304.
- Waniganayake, M., Cheeseman, S., Fenech, M., Hadley, F., & Shepherd, W. (2012). *Leadership: Contexts and complexities in Early Childhood Education*. Melbourne, VIC: Oxford University Press.
- Weinstein, C. S., Tomlinson-Clarke, S., & Curran, M. (2004). Toward a conception of culturally responsive classroom management. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55(1), 25-38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487103259812>
- Wellington, J. (2015). *Educational Research: Contemporary Issues and Practical Approaches* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Williams, N. (2016). Culturally responsive leadership in Aotearoa New Zealand secondary schools. *Master of Educational Leadership Thesis*. Auckland University of Technology.
- Wlodkowski, R.J., & Ginsberg, B. (1995). A framework for culturally responsive teaching. *Educational Leadership*, 53(1), 17-21.
- Woods, P. (2012). A Four-fold Approach to Social Justice. A 2-page information sheet available to download at https://www.academia.edu/5755395/A_Four-fold_Approach_to_Social_Justice, accessed on 8/1/2015.
- Woods, P., & Roberts, A. (2016). Distributed leadership and social justice : Images and meanings from different positions across the school landscape. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2015.1034185>
- Yin, R. (1989). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, (2nd ed). London, UK: Sage Publications Inc.
- Young, I.M. (2012). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*; Princeton University Press: Princeton, NJ, USA.

Young, I. M. (2014). *Five Faces of Oppression*. State University of New York Press, Albany