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From responsive social learning contexts to culturally responsive pedagogy: Contributions from early New Zealand research

Ted Glynn
Faculty of Education
University of Waikato

Introduction
One major world view that dominates the field of developmental psychology is the organismic world view. This world view depicts individuals, including children, as active agents who know the world in terms of their own operations upon it. Individuals are seen as being in control of their own learning.

It is within responsive social contexts that individuals acquire not only specific skills but also generic knowledge about how to learn. … we need to discover and analyse those characteristics of responsive, social environments which support and promote independent learning. (Glynn, 1985, pp. 5–6)

I wrote this statement in 1984 as an introduction to an inaugural lecture at the University of Otago, entitled Contexts for Independent Learning. It reflects my appreciation of the work of human development and socio-cultural theorists of the day, for example, Bronfenbrenner (1979), Bruner (1996, 1999) and Vygotsky (1978). Since then, my understanding of responsive social contexts for learning has been expanded by the work of other developmental and socio-cultural theorists such as McNaughton (2002), Rogoff (1990, 2003), Lave and Wenger (1989, 1991), Smith (1995) and Wood (1988). My present understanding is that children acquire intellectual knowledge and experience not simply as passive, receptive learners, but as active learners exercising agency within interactive contexts that are essentially social and cultural in nature.

In this paper I first re-visit earlier research on children’s literacy learning, to recall some of the defining features of responsive social learning contexts, and evidence that supports the effectiveness of each of these features. Then I discuss two New Zealand research studies on children’s literacy learning and explore the importance of including culturally located values and pedagogical practices within responsive social contexts for learning. These studies explicitly address building and maintaining equitable relationships between teachers and learners, and between schools and their communities. They also respect the cultural identities, culturally located values and
culturally preferred pedagogies of Māori learners and teachers. They demonstrate a clear commitment to responding to the message that “culture counts” (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Sleeter, 2011; Valenzuela, 1999). They also respond to the repeated calls from Māori that Māori-preferred literacies and pedagogical practices need to be acknowledged, respected and incorporated in the teaching and learning interactions and relationships within their classrooms. Māori want their children to succeed in the New Zealand education system, but to succeed “as Māori” (Durie, 1995, 1998).

**Responsive social contexts for learning**

A previous review of literature of children’s language and literacy learning (Glynn, 1985) identified the following four features of responsive social learning contexts as being contexts that (1) support initiations by the learner, (2) incorporate authentic shared activities between less-skilled and more-skilled participants, (3) promote reciprocity and mutual influence between learner and teacher participants, and (4) provide appropriate and contingent feedback for learners. I will now look at each feature in turn.

1. **Learner initiations**

Opportunity for learners to initiate interactions is crucial within a wide variety of learning contexts, for example, infants learning to speak, children learning to read and write, and learning to speak a second language. If these learners are to exercise agency and take control of their learning, then learning contexts should allow them to initiate interactions with people and with materials. However, very many school learning contexts are constructed so that learners are positioned to respond, to questions, events, actions and ideas provided by someone else, rather than to initiate an interaction or a conversation. These learning contexts are neither responsive nor social. In contrast, in a more responsive and social context, an adult or teacher might employ a strategy known as Incidental Teaching, as explored fully by Hart and Risley (1968, 1974, 1975, 1980). First the adult or teacher identifies an appropriate way of responding to the child’s initiation, such as reacting to a gesture, answering a question, handing over a requested item or providing access to a desired activity or new task. Next, the adult or teacher delivers the requested item, information or activity, but always ensuring that delivery is contingent on the child engaging in a further language exchange. Incidental Teaching is a powerful language learning strategy because it is child-initiated and also because the child learns an effective general strategy for engaging adult attention and interaction. Charles, Glynn and McNaughton (1984) compared the use of Incidental Teaching and Talking Up (an adult-initiated procedure for prompting child language with direct questions and comments from caregivers). The Talking Up procedure was found to be counter-productive as it resulted in fewer child initiations. Children had fewer opportunities to initiate because they were so busy answering questions. Adults need to relinquish such tight managerial control over language interactions if children are to exercise agency over their own learning.

Several studies of children’s oral reading in one-to-one contexts (Clay, 1979; McNaughton & Glynn, 1981; Singh & Singh, 1984), established that if teachers or adults would delay by a few seconds their corrective feedback following children’s reading errors, children would gain opportunities to initiate their own error correction processes. Similarly, studies of language use by children with intellectual disabilities
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(Halle, Baer, & Spradlin, 1981; Halle, Marshall, & Spradlin, 1979) showed that these children increased their language initiations when adults and teachers delayed their use of intrusive language prompting. In a study of pre-schooler’s language use at mealtimes, Baker, Foley, Glynn, and McNaughton (1983) found that children’s language initiations were much higher when caregivers positioned themselves as responsive partners rather than as supervisors of children’s eating. Findings from these various studies confirm that a key factor in promoting child language initiation is for adults to respond to, rather than direct, children’s language use.

2. Shared authentic activities

The concept of shared activity is particularly important within responsive social learning contexts. These contexts should provide opportunities for learners to engage in a shared activity with a more skilled participant. This type of context qualifies as a “primary developmental context” in which children learn both intellectual and social skills (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Within such contexts, “shared learning tasks” need to be authentic and functional for both participants. Parents engaged in helping their child learn to talk are learning skills and knowledge along with their child. Growth in the child’s skill in using language is paralleled by growth in the parent’s skill in interpreting and responding to their child’s language. From careful listening to a conversational initiation from their child, and identifying the context in which that initiation occurred, parents learn to extend the conversation with just the right content focus and language complexity for their child to continue participating. The conversation is both authentic and functional for both participants. Mutual engagement in conversation that builds and maintains positive social and emotional relationships between parents and children is another key feature of responsive social learning contexts.

Morgan and Lyon (1979) reported a clear example of an authentic shared activity in their study on a ‘paired reading’ strategy. Parent and child begin by simultaneously reading from a familiar storybook chosen by the child. As soon as the child feels ready to ‘go it alone’ (read independently), he or she knocks on the table as a signal to the parent to ‘stop reading’ while the child continues reading alone. The adult remains silent until the child makes an error, at which point simultaneous reading resumes. With this simple strategy the child is afforded a degree of control over the amount and pace of tutor intervention they receive. In a study of children’s engagement in silent recreational reading (Pluck, Ghafari, Glynn, & McNaughton, 1984), a teacher engaged in her own personal recreational reading concurrently with the children. Her children’s engagement with their reading was greater when she positioned herself as an active model rather than when she positioned herself as supervisor/controller or manager of children’s reading. Children had an uninterrupted opportunity to engage with their reading books, without the intrusion of frequent management interventions from the teacher. Teacher and students were sharing in a reading task that was authentic for both.

Few children regularly get to share in authentic literacy tasks (such as reading or writing) with a teacher or more skilled participant, or get to observe family members, teachers or other adults enjoying working on authentic reading or writing tasks. However, this may now be occurring in home contexts where children can engage with family members in a wide range of literacy learning through email exchanges and through social media. In contrast, in many classrooms so much teacher time is still spent in introducing tasks to be completed, giving detailed instructions, monitoring
student behaviour, providing evaluative feedback, and recording outcomes. Engaging in these activities can leave little time for teachers to respond to what students are saying, reading, writing and thinking, and for working alongside children on genuinely shared tasks. Further examples of authentic task sharing between students and teachers or other adults are reported in the study of responsive written feedback discussed later.

3. Reciprocity and mutual influence

Responsive social learning contexts also demonstrate reciprocity and mutual influence among participants. Learners and teachers not only share in authentic learning tasks but also influence and enhance the learning of the other. This is well illustrated in research on peer or adult tutoring of reading (Houghton & Bain, 1993; Houghton & Glynn, 1993; Limbrick, McNaughton, & Glynn, 1981; McNaughton, Glynn & Robinson, 1982; Wheldall & Mettem, 1985) and spelling (Dineen, Clark, & Risley, 1977). All of these research studies provide clear evidence that peer (or adult) tutors effectively improved the reading of their tutees through skilful interactions around shared tasks. Further, these studies report positive reading gains for the tutors as a result of their engagement and participation in the tutoring role. In the study on spelling (Dineen et al., 1977), children participated in both teacher and learner roles. They gained just as much from the spelling programme when they were positioned as teachers as they did when they were positioned as learners. In the majority of these research studies there were also anecdotal reports that tutors and tutees developed an increasingly positive social relationship as an outcome of working together on their shared tasks. In the parent tutoring of reading study (McNaughton et al., 1982), not only did the children achieve marked gains in reading but also parents reported feeling much more positive towards their children and enjoyed spending more time reading with them (whereas they recalled that their previous interactions with them around reading had been aversive and painful).

4. Appropriate and contingent feedback

The fourth feature of responsive social learning contexts concerns the nature, quality and contingency of the feedback available for learners. An historical study of the ratios of USA and New Zealand teachers’ verbal feedback, contingent on appropriate or inappropriate student behaviour, was in the order of 1:3 (Thomas, Presland, Grant, & Glynn, 1978). Clearly such a focus of teacher attention contingent on inappropriate behaviour would have little place within a contemporary responsive social context for learning. Hopefully this ratio would be reversed! However, while describing teacher feedback on students’ classroom behaviour might seem somewhat simplistic in today’s classrooms and tomorrow’s schools, the following example is informative. Over several weeks Scriven and Glynn (1983) recorded all the written feedback received by a class of low-achieving Year 9 students on the rate and accuracy of their completion of written tasks. This study found that simply by increasing the very infrequent and intermittent written feedback these students received from teachers, their rate of completion of three different types of written tasks dramatically improved. Furthermore, students’ writing accuracy also improved (even though it was already quite high) on the very small amount of written work completed. Coincidently, as students began to increase their rate of task completion, their teachers reduced their managerial/controlling comments.
These findings suggested that with increased work completion, students were becoming less dependent on direct teacher control.

More generally, it has been suggested that teachers may often respond to students’ writing accuracy at the expense of fluency (Glynn, 1982). Excessive attention to corrective feedback, whereby teachers respond to student errors in letter formation, spelling and grammar, leaves few opportunities for the development of reciprocity and mutual influence between writers and readers. Vargas (1978) noted that for beginning writers expressive writing contexts should allow writers to exert some control or agency over the reader by enabling the impact of their writing on a reader to be made more visible through the reader’s responses to it. This idea led to the development of the strategy known as “responsive, written feedback” (Jerram, Glynn, & Tuck, 1988) where teachers or others learned to act as a “responsive audience” to the messages contained within eight-year-old students’ writing. They achieved this by writing a few brief personal comments that responded to what each student was trying to say. This strategy was applied to successive pieces of writing over several weeks. Explicit corrective feedback (on writing accuracy) was not included in this strategy. During periods when written content feedback was provided, in contrast with periods when it was not, children produced markedly longer pieces of writing and, more importantly, this writing was rated as more interesting and more imaginative by independent groups of parents, peers and teachers. The written content feedback strategy has been employed with similar success in a number of more recent research studies (Glynn, Berryman, O’Brien, & Bishop, 2000; Glynn, Berryman, & Weiss, 2005; Vanstone, 2008). All of these studies report that, over time, within the successive exchanges of student writing and the written feedback provided by writing responders there was evidence of a growing and deepening personal relationship between writer and reader. Studies of responsive written feedback provide particularly rich examples of the power of responsive social learning contexts that incorporate all four of the characteristic features discussed—learner initiations, working together on shared and authentic tasks, reciprocity and mutual influence, and receiving appropriate and contingent feedback (through the medium of writing).

Culturally responsive pedagogy

Looking back on these early studies of children’s literacy learning with the benefit of hindsight, the evidence for the effectiveness of incorporating each of the four features into responsive social learning contexts remains strong. Creating responsive social contexts for learning constitutes a powerful pedagogical strategy contributing to positive learning outcomes for many students. However, again with the benefit of hindsight, it is clear that there is something missing. Almost all of the earlier studies reviewed did not explicitly address issues of culture.

Although participants in the these studies came from different cultural backgrounds and communities (Māori, Pākehā, Pacific Island, Asian and other cultural communities), the studies did not incorporate knowledge bases or pedagogies that respect and promote the identities and values of those communities. They focused on the social dimension, perhaps at the expense of the cultural dimension, within sociocultural theorising. They did not explicitly appreciate the strength of the links between culture and learning that later emerged in the message that “culture counts” (Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Valenzuela, 1999; Villegas & Lucas, 2002).
There is a wide range of more recent research projects and programmes that have operationalised what culturally responsive pedagogy might look like in the context of improving the engagement and achievement of minoritised and marginalised students (Berryman, Glynn, & Glynn, 2001a; Berryman, Soohoo, & Nevin, 2013; Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh, & Teddy, 2009; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Gay, 2010; Glynn, Wearmouth, & Berryman, 2006; Ladson-Billings, 2005; Lucas & Villegas, 2010; Villegas & Lucas, 2011). However, in introducing two further studies I will draw on the focus employed in the large-scale New Zealand professional development project, Te Kotahitanga. This project has successfully improved the engagement and achievement of Māori students in mainstream education in New Zealand secondary schools (Bishop, Berryman, Tiakiwai, & Richardson, 2003; Bishop et al., 2009). The conceptual focus in Te Kotahitanga is on culturally responsive and relationship-based pedagogy.

Sleeter (2011) has reviewed the theoretical base, methodologies, findings on Māori student achievement, changes in classroom pedagogy, school-wide professional development and teacher practice outcomes following the implementation of Te Kotahitanga across 49 secondary schools. On the basis of her review of theorising underpinning the culturally responsive pedagogy employed within Te Kotahitanga, Sleeter concludes that by drawing on a pattern of Māori knowledge and metaphor (Bishop, 2005), educators can create culturally responsive and relationship-based learning contexts. These contexts build upon a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations that will improve the learning engagement and achievement of Māori students. Sleeter concurs with Bishop et al. (2009), who found that culturally responsive and relationship-based learning contexts are those learning contexts where: power is shared, culture counts, learning is interactive and dialogic, connectedness is fundamental to relations, and there is a common vision of what counts as excellence in Māori education. As noted earlier, responsive social learning contexts (Glynn, 1985) are those that support initiations by the learner, incorporate authentic shared activities, promote reciprocity and mutual influence, and provide appropriate and contingent feedback for learners.

Clearly these two types of learning contexts have much in common. Broadly speaking, both focus on issues of balance of power and control, on reciprocal or interactive learning, on the need for a common vision, and on the importance of relationships. The essential difference lies in the central positioning of culture within culturally responsive and relationship-based learning contexts.

I now introduce two further literacy research studies which I believe qualify both as responsive social contexts for learning and as culturally responsive relationship-based learning contexts.

The first research study involved the trial of a responsive written feedback procedure to improve the narrative writing of a class of 16 Year 3 and Year 4 students (Glynn, Berryman, Vanstone, & Weiss, 2008). Understanding socio-cultural perspectives on learning and development and implementing culturally responsive pedagogies that engage students from indigenous and other minoritised cultural backgrounds can be highly challenging for beginning teachers. This is especially so when the language and cultural backgrounds of teachers differ from those of their students and their cultural communities.
This study documents the work of one Pākehā mainstream teacher (the third author) in a Decile 1 school. Most of these students were English second language learners, and 14 were of Pacific Island origin, one was Māori and one was Afghani. For 10 weeks, responsive written feedback on their emergent writing was provided through the post by a ‘writing responder’. This was a young woman of Samoan and Māori descent, the fourth author and a friend of the teacher. She lived in a different city and did not know any of the students. However, she was able to engage successfully with the lived experiences of these students. Her written feedback responded to the events, messages and feelings expressed in their writing, but did not focus on correcting errors in spelling, punctuation or language structure. Responsive written feedback was introduced first to one group of 10 students, and later to a second group of six students.

Quantitative analyses of students’ writing indicated that following the introduction of the responsive written feedback, these students did not increase the total number of words they wrote, and the effect size of the pre-post change was minimal. However, both groups increased the number of ‘high-risk’ words in their writing (low frequency words beyond the students’ current spelling level) and the effect size of the pre-post change was moderate. Despite attempting more ‘high-risk’ words, one group maintained and the other group increased their spelling accuracy in their writing, and the effect size of the pre-post change for this group was moderate.

Analyses of the independent readers’ ratings of qualitative features of students’ writing showed that students received markedly higher ratings of their writing for reader interest and language fluency in their writing. The effect sizes of the pre-post changes were strong.

The findings support the idea that access to regular responsive written feedback can provide students with a socially and culturally responsive context for their writing, and that even their beginning writing can become a genuinely shared task. Their teacher’s comments reinforced this. As the 10-week responsive written feedback procedure progressed, she reported that her students became highly excited when their exercise books arrived back in the mail. They were strongly motivated to find out what their new friend had written to them. Many of these students had never received a letter from anyone prior to this. They were highly motivated, also, to write something back to her, and needed little assistance to think of things to say to their friend.

Data from this study are very encouraging. Successful teachers of minoritised and marginalised students do not have to come from the same language and cultural background of their students (Ladson-Billings, 1995). This teacher broadened and deepened her knowledge and understanding of her students through their writing. She collaborated with a friend of Samoan descent who shared her commitment to avoid deficit theorising about her Pacific Island students, and who respected her commitment to finding pedagogies that will improve their English literacy. Through the medium of writing, the responder was able to engage positively with the lived experiences of these Pacific Island students and those from other cultures. She was able to develop an ongoing relationship with them as a friend. This friendship motivated the students to share with her their own feelings and interests through the medium of writing, and by doing so, to improve the quality of their writing.

This study demonstrates the usefulness of both socio-cultural theory and culturally responsive relationship-based pedagogy for conceptualising ways to improve the literacy achievement of students who might potentially become marginalised and
minoritised in mainstream classrooms. Literacy learning is embedded in social and cultural contexts. This teacher was able to modify her classroom culture and make it safe for students to bring their own knowledge bases, values and lived experiences into the classroom.

The second study (Glynn & Berryman, 2003) introduces findings from one of nine schools participating in a home and school literacy project. Home-school liaison workers were trained to assist each school to develop a literacy partnership with students’ parents or whānau. The great majority of students and their whānau in this school, as well as many of the teachers, the principal, and members of the school Board of Trustees, were from one hapū of Ngāti Whakaue. Some of these students were learning to read and write in English, while others were learning to read and write in Māori as second language learners. This school provided a rich context for understanding the power of culturally responsive pedagogical approaches to school and community partnerships.

A key person in this context was Hiro, the school’s home-school liaison worker. Although not a member of this hapū and iwi, Hiro was widely known and respected within the school’s Māori community, and within the professional educational community in the city, for her knowledge of te reo Māori and her cultural expertise. Hiro succeeded in supporting the school’s whānau to participate and take ownership of the project in their school. Participating in the project enabled these parents to improve reading and writing outcomes for their children (whether they were learning in Māori or English medium settings) over and above outcomes achieved by students participating in the regular school reading and writing programmes.

This section presents excerpts from a collaborative narrative between Hiro and Mere Berryman. Hiro’s engagement with whānau identified key cultural concepts, actions and understandings that affirmed Māori parents’ cultural identities and also activated whānau processes. Her engagement generated authentic learning contexts, promoted reciprocity of learning and teaching roles, and shared ownership of the research project. These culturally located processes help explain the positive student reading results achieved, which have been reported elsewhere.

Affirming cultural identity

The most essential element identified was that Hiro not only understood but also affirmed the cultural background of her students, their whānau and their teachers. She affirmed them in the school, at home and in their community.

Hiro: One of the other liaison workers had difficulty getting a couple of the parents on board. But I think the problem there was because there was lack of communication between her and the senior teacher in charge of those bilingual children. Some of those children were in the bilingual class. There was no consultation [with the senior teacher in the bilingual classes] and she could have been a big help if the coordinator had asked her, but she wasn’t asked.

Mere: Why was it so important that she be asked?
From responsive social learning contexts to culturally responsive pedagogy:

Hiro: She knew those parents very well and she would have been able to help make the coordinator’s road a bit easier. It wouldn’t have been such a heavy job, getting them to come on board.

Mere: Do you know how she [the senior teacher] felt about not being asked?

Hiro: Ah, all she said was just “well I wasn’t asked, but kei te pai [that’s fine] because I’ve got plenty of work”. Some [liaison workers] have got the knack of getting around teachers without causing big hassles. Sometimes you need a bit of awhiawhi [support] and a bit of patipati [encouragement]… But some [teachers] tend to sort of take the approach that you’ve got to try and lay the law down. And some of our Māori parents back away from that. That approach sort of worries them so they go backwards. They won’t come forward.

Researchers experienced at first hand how teachers’ pre-judgement of parents can perpetuate the marginalisation of minority cultural groups (for example, concluding they were uncaring or apathetic if they did not attend meetings called by the school). The children and whānau Hiro worked with became part of her life and she part of theirs. This was not just a relationship that held for the research project and research meetings. It went beyond that. Values of individual achievement and competition between individuals that are so common in the majority culture were gradually replaced by values of collective achievement and collective responsibility for the wellbeing of all members of the research project.

Participants were developing relationships and patterns of organisation similar to those within a traditional Māori whānau. They had begun to operate in ways that called for Māori people to identify and act collectively.

Hiro: Well they sort of formed their own whānau and helped each other too. [It] didn’t matter that they weren’t brother and sister and that word whanaungatanga [interconnectedness] through relationships came out very strongly with that group of parents, with their ‘network’ going. We also had to share cassette recorders, and so one of them would finish with it, and go round the corner and pass it on the next one down the street…. And I got them all back at the end of the programme. So that was excellent. And they helped each other in that way. Well even with the responsive writing. That’s another way that whanaungatanga came out because as we said last time, they got sick of waiting for the teacher and they took control. I mean I started [by just] listening, but the busier I became, they decided that they would take control and they did…

Mere: That strong whānau network that had developed, I haven’t seen it in any of the other places. How do you think you got it?

Hiro: That’s the way our school is. Well we’ve got about 90% [Māori students and whānau]. And that’s the way our school is run. It’s run like a big whānau whether you are in mainstream [English medium] or immersion [Māori medium]. Everything is whānau.
Activating whānau processes

In establishing this home and school partnership, it was essential that these parents and whānau members exercised some control over the context and direction of their learning. Hiro and the school were striving to engage whānau members directly in their pedagogical practice. They believed whānau not only could but should become involved in the formal education of their children. Both groups were able to work alongside and learn from each other. The central collective focus was as much on promoting the wellbeing of the whole group (teachers and parents) as it was on improving literacy outcomes for students.

Hiro: … the hardest part was getting them into that routine of working with the teacher. Mind you, it was hard getting the teacher into the routine too!

… when it came to the responsive writing and brainstorming, well it ended up the parents decided they’d do it at home. They took it away from the teacher because they got sick of waiting for him and I can understand that, being a parent and a grandparent myself. But I can also understand the teacher, who was only new to our school so he was still getting to know his children and still settling in.

This example of collaborative problem solving provided an opportunity for the co-operative and active learning roles of the teacher and whānau to be interchanged, while keeping intact the mana of both teacher and parents. The project provided an authentic context for learning for the whānau and for Hiro herself. Whānau members were helping their children improve their reading and writing at school.

After this project was completed, the whānau continued to be active. More and more people have got on board the waka (canoe). They have participated in making two videotapes, which present the experience of the whānau and the school in the whole research process. The first video (Berryman et al., 2001a) depicts the various cultural qualities of the home and school partnership in this school, as conveyed through the stories and voices of students, parents, grandparents, teachers, principal and other school staff. The second video (Berryman, Glynn, & Glynn, 2001b) provides a detailed close-up of parents learning to use the tutoring procedures with children from their community. Both videos validate and affirm Māori culturally preferred ways of speaking, acting and theorising about their children’s learning to read at home and at school.

There are two important lessons to be learned from our experience on this project. The first is the central importance of culturally responsive pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995) in establishing effective literacy strategies for Māori students and students from other minoritised groups in mainstream schools. The second is the pedagogical power that emerges from activating whānau structures. Graham Smith is right in wanting to awaken whānau to intervene and revitalise language and culture (Smith, 1995). Within the context of home and school literacy partnerships, “culture counts” (Bishop & Glynn, 1999).
Conclusion

Reflecting on the findings from the earlier studies on responsive social learning contexts for literacy learning, together with the findings from the two more recent studies, confirms that the responsive social contexts created in these studies have much in common with the contexts created within culturally responsive and relationship-based pedagogy. Both address issues of balance of power and control (positioning of the learning and teaching roles). Both promote interactive and reciprocal learning and value the importance of sharing authentic learning goals and tasks. Both emphasise the central importance of building and maintaining learner-teacher relationships. The essential difference between the two types of contexts centres on the inclusion of cultural responsiveness.

While the earlier studies of responsive social learning contexts did not explicitly address issues of culture, their findings can contribute much to strengthening the pedagogy within culturally responsive and relationship-based learning contexts. The earlier research findings offer educators examples of specific well-researched strategies and operations that help to embed theory into educational practice.

The two later studies explored do address issues of culture. They engaged with Māori in the expressing and protecting of cultural identities and cultural values, and the interface of these identities and values with those of other cultures. These two studies incorporated specific cultural practices of their Māori participants, under the advice and guidance of kaumātua and kaia. This is evident in the way these studies negotiated the research questions, research designs, data-gathering procedures (particularly what ‘counts’ as data), and in the way they interpreted (made sense of) the research findings. In all of these negotiations, Māori voice and Māori agency are transparent. In my view, the strategic interventions carried out in these studies, while drawing much from Western/European positivist research, definitely ‘count’ as operational examples of culturally responsive and relationship-based pedagogy.
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