The importance of identity, language and culture for ākonga Māori

Introduction

This paper summarizes the findings of recent research completed by researchers at Kōtātā Insight using the Te Kupenga survey of Māori wellbeing. The research creates a new measure of Māori identity, language and culture, and links Te Kupenga respondents to ākonga Māori living in the same household. Researchers use this linkage for two applications: exploring the relationship between the identity, language and culture in the households of ākonga and their educational attainment; and estimating the impact that Māori medium education has on ākonga outcomes.

Key findings

The report finds that:

» There is notable diversity within ākonga Māori in terms of exposure to household identity, language and culture.

» Connection with identity, language and culture appears to have large effects on NCEA outcomes for ākonga Māori.

» Māori medium education works: ākonga attending Māori medium secondary schools have much higher attainment than their peers in English medium schools.

» Māori medium effect appears to be explained by factors relating to kaiako Māori – ākonga Māori in schools that do not offer Māori medium education but that have large concentrations of kaiako Māori achieve NCEA at similar rates to ākonga in schools offering Māori medium.

» Ākonga from households that most strongly emphasise the aspects of identity, language and culture measured here have the highest reported whānau wellbeing, and higher NCEA attainment rates than similar ākonga from households with different identity, language and culture profiles.
What is this paper about?

This paper is a brief outline of the findings of research recently conducted using the Te Kupenga survey of Māori wellbeing. This research leverages off the engagement done by Statistics NZ to identify and measure critical aspects of Māori identity, language and culture to understand how these cultural markers relate to educational attainment.

Connection with identity, language and culture is an important outcome allowing for a better understanding of self, the relationships and values that matter and how they are associated to wellbeing and other outcomes. The education system has an important role to play in supporting identity, language and culture, particularly for ākonga Māori. Research has demonstrated that a learning context that is responsive to the culture of the student – instead of one where the culture of the kaiako is given central focus – has the power to improve learning outcomes, as well as supporting cultural identity (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh, Teddy, 2009).

Connection with ākonga identity, language and culture is a central theme in many recent strategic priorities for the education system. Recent reforms relating to the Tomorrow’s Schools review, have focused on the goal of building a more responsive, accessible and integrated education system that ensures success for all ākonga (Ministry of Education, 2019a). In addition, the government’s nine priorities for the education system is to ‘incorporate te reo Māori and tikanga Māori in the everyday life of the place of learning (Ministry of Education, 2019b, p.3). The government’s Child and Youth Wellbeing Strategy articulates goals to free all children and young people to from racism and discrimination, and to be connected to their culture, language, beliefs and identity including whakapapa and tūrangawaewae (DMPC, 2019).

The current research was partially motivated by a desire to be able to measure and monitor the extent to which ākonga Māori connect with identity, language and culture. Among other benefits, having a measure of identity, language and culture makes it possible to assess whether these goals are being achieved over time, as well as identifying how identity, language and culture impacts and is impacted by other aspects of wellbeing.

How did the research measure identity, language and culture?

The research makes use of the Te Kupenga survey conducted in 2013. This was a representative survey of 5,549 people who identified as Māori (either by ethnicity or descent) in the 2013 Census. Te Kupenga asked respondents a range of questions relating to various aspects of Māori identity, language and culture. These aspects were derived from previous frameworks relating to Māori, including the Te Hoe Nuku Roa study by Durie (1995).

The researchers based their measures of Māori identity, language and culture on responses to a set of 23 individual questions in Te Kupenga about practices, capabilities, and attitudes relevant to Māori identity. The research used a statistical technique to group these items together into five major aspects, based on people’s responses. For example, people who indicated that they can speak te reo Māori also tended to answer that they can read and write te reo Māori, so the statistical technique grouped these items into a single ‘te reo Māori’ aspect. The five aspects of identity, language and culture that were identified in this way are shown in Table 1.

---

2 The research was conducted by Beltran-Castillon, Smith and Tibble (2019). For the full technical paper this summary is based on, see https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/schooling/nga-tamariki-o-te-kupenga-final-report.

3 Because this was a representative survey, we can use this relatively small sample to say something about the entire population. For this reason, when we count numbers of people in this report, these are extrapolated estimates across the entire population.

4 Researchers used exploratory factor analysis with a maximum likelihood oblique rotation to select 5 factors, explaining 52.8% of the total variance in responses.
Table 1: The five aspects of Māori cultural identity and connection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Captures:</th>
<th>High score represents someone who:</th>
<th>Low score represents someone who:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te reo</td>
<td>Fluency in te reo Māori as well as the use of te reo in the home.</td>
<td>is fluent in te reo Māori and who uses the language on a daily basis.</td>
<td>cannot speak te reo Māori or, at most, knows only a few words and phrases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūrangawaewae</td>
<td>The strength of traditional Māori identity and a sense of ‘being’ Māori.</td>
<td>is likely to identify solely as Māori and to be seen as Māori by others.</td>
<td>has Māori ethnicity, but is likely to identify with other ethnic backgrounds and may not be seen as Māori by others. They may not feel that being Māori is their primary identity and have little connection with their ancestral places or iwi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga</td>
<td>Engagement with traditional and modern Māori tikanga.</td>
<td>is frequently engaged in activities associated with Māori culture and has little need for support from family members to help with cultural issues.</td>
<td>is likely not to be engaged in Māori cultural activities and, if they needed to perform a mihi or speech in Māori, would likely need to look to family members for help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairua</td>
<td>Engagement with spirituality and religion.</td>
<td>is likely to find both religion and spirituality important, and to attend church regularly.</td>
<td>is likely to report a lack of spiritual connection and have little engagement with religion or church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahi marae</td>
<td>Engagement with and time on the marae.</td>
<td>is frequently on marae and contributes to the functioning of the marae by providing unpaid help and support with the tasks necessary for the functioning of the marae.</td>
<td>lacks significant connection to a marae.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Reproduced from Beltran-Castillon, Smith and Tibble (2019). For the full range of items grouped underneath each aspect, see the full report.

What types of identity, language and culture are school students exposed to?

It is important not to over-interpret the meaning of these groupings. They are merely a heuristic device to group people together who share similar connection to these cultural markers. In reality, people will be on a continuum of their connection to these aspects. This process is a mechanism to describe how many people associate more or less strongly with these dimensions.

One finding this research (as well as similar research, such as Houkamau and Sibley, 2010 and Durie, 1995) showed was that the aspects of identity, language and culture are multi-dimensional. The five aspects described above cannot be reduced to a single ‘Māori identity scale’, because there is no single way of ‘being Māori’. To get a sense of the different ways in which people engage with Māori identity, language and culture, the researchers used a different statistical technique⁵ to identify six groups of people who differed in terms of which aspects of Māori identity were more important to them.

---

⁵ Discrete cluster analysis was used to analyse the different profiles of Māori identity. A varying number of clusters were trialed from 3 to 8 clusters. After 6 clusters, adding more clusters contributed little to total variance, therefore 6 clusters were used.
The clusters of identity, language and culture this research identified

### Whero (23.4% of ākonga Māori)

Whero households report about average levels of emphasis on all aspects of identity, language and culture.

- **Ages of ākonga living in these households:**
  - 49% 5-10 years
  - 51% 11+ years

- **Ethnicities of ākonga living in these households:**
  - 36% Māori only
  - 36% Māori + 1 other
  - 53% Māori + 2 or more others

- **Household composition:**
  - 36% Māori only
  - 36% Māori + 1 other
  - 53% Māori + 2 or more others

- **Whānau wellbeing:**
  - 7.21/10

### Karaka (23.3% of ākonga Māori)

Karaka households do not strongly emphasise any of the five aspects of identity, language and culture.

- **Ages of ākonga living in these households:**
  - 45% 5-10 years
  - 55% 11+ years

- **Ethnicities of ākonga living in these households:**
  - 13% Māori only
  - 74% Māori + 1 other
  - 12% Māori + 2 or more others

- **Household composition:**
  - 18% Māori only
  - 60% Māori + 1 other
  - 21% Māori + 2 or more others

- **Whānau wellbeing:**
  - 7.41/10

### Kahurangi (16.0% of ākonga Māori)

Kahurangi households place particularly high emphasis on mahi marae, tūrangawaewae, and tikanga Māori.

- **Ages of ākonga living in these households:**
  - 47% 5-10 years
  - 53% 11+ years

- **Ethnicities of ākonga living in these households:**
  - 39% Māori only
  - 53% Māori + 1 other
  - 8% Māori + 2 or more others

- **Household composition:**
  - 18% Māori only
  - 51% Māori + 1 other
  - 31% Māori + 2 or more others

- **Whānau wellbeing:**
  - 7.16/10

Different groups emphasise different identity, language and culture aspects - but all describe equally valid ways of ‘being Māori’.
The Kākāriki group represents Māori households that strongly emphasise all aspects of Māori identity, language and culture

**Waiporoporo (13.2% of ākonga Māori)**

Waiporoporo households put more emphasis on te reo Māori and tūrangawaewae, with other aspects being slightly above average.

Ages of ākonga living in these households:
- 52% 5-10 years
- 48% 11+ years

Ethnicities of ākonga living in these households:
- 48% Māori only
- 43% Māori + 1 other
- 6% Māori + 2 or more others

Household composition:
- 17% Māori only
- 41% Māori + 1 other
- 42% Māori + 2 or more others

7.23/10 Whānau wellbeing

**Kōwhai (12.6% of ākonga Māori)**

Kōwhai households strongly emphasise the wairua aspect of identity, language and culture. These households put below-average emphasis on the other four aspects.

Ages of ākonga living in these households:
- 40% 5-10 years
- 60% 11+ years

Ethnicities of ākonga living in these households:
- 24% Māori only
- 60% Māori + 1 other
- 21% Māori + 2 or more others

Household composition:
- 18% Māori only
- 51% Māori + 1 other
- 31% Māori + 2 or more others

7.16/10 Whānau wellbeing

**Kākāriki (11.4% of ākonga Māori)**

Kakariki households strongly emphasise all aspects of Māori identity, language and culture, having the highest scores on almost every aspect.

Ages of ākonga living in these households:
- 47% 5-10 years
- 53% 11+ years

Ethnicities of ākonga living in these households:
- 60% Māori only
- 33% Māori + 1 other
- 4% Māori + 2 or more others

Household composition:
- 21% Māori only
- 44% Māori + 1 other
- 31% Māori + 2 or more others

7.51/10 Whānau wellbeing

*Note:* Whānau wellbeing is the response to a subjective question asking Te Kupenga respondents to rate “how their whānau is doing” on a scale from 0 to 10, where 0 is ‘extremely badly’ and 10 is ‘extremely well’. Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding and suppression of small categories.
These groups are labelled according to colours: Karaka, Whero, Kahurangi, Waiporoporo, Kōwhai, and Kākāriki. The labels for these clusters are deliberately arbitrary. This was to avoid creating connotations associated with any of these groups – all describe equally valid ways of ‘being Māori’. It is important to note that there is still a lot of diversity in identity, language and culture between individuals within these six major groups. The groups are simplistic categories that allow us to explore and illustrate the importance of identity, language and culture, but do not adequately describe the totality of an individual’s lived experiences.

To explore the importance of identity, language and culture in the education system, the research used Statistics New Zealand’s Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI) to link Te Kupenga respondents with any ākonga Māori living in the same household.7 The IDI is a secure dataset that allows researchers to link survey data such as Te Kupenga to other anonymised data collected by the government, such as other people living at the same address, as well as education, income, health, and neighbourhood and regional characteristics. Because our focus is on the educational implications of identity, language and culture, the rest of this report will discuss ākonga grouped by the cluster of their household.

Each cluster has varying degrees of connection to these aspects of identity, language and culture. Kākāriki households place strong emphasis on all aspects of identity, language and culture we examined, while Karaka households do not strongly emphasise any aspect. Whero households have about average emphasis on each aspect. The remaining three clusters mostly reported average values on most aspects, with some emphasis on wairua for Kōwhai, te reo Māori and tūrangawaewae for Waiporoporo, and mahi marae, tūrangawaewae and tikanga Māori for Kahurangi.

These groups are also quite different in terms of their demographics. For example, ākonga Māori living in:

» Waiporoporo households are relatively young, while those in Kōwhai households are relatively old.
» Kākāriki households are more likely to solely identify as Māori, whereas a majority of ākonga Māori in Karaka households also identify as Pākehā.
» Karaka households mostly live with their parents and siblings, while 42 percent of ākonga in Waiporoporo households also live with adults who are not their parents.

These clusters are not necessarily distributed evenly across the country.8 There is a fair distribution of ākonga from Karaka, Whero, Kōwhai and Waiporoporo households across all school regions. However, the Kākāriki group is dominant in the Northland and Bay of Plenty regions, while almost non-existent in the South Island and Auckland regions. The Kahurangi group has fair representation across all regions except in the South Island. The South Island is mostly dominated by the Karaka, Whero and Kōwhai groups.

Quantifying the importance of identity, language and culture in education

The researchers examined relationships between identity, language and culture and two measures of educational attainment: the attainment of the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) Level 2 and University Entrance (UE). Both measures only indicate whether ākonga attain the measure or not, and do not clarify the range of subjects taken or achievement levels. There are also concerns that assessments such as NCEA do not always recognise the range of educational success that is important to Māori (Ministry of Education, 2019c). However, there is relatively little data available on educational outcomes other than NCEA, so our analysis is unavoidably limited in this way.

6 Some identity, language and culture details are best explored through qualitative work, such as Houkamau and Sibley (2010).
7 In total, the researchers identified 1683 students who lived in the same household as a person who completed Te Kupenga. In 369 cases, the student themselves completed the survey.
8 Figure 14 in the full report shows the distribution of students across New Zealand according to the six clusters of household identity, language and culture.
Figure 1 shows the relationship between living in households with different identity, language and culture profiles and the subsequent attainment of ākonga. The results are presented as odds ratios, relative to ākonga in Karaka households. If a cluster is above 1, this means ākonga from this type of household are more likely to achieve NCEA Level 2 or UE than similar ākonga from Karaka households. When the researchers statistically adjust for the effects of other factors that drive educational outcomes, so that only identity, language and culture is isolated as the only effect on outcomes, the research finds that ākonga Māori from all types of households outperform or do just as well as ākonga from Karaka households in NCEA Level 2. In particular, the results imply as ākonga from Whero and Kākāriki households are about 1.1 times as likely as ākonga from Karaka households to attain NCEA as similar ākonga from Karaka households.10

Some of the differences between clusters in terms of attaining UE are even larger. The results imply that ākonga from Kākāriki households are about 1.3 times as likely as ākonga with similar characteristics from Karaka households. In contrast, ākonga from Kōwhai households are about 0.7 times as likely to attain UE as similar ākonga from Karaka. In total, these findings indicate that aspects of Māori identity, language and culture that ākonga are exposed to can be highly predictive of educational outcomes over and above the benefits they can provide to the cultural identity and wellbeing of ākonga. However, findings such as the lower odds for Kōwhai relative to Karaka also indicate that these relationships can be complex, and do not always translate to a higher emphasis on Māori identity, language and culture leading to higher attainment.

Note: The results represented here have adjusted for other relevant differences (mentioned in footnote 9) between ākonga. Error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.

9 The statistical model adjusts for the effects of demographics, family background, and deprivation, including ākonga gender and additional ethnicities, whether ākonga received learning support, NZ Deprivation Index, household crowding, household income, parents’ education, and whether either parent was supported by a benefit were controlled for in this model.

10 For the figures discussed in the text, the odds ratios in Figure 3 have been converted to approximate relative risks. In this case, an odds ratio of 1.3 translates to a relative risk of approximately 1.3. For this reason, the numbers do not directly correspond to those in the figure.
The impact of Māori medium education

Another application of this measure of identity, language and culture is that we can use it to get a better estimate of the impact of Māori medium education (MME) on outcomes. To quantify the effect of Māori medium education on outcomes, the researchers extended the results shown in Figure 1 to sequentially include variables that show whether a student attends a Māori medium school or not. At the time of doing this research, the IDI did not contain an indicator for each ākonga that showed whether they themselves participated in Māori medium education. Instead, the researchers used an indicator of whether the last school/kura attended offered Māori medium education. Because some schools offer a combination of Māori medium and English medium (EME), this means some ākonga in our sample might attend a Māori medium school yet receive instruction entirely in English medium. This means that our estimates are likely to underestimate the benefits of Māori medium education.

Figure 2 shows the effect of Māori identity clusters and attendance of a Māori medium school on educational outcomes. The results imply that ākonga who attend Māori medium schools are about 1.1 times as likely to attain NCEA Level 2, and about 1.3 times as likely to attain University Entrance, as ākonga who attend English medium schools, but who have similar socio-economic backgrounds and live in households with similar identity, language and culture profiles. While this research is not totally conclusive, this is strong evidence that Māori medium education is more effective than English medium education in promoting learning outcomes for ākonga Māori.

Figure 2: The impact of Māori medium education on NCEA and UE

It is interesting to note that the higher outcomes for Kākāriki are not diminished by the inclusion of the Māori medium education factor. (That is, the odds ratios associated with Kākāriki households in Figure 2 are similar to the odds ratios in Figure 1.) Being a student from the Kākāriki household is still associated with much higher odds of attaining NCEA Level 2 and UE. This implies that the exposure to this household identity, language and culture might confer an additional benefit to ākonga learning regardless of whether the ākonga participates in Māori medium or English medium education.

Note: The results represented here have adjusted for other relevant differences (mentioned in footnote 9) between ākonga. Error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.

11 Māori medium education describes learning environments where ākonga receive at least 51 percent of their instruction in te reo Māori. This can include schools where instruction is entirely in te reo, as well as schools where some students receive instruction in te reo and others learn in English.

12 These results are consistent with the school leavers data published on Education Counts (Ministry of Education, 2019e) that show superior outcomes for ākonga in MME relative to those in EME over the period 2009-2018.

13 This research is not fully conclusive because there might be other unobserved differences between ākonga in Māori medium and English medium schools that researchers have been unable to account for here such as whānau characteristics.
A 25 percent increase in kaikō Māori within a school (whether Māori medium and English medium) is associated with being 1.3 times as likely to attain university entrance.

This finding of a large benefit associated with Māori medium education raises the question of what characteristics of Māori medium education might be causing these benefits. As one possibility, the researchers investigate the potential impact of teachers who are Māori (kaikō Māori). Available data does not allow researchers to match ākonga to their kaikō, so the research instead uses the proportion of kaikō at each school/kura who are Māori. Figure 3 shows the impact of a 25 percent or more proportion of kaikō Māori on educational outcomes.

The results imply that a 25 percent increase in kaikō Māori within a school (whether Māori medium or English medium) is associated with being 1.1 times as likely to attain NCEA Level 2, and 1.3 times as likely to attain UE. An interesting observation from these results is that once the researchers add the effect of kaikō Māori, the impact that Māori medium education has on outcomes is eliminated for NCEA level 2, and is substantially reduced for UE. This suggests that the benefits of Māori medium education are conferred largely through factors relating to kaikō, as opposed to any other differences between the sectors.

One potential concern with these findings is that if there are no English medium schools with high proportions of kaikō Māori, then the Māori medium variable and the kaikō Māori variable might really be two measures of the same concept – whether the school offered Māori medium or not. Further exploration of the Te Kupenga linked data showed that there were 108 ākonga Māori in the linked Te Kupenga sample who attend schools that do not offer Māori medium education, but where more than half of kaikō are Māori. This compares to 243 ākonga in the sample who attended schools offering Māori medium with a majority of kaikō Māori. A comparison of NCEA results for ākonga Māori in schools not offering Māori medium also indicates that achievement rates are substantially higher in the schools where the majority of kaikō are Māori (78 percent, compared to 68 percent in schools with fewer kaikō Māori). While this is not a conclusive comparison (because it does not adjust for the effects of other differences in these groups of ākonga), it does indicate that there are English medium schools with high proportions of kaikō Māori, and provides supporting evidence that kaikō Māori support positive attainment outcomes, whether in Māori medium or English medium education.

Figure 3: The impact of kaikō Māori on NCEA and UE

Note: The results represented here have adjusted for other relevant differences (mentioned in footnote 9) between ākonga. Error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.

The importance of identity, language and culture for ākonga Māori

It is interesting to note that the higher outcomes for Kākāriki are not diminished by the inclusion of the Māori medium education factor. (That is, the odds ratios associated with Kākāriki households in Figure 2 are similar to the odds ratios in Figure 1.) Being a student from the Kākāriki household is associated with being 1.3 times as likely to attain university entrance.

Figure 2: The impact of kura identity on NCEA and UE

Note: The results represented here have adjusted for other relevant differences (mentioned in footnote 9) between ākonga. Error bars represent the 95% confidence intervals.
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Implications

Identity, language and culture is commonly acknowledged as a critical outcome for ākonga Māori. This research indicates that it is possible to construct measures of identity, language and culture, and provides a blueprint for how these measures could be continue to be collected, either within or outside of the education system. The research also demonstrates that the identity, language and culture present in the households of ākonga Māori are often strongly related to their attainment at school. In particular, ākonga in Kākāriki households (which most strongly emphasise all aspects of Māori identity, language and culture) have the highest whānau wellbeing and achieve the highest attainment outcomes, after adjusting for relevant differences between groups. This further supports findings from previous studies showing that when the education system intentionally cultivates and enhances the mana, mauri and tapu of ākonga Māori it also ultimately positively impacts on the wellbeing and educational outcomes of these students.

The research has also provided the most conclusive quantitative evidence to date that Māori medium education has large positive impacts on the learning outcomes of ākonga Māori. Further, the research implies that the much of the mechanism through which Māori medium education is effective is the concentration of kaiako Māori at the kura. There are some English medium schools with high concentrations of kaiako Māori, and ākonga Māori at these schools also appear to achieve highly. Workforce data indicates that the proportion of kaiako in secondary schools who are Māori has been consistently increasing, from 8 percent in 2004 to 12 percent in 2018 (Ministry of Education, 2019f). The results of this research imply that further increasing the representation of kaiako Māori is likely to have particular benefits for the educational outcomes of ākonga Māori.

Exactly how kaiako Māori more effectively promote learning of ākonga Māori is not addressed in this research. This benefit could come through creating a culturally safe environment, expressed through the absence of racist harassment, low expectations and damaging stereotypes (see McGregor & Webber, 2019 for an exploration of racism and discrimination in secondary schools). Another possibility is that kaiako Māori are more able to promote positive kaiako-ākonga relationships through a culturally responsive teaching approach (Alton-Lee, 2015), or provide a positive role model for ākonga Māori (Gershenson et al., 2018). Kaiako Māori could also be more effective in engaging whānau in the learning process, and coordinating between learning in the classroom and learning at home, in addition to deliberately connecting with ākonga through their shared identity, language and culture.

These findings have two important implications for policy and practice. The first is that it is important to ensure that Māori medium education is accessible for any ākonga who wants it. While access to Māori medium is increasingly available in primary school, barriers to studying in te reo Māori in senior secondary years are much higher, and this may not currently be an option available for all ākonga. This is likely to require supporting the development of te reo Māori proficiency in the secondary teacher workforce, as well as exploring options for how to deliver a range of subject options in kura that may not always be large.

The implication for practice from this research is that there are likely to be important lessons non-Māori kaiako can learn from kaiako Māori (in both Māori and English medium settings) on how to establish and sustain the conditions for educational success.14 Given the findings of this research, much of this effective practice from kaiako Māori is likely to come through acknowledging, supporting and promoting the identity, language and culture of ākonga Māori and their whānau.

---

14 One avenue for facilitating the sharing of culturally-responsive practice is the recently-announced Te Hurihanganui: https://www.education.govt.nz/our-work/publications/budget-2019/restarting-te-kotahitanga-te-hurihanganui/
Disclaimer

The results in this report are not official statistics, they have been created for research purposes from the Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI), managed by Statistics New Zealand. The opinions, findings, recommendations, and conclusions expressed in this report are those of the author, not Statistics NZ or Department of Education.

Access to the anonymised data used in this study was provided by Statistics NZ in accordance with security and confidentiality provisions of the Statistics Act 1975. Only people authorised by the Statistics Act 1975 are allowed to see data about a particular person, household, business, or organisation, and the results in this report have been confidentialised to protect these groups from identification.

The results are based in part on tax data supplied by Inland Revenue to Statistics NZ under the Tax Administration Act 1994. This tax data must be used only for statistical purposes, and no individual information may be published or disclosed in any other form, or provided to Inland Revenue for administrative or regulatory purposes.

Any person who has had access to the unit record data has certified that they have been shown, have read, and have understood section 81 of the Tax Administration Act 1994, which relates to secrecy. Any discussion of data limitations or weaknesses is in the context of using the IDI for statistical purposes, and is not related to the data’s ability to support Inland Revenue’s core operational requirements.

Careful consideration has been given to the privacy, security, and confidentiality issues associated with using administrative and survey data in the IDI. Further detail can be found in the privacy impact assessment for the Integrated Data Infrastructure available from www.stats.govt.nz.

For other issues go to: www.educationcounts.govt.nz/goto/whakaaro

Look out in your inbox for the next He Whakaaro.

For further information, questions or discussion around additional analysis and potential topics for an Education Insights please contact Requests.EDk@education.govt.nz
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