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Abstract

If we look at a child’s colouring book, before it has any colour added to it, we think of the page as blank. It’s actually not blank, it’s white. That white background is just “there” and we don’t think much about it. Not only is the background uniformly white, the lines are already in place and they dictate where the colour is allowed to go. When children are young, they don’t care where they put the colours, but as they get older they colour in more and more cautiously. They learn about the place of colour and the importance of staying within the pre-determined boundaries and expectations.

This thesis argues that this is the setting for our mainstream, or what I have called, whitestream New Zealand schools — that white background is the norm. When we talk about multiculturalism and diversity what we are really referring to is the colour of the children, or their difference from that white norm, and how they don’t fit perfectly inside our lines. If the colour of the space doesn’t change schools are still in the business of assimilation, relegating non-white children to the margins, no matter how many school reform initiatives, new curricula, strategic plans, or mandated standards we implement. What the schools in this study have tried to do is change the colour of the space - so that the space fits the children and they don’t have to constantly adjust to fit in.

New Zealand’s education system has been largely silent on the topic of whiteness and the Eurocentric nature of our schooling policy and practice. However, when I talk to senior Māori and Pasifika ‘warrior-scholars” in Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School about “white spaces” they have encountered in their schooling experience they can identify them all too easily. “White spaces,” they explain, are anything you accept as “normal” for Māori - when it’s really not, any situation that prevents, or works against you “being Māori” or who you are, and that requires you to “be” someone else and leave your beliefs behind. White spaces are spaces that allow you to require less of yourself and that reinforce stereotypes and negative ideas about Māori. Most telling of all was the comment from a Māori student that goes straight to the root of the problem, “White spaces are everywhere,” she said, “even in your head.”

This thesis describes the 25 year journey of two schools and their community’s determination to resist and reject alienating school environments in favour of a relevant culturally-located, bilingual learning model based in a secure cultural identity, stable positive relationships, and aroha (authentic caring and love). While the research design is a case study, in terms of western, “white space” academic tradition, it is also a story in terms of kaupapa Māori and critical race methodology. More importantly, it is a counter-story that chronicles the efforts of these two schools to step outside education’s “white spaces” to create new space. This counter-story is juxtaposed against pervasive, deficit-driven whitestream explanations of “achievement gaps” and
the “long tail” of Māori and Pasifika “under-achievement” in New Zealand schools. In the process of this research the focus shifted from how could Māori and Pasifika learners develop secure cultural identities in mainstream schools, to examining what barriers exist in schools that prevent this from happening already? As these issues became clear the language of the thesis shifted accordingly; “developing” a cultural identity was reframed as a reclamation of educational sovereignty — the absolute right to “be Māori” or “be Pasifika” in school — and “mainstream” schooling became better understood as the “whitestream.”

The study hopes to contribute to the journey other schools might take to identify and name their own white spaces, and to make learning equitable for indigenous and minoritised learners.
Original art work by Blaine Te Rito

The design was initially inspired by the black and white image of a classroom scene in which the faces of two pupils were coloured in brown shade.

It reminds me of how over time we as tangata whenua have had to fit in and conform to the structure and values of foreign interests.

This design reflects the cultural diversity of the students within Kia Aroha College. I focused on artistic symbols from throughout Aotearoa and the Pacific region from which many of the students descend. These symbols also refer to their proud and noble ancestors through whose authority we were successful in developing thriving and effective societies throughout these regions ...until the arrogant establishment of foreign interests within these borders, which is still perpetuated today. This situation is not unique to Aotearoa.

The circle represents the importance of these pre-colonial societal structures viz; education, language, culture, theology, and environmental resources.

The break in the circle represents the disruption and the white spaces incurred, and the difficulty of re-completing the circle with pieces or structures that just don’t fit.
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Chapter One

The Whitestream

Historically, Indigenous peoples have insisted upon the right of access to education. Invariably the nature, and consequently the outcome, of this education has been constructed through and measured by non-Indigenous standards, values and philosophies. Ultimately the purpose of this education has been to assimilate Indigenous peoples into non-Indigenous cultures and societies. (The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights in Education, 1999)

The Coolangatta Statement represents a collective voice of Indigenous peoples from around the world who support fundamental principles considered vital to achieving reform and transformation of education for Indigenous peoples. The need for such reform and transformation is self-evident. Over the last 30 years, Indigenous peoples throughout the world have argued that they have been denied equity in non-Indigenous education systems which have failed to provide educational services that nurture the whole Indigenous person inclusive of scholarship, culture and spirituality.

Each chapter in this thesis is introduced with a quote from The Coolangatta Statement. This Statement locates the issues faced by Māori and Pasifika youth in New Zealand’s education system, central to this study, within the international indigenous context.

Introduction

This thesis proposes that a secure cultural identity is crucial to children’s growth and success. However, many of our schools constitute “white spaces” that deny Māori and Pasifika students this crucial identity, because they operate within a racialised social order that is toxic to the development of their Māori and Pasifika students (Ballard, 2008). To address this issue new practices and pedagogies are needed that are not framed by, or limited to, Eurocentric norms. Māori and Pasifika students’ schooling experiences will be enhanced when schools understand what success as Māori, as Samoan, as Tongan, or as Cook Islands Māori, looks like in everyday practice, and when schools learn how to support the development of students’ cultural identities and critical consciousness. These are essential if Māori and Pasifika students are to
become equal partners in the construction of knowledge. When schools implement curriculum and relationships-based pedagogies that respond to Māori and Pasifika values and knowledges, Māori and Pasifika students will succeed both in terms of their own languages and cultures as well as in terms of those of the mainstream education system.

This chapter identifies some of the toxins within education policy and practice that marginalise and minoritise Māori and Pasifika youth. The importance of cultural identity is discussed in this chapter and the central concept of White Spaces in our whitestream education system is introduced. The chapter examines the different contexts that background the pedagogical changes that have been developed in Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School to address barriers in our education system that prevent Māori and Pasifika learners realising their potential. These contexts include local community, regional and national settings, national achievement data, and Māori and Pasifika perspectives. The final section of this chapter describes the Power Lenses Learning Model (Milne, 2004) which is the schools’ response to “colouring in the white spaces” to empower Māori and Pasifika students to learn “as” Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Islands Māori.

**Previous Study**

My masters’ thesis, “They didn’t care about normal kids like me.” Restructuring a school to fit the kids (Milne, 2004), found that the disempowerment that Māori and Pasifika communities share is perpetuated by the pervasive white lens through which our education systems structure and view learning. In order to empower indigenous and ethnic minority students to challenge existing school structures to make learning more relevant and accessible, it is necessary to change this white lens. The thesis developed the notion of three interdependent lenses of equal status. Most important of these is a ‘self’ lens which empowers learners to develop cultural competence and identity within the school setting. In this model these competencies are not seen as peripheral to the school curriculum or as a stepping stone towards higher ‘academic’ achievement but as legitimate and high status achievements in their own right. The study found that the development of children’s cultural identity was crucial to their success at school as Māori, as Samoan, as Tongan or as Cook Islands Māori.

**This Study**

The present thesis, a qualitative intrinsic case study (Stake 2000, p.437), continues to explore and understand the issue of the alienation of indigenous and ethnic minority students within mainstream school systems, that is endemic both in New Zealand and internationally. It examines the different contexts, backgrounds, and pedagogical changes that were developed in Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School to challenge barriers preventing Māori and Pasifika learners from realising their potential. The thesis employs the analytical tool, the “Power Lenses Learning Model” (Milne, 2004), to “colour in the white spaces.” This tool is used to analyse and
interpret the research findings concerning students’ growth in self-knowledge, school knowledge and global knowledge.

While the research design is a case study, in terms of western, “white space” academic tradition, it is also a story in terms of kaupapa Māori (Māori ideology/philosophy) and critical race methodology. More importantly, it is a counter-story that chronicles the efforts of these two schools to step outside education’s “white spaces” and create new space. This counter-story is juxtaposed against pervasive, deficit-driven whitestream explanations of “achievement gaps” and the “long tail” of Māori and Pasifika “under-achievement” in New Zealand schools. Over time the research focus shifted from asking how Māori and Pasifika learners might develop secure cultural identities in mainstream schools, to examining what barriers exist that prevent this from happening already? As these issues became clear the language of the thesis shifted accordingly; “developing” a cultural identity was reframed as a reclamation of educational sovereignty—the absolute right to “be Māori” or “be Pasifika” in school—and “mainstream” schooling became better understood as the “whitestream.”

**The Whitestream**

Tomlins-Jahnke (2007) describes “mainstream” schools as follows:

> Most Māori children in Aotearoa New Zealand are located in state mainstream schools where for many there is a disjuncture between the culture of the home and that of the school, between the lived realities of family and the school habitus. The term mainstream is a euphemism or code word for schools that privilege a western/Eurocentric education tradition. Mainstream schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand are controlled by those who have political, economic and cultural power and where western values, knowledge, culture and the English language are the central focus of the school habitus. Schools incorporate aspects of Māori language and culture as additions rather than core components of the curriculum or school knowledge. (pp. 6, 7)

Denis (1997) defines “whitestream” as the idea that while American society is not “White” in sociodemographic terms it remains principally and fundamentally structured on the basis of the Anglo-European, “White” experience. Grande (2000a) points out that “mainstream” implies “white.” She uses the term whitestream as opposed to mainstream to “decenter whiteness.” Urrieta (2009, p.181) defines “whitestream schools” as all schools, “from kindergarten through graduate school and to the official and unofficial texts used in U.S. schools that are founded on the practices, principles, morals, and values of white supremacy and that highlight the history of white Anglo-American culture.” He believes however, that the normalcy of whiteness and white supremacy in “mainstream” schools is not exclusively the work of whites and that, “Any person, including people of color, actively promoting or upholding white models as the goal or standard is also involved in whitestreaming” (p. 181).
In agreement with Tomlins-Jahnke (2007), I find the term “mainstream” to be a euphemism for an education system which normalise practice that damages Māori and Pasifika learners and has “consistently treated [Māori learners] paternalistically, watching them to see whether they were capable of being as good as Pākehā” (Penetito, 2010, p.51). The word “mainstream” therefore will not be used in the remainder of this thesis to describe our New Zealand education system or schools unless it is used in a quotation or in summary of another work. The title of this thesis, “Colouring in the White Spaces: Reclaiming Cultural Identity in Whitestream Schools,” reflects this decision to intentionally reject the notion of a “mainstream” which marginalises and fails Māori and Pasifika children, and to use the term “whitestream” as a more truthful descriptor.

In direct contrast to “whitestreaming,” Durie (2001, 2003) proposes a framework for considering Māori educational advancement and “Māori-centred” education. He identifies three broad goals for Māori in our education system; to live as Māori, to participate as citizens of the world and to enjoy good health and a high standard of living. This thesis explores the development of cultural students’ competence and cultural identity at the combined school campus of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga, in Otara. It provides a model of what ‘living as Māori,’ or as Samoan, as Tongan, or as Cook Islands Māori, looks like in these school settings.

The Research Topic

The New Zealand Ministry of Education’s Māori Education Strategy 2008-2012, Ka Hikitia (Ministry of Education 2008a) has the goal, “Māori children enjoying success as Māori” (my emphasis). This strategic intent is explained in this way:

‘Māori enjoying education success as Māori’ means having an education system that provides all Māori learners with the opportunity to get what they require to realise their own unique potential and succeed in their lives as Māori. Succeeding as Māori captures and reflects that identity and culture are essential ingredients of success. (Ministry of Education 2008b, p.18)

If identity and culture are essential ingredients of success at school, then conversely, the denial of that identity and culture will significantly impact on that success.

Hypothesis

My hypothesis is that it is possible to connect young people to their cultural identity and all facets of their learning through a pedagogy that “colours in” the white school spaces. ‘Colouring in the white spaces’ will empower Māori and Pasifika students to experience the same quality of educational sovereignty as Pākehā (New Zealander of European descent/white) students, to be secure in their cultural identity, to be critically conscious and to become equal partners in the construction of knowledge that is relevant to their past, their present, and their future.
Specific Research Questions

I am the principal of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga, two decile one schools in Otara, Manukau, New Zealand. A few years ago I was waiting in my office, with a group of visitors, for word from the Samoan bilingual unit that they were ready for the visitors to attend an ‘ava ceremony. I was seated with my back to my open office door and, as we chatted, I noticed the visitors’ attention attracted to something behind me. I turned to find a Samoan student seated on the floor in the doorway. When I acknowledged her she quietly said, “Lumana’i are ready for you Miss.” She then shuffled, still seated, out of our sight. One of the visitors commented that we should have noticed her earlier as she must have felt too shy to knock and interrupt us.

When I related this story to our Samoan staff later they were delighted. No one had told the student to do this. She simply had been sent to let the visitors know it was time to come. Mageo, (1889, p.420) explains that because relative physical elevation is a Polynesian metaphor for relative social elevation, Samoan children are not allowed to address seated elders while standing but must sit down themselves so that their head is beneath that of their perceived superior. The decision to follow this appropriate Samoan cultural norm was the student’s alone. To Samoan staff this was an achievement worthy of the highest recognition and a clear indicator that the student was well versed in fa‘asamoa. I have told this story many times since. It raises the questions that are the basis of this research:

1. What were the conditions that existed in the school that made it both acceptable and comfortable to empower the student to follow her cultural norms, even in the palagi principal’s office and to a group who were not Samoan?
2. Why was this important?
3. How would this confidence and cultural competence benefit her?
4. Had the school contributed to the development of her knowledge in this area in any way or was this purely due to her home background?
5. How could the school ensure all students had this same strength in their own cultural identity?
6. How would we know this was developing?
7. What would be the Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Island Māori ways of knowing that young people were developing these skills?

1 A school’s decile in the New Zealand indicates the extent to which the school draws its students from low socio-economic communities. Decile 1 schools are the 10% of schools with the highest proportion of students from low socio-economic communities.
2 Traditional Samoan welcome ceremony
3 The name of the Samoan unit at Clover Park Middle School – meaning ‘future’
4 The ‘Samoan way’ – traditional Samoan practice
5 Samoan for White / European
8. How can schools recognise, and address, barriers that exist in their practice to the development of a secure cultural identity?

Although these questions are focused on culture, the findings reported later also demonstrate changes in self, school, and global learning that illustrate the need for critical consciousness and participation in the co-construction of knowledge. Dei (2011, p.168) places the struggle to retain one’s identity within the struggle to wrestle control of knowledge production from the coloniser. He states, “Indigenous knowledge is about resistance, not in the romanticized sense, but resistance as struggle to navigate the tensions of today’s modernized, globalized world while seeking to disrupt its universalizing, hegemonic norms.” The development of one’s cultural identity in a whitestream education system cannot be separated from this struggle.

Penetito (2010, p.269) explains that being Māori “goes all the way down” and that while there are many ways to be Māori, one constant is that the collective has priority over the individual. The individual “can only become truly well-developed by evolving a consciousness of self in relation to objects (people, things and events) outside or beyond the self.” The hypothesis for this thesis suggests that the development of a cultural identity for Māori and Pasifika learners in New Zealand schools also has to “go all the way back” to develop a critical awareness of the role of schooling as a tool of colonisation and assimilation, “all the way across” to understand events, policies and thinking that shape contemporary whitestream schooling in the present, and “all the way forward” to develop new knowledge and pedagogies to co-construct a different educational pathway for the future.

The significance of the study

The New Zealand Government’s annual report, The Social Report 2010, (Ministry of Social Development, 2010) identifies ten discrete domains or areas of people’s lives, such as health, education, standard of living and safety, which are referred to as “ideal” social outcomes rather than specific targets (p.4). One of the ten domains is cultural identity. The desired outcome for cultural identity is that: “New Zealanders share a strong national identity, have a sense of belonging and value cultural diversity. Everybody is able to pass their cultural traditions on to future generations. Māori culture is valued and protected” (p.9).

There is little doubt, however, that far from being “valued and protected,” the wellbeing of Māori youth in New Zealand schools is in crisis. Tomlins-Jahnke (2007) suggests that the pattern of consistent Māori underachievement over many decades seems to confirm a certain level of Government tolerance of the crisis in Māori education. The Ministry of Education’s Statement of Intent 2011/12 - 2016/17 (Ministry of Education 2011a), claims a focus on improving the education system’s performance for all students. It acknowledges however, that the system performs better for students in higher decile schools, and for European/Pākehā students and Asian students (p.8).
Groups of students “currently under-served by the system” are identified as “Māori students, Pasifika students, students from low socio-economic communities and students with special education needs” (p.8). “But,” the strategy promises, “we will do better.” “Better” for the “underserved” groups is defined in terms of “accelerated literacy and numeracy achievement” (p.18), accelerated achievement for Māori and Pasifika students, and improved retention and engagement in learning. The goals of Ka Hikitia (Ministry of Education, 2008a) and the Pasifika Education Plan (Ministry of Education, 2009d) are specified, again in terms of the “improved” and “increased” achievement and engagement of young people and their families. In spite of references throughout the document to “culturally responsive teaching” and “cultural identity” there is no reference to the assets and cultural knowledges these students might already have.

These Government measures might well align with Māori and Pasifika aspirations, but Duncan-Andrade (2006a) asks, what is the cost we are prepared to pay for these outcomes? He believes that middle class white children tend to come to school with faith that the system will operate to their benefit, providing a sense of purpose in the larger society and a sense of hope that their purpose will be fulfilled. Non-white children tend to come to school with questions in each of those areas. Our definitions of achievement and success might be embodied within the popular national measures, such as the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) credits, literacy, numeracy, university preparation or university enrolment, but as Duncan-Andrade asserts there is little doubt that without the human measures of achievement and success, such as a positive self-identity, purpose, and hope, young people will become disengaged and disillusioned with school, and find the national goals unattainable.

The narratives of students in Te Kotahitanga research project (Bishop, Berryman, Richardson & Tiakiwai, 2003) told us that. So also did a group of former Clover Park Middle School students when they dropped out of a range of different senior secondary schools and asked if they could return to the Māori learning environment where they had been successful during their middle school years. After five years of struggle the school community won approval to open Te Whānau o Tupuranga in 2006 as a designated- character Māori bilingual Year 7 to 13 secondary school. This came as a direct response to the courage of these young people in refusing to accept what was happening to them and to demand change.

Otero and West Burnham (2006) state that the success criteria we are focused on currently are those of a previous generation. They believe that, “Our focus on school improvement leads to bonding, introspection and detachment, which compromises engagement and networking - the basis of the creation of social capital.” Durie, in a longitudinal study (2003, p.68), finds that a secure identity is a necessary prerequisite for good health and well-being. If we are serious about engaging Māori and Pasifika youth in learning, in ways that will equip them for the future, it is time to

---

6 NCEA is New Zealand’s national qualifications for senior secondary school students.
examine our definitions of success and achievement and to develop learning models that will allow them to develop secure identities throughout their learning experience at school.

The Schools

Clover Park Middle School

My Master’s thesis (Milne, 2004) told the story of Clover Park Middle School’s development from a traditional two-year New Zealand intermediate school to a four-year middle school, one of the first in New Zealand. This change of class was the result of four years of struggle by Māori parents to have their children stay longer in the then Māori bilingual unit, Te Whānau o Tupuranga. Parents wanted continuity of a Māori, whānau (extended family group), learning environment and te reo Māori (Māori language). They wanted teachers who knew their children well and with whom both students and whānau could establish a relationship. They wanted high academic outcomes and consistently high expectations. They wanted their children to have clear boundaries and they worried about their children’s safety and learning in a secondary school system where Māori values and knowledge had little worth and where they had to relate to many different adults each day. Many families spoke from the schooling experience of the parents themselves and also of older siblings in the family.  

At the time, in the early 1990s, we had no knowledge of middle schooling as a concept, we simply looked for ways to keep the children in the bilingual whānau for longer than the two traditional Intermediate school years. We were unprepared for the opposition we faced from the Ministry of Education in response to what parents felt was a logical and simple request, and were surprised at its intensity. We found later, through professional reading and study as a staff, that what our Māori parents were asking for was closely aligned with the basis of middle school philosophy and the core developmental needs of the emerging adolescent, 11 to 15 years age group. These included; a sense of competence and achievement, self exploration and definition - identity, supportive social interaction with peers and adults, challenging and rewarding physical activity, meaningful participation in school and community, routine limits and structure and diversity of experience (Dorman, 1980; Lipsitz, Mizell, Jackson & Austin, 1997; McKay, 1995). These goals became the foundations of our learning programme, with the development of a secure identity as Māori, Samoan, and Cook Islands Māori at the centre. Clover Park Intermediate School won approval to change its status to Clover Park Middle School in 1995, but by this time we had already managed to keep Years 9 and 10 students in the school from 1990 through a variety of arrangements, some with, and some without the Ministry of Education’s knowledge.

Tacit knowledge – I was a teacher in Te Whānau o Tupuranga from 1984 to 1986 and the senior teacher in this unit from 1986 to 1992. In this role, and subsequently after my appointment as principal in 1994, I initiated the development of the bilingual whānau and led the change to middle school status.

New Zealand Intermediate schools are traditionally a two year programme for Years 7 and 8 (US Grades 6 & 7) students.
**Te Whānau o Tupuranga**

In 2001 the Board of Trustees of Clover Park Middle School received a request from a delegation of parents and former students to explore ways to allow these young people to return to Te Whānau o Tupuranga (Milne 2004, p.201). Five further years of struggle followed this request. Key events in this protracted process included a visit to the Minister of Education in Wellington late in 2001, threat of legal action and many tense meetings with local Ministry officials, directives to place the students elsewhere, and warnings to parents by officials that Clover Park would disadvantage their children’s academic progress (missing the point that that had already happened elsewhere). The Clover Park Board of Trustees sought an independent legal opinion to counter the Ministry’s ruling. The education law experts consulted found that, “Subject to finalising its precise terms, the proposed agreement appears to fall squarely within the terms of section 158(1) of the Act,” and found the Ministry’s analysis of the act a “possible interpretation, albeit an extremely strict one.”

Again, with the Ministry of Education’s knowledge, we simply retained the 14 students from the original delegation and this number grew each year as parents of students graduating from Year 10 argued that their children should not have to first experience alienation before they were entitled to be in the class. In 2004 the board decided to stop trying to find ways to formalise the status of the “senior class” as the group had become known, (by attaching these students to the rolls of other schools), although we had felt from the start that this option was within our autonomy under Section 158 of New Zealand’s Education Act (1989), which allows:

> Provision by one Board of tuition for students enrolled at school administered by another (1) By agreement between the Boards concerned,
>   (a) Students enrolled at one state school may receive tuition at or from another

We decided to change our strategy and apply to establish Te Whānau o Tupuranga as a separate “designated-character” school in its own right under Section 156 of the New Zealand Education Act 1989, which allows the Minister of Education to approve such a school under the following conditions:

a. the parents of at least 21 people who would, if the school were established, be entitled to free enrolment there, want the school to be established; and
b. the parents want the school to have a character that is in some specific way or ways different from the character of ordinary State schools; and
c. the parents have given the Minister a clear written description and explanation (expressed in the form of aims, purposes, and objectives for the school) of the way or ways; and
d. students at a school with such a character would get an education of a kind that—
   i. differs significantly from the education they would get at an ordinary State school; and

---

9 Letter to Board of Trustees dated 28 November, 2001
ii. is not available at any other State school that children of the parents concerned can conveniently attend; and

e. it is desirable for students whose parents want them to do so to get such an education. (Education Act, 1989)

Our application was lodged with the Ministry of Education in June, 2004. The requirement for at least 21 people was well exceeded with a signed register of 270 names of students whose families pledged they would enrol in the years to come. In May 2005 we received the Minister’s long-awaited approval to establish Te Whānau o Tupuranga as a designated character, Māori, bilingual, secondary school - the first school of this type in New Zealand (Figure 1).

Figure 1: The official New Zealand Gazette notice establishing Te Whānau o Tupuranga

![Te Whānau o Tupuranga Establishment](image)

Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s official designated character is set out in the following Statement of Aims, Purpose and Objectives:

**Aims**

1. To provide a learning environment where Māori tikanga (custom), language and knowledge is the norm.
2. To enable children to live as Māori at school, to develop the skills and knowledge to actively participate as citizens of the world to enjoy good health and a high standard of living. (Durie, 2001)
3. To provide an holistic learning environment based on the philosophy and practice of whanaungatanga (relationship).
4. To honour the Treaty of Waitangi.\(^{10}\)

**Purpose**

1. To provide a Māori learning environment for children in a composite Year 7 to 13 designated character school, under Section 156 of the Education Act, named Te Whānau o Tupuranga

---

\(^{10}\) Signed in 1840 between representatives of the British Crown and Māori chiefs, The Treaty of Waitangi, guaranteed equality and is generally considered the founding document of New Zealand as a nation.
2. To provide Māori whānau in Otara with a Māori bilingual option for children beyond Year 6.

Objectives
1. To comply with the National Education Guidelines
2. To give students participation in decision-making in curriculum content and planning
3. To develop classroom practice where Māori knowledges are normal, valid and legitimate and guide classroom interactions and learning.
4. To ensure that children will be secure in their knowledge about the Māori world to enable them to participate in the wider world.
5. To involve parents and wider whānau in the education of their children, in culturally familiar ways that are empowering.
6. To foster high expectations for excellence in learning, culturally, socially and academically so Māori children have choices for their future.

The school was bound by the above aims and objectives which were published with the establishment notice in the *New Zealand Gazette*, 21 July 2005. Te Whānau o Tupuranga opened on 7 February, 2006 and was formally declared open by the then Member of Parliament for Tainui, Hon. Nanaia Mahuta, at a ceremony on 24 February, 2006.

From February 2006 to October 2008, Tupuranga staff and students occupied a series of temporary buildings and both schools shared what became a major construction site. Te Whānau o Tupuranga moved into their new classrooms in October 2008 and after, completion of other buildings and the refurbishment of Clover Park’s classrooms, both schools enjoyed their Grand Opening Day on 6 June, 2009. The facilities, shared by both schools, have been specifically designed to fit our philosophy and practice and this is further detailed in Chapter 6.

Legally required to have two separate boards of trustees in the establishment phase, in spite of the community’s stated preference in our application for one board and one principal, the board was required to embark on a further year of consultation, application, and approval to combine the two boards. Once this was achieved the combined board made the decision to appoint one principal for both schools. I resigned from my position as principal of Clover Park Middle School, applied for and was appointed principal of both schools in December, 2006.

**The Struggle Continues**

In August 2007 the combined board was approached by a group of Pasifika parents of students in Clover Park Middle School. They asked the board to seek ways to give their children the same access to bilingual continuity and the whānau learning environment through to Year 13 that Te Whānau o Tupuranga had achieved. Again the board listened to the community and agreed to lodge an application seeking the Minister of Education’s approval to extend the range of year levels at
Clover Park from Years 7 to 10, to Years 7 to 13. After six months of consultation, and with 96% of both school communities’ signed support, this application was submitted in April, 2008.

In August 2009, with the outcome of this application still pending, older Years 11 to 13 Clover Park students opted to enrol in the Māori designated-character programme in Te Whānau o Tupuranga as an alternative to leaving the campus for other secondary schools. The final outcome of this third struggle is discussed in Chapter 8.

Unfortunately, each of these three prolonged efforts by parents to resist and reject alienating school environments in favour of a relevant culturally-located, bilingual model, was met with exactly the same opposition from our education authorities. This opposition, spread over a period of 25 years, was based each time on arguments that are primarily about protecting the ‘network’ of existing schools. In official minds the country’s network of state-funded schools already provide an education relevant to all students, in spite of the evidence that this is certainly not the case for Māori and Pasifika learners. Ministry of Education data show that, in 2010, Māori students were more likely than any other ethnic group to become non-enrolled or to drop out of school. Schools continued to stand-down, suspend and exclude more Māori students than any other ethnic group, and unjustified absence rates remained substantially higher amongst Māori and Pasifika students. These have not significantly changed since 2004. Māori and Pasifika had the lowest proportions (20% and 25.8% respectively) of school leavers achieving a university entrance standard, compared with Asian (65.3%), and Pākehā school leavers (47.5%). (Ministry of Education, 2010a).

Definitions

Race, Ethnicity, and Culture

In New Zealand the terms “ethnicity” and “culture” are in more common use than the word, “race.” This is not always the case in the literature, where often race, ethnicity and culture are equated or conflated, or the terms and meanings change depending on the author or the context. Penetito (2010, p.63) suggests this preference in New Zealand educational discourses, “can be shown to be part of the ideological hegemony.” He finds however, the Māori conceptual preference, historically and in the present, is to favour the term culture rather than ethnicity or race. He explains, “The concept of culture as used by Māori tends toward including notions of biology, genetics and inheritance, making it equivalent to the concept of race or ethnicity. When they think about culture, Māori are likely to be thinking of their identity, their whakapapa (genealogy), which carries with it the notion of determinism.” (p.64).

For the purposes of this thesis I have chosen to use the terms “ethnic group” or “ethnicity” to denote a person’s racial heritage and the terms ‘culture’ or ‘cultural’ to describe the accumulated experiences of a people or group through social interactions in which values, beliefs, experiences
and traditions are practised and evolve. It is understood that other definitions may include culture in the terms “ethnicity” and “ethnic group.” The Encyclopaedia Britannica defines “ethnic group” as, “a social group or category of the population that, in a larger society, is set apart and bound together by common ties of race, language, nationality, or culture.” However, “ethnic group” and “ethnicity” are used by Statistics NZ in the official New Zealand Census to denote racial groups and these terms are also used in Ministry of Education statistics.

In Clover Park Middle School a respected Samoan teacher explains their ethnicity to his Samoan students by saying, “You were born a Samoan, and when you die, no matter where you go, or what you do, you will still be a Samoan.” He uses this statement to describe his students’ Samoan racial heritage. His students learn about their fa’asamoa11 - their Samoan culture, through their involvement in family events and practices, including those followed in their Samoan bilingual programme at school. They also interact with other youth, with church, sport, music, technology and a wide range of groups outside school and home. All of these experiences shape the development of their cultural identity – which is a mixture of traditional Samoan practice, contemporary Samoan family practices in their New Zealand setting and the identity shaped through the involvement of these young people in these many other social groups. This example clarifies the use of these terms in the two schools in this study and in this thesis. Identity development is discussed in Chapter 2.

**Pasifika**

The use of the term, *Pasifika* has both positive and negative connotations. The term is currently preferred by the Ministry of Education which has, in the past, used labels such as “Pacific Islanders” and “Pacific Nations.” Samu, (2006, p.36) explains that *Pasifika* is a good choice because it translates from the word, “Pacific” in several of the Pacific languages in New Zealand. She favours its use also because, “The fact that as a term, it ‘originated’ from us, is of no small consequence because being able to define ourselves is an issue of control.” On the other hand, Kepa and Manu’atu, (2006, p.53) argue that this mainstream construct of Pasifika simply reinforces assimilation by dismissing and devaluing different languages and cultures. They use the example of, “the tendency among the Samoan people, in particular those representatives from the Ministry of Education,” to reinforce the numerical dominance of Samoan, “thus relegating to a marginal and devalued status the beliefs and practices of the numerically weaker Pasifika peoples” (p.53). Samu believes there is value, however, in a ‘collectivising’ term such as *Pasifika* in that its unifying effect can counter oppositional forces such as neocolonialism and, for Pasifika groups in New Zealand, the oppositional forces of, “assimilation and social/economic/cultural marginalization” (Samu, 2006, p.40).

11 The ‘Samoan way’- traditional Samoan practice
The term *Pasifika* has been chosen as a collective descriptor for this thesis because it is the stated preferred term of Samoan, Tongan, and Cook Islands Māori staff at Clover Park Middle School. Where possible, and where it is relevant, the different Pasifika cultures will be referred to using their respective specific names. Cook Islands Māori will be used in all specific references to people from the Cook Islands, again following the advice of Cook Islands Māori staff.

**Cultural Identity**

**Shape-Shifting: Identity changing, identity as resistance**

For an example of the typical “shape-shifting” identity faced by many families, I need look no further than my own four children. On my side of the family their forebears are Pākehā, my parents both being descendants of early settlers from England and Scotland, who arrived in New Zealand in the late 1800s. On their father’s side; a mother, with one Samoan and one English parent, and a father whose parents were also English and Scots - or so the family thought, until well after his death when a direct Māori whakapapa to Ngai Tahu and a network of relatives, was discovered in his father’s family through my own research into our children’s family history.

If we were to attempt to quantify my children’s ancestry, it is predominantly Pākehā, on both sides of the family. However, my four children identify first and foremost as Māori. If you ask them about their cultural identity they will tell you emphatically it is Māori. This is evident in their daily lives, socially and politically, and in their choices for their children. My grandchildren and great grandchildren are being educated in Māori immersion or bilingual settings and are all becoming fluent speakers of Māori. How has this happened?

In our case there is clearly no kaumātua or kuia in our whānau passing down cultural knowledge, and their father was unaware of his Māori heritage until well after our children were born. The answer is partly due to my own upbringing in a rural Māori community, my choice to involve our children in Māori activities from an early age, and my long term involvement with Māori education, as a student, a teacher and a school principal. None of us can recall any family discussions about, or any deliberate influence on, our children’s choice to “be Māori.” This was something that just evolved in our experience. This has not meant that their other cultural identities are denied. They are comfortable and competent in Pākehā and Samoan settings, however they choose to “live as Māori” (Durie, 2001).

The influence of my choices aside, there is a much more important explanation for my children’s Māori identity. Bishop (1996, p.36) describes the similar story of the loss of his family’s whakapapa and the “inexorable process of Europeanisation” that had overtaken his family, as a “vignette of New Zealand’s history.” Not only had this same process caused my children’s paternal grandfather’s Māori ancestry to disappear altogether from the family’s knowledge, it also caused
their paternal grandmother to deny her Samoan heritage and to prevent her children from any involvement with Samoan language or custom. The extent of this denial became clear to me on the day I found her massaging my days-old daughter’s nose to ensure it didn’t remain “too flat” and identify her features as Samoan. Having taken real pride in the fact she had married a ‘palagi’ she was horrified to later learn of his Māori heritage, which she then also strenuously denied.

Within just two generations, through this denial of their Māori and Samoan heritage, the “whitening’ of our children could have been complete. Their commitment to resist, reject, and reverse this process through their strong identification as Māori is something I celebrate. The results of this resistance are evident in the next generations, my grandchildren and great grandchildren.

Wijeyesinghe (1992) identifies several factors that can significantly impact the process of establishing biracial identity. They are biological heritage, sociohistorical context of society, early socialization experiences, culture, ethnic identity and heritage, spirituality, individual awareness of self in relation to race and racism, and physical appearance, as well as other personal social identities. Many of these factors can be identified in my family’s story.

However, just as my children choose to identify themselves primarily as Māori, if I search the enrolment information of the 350 children in the two schools in this study, parents rarely provide more than one ethnic group in their enrolment details. This is in spite of the fact that the enrolment form provides spaces for several ethnic groups and I know large numbers of students are from mixed ethnic backgrounds and cultures. May and Sleeter (2010, p.5) observe that identity choices are a product of power relations, inevitably shaped by one’s position in society. They suggest that the notion of multiple or hybrid identities presupposes “that everyone has an equal opportunity to pick and choose freely from the mélange of identities available to them. But this is simply not the case.” It seems the reality is that people make a choice and the context allows identities to ‘shape-shift’ according to need and situation. Pollock (2004, p.31) calls this process of daily wrestling with race categories. “race-bending.” The development of racial identity theories over time is discussed in Chapter 2.

**identity lost: Social Toxins**

The notion of society and schools as ecosystems features prominently in research presented to New Zealand audiences in 2008 and 2010 (Duncan-Andrade & Yang, 2008, Duncan-Andrade, 2010). Originating with Garbarino (1995), the idea of a society that is toxic to children and young people, draws on a conceptual framework from Bronfenbrenner (1977) and ecological systems theory. According to Garbarino (pp. ix, 4), “the mere act of living in our society today is dangerous to the health and well-being of children and adolescents... the social world of children, the social context in which they grow up, has become poisonous to their development.” Garbarino finds the elements
of social toxicity are easy enough to identify: “violence, poverty and other economic pressures on parents and their children, disruption of relationships, nastiness, despair, depression, paranoia, alienation - all the things that demoralize families and communities. These are the forces in the land that pollute the environment of children and youth” (pp.4-5).

This concept underpins the acclaimed seven part California Newsreel documentary series, *Unnatural Causes: Is inequality making us sick?* (Adelman, 2008), exploring racial and socioeconomic inequities in health in the United States. Evidence presented in this series suggests that more equitable social policies, secure living-wage jobs, affordable housing, racial justice, good schools, community empowerment, and family supports are health issues just as critical as diet, tobacco use, and exercise. Episode 3 of the series, titled, *Bad Sugar* explores the reason for the poor health of the Tohono O’odham American Indian people who have the highest incidence of Type II diabetes in the world. The causes lie, not in the routinely expected poor diet and limited exercise, drugs and medical care, but in economic, political and social structures:

They may be hard to see, yet they can be powerful determinants of our health. Pacific Islanders, African Americans, Aboriginal peoples in Australia, all suffer from Type II diabetes at rates double or triple the national averages…. They have totally different histories. They are all different populations, and yet they all have the same manifestation... what’s going on? What’s the common denominator? And in every case, we’re talking about people who have been dispossessed of their land and of their history. They haven’t been able to re-create it. In all these far-flung parts of the world the social circumstance of being ripped from roots ends up with the same manifestation of disease. (Californian Newsreel, 2008)

Similarly, Shields, Bishop and Mazawi (2005, p.3) link pathologizing practices and policies to education (deficit thinking, teacher dominant pedagogies, schooling itself as a tool of colonization and assimilation are examples), and describe the damage these cause to Navajo, Māori and Bedouin Arab children in education systems that would, at first glance, seem to be literally worlds apart.

Fullilove (2004), links this issue to cultural identity, using the gardening phenomenon of “root shock” to describe the impact of the dislocation of people from their communities, their cultures and identities - their very roots. An ecosystem in nature relies on achieving a perfect balance for its wellbeing and survival, and loss or change to any part of the ecosystem causes this to be disrupted, often permanently. The same effect can be seen in groups of people who have been removed from their environments through policies of urban renewal, gentrification, and racism. The impact and stress suffered through root shock can last for generations:

Root shock undermines trust, increases anxiety about letting loved ones out of one’s sight, destabilizes relationships, destroys social, emotional, and financial
resources, and increases the risk for every kind of stress-related disease, from depression to heart attack. (Fullilove, p.14)

Duncan-Andrade and Yang (2008) connect root shock to education, positioning school classrooms as ecosystems where pain suffered by one student in the ecosystem can be transferred to others. Conversely healing can also be transferred. We have to be able to identify external toxins that come into our ecosystem in schools in order for us to attempt to heal them.

In New Zealand we have the same health discrepancies, which we for the most part, seem to attribute to the victims’ ‘choice’ of lifestyle. However, look further into the statistics and inequity soon surfaces. Robson, Purdie, Cram & Simmonds (2007) looked at the age-standardised measure used to compare health statistics in New Zealand. An age-standardised rate is a summary measure of a rate that a population would have if it had a standard age structure, however because the age structure of Māori is substantially younger than that of non-Māori the World Health Organisation (WHO) standardised measure is not valid. Using a kaupapa Māori analysis the researchers observe that, “The use of the WHO standard thus privileges the colonial population's mortality experience, potentially influencing prioritising decisions and perceptions of disparities between the two populations.”

In 2004, in response to a political debate over health funding, Professor Tony Blakely, Director of the Health Inequalities Research Programme (HIRP) at the University of Otago, decided to pre-release findings of an unpublished study that looked at death rates in terms of both ethnicity and income levels. The results, he said, were “too critical” to leave until they were formally published. The media release (Blakely, 2004) states that the findings of the New Zealand Census-Mortality Study showed clearly that Māori still had a higher death rate - regardless of how much they earn:

Income is a major determinant of health, no matter what ethnic group you belong to,... But it is absolutely critical to note that very large differences in mortality still remain between ethnic groups even after allowing for income. High-income Māori still have a 40 per cent higher death rate than low-income Europeans. (Blakely, 2004)

In a Ministry of Health commissioned report (Blakely, Tobias, Atkinson, Yeh,& Huang, 2007), it is noted that although income disparities may be narrowing, the mortality rates for Māori in the high-income group were similar to, or greater than, the mortality rates for European/Others in the low-income group in each period, for males and females aged 25-74 years. Similarly, Keith Ballard (2008, p.4) cites a joint Ministry of Health and University of Otago (2006) report that found, “discrimination and socio-economic position are closely intertwined” reflecting “a racialised social order” in which health inequalities are the result of inequalities of resources and power. (Ballard, 2008, p.4). This report found that inequality in life expectancy persists within socio-economic groups, indicating that socio-economic position alone was not the major impact on health.
For young people the cost of the loss of identity can be more immediate than disease in later life. The suicide death rate for Māori youth (15-24 year olds) in 2007 was 28.1 per 100,000, compared with the non-Māori rate of 12.3 per 100,000 (Ministry of Social Development, 2010). Young Māori males are most at risk with 40 per 100,000 suicide deaths compared to 19 per 100,000 for young non-Māori males (Best Practice Advocacy Centre, 2010). Young Māori females are twice as likely, to die by suicide than non-Māori females (Beautrais & Ferguson, 2006). Coupe (2005) finds that not being connected to Māori culture is a key risk factor associated with attempted suicide among Māori. Among the group that attempted suicide there were higher numbers for those who were not connected to things Māori.

**Naming the White Spaces**

Naming the white spaces in our schools is important in progressing understanding of the realities for non-white students. Fitzsimons and Smith (2000) explain the importance of naming:

> Since naming the world is an exercise in power relations, interpretation by Māori is an exercise of power. For Māori ... partnership in terms of the Treaty of Waitangi implies power sharing and involvement at all levels of policy development, application and evaluation (that is, to also reserve the right to determine what counts as success). The control of the evaluation and assessment factors to evaluate services for Māori is critical; it is a means for Māori to name their world. Naming is employed in the sense of using language to control conditions of existence through cultural definitions of the world. (p.39)

Gillborn (2005, p.485) uses this quote from bell hooks (1989) to illustrate his gradual realisation of the role of education policy in the active structuring of racial inequity:

> As I write, I try to remember when the word racism ceased to be the term which best expressed for me exploitation of black people and other people of color in this society and when I began to understand that the most useful term was white supremacy. (hooks, 1989, p. 112)

Gillborn (2005, p.488) points out that a critique of whiteness is “not an assault on white people per se,” rather it is an assault on the socially constructed power of white interests and the constant reinforcement of these. He believes that, “it is possible for white people to take a real and active role in deconstructing whiteness but such ‘race traitors’ are relatively uncommon.” However, while agreeing that “race treason” is a definite choice for many white people, Zeus Leonardo, (2005, p.37) explains that, without accompanying structural changes even those whites who do reject and work against white privilege still benefit from that privilege. He uses the analogy of Scheurich (1998) that “being white is akin to walking down the street with money being put in your
pant pocket without your knowledge.” This is a difficult concept to grasp for those who have grown up without ever needing to question their own whiteness, as McIntosh, (1988) explains in her long list of ways in which “I enjoy unearned skin privilege and have been conditioned into oblivion about its existence, unable to see that it put me ‘ahead’ in any way, or put my people ahead.”

Akom (2006, p.89) observes that many of the leading theories of social capital are silent on the issue of race, and ignore the contribution by young people in poor communities to a wide range of social networks, which “often exist as a way for youth to learn how to resist and cope with persistent racial marginalization.” He calls for a new model of social capital that pays careful attention to race, racism, and the processes of racialisation, identity-based frameworks; context dependency; and the issues of power:

We have to move to the point where the very act of naming and mapping processes of racial subordination is not particularly radical or activist, but rather, part of a collective, normalized goal of worldwide black emancipation. I am hopeful. (p.90)

To “name the white spaces” in our schools we have to have to talk about white privilege and white supremacy without taking these terms personally. We have to ask the hard questions about the purpose of schools, whose knowledge counts, who decides on the norms we expect our youth to strive to achieve, who decides on literacy and numeracy as the holy grail and almost sole indicator of achievement and success? We have to understand the importance of relationships and the power of whānau. We have to name racism, prejudice, stereotyping, deficit thinking, policy and decision making, power, curriculum, funding, community, school structure, timetabling, choice, equity instead of equality, enrolment procedures, disciplinary processes, poverty, and social justice. We have to reject framing culture as problematic and stop negating cultural identity within assimilationist terms such as multiculturalism and diversity. We have to challenge Eurocentric solutions that perpetuate the myth that “white is right,” and come from the perspective Stovall (2006, p.108) calls, “giving those poor people of color what they so desperately need.” Whiteness and white privilege are discussed in Chapter 2.

Identity however is never a simple white/non-white binary. Colouring in the white spaces also requires us to look at the many shifting and changing identities young people must negotiate in our schools and in society if they are to navigate the white spaces successfully.

The Contexts

This section examines these white spaces more closely through looking at the learning contexts that background the changes that have been developed in Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School. The section is divided into three parts. The first explores the realities of our education system for Māori and Pasifika learners, provides supporting national data and
international comparisons and discusses barriers to school reform. The second part narrows the context of the community of these two schools’ in Otara, Manukau City. Thirdly the learning model, developed by the schools in response to the first two contexts, is explained.

The National Context: Māori and Pasifika Education in the White Space

One of the four key focus areas of Ka Hikitia, is “Young People Engaged in Learning (particularly years 9 and 10)” (Ministry of Education, (2008a). To see the stark reason for this focus, and the distance we still have to travel, I present a snapshot of 1,000 Māori students who would have started secondary school in New Zealand in 2005, and use 2009 data (Ministry of Education, 2010a) to plot their educational pathway or the pipeline from school through to higher academic qualifications (Figure 2). Comparative data for Pākehā students are provided in parentheses.

Figure 2: Māori Educational Pipeline, 2005-2009
Of these 1,000 students, 311 (31.1%) have left school by the age of 17 years. This number includes 21 students (21.2 per 1,000) who have been removed legally through early exemptions granted by the Ministry of Education at age 15 (13.5 per 1,000 students), exclusion if they were under 16 years (5.3 per 1,000 students), and expulsion if they were over 16 years (2.4 per 1,000 students). We can predict the pathway of the 689 students who are still in school at age 17, based on 2009 tertiary education entry and completion data (Ministry of Education, 2010a). To attempt to complete their school requirements to ‘bridge’ their entry into tertiary study, 86 (8.6%) students will embark on further Level 1 to Level 3 courses, and 67 students will enter tertiary education to begin Level 4 Certificate (40 per 1000) and Level 5 (27 per 1000), Diploma study. Based on 2009 data, 68 of these students will achieve a one year Level 3 qualification and 46 will complete Level 4 or 5 two year qualifications.

Of the students who remain in school beyond 17 years of age, 224 (22.4%) achieved university entrance qualifications in 2009. Some of these 224 may choose Certificate and Diploma level study and be counted in previous figures, and 31 (3.1%) enter university to commence a bachelor level degree. Again, based on 2009 patterns, 18 (58%) will complete this degree after three years study. If these 18 students go on to further postgraduate study we can predict that 12 (68%) will complete a Masters level degree and none of the 1,000 students will achieve a Doctorate.12

The ‘pipeline’ from school to higher academic learning for Pasifika learners (Figure 3) has a different profile in that more Pasifika students remain in school for longer, however there is a dramatic drop off at university entrance qualifications level, with only 27.8% achieving this qualification in 2009. From this point the numbers entering and completing tertiary qualifications become very similar to, or even fewer than, those for Māori.

Figure 3: Student Alienation and University Entrance eligibility 2009, by ethnicity. (Ministry of Education, 2010a)

12 These numbers are a prediction based on 2009 school leavers and participation data and 2009 tertiary entry and completion data from the Ministry of Education. These are the most recent data sets available at the time of writing.
McCaffery and McFall-McCaffery (2010) examine the status of Pasifika languages in New Zealand and find “significant signs of language shift and loss, with several languages unlikely to survive unless urgent maintenance and revival measures are adopted.” They also state:

We critically examined the Pasifika Education Plans 2001-2012 and other moves by the New Zealand Ministry of Education to find a place for Pasifika languages as subjects rather than as mediums of instruction. We showed that on a best-evidence research basis these measures present a well-meaning but misguided hegemonic dominance of an “English only” education future. (p.86)

If we break these statistics down into socio-economic areas by school decile, the picture is significantly worse. The Ministry of Education’s Pasifika Education Plan 2008-2012, (Ministry of Education 2008b) was subtitled, “From good to great: Stepping up for Pasifika education.” The opening statement claimed, “New Zealand’s education system is world-class. Every young New Zealander can be, and deserves to be, part of its success.” The Pasifika Education Plan 2008-2012 sets out what needs to be done so the education system 'steps up' for Pasifika students. However, Pasifika students and families have every right to question the implication that the status of Pasifika education was “good” in the first place, given the data shown above, and to challenge the statement that our education system is “world class.” These concerns are validated in the revised Pasifika Education Plan 2009-2012, (Ministry of Education 2009d) introduced to align the plan with the National Government’s mandated National Standards (Ministry of Education 2010c).

**School alienation, “gaps” and poverty**

Yang (2009) points out “the achievement gap is a mirror image to the punishment gap.” He believes these are more aptly described as the exclusion rate—the rate by which students are removed from the classroom—and the inclusion rate—the rate by which students matriculate to higher education” (p.51, emphasis in original). Yang states these rates should be key indicators in the assessment of overall school climate.

The alienation of Māori and Pasifika learners from school is not just an intermediate/middle or secondary school phenomena. Disengagement and dislocation from their cultural identity begins when children enter our schools’ white spaces. Just because it takes some years for the impact of this dislocation to manifest itself does not absolve primary schools from their responsibility to respond differently. Nor is school alienation due solely to socio-economic status or poverty, although this is a contributing factor. The debilitating effects of poverty need to be put in context of the root causes of inequality, rather than attributed to individual and/or group pathologies (Ginwright & Cammarota, 2002, p.82). Ginwright (2010b) shows that the issue is about more than poverty in the following tables Table 1, Table 2). Although these are from an American context the issues are just as relevant in the New Zealand system and serve to demonstrate that many of our schooling solutions are driven by fixing symptoms rather than exposing and owning root causes.
Table 1: Symptoms and Root Causes of Poverty (Ginwright, 2010b, p.7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symptom</th>
<th>Root Cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic failure</td>
<td>Unequal distribution of resources for quality schools based on racial demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>Lack of health care and available drug treatment opportunities due to income and social class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruptive behavior</td>
<td>Coercive school policies and practices that focus on punishment rather than potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionate incarceration rates</td>
<td>Racialized sentencing laws and policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Questions that address the Symptoms and the Root Causes of Poverty (Ginwright, 2010b, p.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions that address the symptom</th>
<th>Questions that address the root cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What does this student need to academically succeed?</td>
<td>How can we eliminate inequities in the distribution of resources and power that shape academic outcomes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can students protect themselves against health problems?</td>
<td>What types of community organizing and alliance building are required to protect communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What types of programs &amp; services do youth of color need to be healthy?</td>
<td>How can we change institutional policy to assure equity in decision making and resource distribution?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kohn (2011, para. 13) argues that demands to focus on closing the achievement gap and a single-minded focus on “raising the bar” serves to push low-income youth out of school and to develop curriculum and practice in which the emphasis is on “succeeding” rather than the questioning, arguing, collaborating more common in more affluent schools. This type of teaching has been called a “pedagogy of poverty” (Haberman, 1991) - the “‘gold standard’ for the way you are supposed to teach kids of color” (Kohn, 2011, para.4, emphasis in original). Thus students living in poverty are exposed to a double dose of deprivation by virtue of poor teaching, teaching to the standards of imposed national expectations that lack depth and relevance and the capacity to engage students:

Standardized exams serve mostly to make dreadful forms of teaching appear successful. As long as they remain our primary way of evaluating, we may never see real school reform -- only an intensification of traditional practices, with the very worst reserved for the disadvantaged. (Kohn, 2011, para. 21)

Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh & Teddy (2009, p. 736) agree that it is teachers who have the capacity to change the educational outcomes of Māori students. Hattie (2003, cited in Bishop et al., 2009) used reading results to confirm that the disparity between Māori and Pākehā learners was constant regardless of the socio-economic status (SES) of the schools they attended. He concluded that it is not socio-economic differences that have the greatest impact upon Māori student achievement and suggests that it is cultural and teacher/student relationships
not socio-economic resources that make a difference. These relationships are discussed in later chapters.

A second chance

Entering tertiary education directly from school is only one of the options available to learners. Certainly in recent years there has been growth in the numbers of Māori who enrol in Māori tertiary institutions in ‘second-chance’ learning. Durie (2009) attributes this growth to “the indigenisation of higher education in New Zealand.” This includes the establishment of three wānanga (tertiary institution), “which account for some 60% of all Māori tertiary students and have been largely responsible for the transformational increase in Māori participation in tertiary education since 2000” (p.5). Compared with other student profiles, Māori students tend to be older than 25 years when they participate (Figure 4) and are more often studying on a part-time basis (Ministry of Education 2010a; Durie, 2009). The crucial question for secondary schools however, is why are the ‘first chance’ learning opportunities they offer working so ineffectively for their Māori and Pasifika students that they leave them without the option of a direct pathway to tertiary study?

Figure 4: Participation Rates in Tertiary Institutions by Age and Ethnicity: 2010 (Ministry of Education, 2010a)

The International Context: Comparison with International Data

The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) is an international study that assesses how well 15-year-old students are prepared to meet the challenges of today’s society. In 2006 PISA assessed three key areas of knowledge and skills: reading literacy, mathematical literacy and scientific literacy. In scientific literacy, of the 57 countries participating in PISA 2006, only two countries performed better than New Zealand, however when this result is analysed by ethnicity (Figure 5) it can be seen that Pākehā and Asian students performed well above the Organisation for
Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) mean, while Māori outcomes were well below this level, and Pasifika results were lower still.

The same pattern was repeated in both reading and mathematical literacy results, with New Zealand ranked fourth and sixth respectively in 2006 (Telford & Caygill, 2007). These data show that our reputation for a “world class” education system is certainly not equitable, with Māori and Pasifika learners featuring at the lowest end of the range of achievement. in what has become known euphemistically as our long ‘tail’ of disparity (Hattie, 2003; Airini, McNaughton, Langley & Sauni, 2007).

Despite New Zealand’s international reputation for high levels of literacy achievement there is a long tail in the distribution of achievement. Māori and Pasifika students from low decile schools are over represented in this tail. The diverse urban schools of South Auckland which have high proportions of Māori and Pasifika students have long been identified as sites for low achievement, particularly in literacy. (Airini, et al, p.33)

Figure 5: Analysis of PISA 2006 Outcomes by Ethnicity (Telford & Caygill, 2007).

The 2009 PISA data, where Reading was a major focus, found that New Zealand’s mean reading performance did not change over the nine year period, 2000 to 2009. Again, Pākehā and Asian students were more likely to be at the higher end, and Māori and Pasifika students were over represented at the lower end. There was also no significant change in New Zealand’s 15-year-olds’ mathematical literacy performance between 2003 and 2009 (Telford & May, 2010). Given our almost single-minded national education policy focus, for more than a decade, on improving literacy and numeracy, these results are telling.
Reforming the White Spaces

In order to discuss school reform and schooling improvement initiatives for Māori and Pasifika students, that have been implemented in whitestream New Zealand schools, it is important to restate that the context that initiates, supports and determines the shape of these initiatives is still a white space. As Tomlins-Jahnke (2007) explains, “what counts as school knowledge, the way school knowledge is organised, resourced, taught and evaluated, the underlying codes that structure such knowledge, access to and legitimation of school knowledge is determined by the dominant culture.”

This is rarely considered in the design of school improvement and reform which most often comes from a mindset of getting better at doing the same things. Hence we see the major focus on raising literacy and numeracy levels, improving national qualifications results, and reducing high levels on non-engagement. These initiatives largely persist in seeing the white space as neutral and the goal is to raise Māori and Pasifika students’ achievement to ‘national norms.’ This is a deficit mindset. Dyson (1999, p.219) calls this fulfilment of the fantasy that the white norm is neutral and objective, “whitewishing.”

Gutiérrez, Asato, Santos & Gotanda, (2002), observe that the key tactic to getting the public to support these types of reforms is to use, “code words, phrases, and symbols which refer indirectly to racial themes, but do not directly challenge popular democratic or egalitarian ideas, such as justice and equal opportunity. They argue that “backlash” pedagogies, “products of ideological and institutional structures that legitimize and thus maintain privilege, access, and control of the sociopolitical and economic terrain,” underpin this type of educational reform which, “accepts substantial inequality as a neutral baseline for educational practice and reform and, simultaneously, enshrines the status quo”). Thus whiteness, or “the status quo camouflaged as color-blind, becomes the uncontested baseline of educational reform.”

Often this requirement to measure success in terms of these national norms goes hand in hand with the expectations of the source of funding, usually the Ministry of Education, to have the outcomes defined and evaluated on their terms. Not only is the focus of these reforms generally to improve or ‘fix’ the children’s deficits, many also expand their focus to ‘fix’ the deficits in families, so we have initiatives like family literacy programmes, to teach parents how to better support their children’s reading, and projects that provide incentives to help families create ‘quiet’ spaces for homework and reading.13 We thus imply to parents and whānau that the natural, noisy, busy, environment of a large extended family is not conducive to learning, and to parents that they lack the skills to support their children’s learning. In a just and reciprocal partnership, schools would go to equal lengths to learn about Māori and Pasifika norms and incorporate these into “schooling improvement” initiatives. This is rarely the case. Not only does this practice reinforce to Māori and

---

13 Both initiatives have occurred in South Auckland
Pasifika families that the problem is of their own making, it robs children of exposure to their own cultural norms in their daily lives at school. Corson (1995) describes the impact of this:

When people in majority culture education systems ignore minority culture discourse norms, for that moment the cycle of cultural reproduction reinforced by those norms is disrupted. More than just miscommunication results. Over time, culturally different children are deprived of the everyday reinforcers of values that are central to their culture’s world view; and children deprived in this way of a developing and shared world view have less understanding of who they are, where they are going, and where in the world they might have a value as individuals and as group members. (p.195)

Durie (2003, p.202) asks “what is the benchmark against which Māori should gauge progress?” He suggests that comparison of Māori with non-Māori, “presupposes that Māori are aiming to be as good as Pākehā when they might well aspire to be better, or different, or even markedly superior.” Durie believes it is misleading to assume that these types of comparisons provide useful information about Māori progress. There is no justification, he states, for educational disparities, which should not be tolerated. He advocates zero tolerance for education failure but points out present trends where Māori youth “are trapped in lifestyles that are essentially incompatible with healthy growth and development and will struggle to participate in either te ao Māori or the wider global community” (p.203).

Durie (2003, p.199) asserts, education should enable Māori to “live as Māori.” This goal was subsequently incorporated into the goal of the Ministry of Education’ strategy document, Ka Hikitia: “Māori enjoying education success as Māori.” The stated purpose of Ka Hikitia is to “transform our education system for Māori” (Ministry of Education, 2008a, p. 2). Whitestream teachers who want to make change to their practice will look to the document for guidelines that make “as Māori” explicit. They will find however, little more than the statement that ‘identity and culture are essential ingredients of success,’” and references to Māori ‘aspirations’ and ‘unique potential’ (Ministry of Education, 2008b). Durie (2003, p.199) is more specific. “As Māori” he states means, “to have access to te āo Māori, the Māori world - access to language, culture, marae, …tikanga (customs) and resources. He adds:

If after twelve or so years of formal education a Māori youth were totally unprepared to interact within te ao Māori, then, no matter what else had been learned, education would have been incomplete.

...Being Māori is a Māori reality. Education should be as much about that reality as it is about literacy and numeracy. In short, being able to live as Māori imposes some responsibilities upon the education system to contribute towards the realisation of that goal. (pp.199, 200)
Māori Perspectives

This gulf between the whitestream perspective and Māori aspirations was highlighted in Te Whānau o Tupuranga in 2008 when we hosted a visit from two North American critical educators, Dr. Jeffrey Duncan-Andrade and Dr. K. Wayne Yang. Just before their visit they advised me they wanted to bring a gift with them, in the form of a scholarship, to donate to two graduating students in Te Whānau o Tupuranga. The scholarship was designed to recognise that, “for indigenous youth, the pursuit of education under oppression is a revolutionary undertaking” and to acknowledge two “young revolutionaries who embody the historical struggle of oppressed peoples to liberate their minds and their communities.” They asked staff to name the award so it reflected the values of our school.

I put that question to our Māori staff, who named the award, Te Poho o Kia Aroha, with the subtitle, Ka whawhai tonu mātou mā ake tonu atu. Kia Aroha is the name of our school marae. In their written explanation of why the marae was central to the name of the award, Māori staff described the role of the marae where a child is:

Sustained with ancestral traditions, ancestral knowledge, unfailing love, nurturing, belief, a striving spirit, righteousness, kindness, and skills, where they develop an openness of mind, and become alert, alive, eager, and brave, where a child learns to treat kindly their world, and the surroundings that shelter them, and become aware of those that can harm them. From here growth is seen as reaching the uppermost heights of the realisation of their aspirations, and dreams.

This statement captures Durie’s (2003, p.199) assertion that the purpose of education is as much about preparation for participation in Māori society as it is about participation in society generally. There was no suggestion from the critical educators that these prestigious scholarships, should be for specific academic achievement. Explicit in the award’s intent is “liberating minds and communities,” an expectation of reciprocity, clearly understood in our two schools, to give back to the school and the whānau.

Pasifika Perspectives

An alternative paradigm is also recognised in the literature review commissioned by the Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Group of the Ministry of Education (Gorinski & Fraser, 2006). It is backgrounded by the Pacific Islands School-Parent-Community Liaison (PISCPL) Project which was launched by the Ministry in 1996, to support the more effective engagement of schools and Pasifika

14 Personal email

15 Te Poho means literally ‘the bosom.’ Te Poho was also the name of a taniwha of the local, Ngai Tai, people who nurtured and fed the people. Kia Aroha means through love although aroha is a much wider concept than the English translation. Ka whawhai tonu matou mo ake tonu atu means, we will continue to fight forever.
parents and communities in education in order to raise the achievement of Pasifika students in whitestream New Zealand schools. The review explores both the conceptual and research based literatures on home-school relationships. It highlights the need for a fundamental change of thinking and practice in schools, from looking through a monocultural lens to a multicultural lens, in order to promote effective parent community - school engagement in Pasifika contexts.

The review provides a three-pronged thematic overview of the international, as well as Pasifika-referenced literature related to home-school relationships. These themes include the monocultural paradigm, highlighted by the dominance of a Pākehā education system which works to disadvantage families from cultures with differing values, beliefs and first languages to the dominant culture (Harker & McConnachie 1985; Nakhid, 2003). The review also shows that:

A significant, and growing body of research supports the call for an alternative paradigm, in which all partners in the education process: parents, children, schools, teachers, and communities are involved in the co-construction of shared knowledges. Proponents of an alternative paradigm (Airini, 1998; Bishop, 2003; Podmore and Sauvao, 2003), propose a bicultural/multicultural perspective, which includes an equity pedagogy within an holistic approach that supports learners physically, emotionally, spiritually and communally. An integral part of such a perspective is support for first language maintenance, bilingualism and biliteracy. (Gorinski & Fraser, 2006, p.1)

Yang (2009, p.51) calls the dropout and school alienation realities shown at the beginning of this section, “pushout” statistics. Scheurich and Young (1997) call the context that drives our school policies and reform, epistemological racism:

Epistemological racism means that our current range of research epistemologies- positivism to postmodernisms/poststructuralisms - arise out of the social history and culture of the dominant race, that these epistemologies logically reflect and reinforce that social history and that racial group (while excluding the epistemologies of other races/cultures), and that this has negative results for people of color in general and scholars of color in particular. (p.13)

**Academic Achievement**

The acknowledgement of alternative perspectives however, does not mean that academic success is not an important goal, or that Māori and Pasifika learners should have some alternative achievement goals. Durie (2003, p.203) states that the three goals he proposes as relevant to Māori; enabling Māori to live as Māori, facilitating participation as citizens of the world, and contributing towards good health and a high standard of living, are “concurrent goals—a parcel of goals—all of which should be pursued together,” and he makes the point that “educational failure significantly reduces chances of success in any of the three areas.”
For the two schools in this study it means that academic achievement alone, as defined by hegemonic white norms, is not enough. Sir Ken Robinson (2007) thinks it is time we really examined the relevance of what we call academic achievement. He believes the problem we face in 21st Century schooling is to do with the whole idea of academic ability, which, involves particular, and limited, he says, types of verbal and mathematical reasoning, that may be essential, but there is much more to human intelligence, which is creative and diverse. “Education should develop the potential in our different ways of thinking.”

Robinson urges us to challenge, question and resist the whole concept of going forward into the 21st Century, trying to cling to concepts and learning that came from the past. “We have to rethink, he says, the fundamental principles on which we are educating our children.” He reinforces the point that academic achievement alone is no longer enough. Employers want people who can think creatively, adapt to change, work in teams and communicate. The ordinary academic curriculum, he believes, is not designed to develop these things (Robinson 2007). He states:

This is because our education systems are dominated by particular ideas of academic intelligence. Students are divided into sheep and goats on that basis. The other abilities of many students are stifled or squandered. This is why some of the smartest people in the country passed through the whole of their education thinking they weren’t. At the heart of the system is an intellectual caste system, which is educationally bankrupt, economically inadequate and culturally corrosive. (Robinson, 2008, p.5)

**National School Reform Contexts**

Although current outcomes might suggest there is little hope for Māori and Pasifika students in whitestream New Zealand school reform, for some Māori students in some secondary schools this picture is gradually changing. One of the initiatives showing positive results is the innovative research/professional development project, *Te Kotahitanga* (Bishop, Berryman, Wearmouth, Peter, & Clapham, 2012; Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh & Teddy, 2007; 2009).

Beginning in 2001, the *Te Kotahitanga* project gathered narratives of classroom experience from a range of engaged and non-engaged Years 9 and 10 Māori students through a process of collaborative storying (Bishop et al., 2003). The result from these narratives, together with input from parents, principals and teachers, was the development of an Effective Teaching Profile (p.140) which formed the basis of a professional development intervention with 11 self-selected teachers in four schools. One of the major findings of this first phase of the *Te Kotahitanga* project was that the major influence on Māori students’ educational achievement lies in the minds and actions of their teachers. In particular the research exposed, and addressed through professional development, a

---

16 Video interview between Sir Ken Robinson and New Zealand Minister of Education, Steve Maharey, 2007)
predominant discourse of deficit theorising by teachers about Māori students resulting in low teacher expectations of them, and creating self-fulfilling prophesies of failure.

Phase 2 of the Te Kotahitanga project shifted the focus should from small groups of teachers to a professional development process that involved the whole school staff, to integrate the changes across the school and create a “cultural change.” Phase 3 of the research and professional development programme was implemented in 12 schools with 422 teachers in 2004 and 2005 over a full range of curriculum subjects. Te Kotahitanga schools are beginning to show significant improvements in Māori student engagement with learning and achievement (Timperley, Wilson, Barrar & Fung, 2007, p.263).

The key difference between Te Kotahitanga and many other school reform initiatives is that it puts culture and culturally responsive pedagogy at the centre of classroom practice and creates relationships-based classrooms founded on a kaupapa Māori theory of self-determination. Although the project is indeed transforming practice in whitestream schools, the solution is grounded in Māori beliefs and values:

> The answers to Māori educational achievement and disparities do not lie in the mainstream, for given the experiences of the last 150 years, mainstream practices and theories have kept Māori in a subordinate position, while at the same time creating a discourse that pathologized and marginalized Māori peoples’ lived experiences. (Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh, & Teddy, 2009, p.741)

**Other National Initiatives**

As well as Te Kotahitanga, there are other initiatives in the whitestream which seek to change the education experience of Māori and Pasifika learners. There is potential in the intent of Ka Hikitia. There is also potential in the intent of the revised New Zealand Curriculum and its partner document for Māori medium schools, Te Marautanga o Aotearoa. These documents are further discussed in Chapter 5 in relation to the schools’ learning programme.

However, as the Te Kotahitanga research clearly shows, the shift from deficits, from monocultural dominance, and from epistemological racism, first has to take place in teachers’ and school leaders’ thinking and understanding. Earl, Timperley, & Stewart, (2008), evaluating a research project, initiated by the Ministry of Education, to understand more about quality teaching for Māori and Pasifika students, confirm that cultural responsiveness is an area for teachers that “requires considerable further attention and study to clarify the concept and engage the teaching profession in ongoing dialogue about what it means” (p.12). The project involved 103 predominantly Māori, Samoan and Pākehā teachers working with Māori and Pasifika children in Māori medium, Samoan medium and English medium settings across several subject areas. Schools included primary, intermediate, middle and secondary schools, many of them low decile, although the full decile
range was represented. Earl et al., found that being responsive to culture was “complex and challenging” for teachers. They state:

Cultural responsiveness is a habit of mind that involves the teachers’ conceptions of knowledge, their instructional repertoire, the relationships with students, and patterns of power and participation in classrooms and beyond. Responding to the culture and unique reality of students practice is a complicated and sometimes problematic undertaking that is not well-established in education, generally. (p.97)

Recognising this need for teacher professional development Te Tere Auraki is a work programme initiated by the Ministry of Education which encompasses four separate projects, including Te Kotahitanga and Te Kauhua. Over six years to 2009 Te Kauhua has engaged more than 30 schools and 350 teachers in action research to increase schools’ knowledge and understanding about how to link effectively with whānau in ways that contribute to enhanced outcomes for Māori students. Te Kauhua believes that for teacher change to be sustainable it must facilitate and enable teachers’ critical reflection on challenges in their beliefs about Māori culture and identity. The Ministry of Education research finds evidence of evidence of improved achievement results, increase in learner confidence and reduction in suspension and stand-down rates, as well as positive teaching and learning changes within classrooms and productive partnerships with whānau and the wider community (Education Information and Analysis Group/Group Māori, 2009).

In July 2010 The Ministry of Education initiated He Kākano, “a strategic school-based professional development programme with an explicit focus on improving culturally responsive leadership and teacher practices to ensure Māori learners enjoy educational success as Māori” (Ministry of Education, 2010b). The project proposes that leaders and teachers implement seven elements of change:

These seven elements include: goal setting; developing a pedagogy of relations that creates culturally appropriate and responsive classroom learning contexts; institutional reform that is responsive to classroom changes; a distributed leadership pattern that supports pedagogic leadership spread to include whānau, iwi and hapū aspirations, preferences and practices; evidence-based decision making; and ownership by all concerned of the goals of improving Māori student success. (Ministry of Education, 2010b)

The He Kākano strategy is derived from three Ministry of Education sources, Ka Hikitia, the key understandings learned from the Te Kotahitanga research, and from knowledge of iwi (tribe), hapū (sub-tribe) and Māori leadership development from the Indigenous Leadership Centre at Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi. The delivery of He Kākano is a partnership, named ‘Te Awe o ngā Toroa’, between the University of Waikato and Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi. The input of Māori knowledge from both these partners is significant. The programme offers in-depth professional development for 100 school leaders between 2010 and 2012.
The involvement of the Ministry of Education in initiating and contracting these developments however, also ensures that they are designed with Western/European academic achievement goals and lay few claims to outcomes that lead to developing cultural identity or competencies. There is little room for cultural achievement, other than increased proficiency in heritage languages, within our contemporary educational white space.

New Zealand’s self-governing, community-driven whitestream education system, by its very nature, encourages innovation and the adoption of alternative, more relevant pedagogical and leadership models. However, very few new solutions seem to have emerged. Nationally for example, in 2010, only 2.6% of Pasifika students are learning in Pasifika medium classrooms and only 14.6% of Māori students are involved in Māori medium education. This includes the 3.5% of Māori students who have moved outside whitestream education to enrol in Kura Kaupapa Māori (see Chapter 5 for a breakdown of these figures).

The Community Context

Clover Park, Otara, Manukau

On November 1 2010 Auckland’s eight local bodies merged into a single new local governance structure called the Auckland Council - commonly referred to as the Super City. The Clover Park community is located in the southern part of Otara, within what is now called the Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board area of the new super city structure. The Otara-Papatoetoe Local Board is situated within the Manukau Council Ward.

According to Shirley (2010) the new regional administration is driven by “a form of economic fundamentalism which equates ‘governance’ with managing a ‘business’ and reduces democracy to a token engagement in the decision-making systems of local and regional government.” The restructurering of existing cities and local bodies into one super city was contentious. Shirley cites the lack of democratic representation, the form of governance chosen, the ‘privatisation’ of public assets and the reduction of public accountability as fundamental problems. The Government’s refusal to establish representative Māori seats in the council was labelled “Institutional racism” by Māori Party co-leader Dr Pita Sharples (Govt. Māori Party Relations, 2009). There was widespread concern that the biggest losers in the super city structure would be the low income areas of South Auckland then governed by the former Manukau City Council. While the city boundaries and structure have been redrawn the realities for the communities within the former Manukau City are unchanged. Middleton (2006) paints this picture of the area:

The picture is clear. As a nation New Zealand becoming older while the younger groups in the community are becoming increasingly comprised of Māori and Pasifika. The national trends are, however, only half of the comparable trends in Manukau City which will impact earlier due to the already younger age profile of the population in the city.
Added to this is the fact that the Māori and Pasifika population is growing at a rate that is considerably in advance of that for the population generally. In terms of economic impact, these figures paint a potentially grim picture:

- 46% of New Zealand’s most deprived schools are situated in Manukau City,
- the cost of raising a “troubled boy” from age 0 to age 17 is a little over $0.5m,
- the total cost of high risk youth in Manukau in 2006 will be over $180m per year,
- the total cost of high risk adults in Manukau in 2006 will be over $540m per year,
- the cost of youth unemployment in Manukau is now over $220m per year, and
- current government agency programmes aimed at supporting at-risk young people in Manukau cost over $32m per year.

The inescapable conclusion is that doing whatever it takes to effect increase in educational achievement in Manukau City is the cheap option. (Middleton, 2006)

The area known as Manukau City is one of the most culturally diverse areas in New Zealand, with over 184 ethnic groups in the population of 328,968 in 2006. In the 2006 Census\(^\text{17}\) 46% of Manukau residents identify their ethnic group as European (this includes those who chose the term ‘New Zealanders’ as an ethnic group), 15% as Māori, 28% as Pasifika, and 22% as Asian. Thirty nine percent of Manukau residents speak two or more languages, with Samoan being the most widely spoken language after English (Manukau City Council, 2009).

The concentration of Pasifika peoples in Manukau City, compared with the whole of New Zealand, can be clearly seen in Figure 6. Manukau City is home to 33% of the country’s total Cook Islands Māori population, 34% of the total number of Samoan people, and 36% of the country’s Tongan residents (Statistics New Zealand, 2009a).

In the Clover Park community, where Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga are located, 93.7% of the population is either Māori (20%) or Pasifika (73.7%). This local concentration has significant impact for local schools. In the two schools in this study it is rare to find a single Pākehā student on either roll.

---
\(^{17}\) 2006 Census data are the most recent available as the planned 2011 New Zealand Census was not held due to the Christchurch earthquake on 22 February 2011
Manukau is also a youthful community with a median age of 30.9 years, 5 years lower than the national median. Twenty six percent of people in Manukau City are aged under 15 years. The Otara community has the youngest population in Manukau with a median age of 24 years and with 40% of residents below 20 years of age. It also has the highest level of unemployment, and the lowest median personal income in the city. This profile contributes to higher levels of youth social dislocation and crime.

In 2006, in response to increased reports about escalating youth gang activity and violent assaults in the wider Counties-Manukau area, and a call for significant government intervention, the Ministry of Social Development commissioned research into the prevalence of youth gangs. The 499 participants in this research included youth and adult gang members, youth not involved in gangs, including former gang members, staff from government agencies, youth lawyers, police, school and community representatives and community service organisations. The Ministry of Social Development report (2008) provides some insight into the issues faced daily by the schools in this research and in the community generally. One New Zealand Police estimate in this report suggests that there are approximately 600 youth gang members in Counties Manukau, representing 73 youth gangs. However, an accurate estimate is difficult because of a lack of data. It is also difficult to disaggregate youth crime from gang-related crime (p.5). The research suggests that motivating

---

18 Because people can choose more than one ethnic group totals may not add up to 100.

The “Other” category in these data is significantly larger than in the previous Census (from 2% to 11%) due to the inclusion of a “New Zealander” category in the Ethnicity question. See discussion on this choice in the National Identity section of Chapter 2.
factors that draw youth to gang involvement include the provision of a proxy family unit, financial and material gain, alleviating boredom, improved social status, protection, peer pressure, excitement associated with crime, and adult gang recruitment or prospecting (p.32).

Participants in the Ministry of Social Development report believed that the economic deprivation of the community negatively impacts on social cohesion and therefore undermines positive community values. A number of participants described the proliferation and impact of finance companies, gambling venues and alcohol outlets that contribute to the cycle of economic deprivation (p.28). A further pressure raised was that many Pasifika families are obliged to contribute financially to their family and country of origin and to contribute to daily living expenses, funerals, weddings and other major events. There are also financial obligations and pressure for some Pasifika peoples to contribute financially to their church, with the weekly donation amount read out to the congregation (p.30). Māori participants also spoke of cultural financial obligations, (tangihanga, whānau commitments, volunteering as a cultural obligation. For example) which they framed within a context of cultural disenfranchisement and poverty (p.31).

Those who blamed parents for youth gang membership described a dysfunctional family structure embodying; long-term unemployment, intergenerational benefit-reliant families, single parents, parental drug use, adult gang members or close affiliates, no church attendance, poor educational achievement and the fact that many families are clients of multiple state agencies (p.29).

These are certainly all issues that impact on our families and the young people in our two schools. Just nine houses separate the front gates of the schools’ campus from the nearest liquor outlet. Shopping trucks continually patrol the neighbourhood, taking advantage of families who have few other credit or shopping options, selling overpriced goods and allowing families to accumulate major credit card debt. In 2008, gang-related activity resulted in a shootout at a tinny-house19 400 metres from the school gates, and a six-month covert operation by police investigating gang-related drug offences resulted in highly publicised arrests of over 44 people for possession of ‘P’ (methamphetamine), supplying ‘P’ and money laundering. Many of those arrested lived within the schools’ community and were closely connected to school families. The long term negative impact of this activity is ongoing. Perhaps the event that brought community issues closest to education officials’ attention was in 2009, when two carloads of youths pulled up to a house next door to the school, broke their way in, and stabbed one of the occupants. All the resulting police and ambulance attendance was observed by our students, and by the two visiting Education Review Officers20 who had been in classrooms less than an hour. They observed us having to calm students down and send all staff out to the street after school to ensure students could safely negotiate the cordon and get home.

19 Houses illegally selling tinfoil-wrapped marijuana
20 The Education Review Office (ERO) is the government department whose purpose is to evaluate and report publicly on the education and care of students in schools.
The continual negative media spotlight on “South Auckland” and the media frenzy that inevitably follows individual incidents such as those described above, is a fact of life for our young people and their families, and those who have worked in the community for many years. However all would attest that Otara is nonetheless a rich, diverse, vibrant and proud community with assets that are rarely publicised.

We also have to recognise that increasingly, since the opening of Te Whānau o Tupuranga in 2006, some of our students are travelling long distances to attend the school. Some Clover Park families choose to travel from outside the district specifically to access the Samoan and Tongan bilingual programmes. The widening enrolment catchment area of each school is represented in the following maps (Figure 7, Figure 8)

Figure 7: Map showing Te Whānau o Tupuranga enrolments in 2010

Figure 8: Map showing Clover Park Middle School enrolments, 2010
**Changing the Lens: The Power Lenses’ Learning Model**

In the *Power Lenses* learning model (Milne, 2004) another whole body of legitimate knowledge (self-learning) sits alongside what is mandated in the national curriculum or “school learning.” Our children’s languages, their cultural norms, how they “live as Māori,” how they can learn and succeed ‘as Māori,’ or as Samoan, how they develop a strong cultural identity, their wairua, their spirituality, whanaungatanga – their connectedness - are all high status learning, valid in their own right. We need to value this “self learning” just as highly as we value “academic” learning.

The original *Power Lenses* model (Milne, 2004) was further developed by Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School staff in 2006 and 2007. The most important part of the revised model is the critical, social justice practice at the centre - the ‘kete’ or toolkit young people need in order to challenge and change a system, whose a single-minded focus on Western/European outcomes tells them clearly they are failing. The six relationships in the centre of the Power Lenses learning model (Figure 9) are adapted from the work of George Otero & Susan Chambers-Otero (2002).

Otero’s relationships framework however, does not incorporate student/parent relationships or student and peer relationships. Although he agrees that, “What happens in these two relationships through the use of the three conversations is important territory” (2003, p.9), he states they have not looked closely at their effect on practice. This is where Otero’s model and the Power Lenses model differ. Given the crucial influence of peers in adolescence and the alienation that Māori and Pasifika families traditionally experience from both their own and their children’s schooling staff felt the home-school and peer relationships had to be an integral part of our pedagogical approach. As a result the Power Lenses learning model used in the two schools in this study is based on six key relationships (Figure 9).

In this model the student and peer relationships are about developing a secure cultural identity which answer the questions, “Who am I?” and “Where do I fit?” - into my ethnic group, into my peer group, in my extended family, in my community, in society and in the worlds I negotiate beyond school. The relationship with learning has important questions for students and teachers; How relevant is this learning to students’ background experiences, as Māori and Pasifika youth in this community? How will they be able to relate this learning to further learning? How ready am I for learning about this? Am I able to negotiate and participate in deciding contexts for learning that are relevant to me?
Figure 9: The Power Lenses Learning Model (Milne, 2004; Te Whānau o Tupuranga & Clover Park Middle School Curriculum Statement, 2010)

Six Relationships (after Otero & Susan Chambers-Otero, 2002)

- Learners are always on a continuum - from Unrealised to Unlimited Potential - no other ‘labels’ (special needs, gifted & talented, ESOL, at risk, at/above/below standards) are used
- Learners move from one towards the other through:
  - Six relationships
  - Self learning
  - School Learning
  - Global Learning Interaction in wide range of situations beyond school - peers, community, youth activity (music, sport, etc), global & future connections
- Learners are always situated within a background of hegemonic “white spaces” that must be intentionally countered through Critical Pedagogy and a curriculum centred on social justice.
The relationship between Māori students and teachers is the central focus of the *Te Kotahitanga* research (Bishop et al, 2003) which exposes the impact of teachers’ strongly held deficit views of Māori students. In *Te Kotahitanga* and in the *Power Lenses* model this relationship is seen as one that is reciprocal, with mutual respect and high expectations - from the teacher to students, and vice versa. It is also a whānau relationship, based on trust and authentic caring. In Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School students call teachers ‘Whaea,’ ‘Matua,’ and ‘Nanny’ (or their respective Samoan, Tongan, or Cook Islands Māori equivalents), accompanied by their first names, as they would address parents, aunts or uncles and grandparents. The relationship is supportive with clear guidelines and boundaries for behaviour.

The home-school relationship is also based on reciprocity. Māori and Pasifika parents have legitimate reasons to mistrust the education system in general and schools specifically. This relationship therefore must be an authentic partnership that is of mutual benefit to both whānau and school. Too often these relationships are controlled by schools who offer guidelines and instructions to families which are designed to make children ‘fit’ the school environment:

This idea of reciprocal relationships is very different from the common school practice which develops relationships with the community characterised by school needs and demands. We ask parents to help, expect them to attend school functions, support the school in ensuring their children follow our rules, behave in ways we decide, complete school tasks and assignments and ensure they attend every day. We may be required by legislation to ‘consult’ with our communities but consultation merely implies that we will receive input - not necessarily act on it. How then can we expect dialogue and interaction with families to have a positive impact on young people when the Eurocentric “rules of the game” are set by the school? (Milne, 2004, p.171)

Our home-school relationship in Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga is underpinned also by an Appreciative Inquiry perspective (Cooperrider & Srivastva,1987; Elliott,1999; Milne, 2004) that values parents’ views and uses the experience of positive events in the past to shape a vision for what can happen in the future. This process is very different from processes that arise from the deficit assumptions that most Māori and Pasifika parents experience:

Appreciative inquiry starts from a fundamentally different - and more positive point. It is designed to help local people identify their achievements. This process can be very empowering for people who have always considered themselves poor and disadvantaged. When they look for their strengths, they are often amazed to discover how resilient, adaptive and innovative they are. They have to be - poverty is a cruel and unforgiving circumstance. By focusing on their strengths they can use the “positive present” to build a shared vision of a better future, one that is grounded in reality. Appreciative inquiry creates a development pathway based on what is right rather than what is wrong. (Elliott 1999)
The final two relationships; self and peers, and the wider world are explained in Chapter 4 and Chapter 6. However, in summary, in the context of these two schools, peer relationships, are based in whanaungatanga and are collective, as opposed to individual, relationships. The wider world relationship takes into account all of the other groups and environments our students negotiate in the lives outside school, and those they will encounter in the future, including understanding and connecting to wider struggles for social justice. This wider world relationship includes church, extended whānau, youth groups, and participation in sports and other activities. An important focus of this global lens is on the tools, in particular the technologies and critical thinking, that our youth need to go forward into the global world. This relationship adds to our students’ understanding of society through conscientisation, resistance and transformative praxis.

The following eight key assumptions about learning are integral to all three lenses in the Power Lenses learning model, and they serve to drive school organisation and learning practice in both schools. The ways these assumptions guide practice in classrooms is explained in detail in Chapters 4, 5 and 6.

1. Learning is integrated - across subject areas and with students’ lives and realities.
2. Learning is negotiated - by students, with teachers.
3. Learning is inquiry-based and student-driven.
4. Learning is critical - it provides young people with the power and the tools to understand and challenge inequity and injustice and to make change in their lives.
5. Learning is whānau-based - it is collective, cooperative, collaborative and reciprocal. This means learning is shared - you receive it, you share it, and you give back to other learners.
6. Learning is located within strong relationships - with self, with each other, with teachers, with the learning itself and its relevance, with the world beyond school and between home and school.
7. Learning is culturally located and allows you to live your cultural norms throughout the school day.
8. All students are at different places on the Unrealised to Unlimited potential continuum and this position is always identified.

Outline of remaining chapters

The Power Lenses learning model is used as the basic structure for this thesis. Chapters 4, 5 and 6, discuss the findings of this research, and examine the outcomes for each lens separately (Figure 10).
Chapter Two: Literature and Theories

Chapter 2 is divided into three sections; Theories of Identity, Theories of Schooling and Theories of Solutions. The chapter discusses the literature and theory that inform our understanding of the development of a secure cultural identity in the schooling experiences of Māori and Pasifika youth. The concept of “White Spaces” and whiteness in our education system is further expanded through a review of the literature relating to school and identity. The chapter outlines sociocultural theories that underpin potential solutions for Māori and Pasifika youth in New Zealand schools. The crucial components of these theories are the centrality of race or culture, and a critical perspective. These elements are embodied best in kaupapa Māori theory, Pasifika epistemologies, critical race theory and critical pedagogy. Finally the chapter suggests that solutions must be sought from within a framework of secure positive relationships, explained as a pedagogy of whānau and whanaungatanga.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Chapter 3 describes the research design, an intrinsic case study informed by kaupapa Māori and critical race theory, and the research methods used. My positioning as a Pākehā researcher, a long term staff member, and the principal of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga is specifically addressed. The participation of staff and former students through group interviews and online surveys, and the contributions made through international networks are explained. Finally, this chapter describes the collection of data from a wide range of sources within the school, and the analysis of this information.
Chapter Four: Determining Self (The Self Learning Lens)

Chapter 4 looks specifically at the first of the three lenses in the schools’ learning model - the self-learning lens. It further explores Māori and Pasifika identities as these underpin the action research by school staff to develop an assessment tool to determine students’ growth in their cultural identity and self-knowledge. This tool and the process to develop it are explained in detail. The purpose of this assessment tool is explained in terms of its use within the school. The tool does not intend to be aligned with standard psychological tests of identity or identity one would expect adults to have developed. Its intended use is as a tool to describe the learning and development that the schools in the study view as valid achievement in its own right for our students. The chapter also discusses the concept of “Māori children enjoying education success as Māori,” and explores the use of the self-learning tool and the schools’ practice to examine this concept of “as Māori” or “as Pasifika.” The learning seen through the self-lens is not intended to be a stepping stone to improve learning in other lenses, although the data provided in this chapter shows that this does happen.

The chapter also asks questions about and success, the white space of assessment, and answers these through the data provided by the self-lens research. The development of the self-lens tool, and the knowledge it gives the schools about these previously undervalued, but crucially important skills, is knowledge that cannot be determined by assessments of literacy, numeracy, national standards or NCEA credits. However, it is information which, coupled with the critical practice in the school learning lens, changes both the learning and the assessment white spaces to make them relevant and authentic places for Māori and Pasifika learners.

Chapter Five: Colouring in the School Learning Space (The School Learning Lens)

This chapter describes the schools’ practice through the school-learning lens. The schools’ structure and organisation, the learning programme in practice, the supports in place for this way of learning, and learning outcomes are all discussed. The concept of White Spaces is continued through an exploration of the systematic alienation of Māori and Pasifika students in New Zealand schools from their own identities. The chapter describes the pedagogical practices within these two schools that intentionally “colour in” the school learning white space and specifically describes a pedagogy of whānau in practice. It emphasises however that practice viewed through the school-learning lens is predicated on the belief of these schools that not only do we have to view learning differently, through lenses that include self-learning and global learning, but there is still very much work to be done to review the practice in our education system within this school lens.

21 In each NCEA subject, skills and knowledge are assessed against a number of standards. Schools use a range of internal and external assessments to measure how well students meet these standards. When a student achieves a standard, they gain a number of credits. Students must achieve a certain number of credits to gain an NCEA certificate. There are three levels of NCEA certificate, depending on the difficulty of the standards achieved. In general, students work through Levels 1 to 3 in years 11 to 13 at school.
Chapter Six: Wider Spaces (The Global Learning Lens)

This chapter examines two aspects of the global learning lens—social justice (international), and new skills and knowledge for the 21st Century. The first section of the chapter describes social justice initiatives outside New Zealand and focuses specifically on three programmes in the United States that I have personally visited and with whom our schools have an ongoing association. The connection with these programmes show our youth that they are not alone in the struggle for social justice and educational sovereignty, and that injustice, colonisation, assimilation, racism and white spaces transcend borders to marginalise and pathologise young people the world over. This section identifies seven key principles that these initiatives and the philosophy and practice of the two schools in this research have in common. The second section of this chapter looks at the new skills and knowledges needed for 21st Century learners and describes the development of the first Computer Clubhouse\(^{22}\) in New Zealand on the schools’ campus. This section examines the network of Clubhouses world-wide, the interaction of our students with youth from all over the world and the benefits the Clubhouse brings to the learning programme and the community of both schools.

Chapter Seven: Interpreting the Evidence

Chapter Seven reflects on the main themes emerging from the findings described in the previous three chapters. It explores a range of independent data to validate the information presented in these chapters. The analysis of the evidence presented confirms that appropriate and effective conditions do exist in the two schools to empower the students to follow their cultural norms. These conditions are intentional on the part of the two schools and are embedded in school policy and practice, in all official school documentation and confirmed by independent sources. The voices of current staff and students, and former students whose experience of the school spans twenty years, also strongly support the themes of cultural identity, culturally responsive, critical, pedagogy, whānau, and community.

Chapter Eight: Self-Determining Spaces

Chapter 8 discusses the shift in thinking in this thesis as it moved from an initial study of the development of cultural identity in whitestream schools to questions about why schools don’t do this already and why this seems to be so difficult? These questions highlighted the barriers Māori and Pasifika youth face every day in our Eurocentric education system. This final chapter begins with an explanation for the change of name and structure in 2011 as the two schools merge under the new name, Kia Aroha College. The chapter takes its structure from a set of twelve guiding

\(^{22}\) In October, 2012, the NZ brand “Computer Clubhouse” network began a rebranding process to become known as the High Tech Youth Network (HYTN). Clubhouse 274, on the schools’ campus, was renamed Studio 274, a Lead Affiliate of the High Tech Youth Network. The HYTN continues to be operated by the Computer Clubhouse Trust in New Zealand. As the time periods referred to in this thesis predate the change of name, I have retained the terms ‘Computer Clubhouse’ and ‘Clubhouse 274’ throughout the thesis. The rationale for this significant change, and its relevance to this thesis, is explained in Chapter 6.
principles towards a pathway of self-determination, which were developed by senior students in 2010, and aligns these with the three lenses through which the schools view learning, and which formed the basis of Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Chapter 8 provides answers to the questions which drove this study, and links these answers to the schools’ expectations for students by the time they graduate. An overview of the thesis is also provided in the form of a diagram (see Figure 56).

The last of the eight question central to this research asks how can schools recognise, and address, barriers that exist in their practice to the development of a secure cultural identity? Chapter 8 addresses this question by returning to the concept of hope, first introduced in Chapter 1, and discusses the restoration of genuine “audacious hope” (Duncan-Andrade, 2009), “radical hope” (Freire, 1998) and “radical healing” (Ginwright, 2009, 2010a, 2010b) as crucial elements in the reclamation of educational sovereignty and cultural identity of non-white learners in our schools.

The final section of Chapter Eight asks what did the three schools in this study learn from this journey and the changes that they have implemented? The lessons learned are made available to others who might explore the same issues and embark on a similar pathway, which they in turn can make relevant to their own communities and schools.

Summary

This chapter has introduced the research topic and the questions which underpin this study. The chapter identifies some of the toxins within education policy and practice that marginalise and minoritise Māori and Pasifika youth. The importance of cultural identity is discussed in this chapter and the central concept of White Spaces in our whitestream education system is introduced. The chapter examines the different contexts that background the pedagogical changes that have been developed in Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School to address barriers in our education system that prevent Māori and Pasifika learners realising their potential. These contexts include local community, regional and national settings, national achievement data, and Māori and Pasifika perspectives. The final section of this chapter describes the Power Lenses Learning Model (Milne, 2004) which is the schools’ response to “colouring in the white spaces” to empower Māori and Pasifika students to learn “as” Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Islands Māori. This model is used as the structure for Chapters 4, 5 and 6, to analyse the findings of this research and examine the outcomes for each lens separately (Figure 10).
Chapter Two

Literature and Theories

Volumes of studies, research and reports dealing with Indigenous peoples in non-Indigenous educational systems paint a familiar picture of failure and despair. When measured in non-Indigenous terms, the educational outcomes of Indigenous peoples are still far below that of non-Indigenous peoples. This fact exists not because Indigenous peoples are less intelligent, but because educational theories and practices are developed and controlled by non-Indigenous peoples. Thus, in more recent times, due to the involvement of Indigenous peoples, research shows that failure is indeed present, but that this failure is that of the system, not of Indigenous peoples. In this context the so-called “dropout rates and failures” of Indigenous peoples within non-Indigenous educational systems must be viewed for what they really are – rejection rates. (The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights in Education, 1999)

This chapter explores how the theoretical frameworks and literature regarding students who have been minoritised\(^{23}\) by whitestream education systems, can inform our understanding of the development of cultural identities of Māori and Pasifika youth. This thesis argues that the development of positive and agentic cultural identities is an essential component of successful achievement at school. The chapter is divided into three sections (Figure 11).

Section 1 explores theories of identity; identity development, cultural identity, adolescent identity and the notion of a national New Zealand identity.

Section 2 explores the relevance of cultural identity to the context of school and the impact of the loss of indigenous identities. It examines what is meant by racialised social order, whiteness and “white spaces” in our education system, as well as what happens to identity when school and home cultures collide and how students negotiate the challenges of schooling and academic identity formation.

Section 3 introduces some sociocultural solutions to improving the school achievement of indigenous students that draw on critical theory and critical multiculturalism. It also discusses how

---

\(^{23}\) Shields, Bishop & Mazawi (2005) use this term to refer to those who are treated as if one’s position and perspective is of less worth, who are silenced or marginalised, regardless of whether they are in the numerical minority or not.
Kaupapa Māori theory, Pasifika epistemologies, and Critical Race Theory raise important challenges to the control and production of knowledge that are crucial to the practice and pedagogy within the two schools that constitute the present case study. Solórzano and Yosso (2002, p.27) maintain that, “unacknowledged White privilege helps maintain racism’s stories. These schools chose to break away from the status quo and challenge the racism within our education system. Section 3 proposes a pedagogy of relations based on the ongoing processes of whakawhanaungatanga.

Figure 11: Outline of the Theory and Literature Review Chapter (Chapter 2)

Theories of Identity

What is cultural identity?

It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness — an American, a Negro; two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. (Du Bois, 1989)

Cultural or ethnic identity refers to the degree to which a person feels connected with a racial or cultural group (Bennett, 2004, p.862). Cultural identity is described by Phinney (1996, cited in Bennett, 2004) as a complex cluster of factors, “including self-labelling, a sense of belonging, positive evaluation, preference for the group, ethnic interest and knowledge, and involvement in activities associated with the group.” Nasir and Saxe (2003) also argue that cultural practices - socially patterned activities organized with reference to community norms and values - are
important arenas for the enactment and formation of identity. “It is in these cultural practices - as people “do” life - that identities are shaped, constructed, and negotiated.”

For students from indigenous and minority ethnic groups the development of a cohesive cultural identity is severely challenged in the school environment in which you spend the major part of your daily life, when your norms and values are not those of the dominant culture. This tension is exacerbated during the years of early adolescence when the formation of identity is occurring developmentally (Ghuman, 1999; National Middle Schools’ Association, 2007).

How does cultural identity develop?

Grande (2000a, p.347), analyses of her own identity development as an American Indian woman in the academy within the “prevailing theories of identity, namely those frameworks that have emerged from (left) essentialist, postmodern, and critical identity theories.” Essentialist and postmodern frameworks are discussed in this section and critical frameworks are embedded in the section on theories of solutions and discussion of critical multiculturalism later in this chapter.

Essentialist Frameworks

Stage Models

Root (2004, p.114) identifies the development of racial identity models within specific eras. Between the 1970s and early 1980s, alongside the civil rights and Black Pride movements in America of that time, stage models of racial identity development were popular. In general, Root observes, these models “suggest that there is an initial stage of internalization of a White reference group that necessarily is accompanied by internalization of devalued messages about Black people, values and cultures.”

Banks’ (2004) typology, which identifies six stages in the development of cultural identity (Figure 12) is an example of a stage model, but this model has evolved from his earlier work (Banks 1981). Rather than see these stages and descriptions as the ideal, Banks now describes the typology as a “framework for thinking about and facilitating the identity development of students who approximate one of the stages.”
Banks suggests that in Stage 1 individuals may reject their own culture through internalising the negative stereotypes and beliefs within the wider society about their particular ethnic group. This leads to low self esteem. In Stage 2 individuals typically have newly discovered their ethnicity but still may have mixed feelings. They may try to limit themselves to their ethnic group and interact exclusively within it, considering the group to be superior to others. In Stage 3 individuals have developed an authentic pride in their ethnic group and have clarified their identity and developed positive attitudes towards it. Individuals in Stage 4, ‘Biculturalism’ have a healthy sense of their own cultural identity but are also able to participate successfully in another cultural community. Banks suggests at this stage people have “a strong desire to function effectively in two cultures.” In Stage 5 individuals have clarified their positive personal, cultural and national identifications. They have developed positive attitudes towards other cultural groups. In Stage 6 individuals can function effectively in their own group, and in different ethnic groups nationally and globally—they have a commitment to all humanity. A prerequisite to developing this cosmopolitan stage is “strong, positive, clarified cultural identifications and attachments”:
It is not realistic to expect Puerto Rican students in New York City to have a strong allegiance to U.S. national values or deep feelings for dying people in Afghanistan if they feel marginalized and rejected within their community, their school, and in their nation-state. (Banks, 2004)

Banks believes teachers must be aware of and sensitive to students moving through these stages of cultural development in all their students and facilitate their identity development. Teachers then must play a central role but many teachers in schools are unaware of this responsibility.

Drawing on the stage model first proposed by Cross (1971), and the work of Helms (1990), Tatum (2004, p.118-119) describes five stages of racial identity development; pre-encounter, encounter, immersion/emersion, internalisation, and internalisation-commitment. As in Banks’ typology, in Tatum’s pre-encounter stage individuals take on negative stereotypes believing it is “better” to be White, seeking to assimilate into the dominant culture and rejecting their own. Typically an event or a series of experiences of the impact of racism personally are the catalyst for transition to the “encounter” stage. While Cross suggests this stage usually happens in adolescence or early adulthood, Tatum identifies this change in Black junior high school students in predominantly White communities. Again, similar to Banks’ model, this stage involves opposition to White culture and seeing their own culture as superior. Entering this stage of identity development can have a significant impact on school engagement and achievement.

In the early part of Tatum’s immersion/emersion stage individuals surround themselves with visible symbols of racial identity and in the latter part of this stage actively seek information about their cultural history. This develops an authentic sense of self. Taking this growing security in one’s identity through to the internalisation stage, individuals can now establish meaningful relationships with their own and with other cultural groups. In Tatum’s final internalisation-commitment stage this translates into a personal commitment to the culture as a group, which is sustained over time. Helms (1990, p.66) points out however, that at this level a person is still continually open to “new information and new ways of thinking about racial and cultural variables, and even at this stage particular situations can trigger old thinking and responses.

**Postmodern Frameworks**

**Ecological Models**

Following the advent of civil rights and racial pride movements however, stage models seem to have evolved into ecological models of identity which are not constrained by the time frame and structure of specific stages. Ecological models focus on social processes and variables that influence identity formation and suggest that different identities may be more flexible and reflect different individual or group needs (Root, 2004, p.115).
Cerulo (1997, p.386) describes a shift, from the primary focus of sociologists on the individual’s sense of self, to the collective sense of self. In post-modernism, identity is not unitary or essential. It is fluid or shifting, fed by multiple sources and taking multiple forms. We are all unique and we each have our own distinctiveness but we also have much in common. Postmodern thinking on identity represents the antithesis of the prescribed unitary linear identity development proposed in earlier stage models. For instance, a social constructionist approach to identity rejects any category that proposes essential or core features as the unique property of the members of a collective. Viewed from this perspective, the collective is a social artefact—an entity whose shape and direction is moulded by the predominant cultural scripts and centres of power (Cerulo, p.387).

The literature abounds with explanations of processes to account for multiple and blended cultural identities. Acculturation and hybridity, are two of these. Khanlou (2005, p.13) believes acculturation implies that acculturating individuals from minority cultures may help them acquire the mainstream culture but at the same time lose or weaken their original cultural identity. Kraidy, (2002, p.323) challenges the controversial status of hybridity, and suggests that one of the criticisms of the concept is that it is seen as a strategy of co-option used by the powerholders to neutralise difference. These notions suggest that these constructs could further mask the processes of assimilation and loss of indigenous and already minoritised identities.

May (2009) discusses the challenges multiculturalism faces from postmodernist understandings of identity, and argues for a more critical conception of multiculturalism (see later in this chapter). He states that, “The challenge posed by postmodernist/left critics is this: how can multiculturalism, based as it is on a notion of group-based identities and related rights, avoid lapsing into reification and essentialism?” (p.40). Hybridity theory is opposed to any idea of traditional or cultural “rootedness,” emphasising instead that multiple, shifting, and complex identities are the norm for individuals. However, May points out that one of the weaknesses of hybridity is:

- the considerable disparity between the intellectual celebration of hybridity and the reality of the postmodern world. The world is increasingly one of fractured and fracturing identities. But these identities are usually not hybrid; just the opposite in fact. Nation-states, as conservatives will be the first to tell you, are facing a plethora of ethnic, regional and other social and cultural minority demands, many of which are couched in singular, collectivist terms. (p. 43, emphases in original)

**An Indigenous perspective**

In a story similar to that of my own four children, Grande (2000a) makes this weakness explicit when she describes herself as, “the perfect postmodern subject, a no-size-fits-all kind of girl” (p.345). With Peruvian Indian and Quechua (Spanish and French) ancestry, living away from her
people in the United States she says, “I am differently perceived and named in all of my communities ... as I cross the literal border between the Americas a double invisibility takes place and I am absorbed into the nebula of American otherness.” Quite certain of her identity and positionality when she entered the academy she soon realised that, nearly all of American Indian academe was besieged by the rancor of identity politics where the debate over who are the new Indians, who are the wannabes, who are the frauds, and who are the ‘real’ Indians rages with great fury.” (p.345) In this environment Grande found that “gaining recognition as an American Indian scholar often comes at a price: that writings be accessible and pre-packaged for ready consumption by the Whitestream.” Challenging the postmodernist critique of essentialist constructions of race and identity Grande believes postmodernist views of identity as ‘free-floating’ present a real and significant threat to American Indian communities struggling to define their sociopolitical relationship to the United States:

Unlike other subjugated groups, struggling to define their own local narratives within the democratic project, American Indians have not been working toward greater inclusion in the democratic imaginary but, rather, have been engaged in a centuries long struggle for the recognition of their sovereignty. This particular aspect of the Indigenous struggle completely transforms and reframes the identity question, moving it from the superficial realm of cultural politics to the more profound arena of cultural survival. (p.351)

Paralleling the development of kaupapa Māori theory, Grande calls for the development of a “red pedagogy” and praxis founded on critical Indigenous theory of tribal identity and liberation. Contrary to postmodern thinking Grande believes there are, in fact, stable markers and indicators of what it means to be Indian in American society and in this setting; “Indigenous scholars cannot afford to perceive essentialism as a mere theoretical construct or academic choice and may, in fact, be justified in their understanding of essentialism as the last line of defense against capitalistic encroachment and Western hegemony” (p.351).

Individual, environmental and historical influences must be considered when examining the development of cultural identity. Using an ecological model framework, Khanlou (2005, p.2) describes this as an “ecosystemic perspective” where it is the ongoing interaction between individual and the environment, made up of family, community, and society, that influences human development. She suggests the term, multiculturation to imply that the development of cultural identity is not limited to a linear path, nor does it exclude the stage-oriented approach either. It recognises that in multicultural settings, a range of cultural identity development processes are possible and that such processes are influenced by context. As Grande argues, the context must take indigenous perspectives into account as a safeguard against hegemonic imposition.

Two specific contexts form a backdrop to the development of cultural identity in the present research study. Because the age of students in the two schools ranges from 11 to 18 years, an
understanding of the specific importance of adolescence within the development of identity and ethnic or cultural identity is important. This study is based in two New Zealand schools where there are rarely any Pākehā students on either roll, yet the context of whitestream New Zealand society still intrudes into the identity development of these young people. The literature around these two specific aspects of identity is discussed next.

Māori and Pasifika identity development is central to this case study. This is discussed in Chapter 4, in the context of the schools’ practice and in the development of a tool to describe students’ growth in terms of their cultural identities.

**Adolescent identity development**

Houkamau (2006, p.13) defines identity as, “that aspect of the self-concept that relates to ‘who’ a person is and what that means relative to others.” This is a crucial understanding for all adolescents but even more so for adolescents of colour. Cunningham (2011, p.145) explains that “Māori concepts of adolescence are different than mainstream; the terms taiohi, taitamariki and rangatahi approximate but do not match the term ‘adolescent’.” He uses the term, “rangatahi development.”

Erikson (1968) located the search for and development of one’s identity as the critical psychosocial task of adolescence. Tatum (2003, p.83) explains that this search for identity in adolescence is not only about ethnic or cultural identity but can include such aspects as career aspirations, religious beliefs and values, and gender roles however, “for Black youth, asking “Who am I?” includes thinking about, “Who am I ethnically and/or racially? What does it mean to be Black?” Because our perceptions of ourselves are shaped by those around us when youth of colour begin to encounter others outside their families and peer groups, the racial content of that message is heightened.

French, Seidman, Allen, and Aber (2006), in a three year longitudinal study, looked specifically at two critical dimensions of ethnic identity development, group esteem—how one feels about belonging to one’s ethnic group; and exploration—how much an individual tries to find out about what it means to belong to one’s ethnic group. The study found that group esteem rose for both early and middle adolescents, but exploration rose only for the middle adolescent group. French et al. suggest that in order to have an achieved identity, one must go through a process of exploration and while early adolescents may have positive feelings toward one’s group membership, “these are based solely on accepting what one is taught by one’s family and not on the process of exploration” (p.8). Schools are crucial sites for middle adolescents’ exploration and development of an achieved, positive, ethnic identity.
Tatum (2003) explains that the concept of identity is complex and is shaped by the multiple experiences individuals, or the groups they identify with, family, social, political, and historical, encounter:

“Who am I? The answer depends in large part on who the world around me says I am. Who do my parents say I am? Who do my peers say I am? What message is reflected back to me in the faces and voices of my teachers, my neighbours, store clerks? What do I learn from the media about myself? How am I represented in the cultural images around me? Or, am I missing from the picture altogether? (p.18)

This search for personal identity intensifies during adolescence. As children move from primary school to intermediate or middle school, as they experience puberty and enter adolescence they begin to ask the questions about who they are and where they fit into the society around them. Tatum (2003, p.53) points out however, that while all adolescents look at themselves in new ways, not all adolescents have to think of themselves in racial terms. Why? Because this is the way the world sees them. Our perceptions of ourselves are shaped by the way others see us, and if we are not from the dominant culture, we are seen as being different from, or “diverse” compared with, society’s accepted norms.

**National Identity - New Zealand Identity**

The official definition of ethnicity used by Statistics New Zealand is based on the ‘cultural affiliation’ concept, which measures ethnicity in terms of the cultural identity or identities that people themselves choose.

Chapter 1 introduced the New Zealand Government’s annual Social Report (Ministry of Social Development, 2010) which monitors the wellbeing of New Zealanders across ten domains, including cultural identity. Three indicators were used to measure cultural identity (p.85). The first is the share of New Zealand content programming on television. This indicator is explained by the rationale that “since television is the dominant cultural medium for most New Zealanders, it has a strong influence on how we see ourselves” The second indicator measures the health of Māori language as a central component of culture, “necessary for full participation in Māori society.” and the third indicator is the proportion of people who can speak the first language (other than English and Māori) of their ethnic group. This is seen as an indicator of “the degree to which people are able to retain their culture and traditions and to pass them on to subsequent generations.” The report acknowledges that, “While these indicators cannot provide an exhaustive picture of New Zealand’s cultural identity, they do provide snapshots of the health of particular aspects of it.” There is no indication of how these three measures were decided.

The 2010 report concludes that “Cultural identity outcomes are mixed.” Local content broadcast on television is higher than it was in 2009 but not as high as it was in 2006. There is a decline in the
proportion of Māori who can speak Māori, but an increase in the total number who can do so. The proportion of people who could hold an everyday conversation in the first language of their ethnic group experienced little change. So is our national cultural identity healthy - or not? By these measures it seems, the best we can say is that we don’t know.

**Politics and New Zealand Identity**

This confusion over what we call ourselves and how we measure our identity, serves to highlight the politics and the volatility inherent in the issue of identity for Pākehā New Zealanders. The opposition, sometimes visible, but most often not, inevitably manifests itself in our education policies and practice.

Ballard (2008, pp.14-15) outlines the way a populist racist discourse influenced the draft *New Zealand Curriculum* following the Don Brash, Orewa, speech (Brash, 2004). Brash, then the leader of the National Party in opposition at the time, claimed that Māori were a privileged group who gained special privileges from government funding based on race. In a rapid reaction to the dramatic increase in voter support for the National Party that immediately followed this speech, the Labour government’s aligned themselves with these views by requiring that policy be ‘needs-based’ and not based on specific data for Māori. One example of this change in policy resulted in all reference to the Treaty of Waitangi being removed from the draft *New Zealand Curriculum*. Objection by the Human Rights Commission, as well as many others, subsequently changed this position.

**Backlash Politics**

O’Sullivan (2006, p.1) observes that Brash was responding to a growing political backlash against perceived provision of remedial rights to Māori which were seen as unjust and a “racial privilege.” A similar conservative, white backlash is identified by Giroux (1997) who describes a discourse of Whiteness in America that “signifies the resentment and confusion of many Whites who feel victimized and bitter, while masking deep inequalities and exclusionary practices within the current social order.” Marker (2006) suggests that the particular forms of backlash that colonised indigenous peoples face complicate teachers’ understanding of culturally responsive pedagogy:

> Struggles of indigenous peoples and schooling confront two related problems. First, because of the history of colonization and theft of land, contemporary descendants of white invaders are deeply insecure “when confronted by the indigenous Other” (p. 485), and particularly expressions of “ancient and sustained relationships to land” (p. 486). Second, the Western conceptualization of knowledge as rooted in science, objectivity, and progress, and of schooling as “assimilation into global technocratic norms” that are disconnected from any particular place (p. 502) devalues traditional indigenous knowledge that is connected with place. (cited in Sleeter, 2010, p.21)
Marker (2006, p.482) describes this racist backlash with reference to the Makah people’s treaty-protected right to hunt whales and the widespread, “anti-Indian” reaction which followed such a hunt off the Washington coast in 1999. Marker argues that the ensuing “classroom context of hostility toward indigenous perspectives on land, identity, and food revealed limits to meaningful considerations of culture within educational institutions.

In the New Zealand context, a similar anti-Māori backlash is evident in the controversy which arose in 2003 when eight iwi from the north of the South Island sought declarations from the Māori Land Court that the foreshore and seabed within the Marlborough Sounds region is Māori customary land. (Stone, 2003). The contentious issue has continued to be played out in the media, in the courts, and in parliament, without an acceptable resolution, illustrating our own limitations in terms of understanding cultural viewpoints that are different from white norms. Two more recent examples of backlash politics and subsequent links to backlash pedagogy, under the guise of school reform in New Zealand, are (1) the introduction of mandated National Standards, (Ministry of Education 2010c) ostensibly to reduce our “long tail” of underachievement, and (2) the removal of the goal of bilingualism for Pasifika students in the Government’s Pasifika Education Plan 2009-2012 (Ministry of Education, 2009d). In spite of significant, informed, resistance from teachers, principals, teacher unions, parents, boards of trustees and community to both of these so-called reforms, they have been pushed through at speed and with minimal consultation.

Apple (2004b, p.82) argues that one of the major failures of research on identity is that it has failed to adequately address the hegemonic politics of the Right, which has been able to connect politics inside and outside education, where fear of the “racialized other” is linked to “fears of nation, culture, control and decline—and to the intensely personal fears about the future of one’s children in an economy in crisis.” The next section examines how that hegemony plays out in our school classrooms for children who are not from the dominant whitestream culture.

Theories of Schooling and Identity

Debate about multicultural education, or education for “diversity” or “diverse learners,” to use the more recent terminology, is nothing new and there is still little agreement about what this actually means. Steinberg & Kincheloe, (2001, pp.3-5), identify five positions in the discourse of the pedagogy of multicultural education (Table 3). Critical multiculturalism is discussed here rather than in the next section along with critical pedagogy and critical race theory, as theories of solutions, because the positions and practice outlined in Table 3 are relevant also to challenging the white spaces in our schools. Particularly problematic are the pluralist position and practices, described by Steinberg and Kincheloe as the “mainstream articulation of multiculturalism,” and the “left-essentialist” multicultural education position and practice. Grande (2000a) describes left-essentialism as:
Merely a permutation of essentialist theory in which the categories of race, gender, and other social groupings are viewed as stable and homogeneous entities, or as if the members of such groups possess some unique or innate set of characteristics that sets them apart from ‘Whites’... An essentialist discourse that remains fixated on the individual fails to conceive the sociopolitical whole and, in this way, leaves little room for social transformation and revolutionary coalition. (p.347)

Grande describes the confusion she struggled with against the construct of the “essential or authentic American Indian – as a pure-blood pedigreed individual raised in a reservation community,” which located the struggle for identity in self. Constructions of American Indians as stereotypical, “teepee dwelling, buckskinned warriors, and exotic maidens,” (Grande, 2000a, p.347), or similar exotic constructions of Māori and Pasifika cultures have no place within culturally-located, critically conscious classrooms. Unfortunately a “benevolent multiculturalism” (May, 1994) perpetuates these stereotypes and is often misconstrued by schools who believe that slightly “shading in” the white spaces is a good enough response. These approaches were the basis of the early popular “taha Māori” or Māori dimension policies of the 1980s in New Zealand. Expressions of these policies continue to persist in the ‘one-off’ cultural weeks, ethnic meals, ethnic costume days, and in the “dial-a-Māori” pōwhiri (welcome ceremony) many schools view as a sufficient response to the ethnicities and cultures of their students. Such activities represent those aspects of culture and tikanga Māori that whitestream teachers can feel comfortable with for specific, and short, periods of time. Slightly “shading” the white spaces in this way actually diminishes and demeans Māori and Pasifika children because these activities contribute to trivialising, belittling and marginalising Māori and Pasifika cultural values.

Steinberg and Kincheloe (2001), advocate for critical multiculturalism. Many of the characteristics of critical multiculturalism are consistent with those of critical race theory in that, “the power wielders who contribute to the structuring of knowledge, values and identity” are named:

The power of white supremacy is seen as an important target of critical multiculturalism, with its phenomenal ability to camouflage itself to the point of denying its own existence. Whiteness presents itself not only as a cultural force or a norm by which all other cultures are measured, but as a positionality beyond history and culture, a non-ethnic space. Thus, in a culture where whiteness as an ethnicity is erased, critical multicultural educators receive strange looks when they refer to their analysis of white culture. (p.5)

Table 3: Five positions in the pedagogy of multicultural education (adapted from Steinberg & Kincheloe, 2001, pp. 4,5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conservative diversity practice and multiculturalism or monoculturalism | • superior Western patriarchal culture  
• promotes the Western canon as a universally civilizing influence |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity Practice and Multiculturalism</th>
<th>Liberal Diversity Practice and Multiculturalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• sees the children of the poor and non-white as culturally deprived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• attempts to assimilate everyone to a Western, middle/upper-middle-class standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluralist Diversity Practice and Multiculturalism</td>
<td>• emphasises the natural equality and common humanity of individuals from diverse race, class, and gender groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• argues that inequality results from lack of opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• maintains problems arise from individual difficulties, and not from socially constructed adversities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• accepts the assimilationist goals of conservative multiculturalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left-Essentialist Diversity Practice and Multiculturalism</td>
<td>• has become the mainstream articulation of multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• shares many of the values of liberal multiculturalism but focuses more on differences than similarities in race, class and gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• exoticises difference and positions it as a necessary knowledge for those who would compete in a globalised economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contends that the curriculum should consist of studies of various divergent groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• promotes pride in group heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• avoids the use of the concept of oppression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Diversity and Multiculturalism</td>
<td>• maintains that race, class, and gender categories consist of a set of unchanging priorities (essences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• defines groups and membership in groups around the barometer of authenticity (fidelity to the unchanged priorities of the historical group in question)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• romanticises the group, in the process erasing the complexity and diversity of its history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• assumes that only authentically oppressed people can speak about particular issues concerning a specific group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• often is in struggle with other subjugated groups over whose oppression is most elemental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Diversity and Multiculturalism</td>
<td>• based in critical theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• focuses in this critical context on issues of power and domination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• grounds a critical pedagogy that promotes an understanding of how schools/education systems work by the exposé of student sorting processes and power’s complicity with the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• makes no pretense of neutrality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • rejects the assumption that education provides consistent socio-economic
mobility for working class and non-white students
• identifies what gives rise to race, class and gender inequalities
• analyses the way power shapes consciousness
• formulates models of resistance that help marginalised groups and individuals assert their self-determination and self-direction
• is committed to social justice and the egalitarian democracy that accompanies it
• examines issues of privilege and how they shape social and educational reality

May and Sleeter (2010) also see critical multiculturalism as the best way to prioritise a structural analysis of unequal power relations, “including, but not necessarily limited to racism” (emphasis in original). They argue that:

A structural analysis via critical multiculturalism frames culture in the context of how unequal power relations, lived out in daily interactions, contribute towards its production, rather than framing it primarily as an artefact from the past. Culture and identity are understood here as multilayered, fluid, complex, and encompassing multiple social categories, and at the same time as being continually reconstructed through participation in social situations (p.10).

While critical multiculturalism specifically examines race, white supremacy, gender and patriarchy, socioeconomic class, and privilege, a concern is that indigenous perspectives might be overlooked in this all-encompassing examination of identity and power. Brayboy,(2005, p.434) identifies this issue in his development of a Tribal Critical Race Theory in education (TribalCrit). TribalCrit, Brayboy states, is rooted in “a belief in and a desire to obtain and forge tribal autonomy, self-determination, self-identification, and ultimately tribal sovereignty” (p.433). In TribalCrit notions of culture, knowledge, and power are those that “have been circulating among Indigenous peoples for thousands of years.” Brayboy explains that from this perspective culture is simultaneously fluid or dynamic, and fixed or stable. The choice of critical race theory and Kaupapa Māori theory as theories of solutions in this chapter intentionally include this indigenous perspective.

**Whiteness**

The hidden, and unacknowledged nature of whiteness and power is a fundamental cause of our apparent inability to make change in our schools that will benefit non-white children. Omi and Winant (1994, cited in Apple, 2006, p.234) point out, it is only by noticing race that we can challenge it. Only by placing race at the centre of the debate can we begin to challenge structures and institutions, and our own individual positions to combat inequality and injustice, “inherited from the past and continually reproduced in the present” (Apple, 2006, p.234).
Those who are members of the dominant and powerful group in any society have choices about how they, as individual members of that group, behave. Tatum (2003, pp.11,12) likens these choices about racism to a moving walkway at an airport. Active, racist behaviour is the same as walking fast in the same direction as the conveyor belt. This person has identified with the ideology of white supremacy and is actively moving with it. Passive racist behaviour is the same as standing still. Through absolutely no deliberate effort of your own you are still moved along without resistance to the same destination as those who actively walk. Some might recognise racism and turn their backs, not prepared to go in the same direction as those supporting or passively accepting it and not wanting to end up in the same place - but unless you are prepared to actively walk in the opposite direction, at a pace faster than the conveyor belt - unless you are actively antiracist - you will still inevitably be carried along with the others.

The common threads running through these different perspectives are the issue of power, the ideology of cultural superiority and the politics of knowledge. A Māori perspective is strongly articulated by Smith (1999, p.1) who states, “The nexus between cultural ways of knowing, scientific discoveries, economic impulses, and imperial power enabled the West to make ideological claims to having a superior civilisation.” She believes that the major agency for ‘imposing this positional superiority over knowledge, language and culture in New Zealand was colonial education” (1999, p.64).

One example of New Zealand’s reluctance to discuss whiteness as problematic in education is inherent in the Ministry of Education Best Evidence Synthesis [BES], report, Quality Teaching for Diverse Students in Schooling, (Alton Lee, 2003). This report is one of a series of best evidence syntheses commissioned by the Ministry of Education, intended to inform education policy and practice in New Zealand. Dimensions of ‘diversity’ in this synthesis of evidence and best practice include, “ethnicity, socio-economic background, home language, gender, special needs, disability, and giftedness.” Also included in the definition is diversity within ethnic groups and, “the diversity within individual students influenced by intersections of gender, cultural heritage(s), socio-economic background, and talent” (p.v). This limited definition of diversity together with the overall focus of the BES on quality teaching certainly does not put culture at the centre of best practice. Although there are many references to cultural identity and to research that make cultural norms explicit (Hohepa, Smith, Smith & McNaughton,1992; Durie, 2001) the Best Evidence Synthesis does little to specifically name the inherent Eurocentrism of our education system and does little to challenge Pākehā teachers to address power relations in their classrooms. One of the nine characteristics of quality teaching identified in the Best Evidence Synthesis is that “the teacher leads in representing “us” as everyone in our class community.” The BES (p.26) points out that New Zealand teachers need a ‘we’ that is inclusive of the ethnicities and ethnic heritages which are part of each particular class community. However, as Sleeter (2008) comments, White teachers are often unaware of their own positioning and whiteness:
White people have a long history of, at best, getting in the way of the progress of people of color and, more generally, reinforcing and benefiting from everyday racism. In education, for example, there is ample evidence that White people enter the teaching profession bringing little or no understanding of race and racism, but well-armed with misinformation and stereotypes learned over the years....We assume we can teach anyone but at the same time routinely carry stereotypes into the classroom that support deficit thinking and depressed expectations for academic learning of students of color, particularly African-American students. (p.82)

Privilege or Supremacy?

The *Oxford Dictionary* defines privilege as “a special right, advantage, or immunity for a particular person or group,” and supremacy as “the state or condition of being superior to all others in authority, power, or status.” Studies of whiteness (Leonardo, 2005; McIntosh, 1988; McLaren, 2003; Sleeter & Delgado Bernal, 2002; Sleeter, 2008), generally describe white privilege as the benefits and rights those who are white accrue without any deliberate effort on their part. Leonardo (2005, p.39) supports McIntosh’s assertion that coming to terms with this unearned white privilege is “not about blame, shame or guilt.” He argues however, that although this white racial domination precedes us, it is daily recreated by whites on both the individual and institutional level. Leonardo believes:

> White domination is constantly re-established and reconstructed by whites from all walks of life... it is not solely the domain of white supremacist groups. It is rather the domain of average, tolerant people, of lovers of diversity, and of believers in justice. (p.43, emphasis in original)

Steinberg and Kincheloe (2001, p.17) explain that the power of white supremacy lies in its ability to erase itself, resulting in what they describe as “white nothingness” that is “one of the most powerful nothings we can conjure.” This invisible but all-powerful whiteness creates the white spaces in classrooms this thesis describes, when teachers are reluctant to discuss or are oblivious to whiteness and where, to change this situation, “the white power of nothingness must no longer be allowed to tacitly shape the knowledge production and the academic canon of White schooling (Steinberg and Kincheloe, 2001, p.18). As bell hooks explains:

> When liberal whites fail to understand how they can and/or do embody white-supremacist values and beliefs even though they may not embrace racism as prejudice or domination (especially domination that involves coercive control), they cannot recognize the ways their actions support and affirm the very structure of racist domination and oppression that they profess to wish to see eradicated. (hooks, 1989, p. 113)
Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) use the term “symbolic violence” to describe the “subtle process whereby subordinate classes come to take as natural or ‘common sense’ ideas and practices that are actually against their own best interests. Because schools reflect the knowledge and values of the economically and culturally dominant groups in society they validate and reproduce the “cultural capital” that students from those groups bring from home. Symbolic violence is perpetuated through the overt and covert curriculum and the practice in schools that represent the dominant group’s value systems and norms (Macedo, 1995; McLaren, 2003; Nieto, 2002). Schools devalue the cultural capital of students who occupy the subordinate class and cultural positions. McLaren (p.94) states that low academic performance of students in this position does not represent a lack of ability or competence but is, “the result of the school’s depreciation of their cultural capital.” The domain of literacy provides a good example of the impact of schooling on cultural identity and cultural capital as seen through a critical lens.

**Literacy as a White Space**

No one would dispute that children need to be able to read and write. Competence in literacy and numeracy are the primary goals of our education system and the prime focus of the myriad of schooling improvement solutions implemented in schools in low socio-economic communities in New Zealand and internationally. However, in our determination to remedy the reading and writing ‘deficits’ of young people in these communities, in ways reminiscent of “The 1C”24 programme in Arizona (see later in this chapter), and of the historical practices of punishing Māori children for their use of Māori language at school, few school consider there may be a counter-narrative to the literacy percentage increases they celebrate.

Smith (1999, p.33) directly implicates schools in the redefinition of indigenous worlds, and discusses the dangers implicit in reading and writing. She cites Grace’s (1985) assertion that “books are dangerous” to indigenous readers when:

1. they do not reinforce our values, actions, customs, culture and identity;
2. when they tell us only about others they are saying that we do not exist;
3. they may be writing about us but they are writing things that are untrue;
4. they are writing about us but saying negative and insensitive things which tell us we are not good.

(Smith, p.35)

Grace is specifically referring to school texts and journals. McLachlan's (1996) analysis of 12,526 illustrations used in New Zealand state-produced beginning reader publications25 over a span of 89 years showed that, “Māori presence has been largely relegated to the past and with few exceptions

---

24 The ‘1C’ programme segregated generations of language-minority students, in Arizona, forbidding the use of Spanish, aiming to ‘fix’ the linguistic and academic deficiencies of Mexican children, and relegating them to low level academic tracks.

25 The beginning readers analysed from 1907 to 1995 included Part 1 School Journals and the original and revised Ready to Read series.
unacknowledged in the present” (p.128). The tendency in later years was the use of colour as the single determining ethnic characteristic. This use of “dubious brown” (p.103) without any other distinguishing features failed to differentiate Māori from any other ethnic group, thus making Māori identity largely invisible in texts that were widely used in schools and sent home with young children.

Writing can be dangerous, according to Smith (1999, p.36), because “we reinforce and maintain a style of discourse that is never innocent.” She refers to the misappropriation of texts and the legitimisation of texts, in academic, journalistic and imaginative writing that reinforce ‘myths’ that are hostile to indigenous peoples. Macedo (1995, p.77) also discusses this danger. He analyses the role of literacy in cultural reproduction and critiques the instrumentalist approach to literacy that reduces it to a “competency-based skills banking approach.” He asserts that this notion of literacy is a major and popular goal of the current back to basics drive in our education systems. In this model the rewards go to the “good student” who may be a functionally competent reader but who passively receives information, and is rarely taught the skills to critically analyse “the social and political order that generates the need for reading in the first place” (p.80). Students can be functionally literate but never learn to question the “racist and discriminatory practices that they face in school and the community at large.”

**Critical and New Media Literacies**

Critical literacy, particularly critical media literacy, challenges this instrumentalist approach to literacy (Blackburn & Clark, 2007; Morrell, 2007; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008; Lea & Sims, 2008). Duncan-Andrade (2006b, p.149) explains the high use of electronic media by youth and the need for a, “critical media literacy pedagogy that empowers urban youth to deconstruct dominant media narratives, to develop much-needed academic and cultural literacies, and to create their own counternarratives to those of the media, which largely are negative depictions of urban youth and their communities.” This high use of media by youth in the United States is consistent with New Zealand findings. A report jointly commissioned by the Ministry for Culture and Heritage and Te Puni Kōkiri in 2009 (Fryer, Kalafatelis, & Palmer, 2009, p.24) sampled 1,827 people aged 15 years and older. The report found that young people and Māori are two population groups who are heavy and extensive users of electronic media devices. This is described further in Chapter 6.

**Acting White**

Ghuman (1999), emphasises the importance of a two-way home and school relationship in the development of identity for young adolescents from ethnic minorities:

---
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The development of coherent identity is likely to be facilitated only if there is a symbiotic relationship between home and school. On the other hand, if young people receive conflicting messages from these institutions and diverse emotional and social demands and commitments are expected, they are likely to be confused in their identity. (Ghuman, 1999)

Students are forced to make a choice. One choice is to become "raceless" in school, to deny their ethnicity in order to succeed. The second choice is to actively resist by maintaining their ethnic affiliations and disengaging with school activities (Davidson, 1996, Fordham & Ogbu, 1986). This choice provides one explanation for the disproportionate number of Māori and Pacific students who drop out or who are stood down or suspended from New Zealand schools.

Ogbu, (2004, p.2), faced scholarly criticism (Ainsworth-Darnell & Downey, 1998; Tyson, 2002; Carter, 2003; Horvat & Lewis, 2003; Akom, 2003) of his theory that “the burden of acting white” frames the attitudes, experiences and identities of Black youth in school. He argued, in the last article he wrote before his death in 2003, that critics have misinterpreted his cultural-ecological theory as simply a theory of ‘oppositional culture.’ Ogbu identifies five coping strategies employed by Black people to resolve the tension. “between the demands that they act according to White frames of reference, rather than the Black frames of reference in situations controlled by White people” (p.15):

1. **Cultural and linguistic assimilation:** rejection of black frames of reference and emulation of White people.
2. **Accommodation without assimilation:** a decision to more or less live in two worlds at different times and adjusting behaviour to suit each one.
3. **Ambivalence:** acknowledging that acting White was necessary for school success and for getting good jobs but accepting they would never “be White,” and that obstacles in the path of success and employment were racially based.
4. **Resistance or opposition:** a refusal and objection to adopting White culture and language because it would mean giving up Black identity, which was seen by White people as inferior to their ways.
5. **Encapsulation:** Encapsulated in communities where they could continue to use Black frames of reference. This group do not behave or talk like White people because they do not know how to rather than because they are opposed to doing so.

Ogbu (2004, p.35) concludes that opposition to the “burden of acting White” is one of the factors contributing to low school performance of non-white students. Even more important he believes, are the peer pressures and “societal, school and other community forces that discourage academic engagement.”
Flores-Gonzalez, (2005) summarises the arguments against Ogbu’s theory. Although Ogbu and Fordham may have initially intended to challenge deficit and cultural explanations, their theory ultimately is in danger of serving the popularly held belief that African Americans have a low regard for education. In addition, the concept of a purely cultural explanation for under achievement and non-engagement in school overlooks the structural and systemic factors which affect student learning. Akom (2003), in his study of seven young Black women in the Nation of Islam (NOI), a religious organisation composed primarily of African Americans proposes an alternative to Ogbu’s thesis - one in which individuals are neither accommodating nor resisting, neither succeeding nor failing, neither voluntary nor involuntary. His findings challenge the “burden of acting White” theory by transforming it into “the honor of being black” (p.313), through a strategy of “selective acculturation or segmented assimilation” (Figure 13).

These NOI young women simultaneously engaged in structural assimilation (promoting traditional values, such as hard work), separation (affirming their own racial and cultural identities), and resistance (challenging key tenets of the achievement ideology by not conforming or assimilating to school rules or social etiquette) and, at the same time, understood the importance of academic achievement. (Akom, 2003, p.319)

Figure 13: Akom’s Extension of Ogbu’s Cultural-Ecological Model of Racial-Ethnic School Performance (Akom, 2003, p.320)

Akom (2008) believes that researchers claiming that the “burden of ‘acting White’” is a school based phenomenon fail to understand that what goes on in the community impacts youth in school:
What happens to young people when they get jumped on their way to school? What happens to young people’s notions of sanity and insanity when they see their homies murdered right in front of them? ...What happens to the mind-set of communities when they feel they can’t call the police, because from their perspective the police do not serve and protect their community but, rather, harass and abuse some communities and serve and protect others? ...What Black communities/communities of color need (and white communities too) are researchers who care about the community, real people who want to work collaboratively with the community instead of continuing the age-old academic tradition of exploiting the shit out of it. (p.254)

The most disturbing aspect about the “burden of ‘acting White’” thesis, according to Akom (2004, p.256) is the ways in which white identity is seen as the correct identity to adopt or to aspire to, whereas Black culture(s) are “socially exoticized and characterized (at times) through atypical negative behaviors.”

Noguera (2003, p.23) points out that there is overwhelming evidence of a strong correlation between race and academic performance, but he also challenges the notion of oppositional culture. He cites Steele’s (1997) research that he believes provides, “a compelling explanation for the identity-achievement paradox.”

Steele highlights deeply embedded stereotypes that connect racial identity to academic ability. “Simply put, there are often strong assumptions made that if you’re White you’ll do better in school than if you’re Black, or if you’re Asian you’ll do better in school than if you’re Latino” (Noguera, 2003, p.24). These kinds of stereotypes affect both teachers’ expectations of students and students’ expectations of themselves.

A strong secure identity is possibly the answer to challenging stereotypes such as these. Sadowski (2003, p.1) believes that, in an era of education reform that is increasingly about standards, accountability and testing, there is a powerful case that much of a student’s success or failure at school is centred, not on these outcomes, but on questions of identity - “Who am I?” “What kind of student do I want to be?” “What things are important to me?” “What do others expect of me?” “Where do I want to go with my life?” “How do other people perceive me?” Ginwright (2000), however, cautions that there is more to the solution than this:

If we continue to be sold racial identity as the panacea to ethnic poor and working-class schools and communities we will also pay the price of simplifying the complexity of oppression and injustice to mere racial categories. It we pay this price, we will misdiagnose the reasons why millions of poor children come to school hungry, why thousands of young black boys engage in deadly gang violence, and simply why America’s schools have been unable to address these problems. (p.102)
DeMeulenaere (2009, p.34) sums up the discussion about school and identity when he observes that much of the literature that examines student success and failure in schools, “ignores the process (emphasis in original) of identity construction and cultural production.” He introduces two important concepts when we consider how cultural identity develops in school. The first is Wenger’s (1998) idea that identity is more than just a single trajectory; instead, it should be viewed as a “nexus of multimembership” (p. 159). People occupy and engage in multiple sites of participation, and therefore identity is fluid. The second is Rosaldo’s (1993) concept of “nonorder,” which reflects that young people make choices, and often improvise, depending on the situation. “Nonorder” allows for uncertainty and spontaneity. DeMeulenaere describes culture as process, rather than as a static construct, and identity as fluid and socially negotiated as young people try to reconcile the varied and often conflicting aspects of their identity.

However, does this framework adequately capture the cycle of conscientisation, resistance and transformation that drives indigenous and minoritised ethnic groups to seek self-determination and to deliberately resist being “whitened” as seen in my own four children’s story (see Chapter 1), and Grande’s (2000a) challenge to postmodernist constructions of identity (discussed earlier) exemplify? Moeke Pickering describes a Māori perspective:

The existence of a Pākehā ecology has played a major role in weakening Māori identity. Yet, in another respect, it has instilled a passion and desire amongst Māori to defend, protect and assert their Māori identity, a form of determination that was not accounted for by the early British colonialists. (Moeke-Pickering, 1996)

Māori and Pasifika children don’t have the privilege of making the identity choices that DeMeulenaere (p.47) suggests. Many of them are learning in classroom environments where they are disempowered by a hegemonic system based on Eurocentric norms. In these environments, the choices are already made for them. Bishop (2003, p.224) suggests others from outside the lived realities of Māori people may well believe that to develop a Māori or Pasifika cultural identity in school is a return to essentialism and a ‘romanticised’ past and present. He contends that, “The issue here, of course, is who defines the modes of identification?” He proposes solutions based in Kaupapa Māori educational theory, principles, and practices to develop “new power-sharing relationships and interaction patterns [which] could address Māori aspirations for self-determination in mainstream educational institutions in Aotearoa/New Zealand.” This is explained further in the ‘Theories of Solutions’ section later in this chapter.

The experiences of Māori in the ongoing struggle to maintain their unique identities, in the face of deliberate policies and processes of colonisation, assimilation, integration, multiculturalism and biculturalism, are those of indigenous people world-wide. The following section provides a snapshot of some examples of where a secure indigenous identity is framed by indigenous people as a distant memory and a contested space.
Indigenous cultures and identity

Our biggest Hawaiian question this last century, How can we be more like them? has become slowly, Why do we want to be more like them? Someone has rolled down the window. The breeze of identity rushes toward my skin as the aroma of ocean air fills our memory. (Meyer, 2001, p.125)

Macedo, in his introduction to the 30th anniversary edition of Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Freire, 2006, p.11), describes the struggle to transcend “a colonial existence that is almost culturally schizophrenic: being present and yet not visible, being visible and yet not present.” He writes that through first reading this book in 1971 he finally had the critical tools and language to understand, “the process through which we came to know what it means to be on the periphery of the intimate yet fragile relationship between the colonizer and the colonized.” This is a common experience for indigenous people throughout the world.

In 2009, I visited schools and listened to the experiences of La Raza in Tucson, Arizona, First Nations people in Vancouver and on Vancouver Island in Canada, and indigenous Hawaiian educators. I also met long term Aboriginal activists and academics from Australia and was able to compare the struggle of Māori with these international indigenous counterparts. To discuss indigenous identities is to discuss identity as if it were a memory, something lost that is grieved for, and also to discuss anger and resistance over generations.

In Tucson I was told, “We didn’t cross the border, the border crossed us.” Many spoke of impact of what they referred to as, “The 1C” on their parents and grandparents. Initiated in Southern Arizona in the early 20th century, the 1C programme segregated generations of language-minority students, for the next 45 years, often with tragic results. In the Tucson Unified School District, for example, between 1919 and 1965 the Hispanic dropout rate was always above 60 percent. Spanish was forbidden in the classroom or on the playground and the programme’s goal was to ‘fix’ the linguistic and academic deficiencies of Mexican children who, regardless of their ability, had to follow this low level education track that focused on vocational and homemaking skills. The memories of families who had been involved in “The 1C” are still very raw.

In Port Alberni on Vancouver Island, Huupachesaht First Nation elder, Ki-Ke-In, talked about the residential schools and the experiences of the 370 people he interviewed in his research for the book he wrote in 1996, “Indian Residential Schools: the Nuuchahnulth Experience.” People told him about the loss of family ties, culture, language, the physical and sexual abuse, and a mistrust in the present systems designed to support Nuuchahnulth children, families, and communities. His study shows how the schools failed to prepare the students for life outside of school, while stripping the children of their cultural knowledge and identity. He described the whole generation of First Nations people - those who had been in the schools, who didn’t know how to be parents, because they had been removed from their families and had no parents as role models. As the
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youngest of a family of eight and the only one who wasn’t taken away to residential school he described his guilt, and the anger he suspected his siblings felt, that his experience had been better than theirs.

Edward “Tat” Tatoosh, an elder from the Hupacasath First Nation spoke of the loss of a language, the loss of respect from young people, the loss of traditional skills, and the loss of his Nation’s history. Without your own language you are forced to use the tools of the coloniser to think, record and interpret your experience. Loss of language makes it more difficult to think and act within your own world view. “It’s very hard,” he said, “It’s a constant battle to just survive. A lot of what happened is not even published.” There was a sense of Macedo’s “being present and yet not visible” in his words, “I got my linguistics degree at the University of Victoria in 1977, but I’m not really recognised as a linguist a lot of times.”

I spoke with Dr. Bob Morgan, Conjoint Professor at Wollotuka, the School of Aboriginal Studies at the University of Newcastle in New South Wales in Australia. Morgan chaired the 1993 World Indigenous Conference in Education (WIPCE) and following that conference, initiated the Task Force that drew up the now famous Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples Rights in Education, (1999), which I have drawn from to introduce each chapter in this thesis. Morgan spoke of the “Stolen Generation” and of being lined up with all the other Aboriginal children at his primary school and being told by the “whitefella” teacher that they would never be capable of learning. When he recounted this experience to his mother, “his greatest teacher,” she told him he could live the teacher’s dream or he could live his own dream.

Through the forcible removal of children from families or through policies such as assimilation, integration, multiculturalism and biculturalism, the politics of difference and diversity, and globalisation, indigenous peoples have been stripped of their identities in spite of their long resistance to these hegemonic practices. Smith (1999) explains:

While the West might be experiencing fragmentation, the process of fragmentation known under its old guise of colonization is well known to indigenous peoples. We can talk about the fragmentation of lands and cultures. We know what it is like to have our identities regulated by laws and our languages and customs removed from our lives. Fragmentation is not an indigenous project, it is something we are recovering from. While shifts are occurring in the ways in which indigenous peoples put ourselves back together again, the greater project is about recentring indigenous identities on a larger scale. (p.97)

This international resistance and initiative in education to centre learning and curriculum on indigenous knowledges and identities is further discussed in Chapter 6. Bishop (2003, p.236) suggests Kaupapa Māori theory can both expose the problems and also frame the solutions which address the historical and ongoing power imbalances in our schools. The next section of this
chapter draws on Kaupapa Māori theory, Pasifika epistemologies, and critical race theory to show how these theories inform our practice in the two schools in the present case study.

**Theories of Solutions**

At the heart of Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory lies the understanding that human cognition and learning is social and cultural, rather than an individual phenomenon. Vygotsky’s theoretical framework is based on the assumption that all action is mediated and is inextricably connected to the social context where it is happening.

Constructionism synthesises both of these perspectives by asserting that individual development is enhanced by shared social activity. Constructionism is a theoretical framework that comes out of the work of Papert in the research and development of the Logo programming language (Papert, 1980). Papert also argues that students are not passive receptacles of the knowledge that teachers impart, however he adds that not only must knowledge be built by the learner, but that these processes occur best when learners are engaged in the construction of an artefact or shareable product. Papert describes the difference between constructivism and constructionism as:

Constructionism — the N word as opposed to the V word — shares constructivism’s view of learning as “building knowledge structures” through progressive internalization of actions... It then adds the idea that this happens especially felicitously in a context where the learner is consciously engaged in constructing a public entity, whether it’s a sand castle on the beach or a theory of the universe. (Harel & Papert, 1991, p.1)

Two extensions to constructionism that demonstrate its relevance to social and cultural contexts are social constructionism (Shaw, 1995) and cultural constructionism (Hooper, 1998). Social constructionism states that individual development is enhanced by shared constructive activity in the social setting, and that this activity, in turn, also enhances the social setting. Shared constructive activity refers to the creation of “social constructions,” of which there are five types: social relationships, social events, shared physical artefacts, shared social goals and projects, and shared cultural norms and traditions. Cultural constructionism argues that individuals learn particularly well through creating objects that express their cultural identity and have shared meaning within their home cultures (Hooper, 1998).

These theories are helpful in explaining the need for solutions based in the social and cultural experiences of Māori and Pasifika learners. However, they omit the critical element that is crucial to students’ understanding of power and oppression. This missing element is evident in the explanation of critical multiculturalism discussed earlier in this chapter (Table 3) and in the theories of critical constructivism (Kincheloe, 2005a, p.5).
The missing element of power and oppression is also prevalent in the theory and practice of critical pedagogy. ‘Critical pedagogy’ is the term currently used by the two schools in this case study to describe their learning and teaching practice. Because it is a crucial component of the solution to the empowerment of Māori and Pasifika students in these two schools, the theory is described in more detail below. Duncan-Andrade and Morrell (2008, p.23) state, “critical pedagogies aim to pry theories away from the academics and incorporate them into educational practice.” However, because the schools’ practice is firmly located in Māori and Pasifika epistemologies and in critical anti-racist practice, and because critical pedagogy has acknowledged limitations in those areas (Allen, 2005; Grande, 2000b; Parker & Stovall, 2004; Sleeter & Delgado-Bernal, 2002), the preferred theoretical framework for understanding the solutions proposed in this research incorporates Kaupapa Māori Theory, Pasifika epistemologies and Critical Race Theory.

**Critical Pedagogy**

Sleeter and Delgado Bernal (2002, p.241) use Giroux’s definition of critical pedagogy - “an entry point in the contradictory nature of schooling, a chance to force it toward creating conditions for a new public sphere.” (Giroux, 1983, p.116). Duncan-Andrade and Morrell (2008, p.23) describe critical pedagogues as those who, “drawing on social and critical educational theory and cultural studies, examine schools in their historical context and as part of the existing social and political fabric that characterizes the dominant society.”

The two main sources of critical pedagogy lie in the work of Freire (1972) and in that of the critical theorists of the Frankfurt School, a group of writers associated with the Institute of Social Research at the University of Frankfurt in 1923. These writers, inspired by Marx, rejected all theories that took existing social conditions as given and differentiated between what *is* and what *should be*. A second generation of Frankfurt philosophers, such as Habermas (1971), further developed the idea of critical theory. Habermas further differentiates understanding and knowledge into three ‘cognitive interests’: technical, historical-hermeneutic, and emancipatory, which are grounded in different aspects of social existence; work, communication and power.

Critical pedagogy has four main implications for multicultural education (Sleeter and Delgado Bernal, 2002 pp.242, 243). Firstly it offers tools for examining the concept of “culture”, including critically investigating the dominant culture in depth and reaching greater understanding of colonisation and power relations. The challenging of power relations is central to critical pedagogy (Freire 1972). In benevolent approaches to multiculturalism, “power is often displaced by more comfortable concepts such as tolerance. Critical pedagogy offers an important critique of that displacement and continues to ask the question: comfortable for whom?” (Sleeter & Delgado Bernal, 2002, p.242).
Secondly, critical pedagogy grew out of class struggle, rather than education, primarily. When this background is applied in educational contexts the issues can be clearly connected to the wider social and political issues, “as connected structures of oppression, lenses of analysis and sites of struggle.” (Sleeter & Delgado Bernal, 2002, p.243). Thirdly, critical pedagogy allows us to examine the connection between empowerment and school practice - the power relations in classrooms. Freire (1972) viewed what he called a “banking” form of pedagogy, where teachers simply impart knowledge to students, as a further instrument of control. A critical pedagogy starts with the students’ lived experiences, connects their lives with their learning and involves students in the active creation of understanding and knowledge. The fourth implication of critical pedagogy is the reconnection of culture and language - linking multicultural education with bilingual education and children’s linguistic rights.

Sleeter and Delgado Bernal (2002, p.244) suggest two limitations of critical pedagogy however; the fact that it has been developed mainly at a theoretical level, leaving teachers unclear about what to do and, as the literature about the approach does not directly address race, ethnicity or gender, it has a White bias. “White theorists taking on race and racism does not resolve the problem of whites having the power to define how race and racism are theorized.” Allen (2005, p.54) confirms this position when he asks, “Can a discourse that pays so little attention to race be anti-racist?” He states that on the key anti-racist questions critical pedagogy has been amazingly reticent.

Banks (1997, cited in Parker & Stovall, 2004, p.168), positions critical pedagogy as “connected to social justice and multicultural education, with an emphasis on teaching values of genuine concern about students from all racial, linguistic and social class backgrounds, as opposed to just focusing on race and the black - white binary.” Parker and Stovall refer to critical pedagogy’s position on race and racism and the operation of white supremacy in education as one of, “gaps and silences” (p.169), and argue that the intractability of this supremacy in education institutions is one of the main challenges for critical pedagogy. A further criticism is made by Grande (2000b, cited in Parker & Stovall, 2004, p.172), regarding the failure of critical pedagogy to differentiate between the oppression of indigenous tribal nations and that of other minority groups. Grande believes that the concept of democracy in critical pedagogy has not been seriously questioned regarding how it has been enacted as a lethal colonising force against tribal nations.

**Kaupapa Maori Theory**

Intrinsic to Kaupapa Māori theory is the critique of power structures in Aotearoa that historically have constructed Māori people in binary opposition to Pākehā, reinforcing the discourse of Māori as the ‘other’. Kaupapa Māori theory aligns itself with Critical Theory in that it seeks to expose power relations that perpetuate the continued oppression of Māori people. (Pihama, 1993)
The terms ‘Kaupapa Māori’ and ‘theory’ have been deliberately linked by Smith (1997), in order to “develop a counter-hegemonic practice and to understand the cultural constraints exemplified in critical questions such as ‘what counts as theory?’ A key element in the discussion of Kaupapa Māori is the centrality of te reo Māori me ona tikanga (Māori language and customs). Tomlins-Jahnke (2007) summarises the key principles of kaupapa Māori theory as:

A kaupapa Māori approach is a theory of practice based on a number of principles such as mana tangata (assumes individual rights and autonomy), whaka whanaungatanga (assumes collaborative relationships within a supportive environment), tautoko (assumes support, commitment and encouragement), manaaki tangata (assumes care, sustenance and obligations) and kotahitanga (assumes unity of purpose in the interests of all concerned). (p.14)

The concept of whānau, with its associated concepts of cultural principles, values and obligations is also central. Smith (1997) states that a Kaupapa Māori paradigm in education is founded on three key themes; the validity and legitimacy of Māori are taken for granted, the survival and revival of Māori language and culture are imperative, and the struggle for autonomy over their own cultural well-being and over their own lives is vital to Māori struggle.

He describes Kaupapa Māori theory and praxis as being the response by Māori to the State/Pākehā dominated interests through conscientisation and resistance to transformative action. Freire’s (1972) model of change argues that conscientization leads to action or struggle; when people learn to read the word and read the world of injustice they will then act against it. Kaupapa Māori however contends that this change is not a linear progression. Smith (2004, p.50) suggests that all of these components are equally important and all need to be held simultaneously. The elements are better understood as a cycle which individuals and groups can enter from any position without necessarily having to start at the point of ‘conscientization’ (Figure 14).

Figure 14: Kaupapa Māori Theory & Praxis  (Smith, 2004, p.51)
Smith uses the example of parents who may have enrolled their child in a Kōhanga Reo (Māori language pre-school) because it was the only early childhood option in the town, but this later led to the parents becoming “conscientized” about the politics of language revitalisation and highly active participants in resistance movement.” In this model the arrows go in both directions to signify there can be simultaneous engagement with more than one element or engagement can be in any order. According to Smith, all Māori can be plotted somewhere on the cycle – “the point is that every Māori is in the struggle whether they like it or not, whether they know it or not” (Smith, 2004, p.13). Pihama, Cram and Walker (2002) assert that, through the writings of Māori academics the intellectual validity of Kaupapa Māori has been established as a bona fide theory of transformation.

**Pasifika Epistemologies**

Meyer (2001) articulates the issues for Pasifika learners in education systems that alienate indigenous learners:

> It has been a confusing travelogue with regard to schooling and indigenous knowledge. I was and still am a back-seat passenger in this car called Education. I have sat like a good daughter on some long cross-continental haul, trying to behave, but because I have begun to question acultural and thus apolitical assumptions in the art of teaching and the science of learning, I am in essence changing my own destination. The hermeneutic hazing has begun. It is a strange world indeed, to wake up and realize that everything I have learned in school, everything I've read in books, every vocabulary test and jumping jack, every seating arrangement and response expectation - absolutely everything - has not been shaped by a Hawaiian mind. (p.124)

It is little wonder, Meyer explains, that Hawaiian understanding of this process has come slowly, “dulled by the guessing game of another culture,” still believing, “that literacy is the best indicator of intelligence,” and “always at the short end of a smaller and smaller identity stick.” Hawaiian epistemology, Meyer writes, “is a long-term idea that is both ancient and modern, central and marginalized” (p.126), that is both constant and changes, according to time and influence. She identifies seven ways of experiencing this “ocean of knowing”:

1. Spirituality and Knowing—the cultural contexts of knowledge.
2. That Which Feeds—physical place and knowing.
3. The Cultural Nature of the Senses—expanding the idea of empiricism.
4. Relationship and Knowledge—self through other.
5. Utility and Knowledge—ideas of wealth and usefulness.
6. Words and Knowledge—causality in language and thought.
Tongan academic, Thaman argues, “For over one hundred years, we have promoted (or at least accepted) a view of education ... that is diametrically opposed to our traditional notions of ako (learning and teaching), ‘ilo and poto” (Thaman, 1995, p.731 cited in Huffer & Qalo, 2004). Huffer & Qalo (p.88) compare Pacific thought to a dormant volcano that remains unnoticed by everyone until it erupts, reminding those who would rather ignore it, of its persistent existence. Like a volcano, once it settles again it is easily forgotten, “but we (whether researchers, educators, policymakers, donors, or others) ignore it at our peril.”

In recent years indigenous Pacific scholars have begun to investigate Pacific epistemologies and ways of doing and being. Their work documents and interprets efforts by local communities they are associated with or part of, to validate and explore their own epistemologies and to renegotiate development on their own terms (Huffer & Qalo, 2004, p.88). Sanga (2002) describes the disconnected worlds in which most Pasifika students interact as “In-School” [IS] and “Out-of-School” [OS]:

The world of IS and that of OS are seen as distinct entities. ... The IS world is one of conflicting value systems, of cultural intrusion, of identity denial, of pretensions and of compelling aspirations for things not theirs. ... [The world of OS] is the world of non-compartmentalisation, of being always tentative, of frequent doses of grace, of learning and working together, of competing in fun and of purposive socialisation. (Sanga, 2002)

These studies show that the importance of indigenous Pasifika knowledges and identities in education and school is only recently being recognised by Pasifika people in their home Islands. Pasifika students in New Zealand schools, where the disconnection is even greater, find it even harder to build secure identities against the backdrop of New Zealand culture. Pasifika youth are, what Meyer refers to as, “links in this chain of cultural continuity.” That continuity is threatened when the chain is broken, and when schools see no reason for it to be reconnected.

Smith (2003) asserts that the lessons learned from the Māori experience and kaupapa Māori theory do have relevance and meaning in other indigenous contexts. There is certainly interest from Pasifika communities in the Kaupapa Māori model. However, Smith also advises caution in adopting these strategies uncritically or without proper consideration of the specific cultural context in which they are being reapplied:

There is much to inform other indigenous contexts from this situation, in particular, the need to focus on the process of `transforming', and on the transformative outcomes - What is it? How can it be achieved? Do indigenous people's needs and aspirations require different schooling approaches? Who benefits? Such critical questions, which
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28 Tongan: poto may be defined as the positive application of ‘ilo (knowledge and understanding)
relate to the task of teachers being change agents, must not only inform our teacher education approaches, they must also ensure the ‘buy in’ from the communities they are purporting to serve. (p.14)

Critical Race Theory

Critical race theory (CRT) emerged as a response, predominantly by legal scholars of colour, to social justice and oppression in the United States. Since the early 1990s critical race theory has been used as a framework to examine racism in education.

One of the main tenets of critical race theory is that it puts race at the centre; seeing racism as a "permanent fixture" (Ladson-Billings, 1998), illustrating the fact that despite laws and policies reportedly intended to provide equal opportunity, people of colour still face racism at individual, structural, and institutional levels. Bringing race and racism to the centre of the discussion, means not having to explain that racism persists. Merit is another concept challenged by critical race theory. The United States is a meritocratic society, in which it is argued that anyone who works hard enough can achieve success. Because merit is highly valued, it is difficult to convince whites that people of colour are systematically excluded from opportunities to succeed, through individual racism as well as racist structures and institutions.

Critical race theory challenges Eurocentric epistemology. Ladson Billings, (2000, p.258, cited in Sleeter and Delgado Bernal, 2002), argues that, “there are well developed systems of knowledge, or epistemologies, that stand in contrast to the dominant Euro-American epistemology.” Through its grounding in systems of knowledge that counter the dominant Eurocentric view, critical race theory offers a tool for, “dismantling prevailing notions of fairness, meritocracy, colorblindness and neutrality” (Parker, Deyhle and Vilenas, 1999).

Parker and Stovall (2004), believe that the key to addressing the “color-blindness” of critical pedagogy is to connect it to critical race theory. Where the colour-blind perspective results in assimilation, critical race theory calls for the full awareness and critique of the ideology of race and how the law has been used to marginalise indigenous and minority groups. They suggest that critical pedagogy should look to specific areas of race-based pedagogy. For example critical pedagogy should look to how well schools in low socio-economic areas, with majority students of colour, schools described by Scheurich (1998), as “culture-centric”, value their racial cultures and first languages, how well they focus on community rather than competitive individualism and how well they bring community into the school in a genuine partnership. Critical pedagogy and critical race theory, Parker and Stovall (p.178) observe, are not mutually exclusive. They converge in a contested space, with social justice at its centre, in an attempt to provide a place for excluded voices in education to be heard:
If we are honest with ourselves about the end of oppression, we must be willing to consider all approaches that do not contribute to the further oppression and marginalization of children on color. The space is not always a safe one, but it is necessary if we profess a commitment to the development of safe spaces for young people to recognize their importance to themselves and the world. (Parker & Stovall, 2004, p.178)

Gillborn (2006, p.20), writing from a British perspective, advocates for the adoption of CRT as a tool to revitalise critical anti-racism in a situation where:

Anti-racism risks being reduced to the level of the worst kind of “multiculturalism”: that is, a slogan, evacuated of all critical content, ritually cited but leaving untouched the deep-rooted processes of racist oppression and exclusion that currently shape the education systems in many nation states. (p.27)

A significant difference that sets critical race theory apart is the concept of storytelling. Counter-storytelling is a powerful tool that allows those on the margins of society to tell their own stories and to analyse and challenge the stories of those in power. These powerful personal stories, family histories, biographies, testimonials, journals, diaries and narratives put a human face on the practice of racism in society and challenge the accepted status quo. Similarly Bishop (2003, p.226, 232) discusses ‘storying’ and ‘re-storying’ as a feature of the Māori concept of ako, or reciprocal learning, and of a narrative pedagogy based on the notion that people lead ‘storied lives.’ Bishop states that “Narrative pedagogy is an educational practice that draws together the experiences of the home and school in ways that culturally connect.” Storytelling allows students to bring their lived experiences into the classroom. Stovall (2005, p.96) summarises the tenets of CRT when he lists its ability to:

1. name and discuss the pervasive, daily reality of racism in US society which serves to disadvantage people of color,
2. to expose and deconstruct seemingly “color-blind” or “race-neutral” policies and practices which entrench the disparate treatment of non-White persons,
3. legitimise and promote the voices and narrative of people of color as sources of critique of the dominant social order which purposefully devalues them,
4. revisit civil rights law and liberalism to address their inability to dismantle and expunge discriminatory socio-political relationships,
5. change and improve challenges to race-neutral and multicultural movements in education which have made White students behavior the norm. (Ladson-Billings, 1998, p. 2)

In the classroom CRT puts race and racism at the centre of the debate and explicitly names the white spaces that disadvantage, oppress and exploit young people of colour and challenges hegemonic practices that have made these white spaces the norm in our education system. Similarly, kaupapa Māori theory critiques dominant, racist, and westernised hegemonies, and
advocates for self-determination for Māori. This indigenous perspective is echoed in Brayboy’s (2005, p.430) Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit) which extends the central CRT tenet that racism is a given in society to add the primary notion that colonisation is also endemic to society. Both CRT and kaupapa Māori theory are founded on principles of social justice, which makes these theories both relevant to the goals of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School, the two schools in this case study.

Grande (2000b) however, also reminds us of an important difference in the space where critical theory and indigenous perspectives of identity meet when she writes from an American Indian perspective:

To be fair, I believe that both American Indian intellectuals and critical theorists share a similar vision - a time, place, and space free of the compulsions of Whitestream, global capitalism and the racism, sexism, classism, and xenophobia it engenders. But where critical scholars ground their vision in Western conceptions of democracy and justice that presume a “liberated” self, American Indian intellectuals ground their vision in conceptions of sovereignty that presume a sacred connection to place and land. Thus, to a large degree, the seemingly liberatory constructs of fluidity, mobility, and transgression are perceived not only as the language of critical subjectivity, but also as part of the fundamental lexicon of Western imperialism .(p.483)

A Pedagogy of Whānau

Culture at the centre

Over the past two decades, both in Aotearoa/New Zealand and internationally, there has been an increasing realisation of the central role of students’ cultures in classroom practice. In New Zealand Alton-Lee (2003, p.32) highlights research on student learning that has “shown the importance of the match or mismatch between the social class and ethnic cultural capital of the home and the school.” McNaughton (2002, p.21) explains that when home and school are “well tuned” and “well-matched” children can capitalise on these shared experiences and knowledge to impact beneficially on their learning. Bishop, et al, (2007) suggest that the educational achievement of Māori students in mainstream secondary school classrooms will be improved:

When educators create learning contexts within their classroom; where power is shared between self-determining individuals within non-dominating relations of interdependence; where culture counts; where learning is interactive, dialogic and spirals; where participants are connected to one another through the establishment of a common vision for what constitutes excellence in educational outcomes. (p.1)

Evident in both international and New Zealand research with indigenous and minority ethnic students is the crucial importance of the positive, respectful and reciprocal relationship between
teacher and student (Bishop et al., 2003; Delpit, 1995; Hattie, 2003; Hawk, Cowley, Hill & Sutherland, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1994).

However, there is also ample evidence that the majority of teachers bring to their relationships with students a “pedagogy of whiteness” (Adkins & Hytten, 2001, Levine-Raskey, 2000) that maintains the teacher’s knowledge as the point of reference and the lens through which the relationship is perceived and developed. In the Te Kotahitanga research project, Bishop et al. (2003) developed an Effective Teaching Profile (ETP), to address the need for teachers to reject deficit theorising about Māori students’ achievement and to accept professional responsibility for changing their practice. The ETP includes teachers caring for students as culturally located individuals, teachers having high expectations of their students, and teachers building caring and learning relationships and interactions with Māori students. The “Culturally Responsive Pedagogy of Relations” developed through Te Kotahitanga (Bishop, et al., 2007), is an approach that merges the concepts of culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Osborne & Cooper, 2001), with a pedagogy of relations (Bingham & Sidorkin, 2004; Margonis, 2004; Sidorkin, 1999, 2002; Shields, Bishop, & Mazawi, 2005).

Students’ connectedness, however, needs to go beyond a positive learner-teacher relationship (see Chapter 1). Students need not only to be connected to who they are as culturally located individuals, but need also to see where they fit in the world. This is consistent with Banks’ (2004) framing the necessity to develop a balance of cultural, national and global identifications. Otero and Chambers-Otero (2002) advise, “drop curriculum, drop subjects, teach connectedness, our survival depends on it,” and comment further:

For schools to be effective with today’s young people, it will be crucial to have a sense of self and a sense of how to relate to 12 billion other selves. Ironically, to succeed in a global society, the personal and local must become the focus. The major challenge will be an examination and redefinition of the relationship between the individual and the collective. (Otero & Chambers-Otero, 2002)

**Whanaungatanga**

For Māori, this famous whakataukī (proverb), credited to Apirana Ngata, a famous Māori leader of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, resonates with Akom’s strategy of “selective acculturation or segmented assimilation.”

E tipu e rea mo ngā ra o tōu ao.
Ko tō ringa ki ngā rākau o te Pākehā hei ara mō tō tinana.
Ko tō ngākau ki ngā taonga a o tipuna Māori hei tikitiki mo tō mahuna.
Ko tō wairua ki to Atua, nāna nei ngā mea katoa.

Grow up and thrive for the days destined to you.
Your hands to the tools of the Pākehā to provide physical sustenance.
Your heart to the treasures of your ancestors as a diadem for your brow.
Your soul to God\textsuperscript{29} to whom all things belong. (Apirana Ngata)

Keelan (2001) has developed an “E Tipu e Rea” indigenous theoretical framework for Māori youth development in Aotearoa/New Zealand, built around the lines of this whakatauākī. Keelan’s theory expands the meaning of the lines to include whakapapa (genealogy) and whanaungatanga (relationships). Moeke-Pickering (1996) believes that the sense of collective affiliation from the concept of whānau with its obligatory roles and responsibilities played a major role in forming and maintaining a pathway through which Māori identities could be formed and developed. In spite of urbanisation and dislocation from these traditional ties experienced by many Māori. Moeke-Pickering suggests this does not necessarily mean that Māori are neglecting their whānau cultural practices. Instead many Māori have become adept at maintaining a balance between their Māori and their contemporary worlds. Bishop (2005, endnote 8) agrees, “It seems to me that, in practice, Māori cultural practices are alive and well and that, when used either literally or metaphorically, they enable Māori people to understand and control what is happening.”

Māori students in New Zealand schools, however, seldom have this choice of continuing to “live as Māori” (Durie, 2001), while pursuing academic learning at school. Bishop & Glynn (1999, pp.168, 169) suggest, the principles of Kura Kaupapa Māori and Te Aho Matua\textsuperscript{30} provide “metaphors for a new awareness of theorising and addressing educational relationships.” To achieve authenticity in this culturally located learning model however, Kura Kaupapa Māori had to withdraw from the state education (whitestream) system. Within the whitestream system, where in 2011 96.5% (165,697) of Māori learners and 100% (74,848) Pasifika students receive their education, very few of them enjoy a culturally connected environment (Ministry of Education, 2011b).

Houkamau (2006) studied identity development and change in 35 Māori women across three generations and found a multiplicity of interpretations of Māori identity and “distinct intergenerational differences, not widely articulated in literature.” She also found that families are central to shaping Māori identity and that “positive Māori role models (particularly familial) who model and express favourable ideas about being Māori are important for young Māori” (p.234). Durie (2006) also points out that in the Māori world the transmission of culture, knowledge, values and skills is a primary whānau role. The concept of whānau was originally located in terms of whakapapa and linked relatives who could trace their genealogy to a common ancestor. However,

\textsuperscript{29} Keelan explains that the word ‘atua’ embraces all higher beings of every belief. This line suggests the possibility of offering young people a world beyond what they can touch, feel, smell, hear and see. This part of the theory therefore adds the dimension of spiritual development.

\textsuperscript{30} Te Aho Matua o ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori is the foundation document for Kura Kaupapa Māori. It identifies principles and provides a philosophical and values base identifying the special character of Kura Kaupapa Māori.
in recent times the concept of whānau includes those who are linked due to a common interest. Both notions are included in this definition of whānau:

A collective concept which embraces all the descendants of a significant marriage, usually over three or more generations. However, it also refers to the more recent notion derived from its usage in describing a ‘group of Māori who may share an association based on some common interests such as locality, an urban marae, a workplace and so on (Smith, 1995)

*Te Hoe Nuku Roa* use the term ‘whakapapa whānau’ for those linked by kinship and the term ‘kaupapa whānau’ to denote those who are grouped with a common association. An example of a kaupapa whānau may be a school community as is the case with one of the schools in this study, Te Whānau o Tupuranga.

Cunningham, Stevenson and Tassell (2005, p.21) in their analysis of the characteristics of whānau based on the *Te Hoe Nuku Roa* research, find that despite changes and influences over time, whānau is still essentially the foundation institution of Māori society and culture. Whānau connectedness refers to the relationships that whānau members, and whānau as a whole, have with other people and other whānau. This relationship offers a framework to counter the social toxins and health inequalities described in Chapter 1 and also to provide a foundation for improving education for Māori:

More specifically, connectedness has been shown to have positive outcomes for the health and wellbeing of individuals, with a recent study indicating that two thirds of the sample drew on the support of whānau in seeking to achieve wellbeing. Clearly then, the effect is circular as individual wellbeing is contingent upon whānau wellbeing, and whānau as a whole are more likely to be healthy and well if the individuals comprising them are also healthy (Benton, 2002). Consequently, Māori children who are part of whānau that are relatively healthy are likely to receive beneficial effects, in comparison to those Māori children in whānau that are less healthy. A component of such beneficial effects may be increased educational development. (Cunningham et al., 2005, p.33)

The extended family is also the basis of social organisation for the collective responsibilities and ownership principles inherent and common in Pasifika beliefs and values. Anae, Coxon, Mara, Wendt-Samu, and Finau, (2001) describe this as:

---

31 The *Best Outcomes for Māori: Te Hoe Nuku Roa* study was developed in conjunction with Statistics New Zealand (*Te Hoe Nuku Roa*, 1996) to measure a range of geographic, economic, cultural and social circumstances representing the diverse realities of contemporary Māori. The initial survey was begun late in 1995, with those participating re-surveyed at 3-year intervals. The study is currently collecting its fourth sample wave. Six hundred and fifty five Māori households (958 adults and 618 children) in the Manawatu-Wanganui, Gisborne, Wellington, and Auckland regional council areas are involved.
Familial and collective roles, responsibilities and ownership, frames, influences, and
defines Pacific patterns of individual and group behaviour, Pacific values, Pacific
notions of time, Pacific understandings of knowledge and its value, of ownership of
things tangible and intangible, of gender, class and age relations and so forth. (p.27)

Anae et al.(2001 p.14), explain that kinship networks are very wide allowing literally thousands of
people to claim kinship or affinity with any distinguished leader, “even members of the less
privileged classes.” While there are over-arching commonalities in pan-Pacific philosophies, there
are also very distinct traditions, languages, histories and world-views embodied in Pasifika cultures
and societies. However there are some common Pacific values such as; respect, reciprocity,
communalism, collective responsibility, humility, love, service, and spirituality. They call for,
“educational purposes and goals that reflect Pacific contexts, values, beliefs and knowledge
systems while at the same time recognizing global forces of change and the role of Pacific peoples
in a Western context” (p.12).

This chapter has examined the theory and literature which inform our understanding of identity
formation and the importance of cultural identity, within a context of adolescent identity and
contemporary New Zealand society. It has described the context of “white spaces” and highlighted
the construct of whiteness as all pervasive within our education system. The chapter has identified
sociocultural theories that inform the search for solutions for Māori and Pasifika youth in New
Zealand schools. Crucial components of the collection of theories examined are the need for
constructs of race or culture and the many facets of racism to take centre stage, and the need to
adopt a critical perspective in pedagogy and research. These elements are strongly embedded in
kaupapa Māori theory and in critical race theory. Pasifika epistemologies are also important to the
two schools in this study. Finally the chapter has suggested that solutions must be sought from
within a pedagogy of whānau and the construct of whanaungatanga, together constituting a
pedagogy of relations, and critical pedagogy. These two elements underpin the philosophy and
practice of the two schools in this study and therefore have been selected, from this review of
literature and theories, as the analytic tools with which the pedagogical practices of the two
schools will be examined.
Chapter Three

Methodology

Indigenous peoples have the right to be Indigenous. They cannot exist as images and reflections of a non-Indigenous society (The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights in Education, 1999).

This case study research examines the journey of two Otara schools, Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga, to develop philosophy and practice to resist and counter a hegemonic whitestream education system. The efforts of this Otara community to provide an education model which fits the specific cultural and linguistic needs of its Māori and Pasifika learners span 25 years through three different struggles which resulted in changing pedagogies, practice, and school structure.

This chapter describes the research design, and outlines the specific qualitative and quantitative research methods used. My positioning within the case study as a researcher, as a Pākehā educator, as a woman, as a long term staff member, and as the principal of these two schools is specifically addressed. The chapter also explains the involvement of staff and former students, chiefly through focus group interviews and online surveys, as well as the contributions made through members of international education networks. Finally, this chapter describes how data were collected from a wide range of sources within the school, and how these data were analysed.

Research Design

Figure 15 presents an overview of the research design for this study, an intrinsic case study informed by kaupapa Maori and critical race theory and methodology. These choices are explained in further detail below the diagram.
Case Study

Simons (1996) discusses the paradox of case study, that is, “By studying the uniqueness of the particular, we come to understand the universal.” However, she claims that paradox is actually the point of case study:

It is precisely through the engagement of the case worker in the paradox and living with the tension that creates, holding it open to disbelief and re-examination, that we eventually come to realise the significance of the event, instance or circumstance and the universal understanding it evokes.

Flyvbjerg (2006) also finds that this proximity to the case, and the learning process it generates for the researcher is a prerequisite for advanced understanding. He cites Beveridge’s (1951) conclusion that “there are more discoveries stemming from the type of intense observation made possible by the case study than from statistics applied to large groups. (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p.236). Yin (1994, p.13) defines a case study as, “an empirical enquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.” This type of qualitative research is well suited to the deeper understanding of...
the complexities of the decisions and thinking which led to the changes in the structure of the two schools in this study. Berg (2007, p.3) refers to this thinking as the “how, when and where of a thing - its essence and ambience.”

**Intrinsic Case Study**

The intention of case study research is generally understood as to gain an in-depth understanding of the concerned phenomena in a real-life setting, or to, as Stake (1999, p.8) explains, “take a particular case and come to know it well, not primarily as to how it is different from others but what it is, what it does.” Stake (2000, p.437) describes three types of case study - intrinsic, instrumental and collective. An intrinsic case study is:

...not undertaken primarily because the case represents other cases or because it illustrates a particular trait or problem, but because in all its particularity and ordinariness, [the] case itself is of interest....The purpose is not to come to understand some abstract concept or generic phenomena ...The researcher temporarily subordinates other curiosities so that the case may reveal its story. (p.437)

In an intrinsic case study the researcher has an intrinsic interest in the case, the research uncovers what is seen to be the case's own issues, contexts and interpretations, its *thick description* (Stake, 2000, p.439, emphasis in the original).

**Positioning**

My intrinsic interest in this case is on multiple levels. My position, as a Pākehā educator, closely involved in a lead role, in shaping the Māori initiatives at Clover Park and subsequently in Te Whānau o Tupuranga, as the principal for over 18 years, and as the lead teacher in the development of Te Whānau o Tupuranga prior to that time, means that my personal story is inextricably linked with the story of the two schools. My personal learning as an educator and as a researcher, is woven into the fabric of the story and has enabled me to have a deep understanding of the case. I believe it would not have been possible for me to have carried out this case study research from the position of a neutral or disconnected researcher. My positioning was dependent upon mutual respect, trust and commitment to the kaupapa of the schools and the community involved.

My deep understanding of the philosophy and practice of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School, through my leadership of these initiatives, my long term involvement in this community, my own whiteness, and my personal stake as a mother and grandmother in demanding fair and equitable outcomes for Māori children, all put me in a strong position to be able to contribute to this counter-story to our whitestream education system’s “majoritarian” (Love, 2004, p.229) story. Each viewpoint has helped develop my own understanding of social justice, critical,
culturally responsive pedagogies and research as the story has unfolded. Solórzano and Yosso (2002, p.33) explain that to create counter-stories we begin by finding and unearthing sources of data. They cite Strauss and Corbin (1990) who believe that researchers need to bring to their research a personal quality they refer to as “theoretical sensitivity”:

> It indicates an awareness of the subtleties of meaning of data. One can come to the research situation with varying degrees of sensitivity depending upon previous reading and experience with or relevant to the data. It can also be developed further during the research process. Theoretical sensitivity refers to the attribute of having insight, the ability to give meaning to data, the capacity to understand, and capability to separate the pertinent from that which isn’t. (pp. 41-42)

I believe my “theoretical sensitivity” has been extended by and through this research process. However, I am very aware that this is not my story, but the collective story of those who have been involved in these two schools; students, parents, whānau, boards of trustees and community. Mattingly (1991, cited in Flyvbjerg, 2006, p.237) points out that “narratives not only give meaningful form to experiences we have already lived through but also provide us a forward glance, helping us to anticipate situations even before we encounter them, allowing us to envision alternative futures.” That has certainly been both my experience, and the experience of the other participants in the counter-story of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga.

The philosophy of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga, which is well articulated in the schools’ practice and policy, is one that is based in whanaungatanga (relationships). The close ongoing connection between the researcher and the researched underpins appropriate methodologies for Kaupapa Māori research. These can be seen clearly in the concept of whakawhanaungatanga (building relationships) and the establishment of a “whānau of interest” Bishop and Glynn (1999, pp.174, 175), as a means through which researchers of different ethnicity from those of the key participants can engage with safety, and with minimal risk of imposition of their own worldviews. Kaupapa Māori theory acknowledges the “different epistemological tradition which frames the way we see the world, the way we organize ourselves in it, the questions we ask and the solutions which we seek” (Smith 1999, p.187).

Kaupapa Māori research and critical race methodology offer the researcher an opportunity to stand in a different relationship to the research and the researched. The researcher makes a deliberate appearance in his or her work, (rather than pretending to be invisible) and names race and power as issues central to the research. Both approaches raise the issues inherent in my positioning in this case study - as the Pākehā principal of the two schools, describing the schools’ work towards developing cultural identity and competence in Māori and Pasifika children. The specific actions I have taken to address the power imbalances in these roles are explained in the Methods section of this chapter.
Smith (1999, p.184) reflects on researcher positioning by asking two questions: “Can a Māori researcher who is anti-Māori carry out Kaupapa Māori research?’ The answer given is “definitely not.” The second question, “Can a non-indigenous researcher carry out Kaupapa Māori research?” is relevant to my position in this research. Smith gives two possible answers. The “more radical” response is, “by definition, no, Kaupapa Māori research is Māori research exclusively.” The alternative response, is a qualified yes, as long as there is collaboration with others, and that such a researcher had “ways of positioning themselves as a non-indigenous person” and as long as the power and control lie within a Māori worldview and within Māori cultural space.

Bishop (2005, p.141) believes that non-Māori researchers must be involved, “on Māori terms, in terms of kin/metaphoric kin relationships and obligations, that is, within Māori constituted practices and understandings in order to establish their identity within research projects.” Bishop believes that just as identity for Māori is inextricably linked to whānau, hapū, and iwi, so too, a research whānau of interest provides members with identity and therefore the ability to participate and states, “the message is that you have to ‘live’ the context in which it happens” (p.141):

... researchers understand themselves to be involved somatically in a group process, a process whereby the researcher becomes part of a research whānau, limiting the development of insider/outsider dualisms. To be involved somatically means to be involved bodily, that is physically, ethically, morally and spiritually, not just in one’s capacity as a ‘researcher’ concerned with methodology. (p.143)

Ladson-Billings (2000, p.272) has deliberately chosen to use a critical race theory paradigm in her research because it links intimately to her understanding of the political and personal stake she has in the education of Black children. She explains, “All of my ‘selves’ are invested in this work — the self that is a researcher, the self that is a parent, the self that is a community member, the self that is a Black woman” (2000, p.272). I acknowledge my position as one who continues to be involved somatically in the activities, practice and direction of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga. As Ladson-Billings so powerfully describes, all of my ‘selves’ are also invested in this work — the professional self that is an educator, a researcher and a school principal and member of the Clover Park and Te Whānau o Tupuranga whānau, as well as the personal self that is a mother, grandmother, and great-grandmother of Māori children whose own school experiences have led to my personal stake in the education of indigenous and ethnic minority students (Milne, 2004). This personal philosophy is apparent in this research.
Kaupapa Māori and Critical Race Theory

The principal elements of kaupapa Māori and critical race theory have been described in Chapter 2 and have been selected as the theories to best understand the problem of power imbalances in our education system, which dictate how knowledge is controlled and produced. This “racialised social order” is toxic to the development of Māori and Pasifika students (Ballard, 2008). A growing body of literature and research questions traditional approaches to research on or with indigenous and other minoritised peoples (Bishop, 2005, p.109). Smith (1999, p.38) writes that Indigenous people have, in many ways been oppressed by theory. Specific theories drive research questions, research methods, and the selection or design of research tools. As always, the real power lies with those who design the tools (Irwin, 1992, cited in Smith 1999, p. 38) and, as Audre Lorde (1984) observes, “the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house.” Bishop (2005) describes this traditional research approach as “social pathology”:

There has developed a social pathology research approach in Aotearoa/New Zealand that has implied in all phases of the research process, the “inability” of Māori culture to cope with human problems and proposed that Māori culture was and is inferior to that of the colonizers in human terms. Further, such practices have perpetuated an ideology of cultural superiority that precludes the development of power-sharing processes and the legitimization of diverse cultural epistemologies and cosmologies. (p.111)

Kaupapa Māori theory is developed from a foundation of Māori philosophy and knowledge and, according to Pihama, (2001, p.110) must be about “challenging injustice, revealing inequalities, [and] seeking transformation.” Kaupapa Māori is concerned with sites and terrains, sites of struggle that have been claimed by others (Mead, 1996; Smith, 1997; Smith, 1999). This is certainly the case for education in New Zealand and is also the case for the two schools in this case study.

Pihama (2001, p.104) argues for a “hoa mahi” (Pohatu, 1996) relationship, the relationship of a “friend that works alongside,” between kaupapa Māori theory and Western theories that “can be drawn upon by Indigenous Peoples to engage colonialism.” However, she also warns that such Western theories can be yet another form of oppression. She uses education as just such a case where Māori experiences have been located predominantly within dominant theoretical frameworks and Māori voices have been marginalised. Pihama uses critical theory as an example of a framework that can work theoretically for Māori “given that it is located within the experiences and knowledge of Māori.” While critical theory is not “in itself transformative for Māori,” Pihama suggests that when Māori use critical theory as a tool, “alongside our own tools” it provides “transformative potential.”

I believe that critical race theory has this same potential in a “hoa mahi” relationship with kaupapa Māori theory in the case study of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga. Solórzano
& Yosso (2002, p.25) argue that critical race theory in education is a framework or set of basic insights, perspectives, methods, and pedagogy that seeks to identify, analyze, and transform those structural and cultural aspects of education that maintain subordinate and dominant racial positions in and out of the classroom. Delgado & Stefancic (2001, p. 7) propose two beliefs they think are shared by most critical race theorists: (1) that critical race theory exposes racism as “the usual way society does business,” and that this supposed “ordinariness” makes racism difficult to address. (2) “Our system of white-over-color ascendancy serves important purposes, both psychic and material.” They suggest that because racism “advances the interests of both white elites (materially) and working-class people (psychically) large segments of society have little incentive to eradicate it.” Critical race theory challenges the claims of the dominant ideology of objectivity, meritocracy, colour-blindness, race neutrality and equal opportunity (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002, p.26). Fundamental to critical race theory is the recognition of the experiential knowledge of people of colour as legitimate and critical to analysing racial discrimination.

Working alongside each other these two theories provide an answer to the issue of the “racialised social order” (Ballard 2008) and power imbalances in our education system and schools. They put the challenge to the issue of whiteness, or the domination of our education system in New Zealand by Pākeha decision-making and Pākeha knowledge, at the centre of the solution. Kaupapa Māori and critical race methodology provide us with the ways this solution might be addressed.

**Methodology**

**Kaupapa Māori and Critical Race Methodology**

In an open letter to communities, researchers, and educators, Tuck (2009, p.409) calls on those “concerned with fostering and maintaining ethical relationships with disenfranchised and dispossessed communities” to suspend these damage-centred and damaging research practices. Tuck distinguishes between deficit models, which focus on what a community or family is lacking to explain their failure and underachievement, and damage-centred research, which she defines as, “research that operates, even benevolently, from a theory of change that establishes harm or injury in order to achieve reparation.” (p.413). She aligns damage-centred research to scores of studies that portray schools and communities primarily as “broken, emptied or flattened,” and to research documenting damage due to educational policies such as No Child Left Behind. (No Child Left Behind [NCLB], 2002, cited by Tuck, 2009, p.414). This understanding is directly relevant to this study which names the endemic white spaces in our education system.

Smith (1999, p.143) explains that “within an indigenous framework, methodological debates are ones concerned with the broader politics and strategic goals of indigenous research.” It is at this level, she believes, “that researchers have to clarify and justify their intentions.” Bishop (2005, p.111) summarises these debates and similar concerns about Western research epistemologies in his
identification of “five crises that affect indigenous peoples.” These concerns focus on who has control of the power over issues of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimacy and accountability. These concerns question how the research process begins and whose interests determine the outcomes? Who will gain from this research and will anyone be disadvantaged? How will Māori be represented in this research and will this research adequately depict social reality? What authority is claimed for this text? Who are researchers answerable to and “Who has control over the initiation, procedures, evaluations, text constructions and distribution of newly defined knowledge?” (Bishop, 2005, p.112). These questions are addressed in Table 4:

Table 4: Evaluation Model: Research in Māori contexts (Bishop and Glynn 1999)

| Initiation | The catalyst for this research has been the continued demand from students and wānau of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga for a learning environment that is relevant to the young people of this community. In the process of responding to that demand school wānau have become politically aware and empowered to make ongoing change. It is fitting therefore that the story of this journey be told from within the wānau and I have had many requests to “tell the story,” and, since the completion of my Master’s thesis in 2004, to “continue the story” to include new developments since that time. |
| Benefits | There would be no reason to undertake this research if it did not benefit Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School. The intention is to tell the story of the schools’ journey to affirm the collective work of all who have been involved in the process and, in doing so, to enhance and inform understanding of culturally responsive pedagogy and a secure positive cultural identity for Māori and Pacific learners. It is hoped that the ongoing story of these two schools will encourage other schools to reflect on the white spaces in our education system and white spaces in schools themselves and to envision the restructuring that is required to achieve a better ‘fit’ for indigenous and ethnic minority students. |
| Representation | This study represents the aspirations of the community of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School and the two schools’ attempts to respond to those dreams within the framework of a whitestream school in New Zealand’s state education system. First and foremost this story represents the challenge to our system from the young people in this school, predominantly and proudly Māori and Pasifika, to “listen” to their cultures (Macfarlane, 2004). The study in turn represents the participants’ story faithfully and respectfully to the wider education community. |
| Legitimation | This study has originated from within the schools and all members of the school wānau have been participants in the journey. The story has been shared with them in the writing and has been presented in many different formats to staff and students who have also been involved in interpreting the findings as they emerged, making sense of the findings in terms of their cultural understanding. In the process many |
adjustments have been made to the text as a result of whānau input and the collective sharing of memories, ideas, experiences, and information. The final thesis will be presented back to them for keeping within the school.

As a member of the Clover Park Middle School whānau I continue to be involved somatically with this whānau. I acknowledge my accountability and responsibility in this regard and also have acknowledged the power imbalances inherent in my role as a Pākehā researcher and the principal of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School. This accountability has been addressed in several ways. Firstly, draft findings and ideas have been shared with Māori and Pasifika staff and the Board of Trustees members throughout the research process. Two Māori Board of Trustees members and many Maori and Pasifika staff have been involved with the schools for a long time, some for over 20 years. A senior Samoan teacher, and a senior Cook Islands teacher started work in the school when I did in the early 1980s. There is a strong, open, relationship of trust developed through this longstanding stable association, and through collaborative, collective participation in the struggle staff and Board have been involved in for the last 25 years. In this relationship I have always followed the lead of the members of the different cultural communities in the school whānau. In addition to these relationships, the senior leadership team of the school is made up of four highly experienced Associate Principals, three Māori and one South African of Indian heritage, who have a very strong collective voice in the schools’ journey and story. Many of the schools’ teachers have also been on the staff for many years, some have been students of the schools themselves, and some are parents who have had children attend the schools. Some are parents or grandparents of current students, and many are residents of the Otara community. All of these members of the school whānau of interest are very prepared to contribute to, and to critique themes and findings as they develop. Chapter 4 explains the three year action research which developed the schools’ learning model and which actively involved staff from the initiation stage right through to the trialling and implementation of the model. This process is one example of staff ownership of this work. In Chapter 7 external sources, such as the Education Review Office, find agreement across groups of students, parents, staff, and Board of Trustees members, that support the schools’ philosophy and direction. An example of students’ participation and co-construction of knowledge from this case study is described in relation to the research spiral in Figure 16.

While the research design chosen for this thesis is a case, in terms of western, “white space” academic tradition, it is also a story in terms of kaupapa Māori and critical race methodology. More importantly, in terms of these last two paradigms, it is a counter-story that chronicles the efforts of these two schools to step outside education’s “white spaces” in order to create new space. This counter-story is juxtaposed against pervasive, deficit-driven whitestream explanations of so-called “achievement gaps” and the “long tail” of Māori and Pasifika “under-achievement.” Love (2004, p.229) refers to these as “majoritarian” stories - “the description of events as told by members of dominant/majority groups, accompanied by the values and beliefs that justify the actions taken by dominants to insure their dominant position.” According to Solórzarno and Yosso (2002) “white privilege is often expressed through majoritarian stories.”
Specific tools used in the construction of majoritarian stories serve to obscure white privilege and cause it to appear as normal, natural, and ordinary. These tools include such devices as fostering invisibility, making assumptions of what is normative and universal, promoting the perspective that schools are neutral and apolitical, promoting the myth of meritocracy, endorsing the notion that there is equal educational opportunity for all, referencing dominants as “people” while “othering” subordinates. (p.28)

This notion of stories as an intentional construct of dominant/majority groups which obscure white privilege and promote meritocracy, supports the choice of kaupapa Māori and critical race methodology as the analytical tools for this study to develop the antithesis of these majoritarian stories. The counter-storying of kaupapa Māori methodology provides a lens which asserts the centrality and legitimacy of a Māori worldview, and “presupposes positions that are committed to a critical analysis of the existing unequal power relations within our society (Bishop et al, 2007, p,59). According to Solarzano & Yosso (2002, p.26), “A critical race methodology in education challenges White privilege, rejects notions of ‘neutral’ research or ‘objective’ researchers, and exposes deficit-informed research that silences and distorts epistemologies of people of color.”

**Counter-Storytelling**

Both Kaupapa Māori and critical race methodology recognise storytelling as a counter to the deficit and damaging stories told as an outcome of traditional research. In Kaupapa Māori methodology collaborative stories focus “on [researcher] connectedness, engagement, and involvement with the other research participants within the cultural world view/discursive practice within which they function” (Bishop 2005, p.118). In this type of storytelling, the researcher and the participants co-construct meaning and jointly reflect on shared experiences, in what Bishop & Glynn (1999, p.176), call spiral discourse. This process in practice in this thesis is detailed in the research spiral in Figure 16 and in the Table 4 description of my personal participation in terms of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability.

This spiral process showing the overlap and integration of this case study with the participants and with the story of the two schools can be seen through the research experience of a group of five senior students in 2011 and 2012. The numbers in the description below the diagram refer to the stages in the research spiral in Figure 16.
Towards the end of 2011 senior students were engaged in a social studies investigation on the topic of “My culture defines me.” A critical question arising from this topic was, “but who defines my culture?” A group of five students in Years 11, 12 and 13, decided to investigate how schooling had impacted on their culture, and to explore whether their experience of schooling in Te Whānau o Tupuranga was any different from that of their parents and their peers who had been Māori or Pasifika learners in other schools. (1) They drew on their long term involvement in Te Whānau o Tupuranga as their starting point. (2) Together, with input from several staff members, they developed a set of questions:

1. How is my culture defined by schooling in New Zealand?
2. Why has this happened?
3. What is my family’s experience of this?
4. What is Kia Aroha College’s response to this?
5. How is that response working for us as rangatahi (youth)?

(3) The students had access to presentations I had made during the development of my research. These emerging ideas and findings had been presented to students themselves as part of senior student seminars, they had been presented to staff, and the Board of Trustees in the process of

---

32 In January, 2011 the two schools in this study merged to become Kia Aroha College. This is explained in Chapter 8)
feedback and developing key ideas and themes. I had also made presentations to many audiences, regional, national and international, which were made available to the students. (4) This access and sharing of the research as it evolved gave rise to further student-generated questions.

(5) The group decided they would conduct a survey about people’s experience of school. They chose to survey family members, community members, teachers, past students and current students, both those who had been students in Te Whānau o Tupuranga since Year 7, and those who had enrolled later, after spending time in other secondary schools. They also surveyed students who were not enrolled in Te Whānau o Tupuranga. Altogether they surveyed 100 people, 66% of whom were either current or past students and 74% of whom were under the age of 20. By the end of 2011 the student group had developed rich data from these sources and had decided to select some of the survey participants to conduct in-depth video interviews.

(6, 7) The students also had access to research from other sources, independent of the schools, which included Education Review Office reports, a research report on whanaungatanga in practice following a two-year study of the two schools by the New Zealand Families Commission (O’Sullivan et al., 2011), and a 2011 National Identity and Cultural Diversity Study33 by Massey University which Year 12 students had participated in.

Earlier in 2011 I had been invited to present a paper at the 2012 American Education Research Association (AERA) Conference in Vancouver in a Symposium entitled, Reclaiming Education: Youth Counter-Narratives in the Neoliberal Reform Era. As the student group presented their early work to fellow students and staff it became very evident to me that their research could replace what I had intended to present in this forum. (8) This possibility sparked off wider research by the group into the schooling experiences of First Nations youth in Canada, and they were able to make comparisons with their findings.

(9) In April, 2012, with the full support of their families, the staff, and the Board of Trustees, the five students and three staff members travelled with me to Vancouver where the students presented their research. They received a standing ovation and brought some audience members to tears. They extended their knowledge by attending an indigenous research conference at the University of British Columbia, by attending other sessions at the AERA Conference, by spending time with First Nations community members on Vancouver Island, and visiting a primary school on a First Nations reserve.

(10, 11) On their return this group delivered their conference presentation to the whole school and their whānau, and have since presented their work in many forums with me as co-authors and co-researchers. (12) Their research is a powerful collaborative counter-story and their presentations

---

33 Early, as yet unpublished, results, released to the student researchers in 2012. Personal communication with member/s of the research team
invariably lead to further invitations to share this work with wider audiences. Two of the students sum up the group’s findings with these statements:

There is little doubt from our evidence about the importance of whanau to us in our school, which should be no surprise. In Kia Aroha College teachers use Lisa Delpit’s (1995) term, that we students are “their kids, not other people’s children.” Our research confirmed that feeling. That’s what whānau means. 70% of the youth we surveyed, who had been long term students on our campus, told us that the school worked as a whānau all the time in everything we did. However the students we surveyed from other schools said their participation in Māori Performing Arts was the predominant way they experienced “being Māori” at school (Koha, Year 11).

Our research shows that, from our perspective as young people, it is possible to develop a counter-narrative to our dominant white system where most interventions and reforms have their origin in deficit thinking, and continue to alienate us as Māori and Pasifika learners. The counter-story for us has been whānau - and enabling us to develop the tools we need to challenge that system and to change it. (Deazel, Year 13)

Solórzano & Yosso, (2002, p.27) describe the power of counter-stories in critical race methodology to combat traditional research where, “unacknowledged White privilege helps maintain racism’s stories.”

We believe counter-stories serve at least four functions as follows: (a) They can build community among those at the margins of society by putting a human and familiar face to educational theory and practice, (b) they can challenge the perceived wisdom of those at society’s center by providing a context to understand and transform established belief systems, (c) they can open new windows into the reality of those at the margins of society by showing possibilities beyond the ones they live and demonstrating that they are not alone in their position, and (d) they can teach others that by combining elements from both the story and the current reality, one can construct another world that is richer than either the story or the reality alone. (p.36)

To do justice to the story of the two schools in this study it is extremely important to co-construct meaning through the experiences of everyone involved. Both critical race methodology and kaupapa Māori research raise critical questions about the control and production of knowledge that are crucial in any research in these two schools that have resisted the status quo and challenged racism in our education system. The use of these questions as a focus for the collection and analysis of data, and the retelling of the story is essential to ensure the standard, traditional, story of deficit and damage is challenged and rejected, and that participants – the schools and their Māori and Pasifika communities, are given authentic voice.
Methods

Participation

My original plan was to use predominantly “unobtrusive data” (Hatch, 2002, pp.116-125) and to restrict staff and student input to the collection of information available in forums such as staff meetings, school planning and discussions, with the prior agreement of staff who chose to participate. This limitation was in recognition of the power relations involved due to my position as principal of both schools. As data collection progressed however, it became clear that staff themselves wanted more input, and that there was a rich source of information that could be gathered from former students who were now adults. Their personal experience and stories of their learning and the impact of the schools on their lives since were extremely valuable and would not be heard in my original proposal. The input of these participants made a stronger contribution to the telling and re-telling this collaborative counter-story.

Current staff participation

Staff were invited to participate in the research at the beginning of 2010, in several different ways. (Appendix A). Firstly, I invited senior staff to participate in a semi-structured group interview (Appendix B). The semi-structured interview was chosen because it allowed participants to have control over the direction of the conversation, thus minimising the issue of power relations. This involvement was voluntary and ten staff members chose to take part. Participants were given information sheets and asked to complete and sign consent forms. The interview was recorded with the participants’ signed consent, and a transcript of the interview was made for later analysis. The interview began with my explanation of the research and then participants were simply asked to contribute their thoughts around the practice of the two schools and the development of a secure cultural identity. Although the interview started with discussion around the development of the self-lens tool to describe cultural identity, which most of the group had been involved in developing, it moved through issues of pedagogy and the alienation of Māori and Pasifika children in the wider education system. Staff contrasted their learning and teaching experiences in Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School with their learning and teaching experiences in other schools. These contributions are discussed in Chapter 7.

Rather than being the end point, the group interview was the catalyst for ongoing “Interviews as chat” (Haig-Brown, 1992, p.105), frequent informal follow up conversations as staff added to something they had said, or reflected on an issue that had been discussed. Several senior staff suggested it would have been good for the wider staff to have the same opportunity. This suggestion initiated an online staff survey (Appendix C) where all current staff were invited to participate if they wanted to. This survey followed the same process as the former students’ survey (see below) in terms of information and consent. The online survey attempted to address the issue of power, which could have been a factor in face to face or group interviews, between
myself and less experienced or junior staff. The survey allowed staff to participate purely on their own terms. Two of the senior staff who had been involved in the group interview chose to participate again in this survey, reflecting on and expanding ideas they had brought up in the group interview, and adding new thoughts. Three additional staff participated in the online survey. Staff were also fully involved in the action research project, described in Chapter 6, in developing the self-learning lens tool, and the ongoing use of this measure. They participated also in a wide range of staff meetings and decision-making which became embedded in school practice.

Current students’ participation

Current students in the school were not interviewed, because of concern over potential issues of power inherent in my position. However, a number of students have presented their ideas and comments about the school in a range of different forums and media, some of these being independent of the school, for example, the presentations produced for Clubhouse 274 (see Chapter 6). I have been able to access some of these comments, from eight students whose work is in the public domain and where signed student and parental permission for its publication and dissemination had already been given.

Former students’ participation

Since the growth of Te Whānau o Tupuranga into a stand-alone secondary school, and prior to this official status, since 2002, a number of students have graduated after completing their senior secondary schooling. This group is significant in the story of the two schools as they were the catalyst for the struggle to establish the right to remain in the school right through to Year 13. Their participation and experience brought another layer to this case study research.

Initially I invited a group of past students who had graduated from Years 12 or 13 between 2003 to 2008, and who were now all adults, to participate in a series of semi-structured group interviews. This was a relatively small group, many of whom had stayed in contact with the schools, so the contact details of most of them were available. I sent out information and consent letters to all members of this group. While most were keen to participate, and two did take part in one face to face semi-structured interview, finding times when members of the group were available was highly problematic. Finally, some of the group suggested an online survey was a better option. The members of the group are all young adults, with busy, transient lives, and many were now living or working away from the local community. They are high users of social networking websites and information technology, so communication online was a natural choice for them.
Online surveys

Evans & Mathur (2005, p.195), discuss the way technology, over the last 25 years in particular, has revolutionised the way surveys are administered. Van Selm & Jankowski, (2006, p.435) suggest three positions regarding research via the internet, ranging from “business as usual” to the urgent need for entirely new methods. They opt for a middle position that combines both, and discuss specifically how this method applies to online surveys. They find one of the reasons for conducting online surveys is “the attractiveness of computers to particular (age) groups.” Other advantages include the ability to reach potential respondents distributed across a wide geographic region, flexibility, speed and timeliness, convenience for respondents who can participate in their own time, ease of data entry and analysis, the availability of a range of question formats, and ease of follow up (Evans & Mather, 2005, pp. 198, 199).

Disadvantages or weaknesses of online surveys include some respondents’ lack of online experience, unclear answering instructions, ensuring privacy and security, and the fact that the survey online can be quite impersonal.

This was certainly relevant in a Māori and Pasifika framework where kanohi ki te kanohi, or face to face, interaction is the preference. However, mitigating against this was the fact that the respondents knew me well, and knew each other well, and these were longstanding relationships of mutual trust and respect. These participants were very familiar with online and internet use and were using this technology daily in their interactions with each other. In many ways for this group, electronic communication was their preference and they were just as comfortable with this as they were with hui and face to face interaction. A further important advantage of the online survey was that it gave the group of past students full control of whether they participated or not, the questions they wanted to answer, and the types of answers they gave without any intervention or perceived power from me as their former principal.

Medlin, Roy, & Ham Chai (1999, cited in Van Selm & Janowski, 2006, p.442) distinguish three categories of samples in online surveys: recruited samples, unrestricted and screened samples. In recruited samples, obtained by consulting and selecting from an existing sample frame, intended respondents can be given a password in order to control entry to an online survey. In unrestricted samples respondents are emailed an introductory letter with a hyperlink to the Web based survey and screened samples involve placing a general request for respondents in an electronic communication environment or on a Web page.

The choice of sampling method for the online survey of former students was unrestricted sampling. All those former students, whose email or contact details were known, were sent information and consent letters regarding the research and provided with a link to the online survey. The invitation
was a step-wise process, with further invitations extended to any former students as their whereabouts became known. The survey was left open online from February 2010 to January 2011.

After setting up the survey and inviting participants from the 2003 to 2008 graduate group, I then received further requests from former students who had left the school earlier than 2003. They had been forwarded the link by some of those in the initial group, and in one case it had been posted on a social networking site. All those who contacted me were then sent the information and consent letters via email.

In recognition of the issues of privacy and security, care was taken to use an established provider of web-based survey solutions with a clear security policy, which provided detailed information about its data centre environment detection systems and physical access security.

The online survey (Appendix D) allowed me to set up an introductory screen which again provided all the same information regarding the research to ensure everyone had seen this. The first screen of the survey took participants through a consents process which required them to respond to each question before they could proceed. This included a question regarding their preference about the use of their name (see below). For all other questions, the choice of whether to respond or not was up to the participant. The survey would not allow respondents to return to the site to continue an unfinished survey, but those who wanted to could open up a new survey and avoid the questions previously answered on their first attempt. Many of the group did choose this option.

Most of the questions were open-ended and asked respondents to tell of their experiences or provide their opinions. A final question asked them to simply add anything else they wanted to say. 18 former students responded to the online survey and their experience in the school spanned over 19 years, from the late 1980s to 2008. This is a small sample in relation to the large number of former students, however most former students’ contact details and whereabouts are no longer available. Also, the majority of those who chose to participate were those students who had been able to stay in the school through to senior level - a much smaller group than all graduates. The responses of the former students who chose to participate are analysed in detail in Chapter 7.

**Use of names**

All respondents in all data collection types were asked if they wanted to use their real name or a pseudonym. It is not surprising that almost all participants requested that their real name be used. This is the preference for Māori and Pasifika people where names are extremely important. An example of this is the request by Pasifika staff who participated in the development of the indicators for Samoan, Tongan and Cook Islands Māori cultural identity indicators, that not only their first and family names be used, but their cultural titles and their experience in Pasifika
education or the community also be made explicit (Chapter 6). This request honours and gives added credibility to the self-lens tool that was the result of this staff action research.

Where participants stated they did not want their names used they have been named “Former Student A,” or “Staff Member A,” rather than use a pseudonym. In all interviews and survey responses, where respondents chose to use their real names, they were also given the option of using first names only, or including family names out of respect for the individual’s whakapapa or genealogy.

**International participation**

Although this study is primarily an intrinsic case study, focused on the story of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School, the philosophy and practice of these schools have been aligned with the philosophy and practice of three sites in the United States, in East Oakland, California, Chicago, Illinois, and Tucson in Arizona. I have visited these sites to observe their programmes in action, and lead educators in all three sites have visited Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School over several years, and some of the group have visited more than once. These visits have included interaction with students, teachers and community, thus expanding the understanding and interpretation of the schools to the global level. This networking and interaction around our shared research and involvement in critical, social justice education is ongoing and has provided international contexts for comparing, contrasting and understanding the work of the two schools in this study. In Chapter 6, I describe the three programmes in detail and draw out seven key principles I find are common in the practice of all three sites and in Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School. These seven principles form the foundation for the themes which are analysed in detail in Chapter 7.

The four social justice educators, all eminent in their fields, are Dr. Jeffrey Duncan-Andrade, Dr. Wayne Yang, Dr. David Stovall and Dr. Augustine Romero. They have read and provided comment on the stories of the two schools and on their struggles and programmes. Further additions or amendments were then made to Chapter 6 to take their comment into account. The chapter was used by Dr. Wayne Yang as a framework for a joint symposium presented at the 2011 American Education Research Association Annual Meeting in New Orleans, U.S.A. The symposium was entitled “Schools for self-determination: Critical pedagogy and grassroots organizing for educational sovereignty.”  

Other participation

Chapter 6 also tells the story of the development of the Computer Clubhouse, *Clubhouse 274* on the combined schools’ campus, as this development is closely linked to the schools’ practice and to the community. The Computer Clubhouse is not a school initiative, however the schools’ philosophy and practice were fundamental to the approach from a community group to locate the facility on the combined schools’ campus. The sociocultural constructionist learning (Pinkett, 2000, 2002) in Clubhouse 274 is closely aligned to the learning model used in the two schools in this case study. Pinkett (2002, pp.82,83) identifies four characteristics of Feire’s (1972) work that underpin sociocultural constructionist theory: that education should be learner-centred, empowering, liberating and grounded in praxis, “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it” (p.33). This aim, that education should be transformative, liberating, and empowering, links sociocultural constructionism directly to critical theory and critical pedagogy, and links Clubhouse practice to the ongoing development of theory and practice in the two schools’ global-learning lens. This relationship is described in Chapter 6, as is the thinking which led to the significant change of name to *Studio 274* in 2012. This change is, in itself, a crucial counter-story.

The Computer Clubhouse is operated, and funded, through the work of a charitable trust, The Computer Clubhouse Trust Board. I am a member of the Trust Board and hold the role of secretary. I have been given permission, minuted in the Trust Board’s records, to have access to the Computer Clubhouse records and activities. The section, written in Chapter 6, regarding the *Clubhouse 274* programme and projects has been read and approved by all Clubhouse Trust Board members.

The forms of analysis

The research describes both past and current practice to determine its effectiveness in showing the development of cultural identity across the four main ethnic groups in the school, Māori, Samoan, Tongan and Cook Islands Māori. It describes initiatives already established and reports on the rationale and processes that led to their implementation and the impact on practice and achievement school-wide.

Hatch (2002, p.116-125) discusses the use of “unobtrusive” data as a primary data collection source. Unobtrusive data provide “insight into the phenomenon under investigation without interfering with the enactment of that social phenomenon.” Unobtrusive data are gathered without interference into the ongoing life of the school. Examples of unobtrusive data include meeting records, artefacts, documents, personal communications, records, photographs, and archives. Unobtrusive data, together with the researcher’s tacit knowledge, are an important source of data for this study. Where possible this has been checked against the knowledge of other participants, including the input from current staff and students and former students. The use of
unobtrusive data enables me to tell this story in a way that addresses potential power imbalances. Bishop (2005) describes researchers in Kaupapa Māori contexts as:

...repositioned in such a way as no longer needing to seek to give voice to others, to empower others, to emancipate others, or to refer to others as subjugated voices, but rather to listen to and participate with those traditionally “othered” as constructors of meanings of their own experiences and agents of knowledge.

This is an important point when describing the work undertaken by staff, the majority of whom are Māori or Pasifika, to develop cultural identity in Māori and Pasifika youth. Ultimately, the decisions made about whether the schools’ practice has been effective or not, must be made by those who have been traditionally “othered” —and their different constructions of what it means to “be” Māori, Samoan, Tongan or Cook Islands Māori, is what this thesis records.

There exists a wealth of archival information and external research data from reviewers and independent researchers who have chosen to study Clover Park Middle School and the development of Te Whānau o Tupuranga since its inception as the Māori bilingual unit to its establishment as a designated character bilingual secondary school (Jenkins, 2002; O’Sullivan, H., 2011). Much of these data were examined and are recorded in my Master’s thesis (Milne, 2004). This thesis analyses later data generated independently of the school, which includes Education Review Office reports from general cyclical reviews, official Ministry of Education records, reports and statistics, community consultation and letters. Extensive community consultation has been carried out in the establishment process of the second school, Te Whānau o Tupuranga, and again in the third application to extend the range of year levels at Clover Park Middle School. These data document the aspirations of the schools’ Māori and Pasifika communities.

Since 2004, the two schools have been involved in major restructuring with the division of the site into two separate schools. Of prime importance to both schools, the boards of trustees, staff and the community of each school throughout this process was that the philosophy of culturally responsive pedagogy and strong relationships would be maintained, and that the two sites would work in partnership. Indicative of this goal was the community consultation in 2006 that overwhelmingly demanded that the two boards of trustees become one combined board and that the two schools be led by one principal.

Throughout this period both schools continued to develop their shared philosophy and, in particular, the ongoing reflection and development of the learning approach based on changing the lens through which we view learning. This concept of the schools’ “Power Lenses” (Milne, 2004, p.215), explained in Chapter 1, connects students’ relationships to themselves, to their cultures, to each other, to their wider whānau, their community, the world and to learning in all of those spheres. The key is whanaungatanga - the interdependence of and connectedness to a network that will continue to support them and connect them to their futures. Significant in the “Power
Lenses” model is the “self-lens” that views learning from home and family—language, cultural identity, cultural norms, wairua/spirituality, whānau—as equal in status to Western academic learning or the “school-lens.”

Through ongoing reflection and revision over three years from 2004 to 2007 staff were involved in the refining of practice and initiatives designed to describe students’ growth and development in the “self-lens.” Much of this practice is now embedded in the schools’ learning model, and in fact was Clover Park Middle School’s primary focus in the 2007 Education Review Office review, but it is continually revisited and staff consider it is always an ongoing “work in progress.” This action research is described in Chapter 6.

Data collection and modes of analysis

Data were gathered from a range of sources within the school, both existing data and new data as they were generated through staff development and discussion and the trialling of these processes and initiatives within the schools, electronically stored documents, as well as archived school records and documents. Existing data include:

- records of conversations, team and staff meetings that were held regarding the development of the current learning model,
- aggregated data collected across each school from 2006 using the “self-lens assessment tool” developed through this ongoing action research,
- staff-developed Critically Conscious, Culturally Responsive, Teacher Profiles – Job Descriptions developed in 2008 to reflect the schools’ philosophy and practice,
- the schools’ Curriculum Statement developed in 2009 for the implementation of the revised New Zealand Curriculum,
- Graduate Profiles for students at the end of Years 8, 10 and 13, in each of the different ethnic groups,
- staff-developed indicators of cultural identity (Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Islands Māori) - developed by staff from those ethnic groups,
- independent external data regarding the self-lens tool (e.g. Education Review Office observations and findings),
- staff narratives about the use of this tool in the identification of students’ cultural strengths,
- other assessment tools, including the development of graded reading texts in Samoan and Tongan languages and initiatives such as the “rīpene” used in Te Whānau o Tupuranga to denote cultural competencies and achievement and worn by students in the form of ribbons and badges,
aggregated “school-lens” academic data collected through the schools’ usual assessment processes, and
- data from specific initiatives already in place e.g. The Computer Clubhouse programme.

All of the documentation regarding these data already exists. In addition to the above, new data were generated through ongoing staff development and initiatives already in place, but subject to reflection and revision through the schools’ self-review process, and through the interviews and surveys described in the earlier section of this chapter.

**Computer Analysis**

QSR International’s NVivo 9 qualitative data analysis software (2010) was used to sort and classify data into categories (nodes). Nodes were created as they become apparent in the data. These nodes were the repositories for collecting references which had been coded using key words and ideas from the data. Two “parent” nodes—internal and external data—were the first classification. Within these “parent nodes” further nodes were created for School Documentation, Student and Staff Voice, Independent Voices, and Community Voice. These nodes helped to sort existing data into manageable groups. Data within these groups were then coded to identify emerging patterns and emerging themes (Figure 17). External data were then used to triangulate the school-based data.

**Figure 17: Data Collection Sources**
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Hatch, (2002, p.208) describes the advantages of computer-assisted analysis as the ability to handle large amounts of textual data, the time saved in coding, retrieving, displaying, counting and sorting and the creation of graphic displays. They can focus the researcher to be organised to take a systematic approach and ensure a more careful reading of the data due to the need to read the data line by line when coding. These advantages were all found to be salient in terms of the processes in this study.

Of particular value was the ability to conduct instant matrix queries and displays of the data, allowing questions such as, What do former students think about the model of learning in Te Whānau o Tupuranga? Does this change over different graduate time periods? This type of query was used extensively in the analysis of data and the outcomes that are reported in Chapter 7.

Disadvantages of computer-assisted analysis include the complexity of the programmes and the time taken to learn their use, the potential to lose sight of the contexts of the study, the limitations of inflexibility when categories are set by the computer and cannot be changed and the possible loss of data and completed analyses due to technical failure and human error (Hatch, 2002, p.208). The complexity of the programme and the time to become familiar with it was an issue. However the time saved in analysis and coding compensated for this. NVivo is extremely flexible and all decisions are made by the researcher. This ability to customise the analysis and produce a wide range of reports was an extremely useful feature (see example in Appendix E). Hatch also cautions however that using a computer programme to help with sorting and organising data is not “and never can be a satisfactory alternative to doing the mindwork associated with analysing and interpreting data” (p.207). While the computer programme was useful in managing and organising the data, the “mindwork” involved required knowledge of the schools’ history and story to interpret the themes as they emerged.

O’Donnell (2000, p.97) likens this process to confronting a 5000 piece jigsaw without the picture on the box! The nature of the process is one of discovery, rather than the proving of a preconceived hypothesis. In inductive analysis one looks for commonalities and differences firstly within categories and then across the whole of the data. However Bishop, 1996, p.24) warns that this process alone can still not prevent researcher hegemony in the interpretation of themes, if this process is independent of the research participants. Researchers from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds will notice, and value different things. In this thesis the process of spiral discourse (Bishop, 1996, p.28; Bishop & Glynn, 1999, p.119) and the alignment of the themes to the seven principles common across all four sites studied has ensured their relevance and authenticity. Member checking, by sharing draft writing with international colleagues, and checking within the schools’ whānau of interest confirmed these themes were acceptable to all participants.
**Trustworthiness and Validity**

Triangulation ensures consistency and validity through the use of multiple sources (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1994). LeCompte, Preissle, & Tesch, 1993, pp.323-324, cited in Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2000 p.108) identify several overriding kinds of internal validity or truth value in qualitative research: confidence in the data, the authenticity, credibility, auditability, dependability and the confirmability of the data and the soundness of the research design. Each theme has been analysed using four different sets of data (Figure 17), two internal to the schools, and two external. The analysis in Chapter 7 shows consistency across all four sets of data and supports therefore its validity and trustworthiness. Kaupapa Māori researchers however, challenge the pervasive Western notions of validity because these constructs are all positioned in and defined within another worldview:

Kaupapa Māori rejects outside control over what constitutes the text’s call for authority and truth. A Kaupapa Māori position promotes what Lincoln & Denzin (1994) term an epistemological version of validity, one where the authority of the text is “established through recourse to a set of rules concerning knowledge, its production and representation” (p. 578). Such an approach to validity locates the power within Māori cultural practices where what is acceptable and what is not acceptable research, text, and/or processes is determined and defined by the research community itself in reference to the cultural context within which it operates. (Bishop, 2005, p.137)

Through the process of spiral discourse described earlier in Figure 16 it is clear that the reliability and trustworthiness of the research data in this study lies primarily in my accountability to the whānau of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School. The classification and co-construction of themes arising from the data, checked back with staff and the “whānau of interest” (see Figure 16 process), both locally and internationally, provides rich information to answer the research questions.

The development of cultural identity and competence relies heavily on traditional cultural epistemologies as the basis for understanding learners’ achievements in these knowledges. Cultural knowledge, values and protocols have been respected at all times. Māori, Samoan, Cook Islands Māori and Tongan teaching and support staff have acted as an informal supervisory panel representative of the cultures involved in the study. These staff have been consulted and their advice and guidance followed throughout the development of this thesis.

This chapter has explained the methodology and the methods of analysis used in this research. The next three chapters, Chapters 4, 5 and 6, are aligned with the three “power lenses”, self-learning, school learning and global-learning in the learning model of Clover Park Middle School and Te
Whānau o Tupuranga. They report the findings that have emerged during this research. The first set of findings in Chapter 4 describes practice and outcomes through the “self-learning” lens.
Chapter Four

Determining Self

Indigenous peoples throughout the world survive policies and practices ranging from extermination and genocide to protection and assimilation. Perhaps more than any other feat, survival is the greatest of all Indigenous peoples’ achievements (The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights in Education, 1999).

Findings: Self-learning

The next three chapters focus on the schools’ practice, and the outcomes for students from three different aspects of that practice. These chapters use the three “Power Lenses” that are the foundation of the schools’ philosophy and learning model (Figure 9): school learning, self-learning and global learning (see Chapter 1) as an analytical framework to describe the findings in each of these areas. Chapter 4 examines the initiatives in the schools to support ‘self-learning’ through the ‘self-learning lens’. Chapter 5 describes the schools’ practice and pedagogy within the school learning lens, and Chapter 6 examines learning for the future through the global lens.

This chapter looks specifically at the first of the three lenses in the schools’ learning model - the self-learning lens, and describes the development of an assessment tool to determine students’ growth in their cultural identity and self-knowledge. Three questions that arose from the story, introduced in Chapter 1, of the Samoan girl in the palagi principal’s office, are addressed in this chapter:

1. How could the school ensure all students had this same strength in their own cultural identity?
2. How would we know this was developing?
3. What would be the Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Island Māori ways of knowing that young people were developing these skills?

Firstly, this chapter explores Māori and Pasifika identities as these underpin the action research by school staff to develop the ‘self-learning’ tool. It also asks questions about achievement and
success the white space of assessment, and answers these through the data provided by the self-learning research.

The Coolangatta Statement excerpt used to introduce this chapter suggests that the greatest of all Indigenous people’s achievements is survival, but non-white children have the right to more than mere survival in our education system and the statistics show that many of them actually don’t survive their school experience. Smith (1999) encapsulates the anger felt through a history that “offends the deepest sense of our humanity,” and that systematically annihilated cultural knowledges:

It galls us that Western researchers and intellectuals can assume to know all that it is possible to know of us, on the basis of their brief encounters with some of us. It appals us that the West can desire, extract and claim ownership of our ways of knowing, our imagery, the things we create and produce, and then simultaneously reject the people who created and developed those ideas and seek to deny them further opportunities to be creators of their own culture and own nations. It angers us when practices linked to the last century, and the centuries before that, are still employed to deny the validity of indigenous peoples’ claim to existence, to land and territories, to the right of self-determination, to the survival of our languages and forms of cultural knowledge, to our natural resources and systems for living within our environments. (p.1)

Māori Identity

Māori are counted in two ways in the New Zealand Census: through ethnicity and through descent. These are quite different concepts - the former refers to cultural affiliation, while the latter denotes Māori ancestry. In the 2006 Census, 565,329 people self-identified as Māori, and there were 643,977 people who were of Māori descent (Statistics NZ, 2007a). This means that just over 12% (78,648) of the total Māori population chose not to self-identify as Māori (Figure 18). As Borell (2005, p.8) points out, using a similar result in the 2001 Census, an explanation for the marginalisation of Māori identity may be found in a societal discourse that focuses on negative stereotypes of Māori, or expectations of cultural competence that these individuals feel they don’t have.

The Māori descent figures are used to form the basis of iwi statistics. In 2006, 17.7% of the total New Zealand population were of Māori descent - an 11.1% increase from 1996. A total of 102,366 people of Māori descent did not know their iwi affiliations. Around one-third (34.5%) of people of Māori descent were aged under 15 years, while 4.3% were aged over 65 years.
Of those who self-identified as Māori just over half identified Māori as their only ethnicity. In the remaining group, 42.2% stated they also identified with European (Pākehā) ethnicity, 7% also identified with Pasifika ethnicity and 1.5% also identified with Asian identities. 2.3% of those identifying as Māori chose “New Zealander” as one of their ethnic groups.

Although the Māori population has increased over this period (1991 to 2006), in the last ten years the difference between those who self-identify as being of Māori ethnicity and those who have Māori ancestry has remained relatively constant (Figure 18). However, as Moeke-Pickering (1996) points out, changes in the options offered by the New Zealand Census over time have not necessarily met with Māori approval.

Moeke-Pickering (p.3) identifies two principal sets of characteristics of Māori identity, those that have emerged out of a Māori ecology, such as descent, tribal structures and cultural practices, and those that emerge out of the current ecology such as socio-economic and lifestyle characteristics. The reality for Māori now is that is that Māori identity has become embedded within a Pākehā ecology. Practices driven by this ecology have resulted in the undermining of Māori identity. An example of this is the definition of Māori as decided by the Census process. Prior to 1986, blood quantum definitions determined whether or not a person was Māori. From 1986 Māori have been able to self-identify as Māori without reference to blood fractions. In 1991 Māori were also able to identify tribal affiliations in the Census section on descent. However, Smith (1995) objects to this “state imposed” definition:

I objected to nominate a primary iwi as I take seriously my rights to claim bilineal descent and resent the state imposing definitions through census on how our identity is shaped. In brief these external measurements of identity are significant at an ideological level because they become normative, they set the norm for what it means to be Māori. (cited in Moeke-Pickering, 1996, p.5)
*Te Hoe Nuku Roa* is a study of over 600 randomly selected Māori households, involving over 1500 Māori participants. The study is designed to “track the progress, problems, aspirations and circumstances of Māori people from all walks of life over a ten - or fifteen year period” (Durie, 1998). Starting from 1994 successive cohorts were introduced every third year, with the fourth cohort entering in 2004/2005. Durie (2003), identified four key ‘markers’ for Māori cultural identity, arising from the project: identification as Māori, cultural knowledge and understanding, access to and participation in Māori society and communication - Māori language (see Table 5).

Table 5: Māori Cultural Identity: Key Markers (Durie, 1998, p.58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Markers</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Identification as Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>Tribal history, whakapapa (genealogy), tikanga (custom), social arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and participation</td>
<td>Marae Whānau, hapū, social links Land, forests The environment, fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Level and place of usage, print and broadcasting media Fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using these markers, researchers in the *Te Hoe Nuku Roa* (1999), project have constructed four cultural identity profiles: a secure identity, a positive identity, a notional identity and a compromised identity. A secure identity rests on self-definition as Māori, with significant involvement and participation in all aspects of te ao Māori (the Māori world). A positive identity profile has lower levels of involvement, a notional identity has no access, although they identify as Māori, and a compromised identity reflects non-identification as Māori, although they may have considerable access.

Over half of the participants in the study (53% in early data and 68% in 2000-2001) have a positive identity, described by Cunningham et al. (2005), as having a strong sense of being Māori but relatively estranged from the Māori world. Those with notional identity describe themselves as Māori but have no contact with te ao Māori. Compromised identity, those who do not describe themselves as Māori, is not shown in Figure 19 as the study sample for *Te Hoe Nuku Roa* - participants who identified as Māori - could not be classified as having compromised identity.
Obviously identity is never static and changes with time and the experiences of the people involved. The shape of that identity is moulded by the people from that culture, through their experiences and their associations with others. Irihapeti Ramsden’s words capture the essence of this change:

The future of our people cannot be stereotyped by our current versions of Māoriness. Major cultural markers such as the language of our ancestors, the marae and tangihanga must be retained at all costs, but, under pressure of changing time, many more adjustments are likely. These choices are for Māori to make, they are a matter of mana.... How each of us expresses our Māoritanga is the product of a variety of experiences. None of us is today what our ancestors were, and our descendents will not be like us. With aroha, knowledge, strength, commitment and politicisation our descendents will be Māori, their way.... Our work as today’s version of Māori is the same as that of our tipuna: to continue our story, to strengthen it according to our times and to add the next chapter. That will be done. (Ramsden, 1993)

The fact that one in three Māori are under 15 years highlights the need for schools to understand the importance of Māori identity, especially in adolescence, and to understand the complex, multiple identities of today’s youth. Borell’s (2005) study of Māori youth in South Auckland found that while, for most participants, school was the most important site in terms of accessing aspects of conventional Māori culture, there were also tensions that limited these young people’s participation. Borell’s research draws attention to the importance of environmental factors in identity development. In her study participants identified a distinctive “Southside” identity that, “was a source of collective strength and pride and individual self-confidence and belonging” (p.81) to South Auckland, in spite of the negative stereotypes which these young people acknowledged and rejected. Borell found the young people in her study to be “sophisticated and experienced negotiators of their identity,” and concludes, “action is needed that builds on and reinforces all the positive markers of identity that young Māori display, not just the conventional indicators” (p.82).
**Pasifika identities**

A number of Pasifika writers have identified key components of their specific culture and identity. While there may be no agreed set of essential elements, several themes do reoccur in the literature (Gray, 2001, p.4).

Mulitalo-Lauto (2001, p.261) describes the key components of Samoan cultural identity as social structures, including the family, church, clubs and groups, strategies to ensure survival, ceremony and rituals, protocols and values, and spirituality. Balme (1998) is among those who see the revival of cultural performance as a way for cultural groups to establish cultural boundaries and create and maintain cultural identities. Mitaera (1999) refers to the importance of one’s papa’anga or genealogy, which is the basis of personal identity and provides an understanding of leadership, status, obligations and responsibilities and even career choices for Cook Islands Māori. Other Samoan researchers, such as Hunkin-Tuiletufuga (2001, p.201) and Mailei (1999), argue strongly that the ability to speak one’s Pacific language should be understood as a key measure of one’s identity.

Kepa and Manu’atu, (2006, p.56) insist that the tide has turned so that the educationalists must think of ways to educate and train teachers who will strengthen children who speak Pasifika languages and English, “in order that they become bicultural, bi-literate and bi-lingual citizens in a complex Aotearoa/New Zealand.”

**“New Zealand-Born”**

Samu (2006, p.40) also highlights the critical importance of the unique, “creative, assertive self-determination,” of New Zealand-born and New Zealand-raised Pasifika youth, that blends traditional culture with contemporary influences. This identity option does not exist in the Pacific Islands but is emerging with immigration to New Zealand, Hawaii, the west coast of the U.S.A. and Australia. Samu states:

> Such identities may not be articulated clearly by young Pasifika learners in schools. However, if they are listening to hip-hop music and wearing clothes from the Dawn Raid label and watching the annual Style Pasifika fashion show, and animated comedy series BroTown on television, then they are being exposed to, and participating in, the process of new ethnic identity formation taking place amongst many New Zealand-born Pasifika peoples. (p.41)

In the 2006 Census, 73% of Cook Island Māori, 60% of Samoan and 56% of the Tongan people resident in New Zealand were born here. Six out of every 10 Pasifika people were born in New Zealand (Statistics NZ, 2009a). In addition to this, there is a growing number of Pasifika people with multiple Pasifika and other ethnic identities. In the 1996 Census, six out of ten Fijians and four out
of ten Cook Islands people had affiliations with other ethnic groups, while almost one in three Samoans was married to a non-Samoan (Gray, 2001, p.8). While it might have once been thought that the culture and identity remained strong in the Pacific Islands, Gray cites Bedford’s (1997) statistics proving a growing imbalance, with far more Niuean and Cook Islands Māori people living in New Zealand than remain in those two islands. As island-born populations decline and New Zealand-born numbers continue to grow this imbalance could contribute to what Mailei (1999, p.8) sees as an identity crisis or an identity dilemma.

All of these complex influences on Pasifika identities make it even more critical that schools are able to respond to the needs of Pasifika youth to answer questions about, “Who am I?” and “Where do I fit?” From an indigenous Pasifika perspective outside of New Zealand, Meyer, (2001), makes both the challenges and the answers explicit:

There it is. How do we educate our youth for the challenges of the next millennium? We surround them with our community, we give them meaningful experiences that highlight their ability to be responsible, intelligent, and kind. We watch for their gifts, we shape assessment to reflect mastery that is accomplished in real time, not false. We laugh more, plant everything, and harvest the hope of aloha. We help each other, we listen more, we trust in one another again. We find our Hawaiian essence reflected in both process and product of our efforts. That is Hawaiian education, and understanding our Hawaiian epistemology is our foundation, our *kumupa’ā*. So, let it be said and let it be known: *We have* what we need. *We are* who we need (emphasis in original). (p.146)

What is success?

_Ehara taku toa i te toa takitahi engari he toa takitini_

*My strength is not that of the individual but of the many*

The very divergent Māori and Pākehā attitudes to success and achievement, described earlier in this chapter, are evident in this whakatauākī (proverb). For Māori, success as an individual is important when that success or learning benefits “the collectives of whānau, hapū, iwi” (Wilkie, 2010 p.34). However, in our New Zealand state education system success is seen as the individual pursuit of qualifications and individual academic achievement. Penetito (2001) observes succinctly that the ongoing difficulty faced by Māori in education was that ‘the New Zealand education system has always operated as though its clients were either Pākehā or wanted to become Pākehā; Māori had much to learn from Pākehā but Pākehā had little to learn from Māori’ (Penetito, 2001, p. 18, cited in Wilkie, 2010, p.23).

Wilkie (2010) uses the metaphor of the multi-levelled steps of the poutama to analyse the many factors that make up these opposing world views and to provide a culturally relevant tool to describe success in Māori terms. The continual and spiral nature of learning is captured is this explanation:
Traditionally, poutama teaches us that learning begins before birth, continues through life, and after death. Poutama teaches us that the mana of a learner is equal to all other learners, ahead of them and behind them, on the learning pathway. Poutama teaches us that knowledge is gained in steps, and implies the perseverance needed to progress upwards. Poutama reminds us that knowledge is built layer upon layer, and for Māori the foundations of this knowledge begin with our tipuna and before them eternally, with Papatūānuku, the land. (p.262)

In a personal communication to Wilkie, kaumātua Tuahine Northover explained that “there are only five steps on the learning poutama: Kua Tīmata, the first step; Kua Mārama, enlightened; Kua Kaha, confident; Kua Mōhio, knowledgeable; Ko Te Taumata, the pinnacle.” Learning is not completed on reaching Te Taumata, but continues with the first step on the next level. Northover states, “Traditionally there is no concept of either success or failure in Te Ao Māori. Those who ‘never aim to be successful also never fail; they just don’t reach the taumata, they don’t fail.’ (Wilkie, 2010, p.36) This is a concept that is diametrically opposed to the widely alleged notion of Māori students’ ‘failure’ in schools and to the Western concept espoused in New Zealand’s mandated National Standards, that all learners should master identified skills and learning stages at the same time.

Ka Hikitia

The New Zealand Ministry of Education’s Māori Education Strategy 2008-2012, Ka Hikitia: Managing for Success (Ministry of Education 2008a), introduced in earlier chapters, is a document one would hope would understand these different worldviews and which would be able to define success from a Māori perspective. The strategic intent of Ka Hikitia: Managing for Success is ‘Māori enjoying education success as Māori’. According to the document, “This embraces today’s world where Māori live and contribute as Māori in te Ao Māori, Aotearoa New Zealand and the wider world.” Key words and phrases are scattered through the text: sharing power, self-development, self-determination, Māori potential, identity, culture, multiple concepts of success:

Ka Hikitia - Managing for Success builds on the Māori Potential Approach which emphasises working together and sharing power. It supports Māori self-development and self-determination, and represents a move away from a focus on deficit, problems, failure and risks, to a focus on making the most of opportunities for success. Succeeding as Māori captures and reflects that identity and culture are essential ingredients of success. The strategy takes a broad view of success and recognises the multiple concepts of success held by students, whānau, hapū, iwi, and education professionals and providers. (p.19)

There is a definite shift away from the deficit language of previous years to an approach underpinned by three principles:
1. **Māori Potential:** all Māori learners have unlimited potential;
2. **Cultural Advantage:** all Māori have cultural advantage by virtue of who they are - being Māori is an asset, not a problem;
3. **Inherent Capability:** all Māori are inherently capable of achieving success.

This shift in positioning is spelled out in *Ka Hikitia* in Table 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less focus on...</th>
<th>More focus on...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedying deficit</td>
<td>Realising potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of dysfunction</td>
<td>Identifying opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government intervention</td>
<td>Investing in people and local solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting deficit</td>
<td>Tailoring education to the learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori as a minority</td>
<td>Indigeneity and distinctiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructing and informing</td>
<td>Collaborating and co-constructing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specific student outcomes expected from *Ka Hikitia* (p.18) are that students should become Māori learners:

- working with others to determine successful learning and education pathways,
- excelling and successfully realising their cultural distinctiveness and potential,
- successfully participating in and contributing to te ao Māori, and
- gaining the universal skills and knowledge needed to successfully participate in and contribute to Aotearoa New Zealand and the world.

The strategy for achieving these outcomes acknowledges the Māori principle of “ako” which is the word for both ‘to teach’ and ‘to learn’ in the Māori language (Metge, 1984, Pere, 1982). This is described as a teaching and learning relationship that is reciprocal and in which the learner and whānau cannot be separated. “An unrelenting focus on ako is at the core of *Ka Hikitia.*” Cultural identity also features in *Ka Hikitia* which states:

Integrating an understanding of cultural identity into learning settings is most effective when it contributes directly, deliberately and appropriately to shaping teaching practices and learning experiences for specific students.” Culture and education are inextricably interwoven, in the education system as well as in the learning setting. Māori children and students are more likely to achieve when they see themselves, their whānau, hapū and iwi reflected in the teaching content and environment, and are able to be ‘Māori’ in all learning contexts. (p.20)

---

35 Based on the Māori Potential Approach developed by Te Puni Kokiri (Ministry of Māori Development - the Crown’s principal adviser on Crown-Māori relationships), in 2004 as the public policy approach for government.
“As Māori”

*Ka Hikitia* projects all the words we would hope to see in a pathway towards Māori success and its intent is difficult to fault. However, in the goal of *Ka Hikitia*, “Māori children enjoying education success, as Māori,” (my emphasis) the two key words, ‘as Māori’ are the most powerful words in the whole document, and will be the two words most ignored by schools who have no understanding of what “as Māori” might look like. Sadly, “as Māori” seems destined to become another white space, in that it will be reinvented and seen as no different from “as Pākehā.” (Milne, 2008). This is not necessarily a deliberate action or intent on the part of principals and school leadership, but is indicative of the lack of understanding that is endemic throughout our education system. A personal story serves to illustrate the reality for Māori learners in our schools:

At the beginning of 2008, my then 14 year old granddaughter, formerly a student in a Kura Kaupapa Māori, had no option but to transfer to a large urban whitestream school due to the imminent closure of the kura (school). In her kura programme, thanks to a formal arrangement with a Māori tertiary wānanga, she and her classmates had been given the opportunity to begin their secondary school qualifications pathway in Year 9. Consequently, by the time she left the kura at the end of Year 10 she had already completed NCEA Level 1 and had achieved some Level 2 credits. The whitestream secondary school was sceptical that this could be possible and awaited further ‘proof’ in the results of her external examinations—which confirmed her ability.

In 2008, now in Year 11, when other students in her new school were just starting their NCEA courses, she was required to repeat many of the standards she had already achieved. She also continued with NCEA Level 2. Fluent in te reo Māori, she managed to complete her required Level 2 and Level 3 Māori language standards in Year 11. In 2009, now 15 years old and entering Year 12 she had completed Māori Level 3 and had achieved both her NCEA Level 1 and NCEA Level 2 qualifications. The school now had no idea what to do with her or how to cater for her needs. Sixty credits are required to pass NCEA Level 2. She had achieved 68. Her mother went to discuss her possible learning programme with the school, explaining she did not want her daughter to lose motivation or become disengaged from learning.. She was assured this would not happen. Her mother specifically discussed her girl’s Māori abilities. Was the school able to provide te reo Māori beyond Level 3? What about her ability in Māori Performing Arts where she was a competitor at national level in an adult group? More reassurance was given that they would address these issues.

In June, 2009, when my granddaughter expressed complete disillusionment with school we investigated again to find the pathway she was following would result in her passing Level 2 NCEA for a second time, with a further 78 credits, in addition to the 68 she had already achieved. None of the Level 3 standards she was working on would be useful in achieving
university entrance requirements, and although they had found and enrolled her in a Level 1 University Māori language paper, she was constantly reminded by her teacher that this had cost the school extra money and she should be grateful. Our whānau withdrew my granddaughter from the school and sent her to Auckland to enrol in a school which would value her Māori abilities. This was an unacceptable compromise that resulted in a 16 year old girl being removed from her whānau to live in Auckland in order to find a Māori-centred learning environment.

So much for the Ka Hikitia promise of, “a broad reaching five-year strategy aiming to transform and change the education sector, ensuring Māori are able to enjoy education success as Māori,” and the assertion that “This strategy is about realising potential, understanding and accepting that culture counts.” Throughout this process, in the doubting of her credentials, in the requirement to repeat work she had already achieved, and in guiding her into low level courses that would not put her on a university pathway, the “dumbing down” and low expectations Māori learners face is exposed.

Ka Hikitia was distributed in draft form in August 2007 and launched in April 2008. A year after the strategy’s launch, Māori potential and culture certainly still did not count in the experience of my granddaughter, and although this is one student, in one school, it is a story I hear repeated over and over again from the many disengaged and alienated Māori and Pasifika students who arrive to enrol in our two schools after troubling experiences in their previous whitestream schools.

Ka Hikitia: Lost in Translation

Dr. Paul Goren, who spent six months in New Zealand in 2009, on an Ian Axford (New Zealand) Fellowship in Public Policy,36 chose Ka Hikitia as the focus of his research. His report echoes the concern about the difficulty in changing both the rhetoric and teacher practice and the danger of reducing the intent to a compliance checklist:

The challenge with a policy framework like Ka Hikitia is to change attitudes, thinking, and behaviours in order to improve outcomes for all Māori learners. This means changing hearts and minds rather than solely instituting new compliance requirements. There have been attempts to change Ministry organisational processes to reflect key Ka Hikitia components in areas such as business planning and report writing. Yet, there is concern that Ka Hikitia will evolve into a compliance tick list rather than a broad commitment to improve education for and with Māori learners. The challenge in an organisation like the Ministry is to engage in processes that change attitudes, thinking,

36 Ian Axford (New Zealand) Fellowships in Public Policy were named in honour of Sir Ian Axford, an eminent New Zealand astrophysicist and space scientist. The fellowships were established by the New Zealand government in 1995 to facilitate public policy dialogue between New Zealand and the United States of America.
and behaviours rather than forcing compliance, while adhering to timelines that meet urgent priorities. (Goren, 2009, p.vi)

In fairness to principals and teachers, managing the change required to make the intent of Ka Hikitia is a huge undertaking and one the release of the document certainly does not prepare them for. Goren conducted 64 interviews involving 72 people, including one focus group of 30 secondary school students. Among those interviewed were teachers, principals, Ministry of Education staff members, professional development providers, academics in New Zealand universities, and Members of Parliament. He visited schools in Wellington, Tauranga, Rotorua, Auckland, and Hamilton and worked closely with Ministry of Education Group Māori staff.

Recurring issues raised by those interviewed, particularly among school personnel, professional development providers and Ministry of Education officials, were a lack of coherence, no assistance, no clear guidelines or resourcing for implementation, too many initiatives to deal with at the same time, and in Ka Hikitia itself, “too many combined targets, goal statements, strategies and actions for those who are looking for a place to start” (p.38). The development and implementation of Ka Hikitia cost the Ministry of Education $817,000 from its early development in 2005-06 through its release in the 2007-08 fiscal year (Goren, p.21). No additional operating dollars however, were set aside to implement Ka Hikitia, as it is seen as part of the school’s core business. As Apryll Parata, Ministry of Education Deputy Secretary for Māori Education told Goren, “Ka Hikitia is not about a shift in resources, but a shift in behaviour and attitudes. We have to use the money we have” (p.21).

Ka Hikitia was launched alongside at least fourteen other Ministry of Education strategic initiatives and actions during the 2007/2008 year, including the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007b). and the Pasifika Education Plan, 2008-2012 (Ministry of Education, 2008c). Goren cites an email from one principal which tells of a meeting with 12 principal colleagues where one had given the document to his deputy principal to “look at” and the others hadn’t opened it (p.43). Another principal struggled to find Ka Hikitia as he showed Goren a box where he kept the many documents and strategic plans received from the Ministry, and noted that “we have so many initiatives - (like) a flavour of the month” (p.37). There is also confusion in the Ministry of Education about where the responsibility for the implementation of Ka Hikitia lies:

It is not clear in the Ministry who implements what. Not clear how it works. No clear rules of what to do. It is hard to figure out. (There is) a complete lack of thought on how to help things happen. Without implementation, nothing will happen. Implementation should be part of design. (Ministry of Education staff member cited in Goren, p.38)

Ka Hikitia has been used as the example of policy that says the right words but isn’t then translated into school practice. Similar issues are evident in the revised Pasifika Education Plan 2009-2012
(Ministry of Education, 2009a), with changes made (see pp. 20, 58) under the guise of investigating “ways to best meet Pasifika students’ needs in English literacy” whilst still claiming that “Pasifika languages are an integral part of the learning languages area of the New Zealand Curriculum.” This sounds as if Pasifika languages are important until one realises this means they have now been relegated to the status of “other” languages.

Underlying both these documents is the issue Goren calls “the unspoken” (p.53). Goren cites both the long-standing racism that has caused Māori to lag behind others for so long, and the reluctance of many “to enter the conversation about race and racism, and (who) need safe places to explore issues and build confidence related to Māori student achievement” (p.54). These attitudes and reluctance to engage in the deeper conversations about race are endemic in our education system’s white spaces. Penetito (2010, p.63) observes, “New Zealanders are not comfortable talking about race or racism and nowhere is this more obvious that in official educational discourses.” One school leader Goren interviewed stated:

Māori student achievement is a very complex issue. I have taught 30 years in low decile schools. I taught 10 years in bilingual schools. I taught Māori language... Very few teachers believe Māori kids can be successful. And many believe that Māori should not be successful. This is institutional racism. (We) have to reject deficit theorising. We have to be relentless for the huge shifts in thinking with massive implications for New Zealand. (p.53)

Assessment as a White Space

Determining Self: Self Knowledge

The learning model based on the concept of Power Lenses (Milne, 2004) to support the development of cultural identity, and a pedagogy of whānau aligned to this intent, were initiated in 2003. Throughout 2004 and 2005 staff debated the issue of assessment of the self-learning lens. In the Education Review Office report for Clover Park Middle School in February, 2003, the following comment was made as a suggested “Area for Improvement."

The teachers have not yet collected data on all aspects of the cultural competence of students. This review observed high levels of achievement in cultural performance that is tracked under the performance arts. However, similarly high levels of achievement in areas of manaakitanga, group work and co-operation were not acknowledged in the database. The managers are not yet optimising the potential of the essential skills of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework to monitor cultural competence. The collection of more data on cultural literacy would enable a closer fit between student

---

37 Letter from the Minister of Education, Anne Tolley, to Shirley Maihi, Principal of Finlayson Park School, Manurewa, 21 September, 2010.
achievement reporting and the kaupapa of the school. (Education Review Office, 2003, p.9)

In the Plan of Action required by the Education Review Office to explain how we intended to address issues raised in the report, the Board of Trustees responded:

Māori and Pacific staff are not convinced that the essential skills, developed for the Framework from a Eurocentric perspective, are the best tool with which to monitor cultural competence, and therefore are not sure we wish to ‘optimise their potential.’ The school will continue to explore relevant assessment practices, in consultation with community elders, to measure and feedback to students their achievement and progress in their cultural knowledge and skills.

In our follow-up discussions regarding the ERO comment, the first question we asked ourselves was why should we ‘measure’ cultural skills and competencies? Surely this was an area where teachers and families, experienced in their respective cultures, would be the best judges? To establish any measure would surely be perpetuating the Eurocentric model? Were there Māori, Samoan, Tongan or Cook Islands Māori ways of knowing our children were developing these competencies and ‘self knowledge’ that didn’t require us to quantify them? Why wouldn’t we just see this development through observation? Wasn’t that enough? Why ‘write it down’? That was one school of thought. The other side of the argument asked, if we are as serious as we say we are about the self-learning lens and about self-knowledge being legitimate, high stakes learning, valid in its own right, and of equal status with school or academic learning, were we devaluing it ourselves by not being able to describe it? The two sides of the discussion are evident in these staff comments:

As soon as you do anything different - up go the anti and up goes the requirement of having to prove it. Why do we have to prove stuff all the time? We are proving it when they go out to other schools and they are more confident, and we are proving it when they come back as ex-students who show that they can’t leave, that they have that connection still. We are proving it by the fact that they are coming to school every day—I mean, we’ve got kids who are coming to school every day and not going home every day. We’ve got kids from pretty significant, traumatic backgrounds who are at school every day. Do we buy into the requirement of having to justify, or do we actually start saying we don’t need to justify—we know what we are doing is right? (Haley)

Ann has asked an interesting question because I think for all of us the dream would be that Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School are not unique but rather the norm, so how do we achieve that? That’s about promoting ourselves. In some ways we do need to qualify achievement and we do need to quantify success, because those are going to be the hooks for the rest of the education community. (Willie)
This debate highlights what Wilkie (2010 p.215) refers to as the “exclusion and rendering invisible of Māori worldviews through the dominant Pākehā discourse of success and failure.” In a personal communication to Wilkie, Ngāti Porou kaumātua Dick Grace explained a Māori viewpoint that is relevant to our thinking throughout the five years’ action research to develop the self-learning tool:

“In] tikanga Māori every individual is unique and they have their own time in which to know. … A Māori perspective on this difference is the equality of mana, that applies to poutama; if a person is on Level 1 of knowing in a certain area and another is on Level 6 that person on level 6 has no greater mana than the one on Level 1, that mana is equal, they both have that special power which is the same. (Dick Grace, February 2007, cited in Wilkie, 2010, p.216)

This respect for every person’s mana (prestige, authority, power) and dignity, the “time to know,” the necessity for face to face interaction in any assessment, the tuakana/teina relationship where those with knowledge have a responsibility to share with those who don’t, were all concepts that had to underpin this development. These distinctly different worldviews of Māori and Western cultures to sharing knowledge are aptly summed up and starkly contrasted in Waka Rorohiko, a poem by Sullivan (2007 p.5):

Waka Rorohiko
I heard it at Awataha Marae
in te reo - waka rorohiko -
‘computer waka’, about a database
containing whakapapa. Some tapu
information, not for publication.
A dilemma for the library culture
of access for all, no matter who, how,
However Māori knowledge brings many
together to share their passed down wisdom
in person to verify their inheritance;
without this unity our collective knowledge
dissipates into cults of personality.

How do we know?
We searched for examples of measures of cultural identity from the psychological field but found these did not suit our purpose. We wanted indicators that informed our future teaching and learning, and we particularly wanted a measure that was relevant to Māori and Pasifika children
and one they would understand themselves. Right from the start we felt we wanted to use Māori and Pasifika understandings and values so it was unlikely that a generic or existing measure would suffice. It was obvious to us that Māori and Pasifika ways of knowing must be supported by Māori and Pasifika ways of assessing.

As we discussed what we needed, through formal staff meetings and more often, informally in small groups, I asked questions of our Māori and Pasifika staff. How do you decide which boy you will ask to speak to welcome visitors in a formal pōwhiri? How do you choose the girls who will karanga (ceremonial call)? Who are the students who will assist in the ava ceremony? Each time teachers were unable to answer the question. Playing devil’s advocate, I would probe further and suggest other children who might be candidates for these important tasks. Would they be chosen? Again, every time, teachers told me that child would be unlikely to be chosen or asked to take on the role. These choices were not about which children were fluent in the language. Most times the children chosen then needed to embark on a process of training to be able to do the job.

Teachers became fascinated with these questions and kept adding new scenarios to discuss. All agreed they didn’t know what criteria they were using to allocate these responsibilities or other tasks that required cultural understanding. Often they thought it might be a child who had been brought up by their grandparents, or it might be someone they instinctively felt had an aptitude for the task, or a particular attitude, or someone whose Nanny could karanga for example, but they were at a loss to explain how they could sense this. Teachers commented they’d never thought about their selections before. They also agreed there was tacit understanding and agreement among Māori and Pasifika staff about the students selected. All seemed to agree most of the time that the child selected, possibly just by one teacher, was the ‘right’ one for the role. Barnhardt (2002), describes this conflict of knowledge systems:

The complexities that come into play when two fundamentally different worldviews converge present a formidable challenge. The specialization, standardization, compartmentalization, and systematization that are inherent features of most Western bureaucratic forms of organization often are in direct conflict with social structures and practices in Indigenous societies, which tend toward collective decision-making, extended kinship structures, ascribed authority vested in elders, flexible notions of time, and traditions of informality in everyday affairs. (cited in Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005, p.13)

**Cultural Standards**

We searched for work being done elsewhere in cultural knowledges and competencies. Alaska Native educators had developed “cultural standards” based on the belief that a “firm grounding in the heritage language and culture indigenous to a particular place is a fundamental prerequisite for the development of culturally-healthy students and communities associated with that place”
These standards were adopted by the Alaska State Board of Education and Early Development in the same year (Alaska State Board of Education & Early Development, 2006 pp.37-39). Standards covered five areas: for students, educators, curriculum, schools, and communities. These cultural standards for students have five broad goals:

1. Culturally-knowledgeable students are well grounded in the cultural heritage and traditions of their community.
2. Culturally-knowledgeable students are able to build on the knowledge and skills of the local cultural community as a foundation from which to achieve personal and academic success throughout life.
3. Culturally-knowledgeable students are able to actively participate in various cultural environments.
4. Culturally-knowledgeable students are able to engage effectively in learning activities that are based on traditional ways of knowing and learning.
5. Culturally-knowledgeable students demonstrate an awareness and appreciation of the relationships and processes of interaction of all elements in the world around them.

Each of these goals is further broken down into specific indicators. The indicators for students who meet the first cultural standard, for example, are shown in Table 7:

Table 7: Alaska Cultural Standards Indicators (Alaska State Board of Education & Early Development, 2006 pp.37-39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARD</th>
<th>SPECIFIC INDICATORS: Students who meet this cultural standard are able to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culturally-knowledgeable students are well grounded in the cultural heritage and traditions of their community.</td>
<td>assume responsibility for their role in relation to the well-being of the cultural community and their life-long obligations as a community member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recount their own genealogy and family history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>acquire and pass on the traditions of their community through oral and written history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practice their traditional responsibilities to the surrounding environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reflect through their own actions the critical role that the local heritage language plays in fostering a sense of who they are and how they understand the world around them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>live a life in accordance with the cultural values and traditions of the local community and integrate them into their everyday behaviour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>determine the place of their cultural community in the regional, state, national and international political and economic systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would these standards suit our situation? Was any research being done in New Zealand and the Pacific that might help? We looked at Durie’s (1998, p.58) four key ‘markers’ for Māori cultural identity: identification as Māori, cultural knowledge and understanding, access to and participation in Māori society, and communication (Table 5).
The work of Pasifika researchers (Balme, 1998; Mailei, 1999; Mitaera, 1999; Hunkin-Tuiletufuga, 2001; Mulitalo-Lauto, 2001), has already been outlined in Chapter 2. Recurring themes in Pasifika cultural identities included social structures, language, ceremonies and rituals, access, cultural performance, and knowledge of genealogy.

As a staff we had considered all of this research throughout 2003. We had now moved far beyond being somewhat stung by the ERO report comment. We felt that our ‘self-learning’ self-knowledge learning, was not just about cultural identity. There were other ‘selves’ to take into account and we wanted to describe these as well. We decided that the six relationships that were central to our learning model (see Figure 9) and therefore central to all our three ‘lenses’ should be the basis of our assessment. These were the student’s relationship to:

1. **self** (cultural identity, who am I, where do I ‘fit’),
2. **their learning** (relevance to students’ backgrounds and experiences),
3. **the teacher** (mutual respect, trust, high expectations, support - whānau)
4. **other students** (positive peer influence & support - whānau),
5. **the wider world** (critical, emancipatory, anti-racist, tolerant, against prejudice), and
6. a reciprocal relationship between **home and school** (a mutually beneficial, authentic partnership - whānau).

However two of these, the teacher/student and home/school relationships, included adults. While both are crucial, the adult component in each of those relationships could make it difficult for the student to assume any influence over the quality of the interaction. We felt that the other four relationships encapsulated the self-learning we expected through the self-lens. Our goal was to find ways of showing that students were developing a secure identity and positive relationships.

In 2004, teachers from each of the four ethnic groups, Māori, Samoan, Cook Islands Māori and Tongan, met separately over several months to consider indicators they felt could show cultural identity. There was consensus to begin with that, after considering all of the research, Durie’s (1998) four key areas of identification, cultural knowledge and understanding, access to and participation in the cultural society and communication were common threads through everything we had read, and more importantly were felt by the teachers from each ethnic group to be suitable. We were fortunate to have teachers on the staff, who were very knowledgeable in their cultures. Most were experienced teachers who were fully involved as leaders in the community and in their cultural worlds. This is an critical point. In developing indicators to describe cultural identities, Western academic theory and research cannot be as relevant or valid as the cultural knowledge of the experts in the specific culture. Among our Māori staff at the time we had several teachers who were fluent in the language, extremely knowledgeable in tikanga Māori and had longstanding connections to te ao Māori as well as the local community.
In Clover Park, the fact that there were three different cultures meant we needed experts from each. A breakdown of the depth of knowledge and experience in Pasifika cultures is provided in Table 8, at the request of Clover Park staff who were involved and who wanted to ensure that the self-learning lens tool is seen as credible in Pasifika eyes. They have also requested that their names and where appropriate, their cultural titles, be used. As a white researcher I welcome, respect, and honour their request. The following details were collected by Pasifika staff from Pasifika staff and are included here exactly as they were given to me:

Table 8: Breakdown of the Pasifika cultural knowledge and experience held by Clover Park staff members, in 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Cultural knowledge and experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>Fa’aofonu’u Manufotu Saosili Fiu Fiti Leota</td>
<td>Fa’aofonu’u is an “Ali’i” or high chief title; he also has three ‘tulafale” or orators’ matai titles, from the village of Sili and Gautavai, Savai’i. He is our school caretaker, and his knowledge and understanding of the “fa’asamoa”, is vitally important within our school cultural context. He offers our staff guidance and often plays a leading role in cultural events such as “ava” ceremonies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tapulolo’o Ueta Pene Ta’avao</td>
<td>Tapulolo’o is an appointed chief with a ‘tulafale” or an orator’s status matai title from the village of Auala, Savai’i. He is a long serving staff member at Clover Park Middle School. He has a teaching background in Samoa at Intermediate, Junior and High School level. He is a choirmaster and a deacon at his church as well one of the orators for his church congregation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuiavi’i Eliu Samuelu</td>
<td>Tuiavi’i is an “Ali’i” or high chief matai from the village of Sataoa. He is the current president of FAGASA, a national organisation for Samoan language teachers. He helped established the first Samoan bilingual class firstly at Clover Park Middle School then at Sir Edmund Hillary Collegiate. He played a major role as one of the writers of the Samoan Curriculum. Tuiavi’i has a Master of Educational Leadership degree. He is the longest serving staff member at Clover Park Middle School. His other experiences include roles on Boards of Trustees, radio announcer (Access Radio), choirmaster for church and school and a Samoan stage judge at the annual ASB Festival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seiuli Autufuga Leofa Sani Siliva</td>
<td>Seiuli is an “Ali’i” title from the village of Fagaloa, he also holds two “tulafale” or oratory titles from the same village. He did most of secondary school in Samoa but he is a New Zealand trained teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gisa Eneli Pakau</td>
<td>Gisa is a high chief or an “Ali’i” title from the village of Fasito’outa. Raised and schooled in New Zealand, he has always maintained his “fa’asamoa” and language and understands the transition migrants make to enable cultural norms to survive in our families and workplaces. Gisa was also for a number of years on a School Board of Trustees, including chairmanship. He has been on the National Council for Volunteer Service Abroad (VSA) as a Pasifika representative. He has recently graduated with a Master of Educational Administration and is one of two deputy principals at Clover Park Middle School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toleafao Emile Fa’afusuaga</td>
<td>Toleafao is an Ali’i or a high chief from the village of Faleseala. He is a New Zealand born Samoan and his knowledge of the “fa’asamoa” is forged through his family values and his relationship with his parents. He also lived and taught in Samoa for a number of years. He is currently an RTLB teacher based at Clover Park Middle School, He has taught primary through to secondary schools and recently graduated with a Master of Education in Special Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faifua Tapuai-Gabriel</td>
<td>Faifua was born and raised in the village of Sagone, Savai’i, Western Samoa. He was educated in Samoa up to tertiary level and taught in schools for a number of years before migrating to New Zealand. He has a BEd degree and a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lagi Sipili</strong></td>
<td>TESSOL qualification, and has taught in bilingual classes in a number of schools, including a number of years at Clover Park Middle School. Lagi is a long serving staff member at Clover Park Middle School. She is from the village of Afega. A long serving staff member with TESSOL, and Bilingual qualifications and special needs education experience. A member of the FAGASA, (a national organisation for Samoan language teachers) for a number of years. She has been an active member of her church including roles as the Sunday school teacher, Youth President, Women’s Council President, and Seminary teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holiday Piho</strong></td>
<td>Holiday is one the longest serving staff members at Clover Park Middle School, currently the senior teacher in our Cook Islands Māori programme and mainstream area of the school. Born and raised in Rakahanga, Cook Islands, he has travelled intensively back and forth from the islands and stayed on many of the other islands such as Aitutaki, Mangaia, Rarotonga. He understands and speaks other Cook Island dialects. He has tutored adult Cook Islands cultural groups and for many years tutored our school Cook Islands group. He is involved in a variety of community activities, including cultural and religious events.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pokoina Manukia</strong></td>
<td>Ina was born in Rarotonga, but has lived in New Zealand since the age of eight years old. She did all her schooling in New Zealand. She understands the struggle of retaining her first language as her parents believed ‘speaking English’ was the only way of getting a good job. She had to fight hard to revive her first language, now she speaks Cook Island Māori fluently and has a good understanding of other culture, including her husband’s Tongan culture. She is working towards her TESSOL qualification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sinai Vakauta</strong></td>
<td>Sinai was born in Suva, Fiji to a Tongan father and mother of mixed ethnicity. At age ten years of age she returned to Tonga, where she began learning the Tongan language informally from friends and extended fanau. Sinai has gained variety of qualifications from high school to tertiary level including Bachelor of Education, Diploma in Religious Education, Graduate Diploma in TESSOL and a Masters degree in Communication. Her work experience includes a wide range of roles in the media industry in Tonga: newspaper editor, interpreter for the foreign press and an advocate for freedom of speech and media. She is currently the senior teacher in our Tongan bilingual unit. She is a member of the Lea Faka-Tonga national Advisory Committee and currently tutors our Tongan cultural group for the local ASB festival.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ilifeleti Samiu</strong></td>
<td>Ilifeleti was born in the village of Ha’avakatolo, western side of Tonga. He was educated from primary through to tertiary level in Tonga, including four years full time teacher training and study. Ilifeleti taught at different primary schools in Tonga for a period of 18 years, including two years as the head teacher at a primary school. He began relief teaching in various schools in Auckland until securing a permanent posting here at Clover Park in 2007. He is a member of the Advisory Group for the Lea Faka-Tonga, the Tongan Curriculum document. He helps tutor the school Tongan Culture group. He is currently completing his TESSOL Diploma extramurally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This depth of knowledge and expertise was an invaluable resource in developing the indicators for each of the different Pasifika cultural identities. The discussion of experiences by this group of staff, in collaboration with Māori staff, also caused them to bring up issues I hadn’t considered. If this tool was to be useful teachers felt it had to be relevant to young people and had to relate to their lives. Our students might have little access to their home marae, but how they interacted on our school marae might be a more relevant indicator of their learning. The ‘relationship with the wider world’ for Samoan students in Samoa would be different from that for our students living in...
New Zealand, many of whom were born here. It might also include their relationship to tangata whenua. Teachers wanted these issues to be included in the indicators. Our aim was to describe our students’ growth in these areas at school, for their own self-knowledge, and so we could evaluate our practice and be aware of areas we needed to strengthen or develop.

The teacher groups met to compare their initial thoughts until finally each ethnic group had a list of indicators they thought would allow them to determine students’ self-development in each of their specific cultural identities. These are listed in the following tables (Table 9, Table 10, Table 11, Table 12, Table 13):

**Māori Identity Indicators**

Table 9: Māori Identity Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Self-identifies as Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has positive attitudes towards being Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understands roles and responsibilities within whānau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understands status as tangata whenua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; understanding</td>
<td>Knows own whakapapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeks understanding of tikanga – and follows this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can explain tikanga to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practises values - manaakitanga, tautoko, whanaungatanga, aroha tētahi ki tētahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; participation</td>
<td>Participates in kapa haka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participates in marae activities - looks after the marae and manuhiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has links to own marae - is involved in whānau activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages others to participate, leads by example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Proactive about learning and using Te Reo Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes on speaking roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaches teina kapa haka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leads in kapa haka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explains kaupapa to manuhiri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Samoan Identity Indicators

Table 10: Samoan Identity Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Identification**        | Self-identifies as Samoan  
Has positive attitudes towards being Samoan  
Understands roles and responsibilities within a aiga (family)  
Understands the relationship with tangata whenua and other cultures.  
Is able to identify negative stereotypes and racism and be a staunch advocate for fa’asamoa |
| **Knowledge & understanding** | Knows own family tree  
Seeks understanding of fa’asamoa - and follows this  
Can explain le aganu’u ma tu Fa’asamoa (culture and Samoan way of life) to others  
Practises Samoan cultural values |
| **Access & participation** | Participates in Samoan performing art in any given situation  
Practises the fa’asamoa and aganu’u in appropriate situations  
Has regular links to Samoa- and involves in aiga and lotu (church) activities  
Encourages others to participate and is a role model |
| **Communication**         | Proactive about learning and using gagana Samoa (Samoan language)  
Has ability to use appropriate language for appropriate situations  
Is competent in reading and writing in gagana Samoa  
Is comfortable in talking to audiences in different contexts  
Shows an ability to lead |

### Tongan Identity Indicators

Table 11: Tongan Identity Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Identification**        | Self identifies as Tongan  
Has positive attitudes towards being Tongan in Aotearoa  
Understands roles and responsibilities within the famili  
Understands and acknowledges Māori as Tangata Whenua  
Acknowledges their Tongan heritage |
| **Knowledge & understanding** | Knows own Ha’a (Clan/Tribe)  
Seeks understanding of Anga Faka Tonga (Tongan customs) and uses values and morals that are relevant to their lives  
Can explain Anga Faka Tonga to their friends, educators, visitors and community  
Practises Values: caring, respect, honesty, friendship, patience, tolerance, acceptance |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access &amp; participation</th>
<th>Participates in Faiva Faka Tonga (Tongan cultural dance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participates in Fono activities- looks after the fale fono and kau’hi (classroom, environment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has links to own Church and Tongan community- is involved with famili/community/church activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages others to participate and leads by example- role modelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Proactive about learning and using Tongan as a medium of learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes on speaking roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Converses with each other in Tongan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cook Islands Māori Identity Indicators**

Table 12: Cook Islands Māori Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Identifies as Cook Islands Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has positives attitudes towards being Cook Islands Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understands roles and responsibilities within anau (family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp; understanding</td>
<td>Knows own akapapaanga (geneology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeks understanding of akonoanga (protocols)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is able to explain akonoanga to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practises values aroa, tauturu (love, support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understands takinga meitaki (caring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understands importance of taokotaianga (unity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; participation</td>
<td>Participates in kaparima and/or ura pau (action song and/or drumdance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performs as a rangatira (leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Proactive about learning and is a fluent speaker of Cook Islands Māori language and the different dialects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes on speaking roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Identity Indicators**

The indicators above reflected the strengths of the four main ethnic groups in the school. However some students didn’t belong to any of these groups. Having developed four other sets of markers staff felt that the broad categories would remain constant. They then went on to develop generic indicators that we could use to assess those students who were not Māori, Samoan, Tongan or Cook Island Māori:
Table 13: Generic Identity Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Self-identifies as a member of his/her own culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has positive attitudes towards own culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understands roles and responsibilities within own cultural norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understands status of Māori as tangata whenua in NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge &amp;</td>
<td>Knows own genealogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Seeks understanding of own cultural beliefs/customs/norms and follows these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can explain these values to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practises these values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participates in own cultural events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Participation</td>
<td>Participates in own cultural activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has links to own culture in NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourages others to participate, leads by example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Proactive about learning and using own language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes on speaking roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Converses with others in own language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explains own culture to others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having decided on the markers for the specific cultural identities we turned our attention to the other four relationships we’d chosen. The indicators for these would be generic across all the four cultures in the school. Again we examined the literature and existing research.

**Relationship with Learning Indicators**

Otero and Chambers-Otero (2002) introduce four levels of relationship, each one adding more power to the learner, and believe that it is necessary to move beyond the simplistic evaluation of relationships as good or bad. The *RelationalLearning*™ model suggests that all learning progresses through four levels of relationship. We are always in a relationship but the quality of that relationship and therefore the quality of learning varies considerably (see Chapter 2). As our Learning Model is based on these relationships and this work we felt the continuum provided in the four phases of relationship was a very appropriate framework. These four phases are summarised in our self-learning “Relationship with Learning” indicators (Table 14):  

Table 14: Relationship with Learning Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolated Learners ‘Facts for Forgetting’</td>
<td>All content obtained by listening or reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information downloaded, copied, cut and pasted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning is incidental or on the surface</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Engaged learners ‘Concepts for Analysing’

- Information is absorbed and understood
- Links are made to other learning
- Information makes sense because it is relevant
- Can see the potential use of the information to their lives

### Interactive/Introspective Learners ‘Ethics for Discussing’

- Has started to value learning to him/herself personally
- Understands learning is integrated into own life and lives of others
- Learning with, rather than from, teacher -teaches others too
- Starting to self govern own learning
- Becoming more creative and authentic
- Beginning to decide what really matters to him/her

### Global Self-regulated Learners 'Options for positive action'

- Shares learning with others in meaningful, productive ways that enhance the functioning of the learner, others, and the whānau.
- Thinks critically, seeks different perspectives, can challenge appropriately
- The learner is now part of a larger structure of personal freedom - aware, adaptable, interdependent

**Relationships with Peers**

Cultural context plays an pivotal role in the development of peer relationships. If we wanted to describe our students’ development in their relationships with each other we had to take their cultural context into account. Research on peer relationships has traditionally focused on Western cultures, however, here has been a steady increase in the number of studies focused on peer relationships in different cultures, and the findings have illustrated the wide variety of peer experiences across cultures.

One of the cultural dimensions that has been extensively explored is **collectivism versus individualism** or **interdependent versus independent** orientations (Chen, French & Schneider, 2006, p.5). In Western cultures individual needs and characteristics, personal freedom and independence, and self-realisation are highly emphasised. People are encouraged to become autonomous, self-reliant, and emotionally detached from their groups (Triandis,1995). In collectivistic societies, however, the interests of the individual are considered subordinated to those of the collective. The expression of individuals’ needs or striving for personal autonomy, especially when it threatens the group functioning, is often viewed as unacceptable. Cultures with collectivistic values typically emphasise **inter**dependent ties among individuals, group loyalty, limited personal privacy, and conformity to collective standards (Triandis, 1995). These values are of considerable relevance to social interactions and relationships in the peer context.

Moreover, children are not passive recipients of cultural influence, but instead, are active participants in adopting and modifying existing conventions and values, and more importantly, in constructing their own norms and cultures in peer interactions (Corsaro & Nelson, 2003; Wenger,
Cultural beliefs and values are likely reflected at each level of children’s peer relationships, including interactions, friendships, social networks, and acceptance and rejection within the larger peer group. The peer relationship continuum (Table 15) had to cover a wide range of characteristics. Students could start at any point on the continuum, for example, many children don’t bully others, act dishonestly or spread rumours, but some do, and for some this is typical behaviour initially.

**Peer Relationships Indicators**

Table 15: Peer Relationship Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with peers mainly involves teasing, bullying or making trouble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isn’t honest with others - twists truth to suit own ends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is OK with starting rumours, spreading gossip, setting others up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts staunch - tries to intimidate others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses peer pressure negatively - or gives in to pressure from others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little understanding of whānau or responsibilities to the group - everything is about self - operates as an individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly respectful to peers, can forget at times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to be honest with others - most of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes gets involved in other people’s dramas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks help or advice with conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries not to give in to peer pressure - not always successful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands he/she is part of a whānau but makes minimal contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows respect for peers even if they are not his/her friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest with peers - works hard at not being two-faced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never gets involved in others’ business - never backstabs or gossips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is conflict with a peer, tries to talk it out or seeks adult help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK with self as is - doesn’t feel the need to change to impress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands whanaungatanga and actively contributes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always respectful to peers and encourages others to do the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always honest - can be trusted absolutely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never nosey and will actually report rumours etc to adults</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the skills to resolve his/her own conflicts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never bows to peer pressure and encourages others to do same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands whanaungatanga and teaches it to others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationship with the Wider World

Self-acceptance is a prerequisite to the acceptance and valuing of others. Banks (2004) believes teachers should be aware of and sensitive to the stages of cultural development that all of their students—including mainstream students, students of color, and other marginalized groups of students—may be experiencing, and should facilitate their identity development. This typology is explained in Chapter 2.

Banks believes that students need to reach Stage 3 of his typology, before we can expect them to embrace other cultural groups or attain thoughtful and clarified national or global identifications. The typology is a framework for thinking about and facilitating the identity development of students who approximate one of the stages. It is not intended to be a strictly linear process. As a staff we had closely examined this typology, before the work on developing our self-learning lens tool began. We had placed ourselves on the continuum in a staff workshop and identified stages we felt individual students had reached, and we felt Banks’ typology was a very useful guide. We decided to include Banks’ stages in our self-lens tool to determine students’ readiness to engage positively with their own specific cultural identity and also as indicators of our students’ social interactions beyond their chosen cultural groups. The continuum we decided to use (Table 16) comes from Stages 1 to 3 of the Banks’ typology.

Cultural Identity Indicators

Table 16: General Cultural Identity Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Identity</td>
<td>Low self esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes on negative stereotypes about own culture - believes them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rejects own culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newly discovered awareness of own culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Believes now that their ethnic group is superior to others - interacts exclusively within this cultural group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May not be sure about this - trying to convince themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is able to clarify their own personal attitudes towards their culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now has genuine pride in their own culture - not contrived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genuinely bicultural - healthy sense of cultural identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participates successfully in their own cultural community as well as in another cultural community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong desire to function effectively in two cultures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the Indicators

The action research now became technical. Having established indicators we were all happy with, how were we actually going to ‘score’ this assessment so that the data were useful to us in showing trends and individual progress? Just ticking items on a checklist was not going to be helpful. Our schools’ student management and assessment system\(^\text{39}\) was a database we had been actively involved in developing with the programmer over many years. By 2006 it was a widely used product in many schools but we had a close relationship with the firm and our staff often helped demonstrate the product to new customers. We knew the programme’s capabilities and we contracted the software developer to turn our lists of indicators into an assessment tool that would be robust and could then be tracked over time and used to show trends and patterns. We took a version of this sketch (Figure 20) to the developer as a starting point and continued to work on this throughout 2005 and the first half of 2006.

Figure 20: Suggested Self-learning Lens diagram (2005)

The following decisions became incorporated into the assessment as our discussions progressed:

1. Three of the sets of indicators: the relationships with learning, the relationship with peers and the general identity/wider world relationship were clearly understood as continua. We realised that these were not strictly linear developments but there were recognisable stages and levels that we could identify. Once a certain indicator was chosen, the tool would assume that the indicators prior to the selected indicator in the continuum were also achieved.

2. The specific Māori, Samoan, Tongan and Cook Islands Māori indicators were not a continuum at all and depended very much on participation and involvement. A family might have

\(^{39}\) This programme is called eTAP (electronic Teaching, Assessment, & Planning), and has been developed by ESD (Educational Software & Devices), based in Manukau City.
access to their marae, but no active involvement in learning te reo Māori for example. This meant that these indicators could be selected randomly and each one would be scored separately.

3. We decided to use a 1 to 4 scale on each axis. The horizontal axis would show identity development, using the general and specific cultural identity markers. The vertical axis would show relationship development, using the learning and peer relationship indicators. A formula, developed by the computer programmer, would convert the indicator scores to a result on a 1 to 4 scale, and plot the student’s outcome in each of the sets of indicators on the matrix.

**Key Competencies**

in light of the developments arising at the time from work in the *New Zealand Curriculum* on key competencies, staff considered whether the elements we had selected for the red, self-learning lens tool might also relate to some of the key competencies in the national curriculum. Although this was not the primary purpose of this tool, we felt there was some alignment as Table 17 shows. However, although there was certainly alignment, the deeper question was did we really want to make this link?

Table 17: Alignment of Self-learning Lens Tool Indicators with New Zealand Curriculum Key Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS</th>
<th>KEY COMPETENCIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the relationship to learning indicators</td>
<td>thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the peer relationship indicators</td>
<td>relating to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the specific Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Islands</td>
<td>managing self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori identity indicators</td>
<td>participating and contributing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Macfarlane et al (2008) critiqued the key competencies to align them with a Māori cultural worldview. They felt that Māori knowledge, values, beliefs and ako (learning and teaching), could inform and critique not only the five key competencies, but could also enrich the development of the national curriculum itself. They concluded:

While there was some commonality in meaning between particular key competencies and particular Māori constructs there is more evidence of where the Māori constructs did not ‘match’, because they were coming from quite different knowledge and value bases, and their meaning within a Māori worldview was both wider and deeper than the meaning within the majority European cultural worldview (p.123).

In their discussion of “managing self” Macfarlane et al. (p.118) contrast the western context of individualism and individual achievement with the Māori constructs of whanaungatanga and rangatiratanga which require individuals to fulfil their responsibilities to work for the well-being of the group. Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School staff developing the self-lens
assessment tool indicators and exploring possible links to the “managing self” key competency in 2004 had clearly made the same comparisons. Macfarlane et al. (p.105, 106) also point out that continuing colonising practices with the New Zealand education system marginalise and belittle Māori language, thinking and analytical skills which are seldom evidenced in the curriculum and pedagogical practices imposed in our schools. Again, this thinking is also evident in our staff conversations as this comment from a Te Whānau o Tupuranga staff member shows:

The fact that we’ve spoken at length about where mainstream schools are at is the same process that our people have had to undertake in terms of imperialism and colonisation. There is no such word as post-colonialism for Māori. Freire talks about the oppressed freeing the oppressors, and we have that really strongly on-site (Judith).

The key competencies debate resulted in the decision to retain the capability in the computer programme to produce key competencies results and to determine, with use, if this information was relevant. In practice it hasn’t proved to be as relevant as the self-learning indicators. The use of the key competencies and the information they can show when aligned to the self-learning results is shown in Figures 21 and 22.

After ongoing staff discussion and then professional development with the indicators and the computer database we were ready to trial the self-lens tool at the beginning of 2007 with an assessment school-wide to establish baseline data for the students who were in Years 8 to 13 in 2007. These initial assessments were made through teacher observation, using teachers’ cultural competence in the respective cultures represented in the school as the arbiter for cultural skills and strengths. Subsequent assessments have been made in partnership with students themselves and with whānau. The results of these assessments are shown in the following sections.

**Self Determined: Colouring in the Assessment White Space**

**Self-learning Lens Progress over time: Te Whānau o Tupuranga, 2007 to 2008**

In 2008 it was possible to see the results with the same cohort of students over 2007 (marked 1 on the graph) and 2008 (marked 2 on the graph in Figure 21). These results show a slight shift on both identity and relationships scales, but when these are broken down into the specific key competencies it can be seen that ‘Managing Self’ the indicators related to Māori identity show the greatest gain.
In Te Whānau o Tupuranga the same cohort of students, in Year 12 in 2007 (marked 1 on the graph in Figure 22) and Year 13 in 2008 (marked 2 on the graph), show a different pattern from their younger teina. By now, not only is the identity scale more advanced, there is a significant shift in their relationships with learning and with their peers.

**Māori Identity: Year 9, 2007 & Year 10, 2008**

Māori identity and specific Pasifika identities are the only aspects that are not represented on continua. This aspect scores against any of the four key ‘markers’ for each cultural identity: identification, cultural knowledge and understanding, access to and participation in Māori society, and communication. In the breakdown of Māori identity markers (Figure 23) in Year 9 in 2007, and Year 10 in 2008 growth can be seen in all aspects of these students’ identity as Māori. There is a significant increase in participation in the activities of the school marae and an increase in practising values such as, manaakitanga, tautoko and whanaungatanga.
Progress over time can also be seen in any specific indicator when taken separately and plotted across year levels. Figure 24 shows one self-lens aspect, Māori knowledge and understanding, across all year levels in Te Whānau o Tupuranga.

Figure 23: Māori Identity: Year 9, 2007 and Year 10, 2008

Figure 24: Māori Knowledge and Understanding: Term 4, 2008
Self-lens Assessment: Clover Park Middle School

Figure 25: Self-lens Assessment across all Year Levels: Samoan students, 2009

Figure 25 shows the range of self-lens results for Lumana’i, the Samoan Bilingual Unit in Clover Park Middle School, across all four year levels in August 2009. The biggest gains in identity and relationships often happen between Year 7 and 8 and staff believe this is due to the fact that year 7 students enter from their various previous schools where their cultural identity has not been valued and during their first year in our learning programme changing the lens makes this difference.

When the self-lens results are broken down into their four different aspects it is possible to see the role that specific cultural identity plays in changing students’ other attitudes and learning. Figure 26 shows the range of self-lens results for Tongan students in Fonuamalu across all year levels. In Years 7, 8 and 9 Tongan identity shows the greatest growth, particularly in Year 9. There is a corresponding decline in their general cultural identity—their interaction with and understanding of other cultures and groups. This is to be expected as students in this very Tongan learning environment learn about “being Tongan” and can learn “as Tongan” for the first time in their schooling experience. In Year 10, now with a secure Tongan identity, there is a dramatic shift in their general cultural identity and their identity and relationships become aligned.
The self-lens tool allows us to look at individual aspects as well. Figure 27 shows a breakdown of the range of results for just the Māori Identity aspect, by gender. Using this information staff can ask why this seems to decline in Year 9 and 10, and why this is particularly so for Year 9 boys, and adjust their programme accordingly. Closer inspection of the different indicators that make up this aspect shows that while 72% of Year 9 girls know their whakapapa, only 44% of the boys have this knowledge. In the communication indicators only 32% of Year 9 boys are proactive about learning te reo Māori, whereas 64% of Year 9 girls show this interest. With this information teachers can address the issue.

Figure 27: Māori Identity: By Gender: Years 7-13, Te Whānau o Tupuranga, 2009.

Assessments over four to five years now allow us to see progress over an extended time, through most of a student’s time in the schools. Figure 28 shows one male student’s significant and steady progress in both relationships and Tongan identity from 2008 to 2010. In 2010 a second assessment
shows relationships remained the same and Tongan identity results increased. In 2011, when this student was in Year 11, both improved again. The breakdown of these results is provided in the table below the graph. The range of scores on both the Relationship and Identity axes is 0 to 4.

Figure 28: One Tongan male student’s Self-lens results from 2009 to 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR &amp; ASSESSMENT NO.</th>
<th>DATE ASSESSED</th>
<th>RELATIONSHIP RESULT</th>
<th>IDENTITY RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08 (1)</td>
<td>02.05.2008</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 (1)</td>
<td>23.07.2009</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (1)</td>
<td>11.02.2010</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (2)</td>
<td>21.09.2010</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (2)</td>
<td>20.07.2010</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Putting Self and School Lenses Together

Combining Results

The following examples show the detail it is possible to see when self-lens assessments are shown against school reading, writing, and numeracy data. Figure 29 shows the results over 2007 to 2009 for one student who was excluded from his previous school in 2006 in Year 7. After several failed attempts to enrol him in other schools closer to his home, he was brought to Te Whānau o Tupuranga by the Ministry of Education. Both this student and his whānau had become very alienated from schooling and were resistant to the Ministry’s efforts. He had not been attending school for some months and Ministry officials admitted they had found the process of re-enrolment intimidating.

In 2007 the student was reading at a 10 year level in the Informal Prose Inventory (IPI) test, and working at Curriculum Level 2 in English and Maths, almost four years below his chronological age. He was unaware of his Māori identity, and isolated himself from other students. Between March
2007 and May, 2008 however, there was a dramatic increase in his self-lens identity scores—a gain of over 40%. Up until this time his other learning had very slowly improved. Through 2008, his self-lens results remained steady and increased again in 2009. In August, 2009, at the age of 15 years, this student was working at or above his chronological age across the curriculum. He was a recognised leader in the middle school whānau and his parents were extremely supportive of him and the school. In Year 10 he had seven NCEA Maths credits and continued to achieve further credits in 2009. Teachers commented in his reports on his ability to critically analyse what he is reading and on his understanding of what that means to him and to Māori generally—and to suggest ideas as how that should be changed.

Figure 29: Self and School lens Results: One Māori Student, 2007 - 2009

In Figure 30 a similar pattern can be seen for one student in the Samoan Bilingual Unit, Lumana’i. Entering the programme in Year 7 in 2007 her self-lens results were very low. She was reading at a 10 year level and working at Curriculum Level 2 in Maths and Level 3 in English. In Samoan language her reading was also at a 10 year old level on the graded texts developed by the school. During 2008 there was a significant improvement in her self-lens results and this was followed in 2009 by gains in both her English and Samoan language reading levels and her English curriculum level, which had previously declined. Her Maths results improved through 2008 and remained stable at Curriculum Level 5 during 2009. In 2009, in Year 9, she was reading in English and Samoan at 15+ year level and working consistently in all subjects at Curriculum Level 5.
Both these examples show that when the self-lens identity measures improve other learning gains are made. In some cases however, the importance of the self-lens score is that it can alert staff to abilities they may not have noticed at all without this tool.

Figure 31: Self and School Lens progress over three years, 2009 to 2011: Year 11 Tongan Male
Figure 31 shows the Self-lens results from 2008 to 2011 of one Tongan male student who began with poor relationships and low identity scores in Year 7. The student’s first language was Tongan and he was born in Tonga. He started school in New Zealand at the age of five. In 2009, in Year 9 his reading level in both English and Tongan was 7 to 8 years. In 2010, in Year 10, it was 8 to 9, again in both languages. In Year 9, Maths was his strongest subject and he was working at Curriculum level 3.6, well below what you would expect of a Year 9 student. During 2009, Figure 31 shows a dramatic improvement in his self-lens learning results in both relationships and identity, and in 2010, following the improvement in his self-learning, his other learning – particularly his English and Tongan language showed distinct improvement. In Year 11, he was well on track to complete NCEA Level 1.

Figure 32 is an example of an early self-lens result for one Samoan boy, in Year 10 in 2007. At almost 14 years of age he was reading in English at a 7 to 8 year level and had previously been identified as having special learning needs. However the staff-developed graded Samoan reading texts showed his reading level to be at 13 to 14 years, with 95% comprehension. The self-lens tool showed his knowledge of his Samoan identity and his strong relationships with his peers. With this information teacher attitudes and expectations changed and he developed into the leader of the Samoan unit, highly respected by teachers and other students. In 2008 this student enrolled in Te Whānau o Tupuranga rather than move away from the school and in 2009 completed NCEA Level 1.

Conversely, often teachers can examine all of their assessments for a student who is consistently disengaged from learning, often with associated behavioural needs, and find that has been little improvement in the student’s self-lens assessment. This is particularly obvious in students who enter Clover Park or Te Whānau o Tupuranga at a more senior year level, having already disengaged from their previous schooling experiences and having little previous experience or knowledge of their own cultural identity. Again such information is valuable for teachers who can identify inconsistencies and plan specifically for that student’s needs. A Clover Park, Cook Islands, teacher explains the value of this learning for Cook Islands students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>YEAR LEVEL</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>ENGLISH IPI</th>
<th>SAMOAN IPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>7-8 yrs</td>
<td>13-14 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It’s not so much about the child coming into the school with the knowledge of their culture. Some of our children come into here without culture, without anything. We have reversed the process here for them so that they do appreciate where they come from and seek some form of understanding of their own identity and build on it.

... I believe that the bulk of our Cook Islands students do not have a clue about their culture. If anything they live as white—that’s the culture they’ve been brought up in. The core of them were born in New Zealand with no understanding of the Cook Island values and things like that. Above anything else, our school offers that opportunity for them to have a window and to see that—not only see it, but also live it, and I think that’s the important thing is that we’ve created that kind of environment in our school so that the children can exercise what they are learning as well - so become holistic.

(Holiday).

**The Purpose of the Self-lens**

The examples provided here show that the self-lens assessment tool is doing what it was designed to do. It was never intended to stand alongside standard psychological assessments of identity and doesn’t pretend to. The indicators developed by staff have stood five years of trialling and application. In practice they are providing rich information we wouldn’t see if we persisted in assessing solely for literacy, numeracy against national benchmarks and standards. The self-lens assessment tool identifies and describes for these two schools what ‘as’ Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Islands Māori looks like on this campus.

It is important to re-emphasise that self-lens learning and achievement is seen by these schools as valid, high status learning in its own right. Although the examples above illustrate how all learning is related, and how gains in identity and relationships results may in fact lead to related shifts in other learning, this is not the purpose of the self-lens. The self-lens exists to enable these schools to legitimate and validate Māori and Pasifika knowledges and values in their own right. Self-lens learning however is a valid ‘end point’ in itself. Māori and Pasifika knowledges and values should never be seen as peripheral, or less important learning. Secure self knowledge and identity appears to be a prerequisite for self-esteem and self-efficacy. Self-efficacy in turn might lead to higher engagement in learning in general, which could well include improved English literacy and numeracy outcomes. Self-lens learning is thus intentionally counter-hegemonic. To accept self-lens learning as merely a stepping stone towards improved literacy and numeracy is to make a deliberate choice that perpetuates western academic hegemony and relegates Māori and Pasifika learners to the margins in our education system.

**Learning in the Self-lens**

The development of oneself, as Māori, or developing one’s own cultural identity in school cannot be left to chance. Chapter 5 explains how teacher planning deliberately requires, not only a cultural, critical consciousness in the school lens, but also specific planning for self-lens learning. Within a
Year 13, Business Studies Young Enterprise plan for Te Whānau o Tupuranga, (not the most likely place you would expect to develop cultural identity perhaps), the teacher has included intrinsic Māori dimensions of oranga (wellbeing), wairuatanga (spirituality) and whanaungatanga (relationships) in the plan and aligns Māori values of manaakitanga, (duty of care) aroha (authentic caring) and mahi-tahi (working together) with students’ personal values and their fledgling company’s philosophy of behaviour and operation.

The self and school lenses obviously continuously and seamlessly overlap. Tongan, Samoan, and Māori students have successfully used their learning from their critical school lens work in speech contests. At the Auckland Savings Bank Polyfest, the annual Auckland secondary schools’ performing arts festival, Fonuamalu entered four students from Years 7, 8 and 9 respectively in the Year 9 Tongan language speech competition. They also entered a Year 10 and a Year 11 student, now enrolled in Te Whānau o Tupuranga. Not only did the Fonuamalu students win every section, but also the Years 7 and 8 students were placed second and third, in a competition where all the other contestants were from Year 9. In Te Whānau o Tupuranga speakers have been successful at regional and national level in speech contests for Māori students with speeches that included topics such as information technology, the loss of language, global leadership and hegemony.

Teachers’ comments affirm the value of the self-lens to their practice:

A couple of our teaching team and I were not part of the development of the red lens tool and so have had a number of in-depth discussions about the questions on the assessment regarding our personal definitions and interpretations of the questions. I believe that an awareness of the red lens needs to inform all of our teaching practice in that if we don’t examine our planning and practice from a red lens perspective we risk slipping into and perpetuating a lot of the issues that exist for Māori within the mainstream teaching environment. (Steph)

In mainstream schools, Pākehā students’ cultural identity, language and cultural competences are the norm so of course the majority of Pākehā students would feel comfortable learning in a mainstream setting. So, in a way, for Pākehā the red lens learning is met automatically. However, for Māori (and other ethnicities) their cultural identity, language and cultural competencies are ignored in mainstream against the Pākehā ‘norm’. Tupuranga and Clover Park provide an environment where the cultural identity, language and cultural competencies of the students (Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Islands) are recognised as the norm. From this standpoint, students own cultures are validated and seen as ‘just as important’ or more important than a Pākehā way of doing everything. Students learn that to ‘achieve’ is more than being able to succeed by Pākehā rules but it is to be strong in their own culture and able to confidently interact between their own culture and Pākehā. (Kirsten)
With the Red Lens learning students are not stripped of their cultural identity, norms, values, language, customs and traditions—instead students’ cultural identities are embraced, valued and accepted. ...My view is that it should not be viewed as a privilege but a right! Because their cultural identity has been valued and accepted relationships strengthen, between student and student, teachers and students, parents, teachers and students, and goes beyond the confines of the school into the community. The red lens assessment tool - which in my opinion is real 'groundbreaking stuff '- is a indicator of a child’s progress in terms of his cultural identity - parents are well informed of the child’s curriculum knowledge as well as their own cultural identity. (Cindy)

The Place of Kapa Haka/Performing Arts in Self-lens Learning

As well as intentional planning for the self-lens aspects in their regular programme students are continually involved in Māori and Pasifika Performing Arts at an advanced level. Unlike most schools where these activities are understood as extracurricular, these two schools consider kapa haka or Pasifika performance art to be a core curriculum in itself. Both schools enter prestigious competitions that require months of intensive preparation and hard work. Interestingly, the school and self-lenses overlap with students able to achieve NCEA credits for their cultural performance, and the learning that leads up to these. However the benefits of kapa haka go far beyond an academic learning exercise.

Many schools in New Zealand participate in kapa haka. For many Māori students participation in these groups is what keeps them in school and keeps them connected. Tom Cavanagh (Macfarlane, Glynn, Cavanagh, & Bateman, 2007, p.74) asked the question of one senior student, “What it is like to be a Māori student in senior school?” She answered, “Most of the time the lights are turned off. The light comes on Tuesday afternoon at kapahaka.” However, for many schools this is the only effort they make towards cultural responsiveness, bringing out the kapa haka group at school events to make a superficial, token gesture towards tikanga Māori. As Stephen May (2002, p.11) observes, “In short, a kapahaka (Māori cultural group) group, though not unimportant or inconsequential in itself, does not a multicultural programme make.” For many other schools participation and high level involvement in kapa haka doesn’t transfer to any changes in classroom practice and the two spheres of learning can remain compartmentalised if teachers do not have the knowledge or experience to notice the positive benefits of this engagement and act upon it. Other schools ban involvement in kapa haka altogether, feeling that the time and energy students devote to it detracts from their academic workload. Interestingly many of these schools participate aggressively in inter-college sports, music and other performing arts competitions without any similar concerns. Whitinui (2004) explains the importance of kapa haka from a Māori (self-lens) perspective:
Kapa Haka allows Māori students to reveal the potential of self, culture and identity through the art of performing. It also possesses the ability to link the performance to appreciating individual uniqueness (difference) while helping students to come to know the value of human potential (Hindle, 2002). Kapa Haka instils levels of creativity through the expression of body movements and actions, the expression of words, the connections between the living and those who have past, principles reflecting life and knowing, as well as, how Māori now live today. It is in every dimension of the life itself and in how Māori as a people connect their destiny, philosophies and purpose for being. (p.92)

Our staff agree. This excerpt from Tupuranga’s kapa haka philosophy describes the impact of this high level performance on all aspects of student learning:

Kaiako (teachers) have always maintained that it is the journey students embark on, in preparation for a performance, the skills they develop, whanaungatanga and leadership opportunities, that have more of an impact on student achievement, as opposed to the actual performance itself. ...We have found that Kapa Haka improves attendance, as well as students' general attitude towards school. It encourages parent participation, which flows on to other aspects of school life. Kapa Haka also modifies behaviour, gives our students a sense of pride and history to build their own achievements on, while offering opportunities for collaborative and group learning situations. Kapa Haka is a unique medium for learning and developing relationships, between students, between kaiako and students, between whānau and kaiako, as well as introducing and developing a range of leadership skills.

Kapa haka is also an excellent vehicle for critical pedagogy and action, a vehicle that cannot be driven by inhabitants of white spaces. Senior students and former students compose and choreograph items with a strong message. This is a longstanding tradition in Te Whānau o Tupuranga where haka and waiata have been used as forms of protest to the Ministry of Education and to government officials during the struggle to establish the school (Macfarlane et al. 2008, p.112). Other items have been used to get across messages about the environment, or about health or social justice issues that affect Māori.

In Te Whānau o Tupuranga the ongoing involvement in practice for kapa haka enables students regularly to experience living and sleeping on the school marae, which enables them to learn to perform the roles of providing hospitality and caring for people and to establish and maintain respectful relationships. The school’s facilities attract adult national level competitive kapa haka groups, for their practices. This encourages our students to set their sights even higher. Teachers often describe our students’ interest in kapa haka as an “obsession.” It is certainly a passion for many students. Video tapes or DVDs of adult national level competitive groups are sought after and our young people analyse every performer’s every move. Many aspire to, and have achieved, membership of these well-known groups after leaving Te Whānau o Tupuranga. Our schools have
found that kapa haka is a powerful liberating force in the shaping of our young people’s cultural identity and self knowledge.

Akom (2009), in the U.S.A., makes similar observations about hip hop and introduces a Critical Hip Hop Pedagogy (CCHP) “that can respond to issues of racism and other axes of social difference that Black people/people of color face in urban and suburban schools and communities” (p.54). He argues that the “use of hip hop as a liberatory practice is rooted in the long history of the Black freedom struggle and the quest for self-determination for oppressed communities around the world” (p.53).

CCHHP simultaneously (1) foregrounds race and racism and their intersectionality with other forms of oppression; (2) challenges traditional paradigms, texts, and theories used to explain the experiences of students of color; (3) centralizes experiential knowledge of students of color; (4) emphasizes the commitment to social justice; and finally, (5) encourages a transdisciplinary approach. (p.63)

Each of the ethnic groups in these two schools participates in their form of performing arts. Whether it is as dancers, singers or drummers, students aspire to reach the pinnacle of success. For many students this is their very first experience of advanced achievement and this is a valuable lesson in what success feels and looks like—and the sustained hard work that is required to get there. For both schools there is no “down side” to the involvement in these cultural activities. For both schools performing arts is the medium that continually attracts older role models, former students, who maintain their connection with current students by acting as tutors and composers. These young role models, now successful in their chosen careers, consistently reinforce powerful messages about identity and excellence.

*Ngā Rīpene o Te Whānau o Tupuranga*

Another tangible reminder for students of aiming for high standards is seen in Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s “rīpene” (ribbon) system. Introduced many years ago, ‘Ngā Rīpene’ have been revived in the new school. Rīpene are a visual means of affirming those values and ideals that are crucial in both self-lens (red) and school lens (blue) learning (Image 1). Some rīpene are awarded for self-lens learning only, some for school lens learning and some for both (see red and blue bars on right of text boxes in Figure 33). Rīpene can be recommended by teachers or students. In 2006 senior Rīpene were introduced for students in Years 11 to 15 (Figure 34).

Figure 33: - Ngā Rīpene: Te Wānau o Tupuranga

Image 1: Senior student wearing junior and senior Rīpene
### TE TĪMATANGA
Students who are:
- Developing an understanding of the Kaupapa o Te Whānau o Tupuranga

### POUARAHI
Pakeke (Yrs 9/10) who:
- Have their timatanga rīpene
- Lead and organise their hapū (group/class)
- Ensures every member of hapū stays with hapū during class and Hui times
- Is an awesome role model during class, and at all times during school

### MAHI KAHA
Students who:
- Make a consistent effort
- Are able to follow instructions consistently
- Complete work in timeframes

### RARANGA
Students who are able to:
- Pick harakeke (flax) correctly
- Prepare harakeke for different projects
- Have participated in Raranga (weaving) wananga
- Have completed items for others in the whānau, e.g., in Kapa Haka Roopu

### TE REO RANGATIRA
Students who make an effort to kōrero Māori by:
- Learning new words and sentences
- Encouraging others to kōrero Māori
- Learning and using simple commands and instructions

### KAI KŌRERO
Students who have learned and performed:
- A basic mihi (speech of greeting) for school and marae pōwhiri
- Are developing an understanding of tikanga
- Are beginning to extend mihi

### KAI KARANGA
Students who have learned:
- All the school karanga
- Are developing an understanding of tikanga
- Have performed karanga for school and marae pōwhiri

### KAPA HAKA
- Attend and participate in all whānau performances
- Attend all wananga
- Always improve and extend performance level
- Support other members in the Roopu

### HĀKINAKINA
- Participate in school wide sports activities including:
  - Consistently bringing PE clothing
  - Representing the school at sporting events
  - Striving to improve skills
  - Advocating for and demonstrating fair play rules

### KORI TINANA
Participates in the PE programme and:
- Wears PE clothing
- Is supportive of others
- Follows fair play rules
- Shows, and strives for, improvement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAHI KĀINGA</th>
<th>Students who:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete all set homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have whānau signatures for all home work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make an extra effort to extend their learning at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAHI TOI</th>
<th>Students who are able to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Express ideas creatively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work to develop and extend their skill in art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to develop their own art voice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAHI Tahi</th>
<th>Hapū (Groups/Classes) who:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work together to complete task and achieve goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are responsible to and for each other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilise and encourage all of the talents in the hapū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share roles and responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they are ready and organised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawe te kaupapa ‘in front’ of and ‘behind’ the scenes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAakitanga</th>
<th>Students who show:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Care for others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for kaiako</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for school property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for Tupuranga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care for the marae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ĀWHINA</th>
<th>Students who:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help other students with their work. i.e. peer tutoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help kaiako consistently without being asked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that resources, etc. are put away correctly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HŪMĀRIE</th>
<th>Students who:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have their Manaakitanga rīpene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place the needs of others before their own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing things for others in the whānau without being asked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāore te kūmara e kōrero mo tōna ake reka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAUTOKO</th>
<th>Students who show:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistently encourage others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support whānau and kaupapa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KĀKAHU</th>
<th>Students who:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wear correct school uniform every day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ngā Rīpene o Ngā Mātāmua o Te Whānau o Tupuranga

In Years 11 to 15 students can gain a different set of Rīpene, mounted on a black ribbon. These rīpene are hand-embroidered and use Māori tāniko patterns. Many senior students wear both their middle and senior school rīpene (Image 1). Figure 34 shows some of the rīpene available to senior students:

Figure 34: Ngā Rīpene: Te Whānau o Tupuranga Senior School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rīpene</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAIREA</td>
<td>For Mātāmua who have achieved NCEA Level 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAIAKA</td>
<td>For Mātāmua a who have achieved NCEA Level 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAIRANGI</td>
<td>For Mātāmua who have achieved NCEA Level 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAPA HAKA</td>
<td>For Mātāmua who help tutor Kapa Haka, Year 7 &amp; 8, Ahurea, ASB, and Whānau Kapa Haka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAITITO</td>
<td>For Mātāmua who help compose kapa haka material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-lens learning can’t occur if students are not given opportunities for growth, to make mistakes and to learn about “being” Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Islands Māori, or whatever their ethnicity is. The rīpene system provides a visible reminder about what it means to ‘be Māori.’ Many opportunities are provided for all cultural groups to learn about leadership, to learn about custom, to observe appropriate ritual and ceremony and to fulfil cultural obligations. Far from being an add-on or token gesture, these opportunities are embedded within school policy and practice. All visitors to the school are given official pōwhiri (Māori ceremonial welcome). This might be a small affair or could involve all students and staff of both schools. Pōwhiri may happen on the marae or in the school Performing Arts Centre, or in a classroom. Appropriate Pasifika ceremonies are also observed, with ‘ava’ ceremonies for Samoan visitors for example. Parents participate in many of these events, bringing food and fitting into cultural roles and expectations. Students travel to tangi and attend funerals when these are connected to school whānau. Underpinning all of these practices are the principles of whānau and whanaungatanga, as an authentic context for cultural norms to develop as a part of every day school life. These practices are confirmed in the following two excerpts from Education Review Office reports:
Students are developing confidence and feel secure in their identity as Māori at Te Whānau o Tupuranga. They are provided with a wide range of learning experiences that expose them to Māori culture, tikanga, values and beliefs. These include daily karakia, hīmene and grouping students in waka and hapū clusters. Students have further opportunities to learn about tikanga Māori through their involvement in pōwhiri, at the marae located on the grounds of the school, and excursions. (Education Review Office, Te Whānau o Tupuranga Report, 2009)

The school’s learning model is highly relevant to Māori and Pacific students as there is recognition that students’ cultural values, protocols and practices are enhanced through their learning experiences. In addition, teachers realise that learning is effective when there are strong relationships with peers and teachers, and between home, school and the wider community. Tuakana-teina relationships (older and younger sibling) are used as a way of fostering learning. As a result students are developing as confident young adults secure in themselves and in their cultural identity. (Education Review Office, Clover Park Middle School Report, 2007)

**Determining success: Whose knowledge is of most worth?**

The preceding sections of this chapter have argued that assessment in our schools is a very white space and propose an alternative to this practice. As Tomlins-Jahnke (2008) states, “indigenous education outcomes are inevitably compared with, and measured against national and international norms, benchmarking tests and surveys embedded in western hegemonic values and ideals.”

Apple (2004a, p.xix) asks the question, “Whose knowledge is of most worth?” He reminds us that not only do our educational institutions function to distribute ideological values and knowledge, “they also ultimately help produce the type of knowledge that is needed to maintain the dominant economic, political, and cultural arrangements that now exist.” This “technical knowledge” legitimates the existing distribution of economic and cultural power.

Similar questions are posed by McLaren (2003, p.72) who explains that “critical pedagogy asks how and why knowledge gets constructed the way it does, and how and why some constructions of reality are legitimated and celebrated by the dominant culture while others clearly are not.” McLaren identifies three types of knowledge constructed in schools: technical knowledge, that can be measured and quantified, practical knowledge, that is useful in our daily lives, such as functional literacy and numeracy, and social interaction, and emancipatory knowledge. Emancipatory knowledge “creates the foundation for social justice, equality and empowerment” (p.73) and is the goal of the critical educator and critical pedagogy. It is technical knowledge however, that is considered the primary goal of our education system. The Ministry of Education’s

---

41 In education, the Programme for International Student Achievement (PISA), an international survey of 15 and 16 year olds from 28 different countries, is an example.
Statement of Intent 2011/12 - 2016/17 (Ministry of Education, 2011a) specifies our strategic direction:

The Ministry will continue to focus on improving education system performance for all students, and in particular for those groups of students currently under-served by the system - Māori students, Pasifika students, students from low socio-economic communities and students with special education needs. We will need to do this in a way that delivers greater results for current levels of government expenditure. The sector and the public expect better services. We will need to balance everything we do with the need to operate with current, or less, funding and resource. (p.12)

The plan embodied in the Ministry’s Statement of Intent, identifies the six sector priorities:

1. Increasing opportunity for children to participate in high quality early childhood education.
2. Every child achieves literacy and numeracy levels that enable their success.
3. Every young person has the skills and qualifications to contribute to their and New Zealand’s future.
4. Relevant and efficient tertiary education provision that meets student and labour market needs.
5. The Ministry is capable, efficient and responsive to achieve education priorities and deliver core business functions.
6. Māori enjoying education success as Māori. (p.12)

The language of market forces and economic goals is clear. Having identified in the preamble the disparity in our system the plan to address this focuses on participation, literacy and numeracy, retention to meet labour market needs, the goals of Ka Hikitia, the limitations on the implementation of which have been discussed earlier in this chapter, and the Pasifika Education Plan. Further stipulated, in the actions the Ministry will take to ensure the achievement of the literacy and numeracy goal, is the implementation of the government’s mandated National Standards in reading, writing and mathematics for primary and intermediate schools (p.18). There is little or no room for monitoring self-lens learning within the National Standards and so, once again, an important opportunity to lift the achievement of Māori and Pasifika students, “as Māori” and “as Pasifika” learners has been missed.

Apple (2004a, pp.34-35) explains the connections between this technical, high status, knowledge and the economy. Technical knowledge is required to keep the economy running effectively and to maximise opportunities for expansion. However the widespread distribution of this knowledge is not required by everyone. As long as this knowledge is continually and efficiently produced, then schools are seen as doing their job well. “Thus, certain low levels of achievement on the part of ‘minority’ group students, children of the poor and so on, can be tolerated,” because this is less
important to the economy than the production of the knowledge itself. High status, technical, knowledge is also discrete knowledge with an identifiable and stable content that can be taught and tested. This makes stratifying individuals according to academic criteria easier.

Duncan-Andrade & Morrell (2008) liken this sorting process to a “rigged game of Monopoly,” where everyone supposedly starts at the same place with the same amount of Monopoly money:

Like Monopoly the rhetoric of school-based meritocracy suggests that everyone starts at “Go” with equal chances to move around the board and capitalize on the opportunities that abound. ... Whereas the outcomes in Monopoly are largely random, heavily influenced by the roll of the dice, educational outcomes are much more predictable. In the game of education, groups with high levels of social, political and economic capital move around the same game board as the rest of the population, supposedly competing under the same set of rules, but they afford themselves a supplemental bankroll that guarantees an unfair competition, one that for centuries has produced the same unequal outcomes in schools and in the larger society. (p.3)

If schools are producing the outcomes they are in fact designed to do, and we continue to stratify and sort young people exclusively according to this high status technical knowledge, no matter how many school reform initiatives, strategic intent priorities, new curriculum documents, or National Standards we develop, or how much we euphemistically expect Māori students will achieve these same goals - unless schools create opportunities for Māori students to live “as Māori,” the realities and outcomes for Māori and Pasifika students in New Zealand schools will not change. Duncan-Andrade and Morrell acknowledge this when they state, “We can cite a litany of research data and evidentiary claims to support the arguments that school is a rigged game, but what would be the point? How long must we argue over common sense?” (2008, p.5).

This chapter asked about the Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Island Māori ways of knowing that young people were developing strength in their own cultural identity, and how we could know this was developing. The development of the self-lens tool, described in this chapter, and the knowledge it gives the schools about these previously undervalued, but crucially important skills, have been the schools’ response to these questions. This is knowledge that will never be determined by assessments of literacy, numeracy, national standards or NCEA credits. However, it is knowledge which, coupled with the critical scholarship in the school learning lens (described in the next chapter), changes both the learning and the assessment white spaces to make them relevant and authentic places for Māori and Pasifika learners.
Chapter Five

Colouring in the “School Learning” Space

Indigenous pedagogical principles are holistic, connected, valid, cultural, value-based, thematic and experiential. They promote and reward cooperative learning and the unified co-operation of learner and teacher in a single educational enterprise. They describe who teaches, as well as, how and when teaching occurs. Indigenous pedagogical principles, unlike western paradigms, recognize the important role of non-verbal communication in the learning-teaching process. (The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights in Education, 1999)

Findings: School Learning

The previous chapter explained the learning practice of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School through the self-learning lens. The focus of Chapter 5 is the school-learning lens. It includes the schools’ structure and organisation, the learning programme in practice, the supports in place for this way of learning, and learning outcomes.

The school lens is the lens through which the two schools view the mandated national curriculum and the requirements of New Zealand’s National Education Goals (NEGS) and National Administration Guidelines (NAGS) (Ministry of Education, 2007a, p.43). It is important however to emphasise that pedagogy and practice viewed through the school-learning lens is predicated on our belief that, to better serve our Māori and Pasifika learners, not only do we have to view learning differently, through lenses that include self-learning and global learning, but there is still very much work to be done to review the content of the school lens. Within school-learning experiences there must be room for “opposition scholarship” (Calmore, 1992), that challenges the narrow focus of Western academic learning and has a legitimate and equal place, not alongside the lens, but centred within it (my emphasis).

The ten NEGS set out the governments goals for New Zealand’s Education system. Goal 10 is “Respect for the diverse ethnic and cultural heritage of New Zealand people, with acknowledgment of the unique place of Māori, and New Zealand’s role in the Pacific and as a member of the international community of nations.” The six NAGS are the legal responsibilities of Boards of Trustees.
The following two sections, school organisation and physical environment, are important opening sections to this chapter. They establish the framework of cultural, social and physical settings needed to support the pedagogical changes that shape the implementation of the national curriculum in these two schools.

**School Organisation**

As explained in Chapter 1, the two schools in this study have been involved in a long history of struggle for self-determination and community empowerment. Clover Park Middle School opened as a regular state intermediate school in 1980 and officially changed status to a four year middle school in 1995. Te Whānau o Tupuranga was established as the Māori bilingual unit within Clover Park Middle School in 1988 and opened as a separate Year 7 to 15, secondary school in 2006. The full story of the years of struggle to achieve these changes in structure and in curriculum approach is told in Milne (2004, pp.113-152, pp.201-211).

In July, 2010, there were 135 students enrolled in Clover Park Middle School. The ethnic breakdown is shown in Figure 35. Numbers at each year level are shown in Table 18 and the number of students involved in bilingual programmes in Table 19.

Figure 35: Clover Park Middle School: Roll by Ethnicity, July, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Clover Park Middle School students: by Year Level, July, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samoan Bilingual</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan Bilingual</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Island Māori &amp; General programme</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Clover Park Middle School: Bilingual Programme numbers, July, 2010
The roll of Te Whānau o Tupuranga was officially capped by the Ministry of Education at 250. In July, 2010, there were 194 students on the roll. The ethnic breakdown is shown in Figure 36. Numbers at each year level are shown in Table 20.

Figure 36: Te Whānau o Tupuranga: Roll by Ethnicity, July, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage of Roll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NZ Maori</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Isl</td>
<td>Maori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Te Whānau o Tupuranga students: by Year Level, July, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enrolment**

In order to enrol in Te Whānau o Tupuranga, whānau must agree to accept and support the school’s designated character (see Chapter 1) in which adherence to Māori tikanga, language and knowledge is the norm. There are no restrictions on entry to Clover Park Middle School. In practice, both schools accept all students who seek enrolment and both have become ‘magnet’ schools, sought out by agencies, including the Ministry of Education, to take students who have experienced difficulty in their previous school/s. In August, 2009, staff identified 23 students who had enrolled in Clover Park over the previous two years due to this type of request. Eight of these students subsequently enrolled in Te Whānau o Tupuranga in 2009 when they reached Year 11, rather than move away from the campus to another secondary school. In preparation for an Education Review Office visit in March, 2009, Te Whānau o Tupuranga identified an additional 12 students who had
been stood down or suspended from their previous schools because of extreme behavioural difficulties, or whose whānau had been asked by those schools to remove their child. In addition to experiencing extreme behavioural difficulties, these students typically also experience serious learning difficulties, usually exacerbated by long periods of time when they have not attended school at all. It is not uncommon to be told by these families that their child had been refused entry into several schools before seeking enrolment in Clover Park Middle School or Te Whānau o Tupuranga. This count has not been repeated in 2010 but the requests to enrol students who have experienced difficulty in previous schools has certainly not reduced. A growing trend is seen in the enrolment of students who have been out of school for months, and often one to three years. The adoption by the Ministry of Education in 2009 of a mandatory, online, centralised database has enabled better tracking of children who are non-enrolled.

**Non-Māori Students on Te Whānau o Tupuranga Roll**

The 18 non-Māori students on the roll in 2010 are almost all former students from Clover Park, who had graduated from Year 10, but whose parents had chosen that they remain on the campus. The reason given by parents for this choice include their support for the specific learning model of the schools, their anticipation of a positive outcome from Clover Park’s application to extend the range of year levels to Year 13 (see Chapter 1) and the strong relationships between teachers and students and families. This choice was made by the parents of these senior students so they could continue to learn bilingually in their own language and English through to the end of their schooling. These students learn te reo Māori in Te Whānau o Tupuranga but are also able to maintain a close relationship with their previous Pasifika learning programmes and cultures. They act as role models for younger students and have leadership responsibilities in their previous Clover Park learning programmes. They interact with staff and younger students in these programmes regularly for a full day each week as well as informally at every opportunity. Work towards their NCEA standards in their respective languages and cultures is overseen by Clover Park staff. Clover Park Middle School is separately accredited with the New Zealand Qualifications Authority to deliver NCEA standards and both schools’ teachers work collaboratively in support of these senior students.

**Changing Demographic**

Most children in both schools come from the local community, however a growing number travel from outside the district seeking the specific programmes offered or because they have been alienated from their local schools (see Figure 7, Figure 8).

---

43 Although the practice of asking parents to remove their child from a school is illegal, it still occurs, particularly in school communities where parents may not be aware of their rights.

44 These reasons were given by a large group of parents who met with the Board of Trustees on 15 August, 2007 to ask for the school to retain their older children in their respective bilingual programmes. These three reasons were subsequently central in the Board of Trustees' consultation process in 2007-2008. Responses were received from 96% of all Clover Park families. Of these families, 96% agreed with the proposal for these reasons.
This trend reverses the “white flight” phenomenon, exacerbated by the introduction of the self-governing school reforms in New Zealand in the 1990s (Ladd and Fiske 2001, p.60). Wylie (1999, p.159) also found that one of the costs of increased parental choice of school has been a preference for schools with low or very low Māori enrolment. She states that, “The reforms appear to have acted in an unintended manner which has increased ethnic polarisation in primary schools as well as secondary.”

Names and symbols matter

Ka ruia te kākano kei te rangatahi, kia tipu ai ngā hua, whangāia ki ngā tupuranga.
Plant the seed in the young. It will flourish and bear fruit to nourish future generations.

The name, “Tupuranga” was taken from the above whakatauākī (proverb) which was Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s original motto. Tupuranga means ‘future generations’ and is used to signify growth - from the word ‘tupu’ meaning to grow. This name was given to the original Māori bilingual unit in 1986 and was later extended to ‘Te Whānau o Tupuranga’ - the family of Tupuranga to encompass all who were involved in the programme. In 2006 the use of Te Whānau o Tupuranga as the name of the new school was a deliberate decision on the board’s part not to use the word, ‘school’ at all.

Clover Park was designed as a variable teaching space school, using the open plan design popular in the early 1980s. Each of the four teaching blocks had been originally named ‘Areas’ and simply numbered one to four. Following Tupuranga’s lead, the other Areas in the school each chose a name in 1986, each reflecting an ethnic group within the school. Area 1 became Fonuamalu (Tongan - a safe shelter), Area 2 became Kimiora (Māori - seeking life or well-being) and Area 3 was named Lumana’i (Samoan - future). These names are still used for the learning spaces that exist in the current school. Lumana’i is the name of the Samoan bilingual unit, established in 1991 and Fonuamalu, the name of the Tongan bilingual unit, established in 2003. Kimiora is home to the school’s Cook Islands Māori students, as well as students belonging to other ethnic groups who opt for a general learning programme. Although the Cook Islands Māori programme is not a bilingual model at this stage, it is based in Cook Islands custom and culture. The integrated curriculum model explained later in this chapter allows all students in Kimiora to follow a learning programme that is culturally responsive to their own experiences and ethnic groups.

There are visible cultural artefacts that clearly distinguish the two schools and each learning space. These are described in more detail in the next section. These start however with the two distinct school logos which are worn with pride by students. The original Tupuranga logo (Figure 38, on left) was designed by students in 1986. It depicts the child at the centre with both school and home whānau wrapped around and providing nourishment. Since 1990, with the growth of the whānau to include Years 9 and 10 students, the symbol was then also used to denote the three age groups in
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Tupuranga - the Year 7 child (teina) at the centre supported by the Year 8 (tuakana) and Year 9 and 10 (pakeke) students. In the new logo, designed in 2005 for the new school, Manukau artist, Terry Klavenes Kolomatangi, retained the original concept of three koru and added a fourth koru emerging from the centre to show the growth of another age group in the whānau - the Years 11 to 13 students. The three curving lines that partly surround the koru represent the past, present and future of Te Whānau o Tupuranga.

Figure 37: The Clover Park Middle School logo, 1994

The Clover Park Middle School logo (Figure 37) was designed by students, and adopted in 1994. The two halves show Māori and Pasifika cultures joined together. The bottom half is a Pacific design and represents the roots from which Māori culture derived. The top half incorporates a heart shape to symbolise kia aroha - the original school motto was Kia Aroha (through aroha). This name was adopted as the name of the school marae in 1998. The top part of the logo also represents a flax plant with the children in the centre, the parents supporting them and both surrounded by the extended family.

Figure 38: Te Whānau o Tupuranga logos, 1986 and 2005

These symbols are important because they strongly represent Māori and Pasifika cultural values and make a statement on all documentation and on the schools’ uniforms about the schools’ beliefs. Each year new students learn about the whakataukī, the logos, the names, and their history from older students. In this way the stories are passed on in ways that are culturally appropriate. The logos also represent whānau and symbolise the importance of whanaungatanga in the way the schools are structured and organised. Past students remember this practice as important:
Learning and teaching each other about our whānau, tikanga, karakia, waiata, kōrero o nehe ra, and whakatauākī. (Participant A)

The unit I really enjoyed learning about when I was here was “Ko Tupuranga Tēnei.” This happened every year at the start of the year as an introduction into Te Whānau o Tupuranga. We learnt about the history of Tupuranga and all of Tupuranga waiata and haka. (Kylie)

I remember very vividly a kaupapa called “Ko Tupuranga Tēnei.” It was awesome to work collectively with everyone and learn about our whānau. (Chey)

Learning Environment

Designing a New School

The importance of the school logos as visible artefacts of the schools’ philosophy and cultural identity was explained earlier. From the time of the approval, in May, 2005, to establish Te Whānau o Tupuranga as a brand new school on a shared site with the existing Clover Park Middle School, the board of trustees, staff and students were involved in the process of designing an environment to specifically support the schools’ learning philosophy. The official design team included members of the board, staff, and students, however in practice, anyone who wanted to come to any of the many meetings was included in the design team. The team felt it was important for the architects and project managers to spend time, on the marae and in classes, and their willingness to do this was the start of a genuine partnership and commitment to create a unique learning environment.

Whānau Involvement

In the early stages of the process our Māori school community voiced concerns that the original building that had housed Te Whānau o Tupuranga since its inception in 1988, might be demolished. This was certainly in the project plan. The whānau demanded a meeting with the Board of Trustees, which was attended by many parents, former students, staff, the architects and project manager. Whānau were not happy and this was a very important lesson for the architects who learned that the buildings were just not bricks and mortar in the minds of the whānau. Following this meeting the board was able to come up with some clear directives which were presented to the architects in April, 2006.

The board pointed out that some buildings were sacrosanct in that they held special historical and spiritual significance. While they could be refurbished, they could not be radically altered. These
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included the Wharenui (carved meeting house) on the school marae (meeting complex) and the existing Clover Park buildings of Lumana'i, Kimiora and Fonuamalu. The original Tupuranga classroom building also had special importance. It was originally a split level design due to the contour of the site. A large floor space at the top level, always called the ‘landing,’ was connected to the lower level by wide right angled steps. Two generations, and thousands of young people had sat on those steps over the previous 20 years the whānau had told us, and the steps had to stay, as did a large exposed beam that whānau saw as the ‘tāhuhu’ (backbone) of Tupuranga. They acknowledged that the new school would mean some changes had to be made to the original building but it was important that the entrance, the landing and steps, the tāhuhu, the footprint and foundations of the old building remained undisturbed. This presented some major design problems for the architects and some significant budget implications for the project managers but, whānau were heard and the cultural integrity and significance of the buildings was respected and maintained.

A further area that required special attention was a grove of seven trees, planted at the time of a 15 year reunion of Te Whānau o Tupuranga in 2001. Six of these trees commemorated students who had passed away, some through illness or accident and some through violent circumstances. The seventh tree, named “Te Hunga Wairua,” was planted to honour students’ family members or those close to the school who had passed away, and also to respect the loss of any members of the whānau in years after the reunion. Ngā Rākau (the trees) are an integral part of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and a song has been composed about their importance. Whānau asked that these be protected.

Learning Spaces Design

Other design features were important to the board and whānau. The whole campus had to look and feel Māori and Pasifika. We wanted an open plan design not too different from the original 1980s concept. Computers had to be available as a tool in the classrooms, there as and when needed, and not placed in separate computer rooms. In our learning model teachers are facilitators and rarely ‘stand and deliver’ learning from the front of the class. We wanted no such thing as a ‘front’ of the class. That meant all equipment had to be moveable and multipurpose. Classrooms have no interior walls or doors and are arranged in pods of four, with a very large common “hui” (meeting) space in the centre that allows students to mix, meet and collaborate. This also allows teachers to work together as a whānau - planning and teaching collaboratively, sharing planning and assessment and grouping students in a wide variety of organisations depending on the current topic.

When we asked students what they wanted in the new school, they said they wanted mirrors. This made perfect sense. Mirrors are of vital importance to young people consumed with a desire for excellence in Māori and Pasifika performing arts. The new Performing Arts Centre has a wall of mirrors so students can perfect their performances.
Cultural Spaces

The school marae, *Kia Aroha* is the hub of the campus. New carvings were commissioned to give the marae presence and mana at the entrance of the school. The original carvings were preserved and now form a waharoa, a carved ‘gateway’ over the students’ side entry to Te Whānau o Tupuranga classrooms. The Wharekai (dining hall) was completely remodelled to allow for the preparation of meals on the many occasions students and whānau, or visiting groups, sleep overnight there. The Wharekai kitchen became the new school’s food technology area where our students learn about food and nutrition in an authentic setting and learn to cook for large numbers, catering for our many visitors. This is very different from traditional food technology classrooms.

The former staffroom has become the Fale Pasifika to give our Pasifika community a traditional forum for meeting and gathering. The Whānau Centre, run by our school social worker has its own entrance and provides spaces for families to access help and a wide range of support in confidence, without having to go through the very public process at the school reception office.

External Learning Environment

Outside the environment is designed to be an extension of the learning programme. It includes Māori navigation pathways (Image 8), a traditional Māori star compass, tukutuku (traditional lattice-work) patterns in the paving and Māori and Pasifika designs on concrete planters and seating. At the front entrance of the school four giant ‘pou’ (posts) each represent one of the schools’ four main cultures, Māori, Samoan, Tongan and Cook Islands Māori and vertical battens represent the palisades of a pā site (Image 2). The whakatauākī (proverb) from which Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s name is derived is featured in the pre-cast concrete wall at the entrance to the school campus (Image 3) and every sign in both schools, internal, external and in the school library collection, include all four languages, as well as English (Image 4).

Image 2: The front entrance of the school Administration Block, 2010

Image 3: The whakatauākī which was the origin of Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s name,

Image 4: Signs throughout the campus are in five languages; Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Islands Māori, and English
Image 5: Open plan classrooms in Te Whānau o Tupuranga taken from the original Tupuranga landing.

Image 6: The side entrance to Tupuranga showing the Waharoa made from original carvings from the school marae.

Image 7: The marae atea, Wharenui and Wharekai of Kia Aroha Marae.

Image 8: One of the navigation pathways representing tukutuku patterns.

In July, 2011 Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s buildings were featured in a television series Whare Māori (Scottie Productions, 2011). Teacher, Willie Ropata, captured the essence of the facilities and their importance to staff and students alike in his interview in this episode:

Open plan learning, open plan teaching is a very strong feature of the entire campus. Those ideas around whānau, manaakitanga, the sharing of information, and that philosophy of everybody is a learner, everybody is a teacher - that’s really important.

...All you have to do is look at our learning space and you get this immediate realisation that we are part of a tikanga learning pathway. The colours on the walls, the motifs we have on the windows, that acknowledge who we are, as Māori.

... The landscaping is such an important concept. It’s Papatūānuku, and it reminds our kids every day that our spiritual connect is not only inside, it’s outside, so the landscaping reflects that. The plants that are there, the motifs around the boxing, the colours, they are all part of who we are.

A Pedagogy of Whānau: Whanaungatanga in Practice

Bishop (1996, pp.215-218) discusses the range of uses of the word whānau from its literal meaning of extended family, people linked by blood to a common ancestor, to Metge’s (1990) concept of metaphoric whānau to refer to collectives of people working for a common end, who may not be connected by kinship, let alone descent (Bishop, 1996, p.217).

The word ‘whānau’ is often used in a wide variety of contexts in school settings. In the period of time during the restructuring of Clover Park Middle School (Milne, 2004) we explored questions about how whānau actually work out interaction, respect, expectations, responsibilities, and support, while dealing with mixtures of ages and maturity. The answers often brought up further issues. What about power? Who makes the decisions? Samoan staff told us, for example, that in their families children would have no part in decision-making. The way both schools are organised reflects our final decisions about what we meant by whānau, and whanaungatanga.

In both schools several age levels work together throughout the day, in the same classes and stay with the same small group of teachers for at least four years. Students in both schools work within their own ethnic groups, usually with teachers fluent in their languages, and learn bilingually - in English and Māori in Te Whānau o Tupuranga, in Samoan and English in Lumana’i, in Tongan and English in Fonuamalu, and surrounded by Cook Islands Māori culture in Kimora. Te Whānau o Tupuranga students work predominantly in two levels, vertically grouped Years 7 to 9 classes and Years 10 to 13 classes multi-levelled according to senior NCEA levels.

The Māori concept of tuakana/teina is a key learning process - older students are expected to be responsible for younger ones, more able students are expected to support less able, learning is cooperative and collaborative, sometimes independent, but rarely individual. Teachers work across several classes of students in a flexible team-teaching organisation. Students work in small groups
on tasks that are usually inquiry-based, and which give them a wide range of choices and options. Timetabling is also flexible and teachers typically allow time to work intensively on the current study. There is minimal whole-class, teacher directed instruction. Senior staff from both schools, in a semi-structured group interview in 2011, comment on the schools’ pedagogy of whānau in practice:

It’s having a different attitude like we have in our school about the whole, these are our kids and not other people’s children sort of thing, and that all of us have a personal responsibility which is not the same as a professional responsibility. I think that lots of other schools are able to stop at a professional responsibility but we all take on the personal. ...I think in my experience in other schools there is no requirement to move into that personal space - you can just stay in the professional realm and it doesn’t really matter if they succeed or don’t succeed - you can put it in a box and think that is all I can do. (Haley)

In other schools we talk about whānau a lot but from my experience whānau to them is just like the grouping of sports teams or whatever school competition they run the in school - that’s their form of whānau, or they stick a few Samoans in a class together and they call it a whānau, when they have no real concept of that, whereas we have actually looked deeper. We validate our kids’ cultures so we haven’t just held on to the power to say to our kids - by the way, you are still going to learn this because we say so. (Eneli)

They are still saying our kids are failing. Why? Because of their system—there is nothing in place for our people. If only they would give us a chance with our own way of dealing with our people, for example in Lumana’i we have kids who are good in palagi (English) and we get them to work with kids that are good in Samoan and they share that but in most schools they don’t do that. (Eliu)

I think the difference between us and mainstream schools is that we take our kids—our brown kids—seriously. The difference between us is staff obligation and staff commitment to our Kaupapa, staff obligation to our kids, and to the big picture—the future generation. I’ve got kids in my class that I sometimes want to murder and I’ve got [deputy principal] in my ear saying, “They’re going to be the adults in our community,” so then I have to get over myself and go back and realign or reflect. (Barbara)

What makes our students have their tūrangawaewae (place where one has the right “to stand” or belong) on this ground is that, first and foremost, we welcome them from the home base, the whānau base and the school is the extension of the home, where the mother tongue language is being appreciated. We walk with them on this sacred ground. We look at our students not as the children of others, but they’re our students,

Although both schools in this study are state schools, staff in Te Whānau o Tupuranga often delineate between “mainstream” state schools and Tupuranga’s ‘designated-character’ status, and staff in both schools often describe both schools’ programmes and practice as different from “mainstream” meaning other regular state schools.
our children. ...I came here in 2006 and I encountered my own Tongan students. It took me up to end of last year [2008] for them to accept me - for them to really allow me to step into their sacred ground and now they have that determination to be who they are. (Sinai)

**Authentic Critical Caring**

These teachers are identifying the roles whanaungatanga imposes on whānau members, a series of rights and responsibilities, commitments, obligations, and supports that are fundamental to the group. Bishop (1996, p.218) calls these “the tikanga of the whānau,” attributes which “can be summed up in the words aroha (love in the broadest sense), awhi (helpfulness), manaaki (hospitality), tiaki (guidance).” Duncan-Andrade (2007, p.629) describes the decision of teachers in his research to be committed to a consistent presence in the school community and in the lives of the students and their families. The teachers explain their actions as part of a commitment to solidarity with their students, as opposed to empathy. That shift in perspective is crucial in whanaungatanga. It marks the shift from seeing students as victims, to one of empowerment and authentic caring - aroha in Māori terms, alofa in Samoan, ‘ofa in Tongan and aroa in most Cook Islands Māori dialects. It is important not to see these concepts as a “soft” option. With every privilege inherent in whanaungatanga comes corresponding responsibilities, expectations and accountability. Macfarlane, Glynn, Grace, Penetito, & Bateman (2008, p.110) define aroha as referring to “the manner of responding positively to the hā (essence) of people by accepting their individuality, together with their whānau connections, their strengths and their self-worth.”

The Spanish language equivalent of aroha is cariño which Duncan-Andrade (2006c, p.451) describes “is more a concept than a word. It is the foundation of relationships among the poor and working classes—often the only thing left to give, in families raising children on substandard wages.” He cites Valenzuela’s (1999) description of cariño in the context of schooling as authentic caring, a concept distinctly different from what she calls aesthetic caring (emphasis in original) - an attention to things and ideas that lead to “a culture of false caring, one where the most powerful members of the relationship define themselves as caring despite the fact that the recipients of their so-called caring do not perceive it as such” (Duncan-Andrade 2006, p.451). Valenzuela (2005, p.83) clarifies this distinction by explaining, “teachers expect students to care about school in a technical fashion before they care for them, while students expect teachers to care for them before they care about school (emphasis in original).

Noddings (2003, p.21) also uses the term “aesthetical caring” for caring about things and ideas and associates caring with the action of, “stepping out of one’s own personal frame of reference into the other’s” (p.24), as opposed to projecting one’s own reality on to the other person. Thompson (1998), strongly critiques the colourblind assumption of caring as an emotion-laden practice
characterised by low expectations motivated by taking pity on students’ social circumstances. Antrop-Gonzales and De Jesus (2006) agree with Thompson and advance a theory of critical caring:

Notions of educational caring are not colorblind or powerblind and communities of color necessarily understand caring within their sociocultural context. This context must be acknowledged in order to forge a new caring framework that privileges the cultural values and political economy of communities of color as a foundation for education. (p.413)

Beauboeuf-Lafontant (2002) examines the pedagogy of exemplary black women teachers who exhibit “womanist caring.” She draws on three central points that support womanism: the understanding that oppression provides all people with varying degrees of penalty and privilege, the belief that individual empowerment combined with collective action is the key to lasting social transformation, and a humanism that seeks the liberation of all, not just themselves (p.72). She connects the caring of these women teachers to the mothering of their own children and cites one teacher who established her own school based on a premise of care and accountability, “If the school was going to be good enough for other children it had to be good enough for my own” (p.73). This is an often-stated belief among staff in Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School where, in 2010, nine staff members had made the deliberate choice to enrol their children, grandchildren, or nieces and nephews. Beauboeuf-Lafontant describes the African-American teachers’ attitude towards mothering as a community responsibility. Foster (1993, cited in Beauboeuf-Lafontant, 2002, p.76) maintains that the use of kin terms among black women teachers as “mothers, aunts, and grandmothers” toward their students is a long-standing practice within black communities and links this to studies showing cultural connection between the pedagogy of culturally relevant black teachers and a concept of the maternal in their practice (Delpit, 1995; Foster, 1993; Gay, 2000).

This same cultural connection is very evident in the practice of all staff in the different cultural settings in the two schools in this study. Smith (1995) aligns the concept of whānau with knowledge, pedagogy, discipline and curriculum in the school setting by defining the following elements:

1. The whānau concept of knowledge:
   - is regarded as belonging to the whole group or whānau, rather than being private or belonging to the individual;
   - is for the ultimate benefit of the total group,
   - can be shared for all to gain, and
   - is not essentially a credential for capital gain.

2. The whānau concept of pedagogy:
   - comprises core values (whanaungatanga etc.) that are taken as ‘givens’,
   - incorporates tuakana-teina as part of pedagogical framework;
requires that those with knowledge assist those needing and wanting to learn, and
mixes local wisdom with global knowledge - [it is] not simply a retreat to the past.

3. The whānau concept of discipline:
- positions the total school as constituting a single whānau,
- regards all parents as ‘parents’ to all children in the kura whānau,
- involves teachers being called papa (father), matua (father or uncle), whaea (mother or aunty), kōka (senior woman or aunty);
- regards learning and behaviour difficulties as a shared responsibility,
- emphasizes that needs for discipline are different, and
- emphasizes that types of discipline are different.

4. The whānau concept of curriculum requires that:
- the Māori community has some measure of influence over what counts, what is included in curriculum;
- the curriculum is reorganized to connect with interests, backgrounds of Māori learners;
- that to be Māori is taken as ‘normal’; and
- the Māori worldview is reflected and reproduced within the school. (Smith, 1995, cited in Macfarlane, Glynn. Grace, Penetito, & Bateman, 2008, p.116, 117)

Macfarlane et al., (2008, p.118) link the two constructs of rangatiratanga and whanaungatanga together and highlight this as a major difference in values between a Western/European construct of the individual ‘self’ and individual achievement, and Māori and other indigenous peoples’ worldviews on human development and education. They state:

In a Māori worldview, qualities such as personal autonomy, independence, leadership, and prestige are all learned and exercised within a social context in which people share a powerful collective identity. Personal autonomy, strength and leadership are always exercised within the context of whanaungatanga, of nurturing and caring relationships. … Part of achieving rangatiratanga (chiefl) status involves striving for individual excellence while at the same time providing and caring for the community, and receiving the respect of the community. (p.118, 119)

**Students’ Experience of Whanaungatanga**

The following responses in an online survey and face to face interviews from former students of Te Whānau o Tupuranga, identify what they felt were the key features of the school, and the differences between these and other schools they had attended. They show the importance of whānau and the authentic critical caring described in the previous section:
Te Whānau o Tupuranga works with the whānau for the whānau. ...The kaiako are like your parents, you can ask them for anything day or night and they will do all that they can to give you what you need. (Participant A)

I like the way we try to fight stereotypes. I also like the way that people don’t give up on you, and don’t say, ‘Next school. Away you go.’ They keep trying to help you improve yourself. I like the way you are accepted as who you are. You don’t have to impress anybody here. (Ngawai)

Whakawhanaungatanga: Being able to relate to every person as your brother, sister, aunty, uncle and even nan. I don’t know of any other kura that has this type of vibe. (Kylie)

Whānau! Aroha, manaaki, tiaki, tautoko, mahi tahi. Looking after each other, learning together, being able to make mistakes and know there are people there to help us. ...Te Whānau o Tupuranga was always whānau. It never mattered how long you were part of the whānau, but the fact that YOU were. (Medadane)

After leaving Tupuranga I continued with bilingual education but had not realised, until becoming an adult, what the differences in these experiences were. Some of us were able to slot into the traditional secondary school setting where the bell rings and you move on to the next class. The one constant was whānau, even though the definition of whānau was different in both settings. One whānau setting [Tupuranga] where everyone was included - the good, the bad and the ugly, and the other whānau setting that was somewhat exclusive—these are the rules, are you in or out? (Medadane)

It felt so comfortable being here. Everything you did, it just seemed normal. I didn’t ever feel the need to leave. It was just like being back home, or being at home really. ...When you are here you know who you are and where you are from, you know your history and your whole identity pretty much, and then you go somewhere else and there are people who don’t even know where they are from, and that’s weird. ...I still feel Māori, no doubt about that. I’m going to be Māori anywhere, but when I’m somewhere else besides here, it’s like I have to change who I am to understand everyone else or they don’t take me seriously. It feels I always have to prove myself. (Ngawai)

Tupuranga had a great impact on me. From starting as a Form 1 and seeing all our seniors then, like Kingi, Chey, Jordan, and I couldn’t wait to become a senior and act like them, then becoming a senior and being pushed into the leadership role was a bit hard to get used to at first, but then you get used to it. I think one of the things Tupuranga pushes out is good leaders. (Te Raiwhara)
Whanaungatanga and Positive Behaviour

It’s much harder to fail, or suspend from school, children who belong to the whānau, and not to ‘other people.’ It requires genuine partnership and solidarity with families and a commitment that goes beyond teaching. This means that the practice of whanaungatanga in school requires rethinking usual school policies. In these two schools it means inclusion, so students with special learning or behaviour needs remain in the classroom and are not withdrawn. It means support for parents, grandparents, siblings, and other family members, and the employment of a social worker, and a youth health nurse. The establishment of a Whānau Centre, school marae and Pasifika Centre demonstrate that commitment. It means accepting all students and, having accepted them, not giving up on them. It means being in solidarity with our students, outraged at inequity and injustice and being determined not to perpetuate these in school decision-making and policy. Freire (2004) calls this a “pedagogy of indignation.”

In 2004 the two schools made a decision that if we were serious about whānau we would no longer stand-down or suspend students from school. Figure 39 shows Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s suspension rates compared with (a) the median result for other decile one secondary schools nationally and (b) the median result for other secondary schools nationally (Ministry of Education, 2010d). No Clover Park students have been suspended since 2004. In 2006, 2009 and 2010 the Te Whānau o Tupuranga data represent one student in each year. The data from both schools on student “stand downs” show an identical pattern to that for suspensions.

Figure 39: Te Whānau o Tupuranga Suspensions 2006-2010 (Ministry of Education 2010d)

The commitment required from teachers to retain children in school is part of whanaungatanga. The schools have chosen not to adopt a specific restorative justice programme, or to follow a formal “hui whakatika” process (Macfarlane, 1998; Berryman & Bateman, 2008). Although at different times each school has trialled a series of set consequences for identified behaviours, these too have been discarded in favour of a process that utilises the strong relationships between
teachers and students, students and students, and school and home to develop an appropriate response to each situation as needed.

In keeping with the whānau concept of discipline (Smith 1995), Yang (2009, p.59) warns against a universal discipline policy in favour of a “nurturing Classroom X,” and advocates, “Schools should not invest in a great discipline policy, but rather in a genuine discipline praxis” (emphasis in original) that is geared towards developing teachers’ practice and involves sustained, serious self-critique and reflection. Yang sees “Classroom X” as a learning environment with a critical X-factor:

Classroom X operates as a highly structured apprenticeship, rather than a rule-bound reformatory, as a space for rigorous creativity rather than for free expression. Although safe, it is not a “safe” space, but rather a community of risktaking, of setbacks, of difficulty. This classroom engages the learner in these risks, but also provides the structure to do so. Although collaborative, it is not equalitarian—the teacher exercises authority without becoming an authoritarian (Lisa Delpit, 1988). In this classroom, everybody swims. (p.55)

In these two schools inappropriate behaviour might result in other staff taking that child for a fixed time to give the teacher and child time out. It involves family first, rather than last when all else has failed. Students who disrespect others or the schools’ expectations are made aware of the impact of their behaviour, and are required to be part of the solution to fix the harm they have caused and to face the consequences of their actions. Often this involves mentoring by older students and always the response assumes there is a shared responsibility taken for the actions and decisions of a member of the whānau. This meant for example, when a female Samoan teacher reprimanded a new Māori student to the school and was deliberately jostled by him as a result, Tupuranga staff asked senior students to discuss with Samoan teachers the appropriate Samoan cultural process of ifoga to make an apology. The total Tupuranga staff and student population then seated themselves silently outside the Samoan bilingual unit and waited to be invited in, where senior students and staff then apologised to the Samoa teacher and their apology was formally accepted. This was a powerful lesson to the offender of the widespread impact of his behaviour—and a lesson to everyone else involved as well. These are much more difficult options than being able to avoid the issue by leaving the school either temporarily or permanently. Former students comment:

A key feature of Tupuranga was definitely the kaiako [teachers]. They were awesome! We knew they would go the extra mile for us and be there when we needed them. Also if we were out of line they wouldn’t have to say much for us to get the idea and tune ourselves back up. They built their respect within us first and so it was like being told off by Aunty. (Kingi)

Kaiako listen to the students. If there was a fight they would listen to all sides of the story before they started dishing out consequences. ...Kaiako notice things. Say, like all
of a sudden I went from a excellent student to a haututū student because there were problems going on at home. The kaiako would pick up that something was wrong and then would want try and help me out. (Kylie)

**School-Lens Learning**

The previous sections have described the development of a learning environment that intentionally complements and supports the schools’ learning model and that incorporates whānau and community aspirations for a culturally responsive space. The next section will provide the detail of the school-lens learning programme which is delivered within the New Zealand Curriculum framework. Firstly, the national mandated curriculum is examined and secondly, the schools’ specific practice and outcomes within this framework are explained.

**The New Zealand Curriculum**

The *revised New Zealand Curriculum*, mandatory in all schools from 2010, has the following vision for young people:

- who will be creative, energetic, and enterprising,
- who will seize the opportunities offered by new knowledge and technologies to secure a sustainable social, cultural, economic, and environmental future for our country;
- who will work to create an Aotearoa New Zealand in which Māori and Pākehā recognise each other as full Treaty partners, and in which all cultures are valued for the contributions they bring;
- who, in their school years, will continue to develop the values, knowledge, and competencies that will enable them to live full and satisfying lives; and
- who will be confident, connected, actively involved, and lifelong learners. (Ministry of Education, 2007a)

_The Treaty of Waitangi_ is mentioned in this vision and again as one of the eight key principles which are the ‘foundation of curriculum decision-making.’ The curriculum support material claims that one of the differences between the previous document and the new curriculum is that it “makes the Treaty of Waitangi explicit in the overview, purpose, principles and values.”

“Equity, through fairness and social justice,” and “diversity, as found in our different cultures, languages, and heritages” are two of the stated beliefs that students will be encouraged to value (p.10). New in this curriculum is the identification of key competencies: thinking, using language, symbols, and texts, managing self, relating to others, and participating and contributing. These are seen as “capabilities for living and lifelong learning” (p.12). The key competencies are designed to take account of the vast changes in society, work, knowledge, and technology that have occurred
since education systems were established.” Some of these changes are presented in an online “discussion tool” which includes changes to subject disciplines (Table 21).

Table 21: Changes in thinking about curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>Now and in the future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning key facts of disciplines</td>
<td>Systems-level understandings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrete disciplines</td>
<td>Relationships/connections, comparing and contrasting disciplinary knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplines as ends</td>
<td>old disciplines - resources for generating new knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long apprenticeship in disciplines</td>
<td>Doing things with knowledge from an early age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The curriculum specifies eight distinct learning areas: English, the arts, health and physical education, learning languages, mathematics and statistics, science, social sciences, and technology. Schools have the freedom to structure the learning experiences offered to students and the document encourages schools to work closely with communities to design relevant learning programmes. There is an emphasis on inquiry learning and teachers are encouraged to help students to make connections across learning areas as well as to home practices and the wider world. These types of statements and the fact that the curriculum is now a single document, which provides achievement objectives across all learning areas, is requiring schools which previously worked in an exclusively separate subject approach to radically rethink their practice.

The New Zealand Curriculum sets out official policy relating to teaching and learning in English medium New Zealand schools. A parallel document, Te Marautanga o Aotearoa, (Ministry of Education, 2007b) serves the same function for Māori medium schools. The two documents are seen as a means to “help schools give effect to the partnership that is at the core of our nation’s founding document, Te Tiriti o Waitangi / The Treaty Of Waitangi” (p.6).

Te Marautanga o Aotearoa

Te Marautanga is specific about Māori contexts and language. Māori cultural identity is an explicit and essential goal that must be “reflected in teaching and learning programmes.” The key competencies in the English medium curriculum do not appear in Te Marautanga. Instead the notion of a ‘graduate profile,’ which “articulates the collective aspirations of whānau, hapū, iwi, and kura for students learning in te reo Māori,” is included (p.4). These profiles, “should include statements about high levels of educational achievement, a wide range of life skills, and quality career choices.” The strongest statement to be found in either document about any alternative to Western knowledge systems is the following:

Te Marautanga o Aotearoa acknowledges the inherent wealth of Māori knowledge and highlights the importance of the use of that knowledge in teaching and learning programmes. The kura working together with whānau, hapū, iwi, and the community will identify relevant and culturally responsive curriculum choices of knowledge and skills that are significant to student learning. Students’ learning will:

- build on the student’s existing knowledge as the starting point for all new learning;
- draw upon local knowledge;
- be supported through the inclusion of traditional knowledge held by whānau, hapū, iwi, and community;
- use traditional Māori knowledge as a foundation to produce new knowledge;
- acknowledge and understand that knowledge systems change over time to produce new knowledge;
- encourage active debate about knowledge systems and its relevance;
- promote an understanding that knowledge is different depending on who created it and their cultural contexts.

One of the predominant users of Te Marautanga will be Kura Kaupapa Māori, schools where the philosophy is predicated on Māori language, beliefs, knowledges, and values. This does not involve a significant shift in thinking for these kura. Nor will it be an issue in other Māori medium schools whose communities have already made a decision about the importance of these values. However, it is vitally important to remember that 85.8% of the 171,796 Māori students in our school system are learning in regular English-medium state schools (Table 22). The Level 1 figures include those Māori students attending Kura Kaupapa Māori. In July, 2011, 6099 Māori students were enrolled in Kura Kaupapa Māori—3.5% of all Māori learners in the country (Ministry of Education, 2011b).

Table 22: Māori Learners involved in Māori Medium Education: July, 2011 (Ministry of Education, 2011b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level (percentage of time per week when Māori is medium of instruction)</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percentage of all Māori learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (81-100%) - includes 3.5% who attend Kura Kaupapa Māori</td>
<td>11,478</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (59-80%)</td>
<td>4,427</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 (31-50%)</td>
<td>4,308</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4a (up to 30%)</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>24,474</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pasifika Curriculum Statements

Alongside The New Zealand Curriculum and Te Marautanga o Aotearoa, curriculum documents have previously been developed for Pasifika languages. With the implementation of the revised curriculum, these former documents become resource materials for use in support of the Learning

A total of 29 schools offered Pasifika-medium education in 2011: 22 primary schools, six secondary schools and one composite school. This was two fewer than in July 2010. There were 3,091 enrolments in a Pacific language at secondary level. This is an increase of 205 students (7.1%) since July 2010. (Ministry of Education 2011b). At senior secondary level students can gain NCEA credits for Tongan (*Lea Faka-Tonga*), Samoan and Cook Islands Māori languages up to Level 3.

Table 23: Pasifika learners involved in Pasifika Medium Education: July 2011  (Ministry of Education 2011b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level (percentage of time per week when a Pasifika language is medium of instruction)</th>
<th>Samoan</th>
<th>Tongan</th>
<th>Cook Islands Māori</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
<th>Percentage of all Pasifika learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (81-100%)</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (59-80%)</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 (31-50%)</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4a (up to 30%)</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>1,631</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Curriculum as a White Space: The Politics of Knowledge**

If the implementation of *The New Zealand Curriculum* in whitestream schools is going to effectively support the development of Māori and Pasifika students’ cultural identity, the challenge is not only about increasing the levels or numbers of Māori and Pasifika language learning opportunities. The challenge is also about how to support teachers, not to just rethink their classroom practice in terms of curriculum delivery, but to examine fundamentally the white space ideology that drives the development of the curriculum and identify their own personal viewpoints within that paradigm (Helfand, 2009, Kincheloe & Hayes, 2007; Sleeter, 2001, Swartz, 1992). As Apple (1993) explains, “One thing is perfectly clear. The national curriculum is a mechanism for the political control of knowledge” (p.234):
What counts as knowledge, the ways in which it is organized, who is empowered to teach it, what counts as an appropriate display of having learned it, and just as critically—who is allowed to ask and answer all of these questions are part and parcel of how dominance and subordination are reproduced and altered in this society.' There is, then, always a politics of official knowledge, a politics that embodies conflict over what some regard as simply neutral descriptions of the world and others regard as elite conceptions that empower some groups while disempowering others. (Apple 1993, p.222, emphasis in original)

Apple urges us to be aware of the origins and the history of the curriculum field and to understand that “the knowledge that got into schools in the past and gets into schools now is not random” (Apple, 2004a, p.60). Rather, it is organised around a set of values and principles that represent particular views of normality and deviance and of what “good people act like.” If you ask the question, “What if existing social and economic arrangements require that some people are relatively poor and unskilled and others are not?” (p.60, emphasis in original) you can begin to understand how schools may help to maintain this set of arrangements. Schools typically preserve and distribute what is perceived to be ‘legitimate knowledge’ and confer ‘cultural legitimacy on the knowledge of specific groups’ (p.61). This is an exercise in power. Apple believes that if we examine current curriculum, and what counts as knowledge now, through its historical context, the ideological and economic purpose schools have served in the past, we can comprehend why school reform now is often unsuccessful.

As well as combating the effects of this ideology in the overt curriculum, we have to be aware of the covert or hidden curriculum at work in daily school practice. Darder (1995, p.331) describes this as “curriculum that is informed by ideological views that silence students and structurally reproduce the dominant society’s assumptions and practices.” She speaks of the persistent failure of schools to recognise the importance of cultural identity and “to make explicit the power relations and elitist interests which shape institutional life (including schools)” (p.335). These hegemonic ‘rules of the game’ represent an overwhelming ‘white space’ that Māori and Pasifika learners struggle with every day, resulting in what Darder (p.335) describes as, “a subordination of identity, consciousness and voice, carried out in part by the best intentioned and well meaning teachers and educational leaders of our time.”

Te Whānau o Tupuranga predominantly uses The New Zealand Curriculum document as the basis for planning, and many of the goals of Te Marautanga o Aotearoa are incorporated into the programme. Clover Park Middle School uses The New Zealand Curriculum. The following sections will show the way the curriculum documents complement, rather than drive, the learning contexts and pedagogy in these two schools. These sections also show how a critical pedagogy is essential if we are to challenge the impact of the overt and covert or hidden curriculum in our schools to benefit Māori and Pasifika learners.
Adapting the mandated curriculum

Macfarlane et al., (2008) sought to align the New Zealand Curriculum to a Māori world view by aligning the key competencies with Māori concepts. They found some commonality in meaning between some of the key competencies and particular Māori constructs but found more evidence of where they did not match given that they were coming from, “quite different knowledge and value bases, and their meaning within a Māori worldview was both wider and deeper than the meaning within the majority European cultural worldview” (p.123). Mediating that difference and finding ways to develop a school-based curriculum founded on Māori and Pasifika world views, while meeting the mandated requirements of the New Zealand Curriculum, is an ongoing professional challenge for staff in these two schools as these teachers’ comments highlight:

My teaching journey which began way back in South Africa was always highly political and militant. For me it is so normal to be this way. It is my natural instinct to fight for justice and equality, bearing in mind that I come from a background where the most outstanding violation of human freedom in history was practised, in an education system where there was a different set of expectations and goals for black and brown students. ... I pay special tribute to our approach in teaching, the whānau philosophy of the schools, the unique model that was developed to validate our children’s language and culture, so that they never lose sight of who they are and where they come from, so that they are never ashamed of their identity, but proud of it. ... Although, I am neither Pacific nor Māori, the journey for me has been incredible. I do not believe that if you are not Māori or Pacific you will fail as an educator in a school such as this. (Cindy)

The cultural responsibility of the school—that is one of the significant reasons I applied for the position here and I’m absolutely not surprised that mainstream schools have difficulty incorporating culturally responsive pedagogy into their curriculum and philosophy. Therein lies one of the reasons why mainstream schools are failing Māori and Pacific youth.

...What I’m also appreciating and encouraged by is that the integrated curriculum actually reflects the social, the political, and also the education needs of the student, and so what they are studying is beneficial to the educational, in terms of for the seniors’ pathway to success at [NCEA] Levels 1, 2 and 3, but also it creates a socially conscious mind for students as well. (Willie)

We have actually developed a programme because we’ve got the theory and have followed it up with practical solutions that work. We know that ourselves through trial and error. The curriculum integration we implement is not just one way, we’ve changed it over the years, it’s not just one method, it’s just a whole lot of different ways, but we’ve tried always to suit the culture of the kids that we’ve got.

The key point here is that, we’ve followed the mainstream way of delivering the curriculum and it hasn’t worked, due to the contexts students were forced to work
from. Working from student-driven contexts allows the students to work from a prior knowledge context, which is culturally relevant. (Eneli)

In order to work in a context like ours staff have to decolonise and undertake that process. Why we enjoy being here is the fact that our practice is based in organic research. We evaluate everything to death and that is the success of how we operate. We reflect stuff to death, we evaluate it, and then we come out of it positively, and the students notice that. (Judith)

I have gone from near complete unawareness of there being any difference in the way different ethnicities learn, to realising that mainstream education only fits the needs of a particular group in society. I have learnt that when the culture at home is totally different from the culture at school students are essentially set up struggle their way through school, conflicted by the need to, or unable to, reconcile the two different cultures. (Kirsten)

These comments make it clear that work to develop a school curriculum based in Māori and Pasifika knowledge and values is always a work in progress as new staff come into the schools or as staff reflection and evaluation suggests change. Experience with this process over time serves to highlight the inherent frustrations involved. Examples are off-site teacher professional development that never quite fits the way we work, and the freedom to develop a more culturally located pedagogy against the pressure to confine our definitions of achievement and success to outcomes determined by national norms, benchmarks and standards. Although the revised New Zealand Curriculum gives schools more flexibility to determine the curriculum design for their individual settings, every school curriculum must be clearly aligned with the intent of the national framework. Schools are required to base their curriculum on the principles of the New Zealand Curriculum, and to encourage and model the values it promotes. Johnson (1991) explains why this can be problematic:

... the great delusion is that all pupils — black and white, working class, poor, and middle-class, boys and girls — will receive the curriculum in the same way. Actually, it will be read in different ways, according to how pupils are placed in social relationships and culture. A common curriculum, in a heterogeneous society, is not a recipe for “cohesion,” but for resistance and the renewal of divisions. Since it always rests on cultural foundations of its own, it will put pupils in their places, not according to “ability,” but according to how their cultural communities rank along the criteria taken as the “standard.” (cited in Apple, 1993, p.232)

A Tupuranga teacher provides first-hand experience of this filter from his interaction with secondary colleagues in other schools as they worked towards the mandatory implementation of the revised curriculum in 2010:

I’ve been watching a couple of the local high schools and how they are trying to develop an integrated curriculum and I’ve spoken to a few colleagues at my previous
school, but the reality is—the day-to-day reality is—it’s not working because they have their own mindset and the challenge is to change that mindset. (Willie)

School-Lens Learning in Practice

This section describes actual practice through examining four topics and contexts for study developed in Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School over the course of this research. This section links classroom practice in both schools to theory, and demonstrates how it is possible to work within the mandated ‘school-lens’ curriculum to challenge the white spaces.

Planning

Both schools use the student management system database “eTAP” for planning and assessment. eTAP is customisable and this feature has allowed staff to embed the learning model into the database. When teachers enter the online planning section of eTAP, using Clover Park or Tupuranga passwords, headings built in to the planning module (Table 24), require them to plan in line with the schools’ agreed approach. These vary slightly for each school and the example in Table 24, refers specifically to Te Whānau o Tupuranga. The online capability allows teachers to work from different computers on a collaborative plan for a whole teaching team. The planning module asks teachers to select curriculum achievement objectives or NCEA standards which then become the basis for assessment. As teachers work through the planning process the headings act as reminders to ensure the plan of work begins with student questions, has a critical aspect, is culturally responsive to Māori belief and knowledge systems, incorporates Māori language and information technology and checks for opportunities for self-learning. The vertically grouped, heterogeneous, class arrangements make it essential that teachers plan to differentiate across a range of abilities and year levels. The order of the headings is also important. Planning starts with students’ questions and the planning of actual activities features well down the list after all other considerations. A very important stage is the ‘performance of knowledge’ which asks how students will share this knowledge with others and demonstrate their learning.

Table 24: The Curriculum Planning Process: Te Whānau o Tupuranga, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRICULUM INTEGRATION QUESTIONS re issues of social concern</th>
<th>How were these chosen?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Back Pocket Questions/Issues</td>
<td>What is the CRITICAL aspect?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Relevance</td>
<td>- for te iwi Māori</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*eTAP (electronic Teacher Assessment & Planning) was originally developed by Education Software & Distributors (ESD) as an assessment and planning tool for primary and intermediate schools. Over the past few years it has evolved into a complete Ministry of Education approved Student Management System. Because eTAP is completely accessible online teachers have all its features always available. Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga staff have been very involved in the development of eTAP since its inception.*
| **Organisation** | of teachers, groups, inquiry/ies |
| **Time Frame** | length of time, expectations at each stage |
| **Management** | How will you manage the multiple inquiries and contexts? |
| **Multilevelling** | How will you ensure the activities are relevant to and challenging for each level - how will they differ? |
| **Differentiation (See Special Targets Linked To This Plan)** | Which specific students need individual planning [including special abilities] - for what purpose/what will they do? |
| **NCEA (Yrs 10-13)** | Which standards will fit into this plan and how will they be delivered and assessed |
| **Bilingual Learning** | How/where will Te Reo Māori be integrated into this plan? |
| **Self-learning** | Is there a self-learning aspect in this plan? Might it provide an opportunity for self/cooperative assessment of self-learning achievement? |
| **ICT** | How will you incorporate ICT in this plan? |
| **Activities** | What will the students actually do - some of this might be written after the unit begins and be specific to each group's inquiry |
| **Performance of Knowledge** | How will students show you and others what they have learned? |
| **Assessment** | How do students know what is expected in order to achieve and excellent outcome? How will you measure against those expectations? |
| **Reports** | Is this a plan you will want to report to parents about? What assessment/comment will teachers need to do? |

**Curriculum Integration**

Beane (2003) asks, what is the purpose of schooling if not to extend democracy (in a democratic society) and make a connection between self-interest and the common good? He sees this approach as a way to move—beyond the separate subject approach to a curriculum where:

- young people are involved in planning and assessing their own learning,
- emphasis is on a collaborative community,
- social problems are used as sources of themes to organise the curriculum (democracy needs a curriculum with a social conscience,
- knowledge is integrated and applied,
- diversity is prized (a signifier of democracy), and
- knowledge and assessment are enhanced for all young people.

Clover Park Middle School was introduced to this particular curriculum integration model in 2001. The approach is described in my Master's thesis (Milne, 2004):

In this model, students pose questions they have about themselves, their communities and country and the world. For our students this includes questions relevant to their own people. This gives teachers issues of social concern which are of significance to our
students as our starting point for learning. Māori students can pose questions about themselves, their iwi, cultural traditions, land, colonisation, politics or the implications of the Treaty of Waitangi for example and compare those with the experiences of indigenous people world-wide. Beane also talks about the fourth question that teachers have in their ‘back pocket’ (2003)—the questions the students might not know to ask. This might include questions about prejudice or racism for example. (p.169)

Dr Beane was consulted by the NZ Curriculum project in the development phase of The New Zealand Curriculum and has worked closely with Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School staff. According to Beane (1997) curriculum integration is not about integrating subject areas and working in a thematic approach—it’s about integrating learning with students’ life experiences and realities. It is about problem solving and developing critical thinking. It is about developing social awareness and citizenship. It is “high pedagogy” (p.68).

Both schools use this integrated curriculum model, further adapting and evolving it to become even more oriented towards critical pedagogy and social justice outcomes based on critical participatory action research as described in the next section.

“Warrior-Scholars”

Kincheloe and Hayes (2007, p.29) describe “the critical curriculum of self-study,” as reading and appreciating the pain and the realities of “city kids” in urban classrooms, and developing relationships of trust with youth in these communities. This curriculum develops “warrior intellectuals” involved in critically grounded, engaged scholarship. They contrast these scholars with “chicken intellectuals” who, like chicken hawks, start and support wars but send other people to fight them, and who separate their academic work from the lived world. Warrior intellectuals are not afraid to challenge the status quo and bring compassion, ethical behaviour, social justice and critical insight, not just into their work in the classroom, but into their daily lives:

They have been victimised by skill and drill, test-driven pedagogies and understand their limitations better than most people. They know that such rote based, indoctrinating forms of education breed passivity and contempt for learning. Top down, standards-driven modes of education suck the joy and soul right out of learning and spit them into the hegemonic latrine. (Kincheloe & Hayes, 2007, p.34)

Duncan-Andrade (2006a) also uses the terms, “warrior-scholars,” and “intellectuals” to describe youth involved in critical participatory action research projects in their schools and communities. Duncan-Andrade & Morrell (2008, p.107) explain that engaging youth in critical pedagogy such as this is linked to three major goals: academic achievement, empowered identity development, and action for social change. They advocate for an approach that utilises “critical counter-cultural communities of practice,” which recognise the existence of a dominant set of institutional norms and practices and intentionally sets itself up to counter these.
A critical counter-cultural community of practice intentionally targets the white spaces of alienation, intellectual disenfranchisement, despair and academic failure and replaces them with “large quantities of community, critical consciousness, hope and academic achievement” (p.11). Duncan-Andrade (2006a) compares this approach with other common urban classroom environments in a matrix showing the levels of critique of structural inequity and motivation by social justice (Figure 40). These communities of practice are continually renegotiated, joint enterprises that function through the mutual engagement of their members who share a common concern or passion and work together over time to produce a shared repertoire of communal resources (Wenger 1998).

For Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School staff, this definition seemed to be a description of a pedagogy of whānau, and it fitted perfectly with our already determined practice and direction. The elements in this approach that moved our practice beyond our original curriculum integration model were the intentional critiques of the white space norms in our system and the heightened focus on social justice. Both models begin with issues that are identified by students and are derived from problems and realities our youth encounter in school, in families, in communities, as well as national and international issues affecting indigenous and other minoritised youth. This ensures that the contexts for study are relevant and authentic and culturally responsive to the lived experiences of our young people. As many of the issues our students identify are those experienced in their respective ethnic groups this approach also provides the opportunity to develop secure cultural identities that reflect the traditional as well as their fluid, negotiated, multiple, contemporary contexts. To develop critical counter-cultural communities of practice Duncan-Andrade and Morrell draw on Freire’s (1970) cyclical concept of praxis and employ the five steps of critical praxis (Figure 41).
This practice engages teachers and students in a process of education that leads to “action and reflection on that action” (p. 24). They find that “this cycle breaks down the inherent power relations in traditional pedagogy and identifies students as collaborators with adults” (p.13).

Student-driven Learning

In the two schools in this study, contexts are identified through a range of activities both at the beginning of the year and at different stages throughout the year. All students are involved in this process. Teachers continually ‘frontload’ topical issues as they occur to ensure students’ questions don’t become routine and repetitive. All events provide rich contexts for questioning. Four of these student-negotiated contexts and the learning that evolved from them are explained in the following sections and typify the practice understood through the school-learning lens.

Student Context 1: Citizenship

In 2008 Te Whānau o Tupuranga students regularly attended Manukau City Council citizenship ceremonies each month as the Māori support group for the city’s Mayor. The group was paid by the City Council for this duty, and this funding directly contributed to the costs of the school marae, which is heavily used by all students. These regular public performances also enhanced the school’s profile and were an opportunity for our youth to give service to the community. However, students had questions about immigration, and the impact of the hundreds of new citizens they saw each month, on jobs for Māori whānau. This questioning led to a major study of citizenship by Years 7 to 10 students—not from the usual perspective of what constitutes a ‘good citizen’ but from a critical Māori viewpoint. Students’ questions included:
• Does the government make sure new citizens understand the Treaty of Waitangi?
• How do we retain our tuakiritanga (identity) as Māori?
• If New Zealand changes due to immigration what are we prepared to compromise (if anything)?
• What happens to culture in citizenship?
• Is there ever a time when citizenship should be revoked and when?
• What was the concept of citizenship in the past and how has this changed?
• Do you become colonised when you become a citizen?
• Pākehā think they own the land, but to Māori the land owns us because it is where our tupuna (ancestors) came from - what do immigrants think?

One of the outcomes of this study was a significant reduction in the number of times we agreed to support the city’s citizenship ceremonies as a form of resistance to what students felt were decisions that overlooked Māori rights and interests.

In a second example that no event escapes student questioning, the Prime Minister of New Zealand was interviewed by our students when he made a pre-election visit to Clubhouse 274. Ofoi (Year 11) surprised staff with the questions she prepared and which caused the experienced politician to struggle for effective answers:

Ofoi: One of National’s policies in education is that all students must meet certain norms in literacy and numeracy. My question is, whose norms are these? Are they Pākehā-based norms? Would our values as Pacific Island people be included, like our language our culture and our identity?

Ofoi: Clover Park Middle School is working towards becoming a full college. If you are our next Prime Minister, what support would you give towards making this a reality?

Student Context 2: Māori Education

In April, 2007, senior staff received an invitation to attend an education conference in Manukau City. Jointly organised by the City of Manukau Education Trust (COMET) and the Manukau City Council, with input from the Ministry of Education, the conference, was titled, *Manukau Education Conference: Connecting Education and Community*. The purpose of the conference was to help to shape the development of a new Manukau Education Strategy. This was the first year Te Whānau o Tupuranga had students in Year 13 and the small group was very focused on their destinations at

---

50 Video interview: Ofoi Taumoelau with John Key, 5 November, 2008.
51 COMET is a charitable trust established by Manukau City Council in 1999 to provide leadership, advocacy, co-ordination and monitoring services in education in the city. With the restructuring of Auckland into one Super City COMET has become a Council Controlled Organisation (CCO) of the Auckland Council.
the end of their final year so we decided to register the Year 13 students as delegates to this conference.

The students spent several days in intense preparation for the conference. A set of discussion papers distributed to registered delegates proved a rich source of information and ‘front loading’ about what to expect and what they wanted to find out — Who was the conference for? Who was consulted? What was presented? Who were the presenters? What did they focus on? Who decided what to include? Whose values counted? What was insinuated or suggested? What was left out? They learned about discourse analysis, they drafted questions about the papers, and researched the background of some of the initiatives featured.

At the conference they took photos and notes. As the only young people there, very visible in their formal school uniform, they were approached by many principals and community leaders who asked why they had come, and who were taken aback when the students said they had come to critically analyse the conference from the perspective of Māori learners in Manukau. The students didn’t miss the fact that it was 2.30 in the afternoon before the word “Māori” was mentioned—once—and then in relation to the problem of diabetes, or that the only session run by Māori was at 4.30 on Friday afternoon, or that most people arrived for the first session after the pōwhiri.

Back at school the students were outraged at the marginalisation of Māori education in the conference format and the City’s strategic plan. Each chose a specific aspect of the conference to produce a research paper and a powerpoint presentation. Some of their comments from their findings are shown below.

Lita used critical discourse analysis. In her presentation she first explained what this was:

As an example, if a school newsletter tells parents that they are having a Māori Language Week and a Pacific Languages Week, critical discourse analysis would make us realise that, if there are 38 weeks in the school year, what they are really saying is that they have 36 English Language Weeks. The newsletter makes us feel the school is focusing on Māori and Pacific languages. Critical discourse analysis helps us see that the school’s real focus is English.

She then analysed a paper and presentation by the Ministry of Education on schooling improvement initiatives in Manukau:

Using Critical Discourse Analysis I can say that, with the use of “raising” and “improvement” so frequently, it is insinuated that there was a problem in the first place that needed to be fixed, and literacy is the only solution. Look at me! Do I look like a problem waiting to be fixed? That’s a rhetorical question! I believe that what you focus on becomes your reality. If the Ministry’s focus is only on improvement and raising achievement as defined by Pākehā, they won’t recognise the unique talents and
skills we, as Māori learners, have to offer. The effect of this type of education is cultural genocide, the destruction of our identity. ...My analysis showed that there is little chance that this will be understood by the leaders of our education in Manukau City. (Lolita Lio)

Wiki decided to explore the question of “Whose knowledge counts?”

Whose values count when questions are raised about the purpose of education? Mainstream values, in other words Pākehā values. Where is there a place for Māori values? Tomlins-Jahnke (2007, p.6) says, the term mainstream is a “code” word for schools that privilege a western-Eurocentric education tradition. And so I ask again, what is knowledge? Can we focus on one culture’s learning and leave out the other? I don’t think so! It’s not fair and it doesn’t work! (Wikitoria Ripia)

Lawrence focused on hegemony. “Hegemony is insidious,” he said. “It creeps up on you.” He was later to use his understanding of hegemony in the impromptu speech that won him the regional and national titles in the prestigious Ngā Manu Kōrero speech competitions. He gave his sociology investigation the title, “What’s the use of all this culture stuff?”

By 2050 when it is predicted Pākehā will be in the minority in Aotearoa, will Māori hegemony have a voice? I doubt it from the way our voice was not heard in the conference about the future of education in Manukau. Paulo Freire (1982) says, “The silenced … are the masters of inquiry into the underlying causes of the events in their world. In this context research becomes a means of moving them beyond silence into a quest to proclaim the world.” That means, if they’d asked us, we would have been the experts in telling them what was needed for our education - but they didn’t! (Lawrence Vaevae)

Maurice analysed the photos he took at the conference to show that the majority of people at the conference, and almost all of the presenters, making decisions about education in Manukau City, were white. He then took photos at the Manukau City Centre to contrast the ethnic mix of people who live in the community against who was represented at the conference. He confirmed this by requesting a list of delegates from the organisers. He later went on to analyse NCEA statistics and school Education Review Office reports on local secondary schools to produce a report on the lack of educational provision for Māori students in Manukau:

The conference was in Manukau City, the audience were mainly Pākehā and the people talking about what education should be were Pākehā, but the conference was supposed to be about rangatahi (youth) like us. So what does that mean for us as young Māori learners in Manukau City? To me I think it’s no wonder so many Māori students leave

---

Ngā Manu Kōrero is an annual national Māori speech competition for secondary students. The competition encourages fluency in Te Reo Māori and English. It began in 1965 as the Korimako Contest, (speeches in English) and has grown to incorporate the Sir Turi Carroll competitions for junior (Years 9 and 10) Māori pupils speaking in English, the Pei Te Hurinui Jones (Years 11-13) and Te Rāwhiti Ihaka (Years 9 and 10) competitions for all pupils speaking in Māori.
school before they are even 16 and hardly any of us make it the 7th form.53 (Maurice Toia)

The topic was to become a year-long, in-depth study for this group. Together we mapped out an NCEA pathway built around the theme of hegemony and the marginalisation of Māori. By the end of the year the students had completed a Level 3 social studies investigation and presented their findings to a wide range of audiences including the Minister of Education, members of parliament, Ministry of Education and City representatives and the entire staff of both schools, who formally assessed their work. Their questions prompted a response from conference organisers that the students felt was a poor attempt to cover up the omission of Māori from the conference. They felt they had good reason to believe that a Māori education forum, hastily convened after the event, was in part due to their presentations and questioning. The students were told by the then Minister of Education, a former sociology professor, that their work was the equivalent of Stage 2 sociology at university. Video clips from their presentations were used in my own presentations throughout the country (Milne, Lio, Toia, Ripia & Vaevae, 2007) and when possible, the students accompanied me and spoke to audiences in person. They had read and reviewed a wide range of texts that related to this theme, including an Australian film, a novel by a Māori author, speeches by Malcolm X and Steve Biko, academic papers by Māori researchers, and a series of newspaper articles about police raids on the Tūhoe people. They had produced extended transactional writing using four different genre, produced a short film from their work using professional industry-standard movie-making software, and used computer graphics to advertise the film premiere.

The NCEA standards, chosen by the students with input and advice from teachers, covered social studies, sociology, English, computing and media studies. They covered the 42 credits in prescribed subjects for a university entrance qualification. Together with credits from Māori Performing Arts and te reo Māori, as well as some individual subject choices, such as maths, they provided students with all the credits required to achieve NCEA Level 3.

Figure 42: Te Whānau o Tupuranga Year 13 NCEA Results, 2007 (New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), 2008)
Figure 42 shows the 2007, Year 13 group’s results compared with the results of other decile one and with decile ten schools nationally. These data are sourced from NZQA “participation-based” statistics where the denominator is the number of students who, “on the basis of their results prior to, and entries during, a selected year could potentially gain that qualification by the end of that year” (emphasis in original). This method of calculating national NZQA statistics was introduced in 2008 to “provide more accurate representations of achievement rates for NQF qualifications than the roll-based denominator” (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 2009). Although these results represent only a very small number of students, these outcomes are sustained over subsequent years. The 2008 results can be seen in the next section. Ministry of Education statistics (Ministry of Education, 2010d) show Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s retention rate for 2007-2008 is 64%, which is 20% higher than that of other decile one schools in those years.

The description of students’ achievement on this Māori Education topic and the accompanying data show how an integrated programme can work effectively at senior secondary school level to put students in charge of their learning. The Manukau Education Conference and the marginalisation of Māori from these proceedings immediately caught these students’ attention and kept them engaged and highly motivated. Having been so closely involved in the design, the planning and the choice of contexts within the broad topic, which they had also chosen, these students became predominantly self-directed, requiring only facilitation and support from their teachers who were also co-members of the learning whānau. The learning whānau constituted the critical counter-cultural community of practice described earlier in this chapter. The learning and achievement that came from students’ lived experiences in this context is the powerful learning that results from a genuine critical pedagogy of indignation (Freire, 2004).

This indignation and outrage is well-founded. Early in her first year of university study for a Bachelor of Education degree, one of these four students sent me a copy of her first essay, on the topic of diversity. She wrote about hegemony and dominant/subordinate identities. She quoted a wide range of sources including Freire, Gramsci, and Ladson-Billings, as well as Māori and Pasifika research. Her lecturer’s reaction was to ask for a meeting and to question her closely about how she could possibly know so much about hegemony? The very clear implication was she must have had help or had plagiarised material in order to write in this way so soon after leaving school. Her answer that she had learned this at school was met with disbelief. Other students, now studying at tertiary level, have reported similar incidents. Her essay stated:

Throughout the eight years I spent at my secondary school, I was given opportunities to learn in a culturally relevant learning environment, I was given opportunities and expected to lead and assist the younger members in our whānau. Unlike many other students in secondary schools, my experience of learning has enabled me to develop my
cultural identity, validate my cultural beliefs and learn about the world in an environment that allowed me to live and think as a young Māori woman. (Ripia, 2009)54

Student Context 3: Identity

In 2008 the catalyst for a study by senior students was a film by an 18 year old African American student, Kiri Davis (Reel Works Teen Filmmaking, 2005), who decided to repeat research that Drs. Kenneth and Mamie Clark (Clark & Clark, 1947) had originally conducted in the 1950s—by asking young African American children to choose between a brown and a white doll. In a similar result to the research over 50 years earlier an overwhelming number of children chose the white doll, many stating that it was the “good” doll because it was white.

In a process similar to that described in the Māori Education study above, students chose a range of topics around a central theme of identity. These included, the impact of media on youth and identity, how early influences on identity start, the impact of negative stereotypes on Māori youth, multiple identities, the impact of school on Māori identity, and how others see Māori. The students also conducted a similar brown/white doll experiment with five year old Māori children at a total immersion Māori school—with the same results. Given the very Māori learning environment and whānau choice to place their young children in such a context, our students expected the children would identify strongly as Māori. The results therefore surprised them. Again students presented their findings in a range of settings both in person and through video. One student examined the portrayal of Māori in the media and spoke about an article in The Sunday Star Times (Laws, 2008).

The following three excerpts are from his oral presentation:

So am I fighting against Michael Laws or the judge, Tony Adeane, who Michael Laws is quoting? No! The fight is against the racism and stereotypes of our Māori culture that both these men are portraying. According to Jewish philosopher Abraham Herschel, “Racism is man’s gravest threat to man - the maximum of hatred for a minimum of reason.”

Did Michael Laws actually say he was talking about Māori? No he didn’t, but he implied it through his use of the word Pākehā. He also says the people he is talking about have drug and alcohol problems and have a genetic adherence to an indigenous culture, in other words descend from Māori heritage.

The media contributes to hegemony because it reinforces that thinking and it makes the negative messages believable. And the only way we can change this is to become more aware of hegemony and how it affects us as a people and to become counter-hegemonic. (Te Raiwhara Ropata)

---

Again the one topic carried students through all their requirements for NCEA Level 3 and university entrance qualifications. Figure 43 shows a similar pattern of results to that of the previous year. Although numbers are still small this further data show consistency across two years.

Figure 43: Te Whānau o Tupuranga Year 13 NCEA Results, 2008 (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 2009)

Student Context 4: Social Toxins

In 2009 “social toxins” was the theme for the year, in both schools, and in both middle and senior levels in Te Whānau o Tupuranga. The spark that engendered student questions about social toxins was the visit in September, 2008 of Dr Jeffrey Duncan-Andrade and Dr K. Wayne Yang. Senior students participated in all the seminars these two visiting professors delivered to educators at our school marae. They also worked with these visitors in classes. All staff in both schools also attended their workshops and seminars.

Throughout the 2009 year students explored the question, “Is inequality making us sick?” Groups have investigated the phenomenon of root shock in ecosystems and the impact of many different aspects of this trauma when it is applied to people, from the transience of families, to the loss of land, language, culture and identity due to colonisation, assimilation and integration policies. Te Whānau o Tupuranga middle school students walked to the Manukau City Centre to participate in the march arranged by Māori groups to protest the government’s proposal to merge Auckland’s cities into one super city. Senior students looked at gentrification and the impact of council policies like this on communities like ours. Tongan students asked the question, “Who has the power?” in relation to the government’s decision to amalgamate the five cities in the Auckland region into one “super city.” Cook Island Māori students explored the loss of the Cook Islands Māori language and asked about freedoms, racism and privilege. Samoan students debated whether the goal of their parents and grandparents to seek a ‘better’ life by bringing their families to New Zealand has actually been fulfilled. They studied the ‘root shock’ of immigration and asked is your life really “better” if, as a result of those decisions, you have lost your language and identity?
Figure 44 shows that the pattern of results at NCEA Level 3 in 2007 and 2008 was consistent again in 2009.

Figure 44: Te Whānau o Tupuranga Year 13 NCEA Results, 2009 (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, NZQA, 2009)

School-Lens Outcomes

The previous section has provided NCEA Level 3 results for Year 13 students across three years to show the effectiveness of the schools’ integrated approach based on student-driven contexts and questions at this senior student level. The next section examines school-lens academic outcomes at lower year levels. Figure 45 shows the 2010 results for Year 11 Te Whānau o Tupuranga students achieving the literacy and numeracy requirements for NCEA Level 1. These are roll-based results which show the percentages and numbers of all Year 11 students on July 1 school rolls. The Te Whānau o Tupuranga literacy and numeracy outcomes are higher than the results for all Decile 1 schools, and higher than the results for all secondary schools nationally.

Figure 45: Literacy & Numeracy Requirements, NCEA Level 1, Year 11 students, 2010. (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 2011)

---

55 2010 outcomes are used in this section as 2010 is the last year when achievement data is available separately for Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School. From January 2011 results become combined following the merger of the two schools. This is explained in Chapter 8.
Table 25 shows the participation-based results for Te Whānau o Tupuranga Years 11 to 13 students in NCEA Levels 1, 2 and 3 from 2008 to 2010. These results are compared with all Māori students and all Decile 1 schools nationally. Except for NCEA Level 1 in 2008, Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s results are higher at all levels in all three years.

Table 25: NCEA Levels 1 to 3, Years 11-13 students, 2008-2010 (New Zealand Qualifications Authority, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tupuranga</td>
<td>All Māori nationally</td>
<td>Decile 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEA Level 1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEA Level 2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEA Level 3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Levels and Literacy

The schools’ bilingual education focus is explained in Chapter 5. This section discusses school decisions and assessment about English literacy outcomes.

Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School have developed literacy assessment tools, programmes and resources in English that are process-based, inform the teaching learning cycle and are culturally and socially relevant for the children in our two schools. These literacy assessment tools were developed to collect data which measure literacy progress more precisely and identify specific teaching needs to accelerate student achievement. Informal Prose Inventories were developed based on culturally and socially relevant reading materials for the cultural groups within the school. These text selections, are relevant to student’s cultural backgrounds and experiences, and facilitate students’ use of prior knowledge in engaging with text. The text selections also guide teaching approaches. Readability procedures such as Elley’s Noun Frequency Method (Elley & Croft, 1989), supplemented by the Fry Readability Formula (Fry, 1990), and the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level Readability Test which is a built in feature of Microsoft Word were used to grade the texts. The Informal Prose Inventories focus on close observation and analysis of reading behavior, including comprehension. Currently four types of comprehension questions have been developed based on Nicholson’s (1997) research. In 2006 Pasifika staff developed graded prose inventories in Samoan and Tongan to assess students’ reading in these languages (see Chapter 4).

56 The Flesch-Kincaid readability test is designed to indicate comprehension difficulty when reading a passage of contemporary academic English and is commonly used to assess the readability of text. Microsoft Word has the ability to calculate the readability of documents using the Flesch-Kincaid readability scale.
Widely used tests, such as PROBE (Parkin, Parkin & Poole, 2002), or standardised tests, such as AsTTle\textsuperscript{57} or PAT,\textsuperscript{58} do not make the close connection with our Māori and Pasifika students’ lived experiences that the two schools feel is crucial, even though these tests have been developed for New Zealand learners and are favoured by the Ministry of Education and many schools. Teachers at Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga have debated the use of these types of tests over many years. They have trialled most of them and rejected them because such tests were found to be contrary to our basic philosophy. In fact, staff felt that the predominant monocultural nature of these tests actually discriminated against Māori and Pasifika students. Because we were serious about the kaupapa of a critical, culturally responsive, pedagogy that integrated learning with our students’ lives and realities, it made no sense to assess their literacy using diagnostic tests that flew in the face of all of the principles that underpinned our educational philosophy. Nevertheless, staff also accepted the need to benchmark the school-developed tests and student outcomes against national goals and standards.

Teachers were already using a range of tools to moderate their assessments against national criteria, including the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) Assessment Resource Banks (ARB), an online collection of materials for mathematics, science, and English,\textsuperscript{59} and the National Curriculum Exemplars (Ministry of Education, 2010e) developed by the Ministry of Education. These exemplars provide authentic examples of student work, annotated to illustrate learning, achievement and quality in relation to the levels in the national curriculum statement—in English, Te Reo Māori, mathematics, the arts, science, technology, health and physical education, and social studies. Senior students’ learning and NCEA outcomes are externally moderated by NZQA. Both schools underwent successful external moderation in 2007 and 2009.

In 2008 staff decided to benchmark the internally developed prose inventories against asTTle and PROBE to further check the validity of the school-based data. A sample group representing the spread of reading levels in Year 8 was selected in each school. This process has been repeated in 2009, using the original sample group, now in Year 9 and a new Year 8 group. Three types of comparisons were possible using these tests. Firstly, the PROBE test provided a direct comparison with the reading levels determined by the schools’ own informal prose inventory reading levels. Secondly, asTTle provided a range of results which benchmark students against national norms. We could compare the sample group’s results with those of other Māori students (for Te Whānau o Tupuranga), with those of students in schools like ours, or all students nationally. Finally, asTTle breaks each curriculum level down into three levels, Advanced, Proficient and Basic. Similarly eTAP

\textsuperscript{57} asTTle: Assessment Tools for Teaching and Learning, developed for the Ministry of Education by the University of Auckland to assess literacy and numeracy (in both English and Māori). Provides information about a student’s level of achievement relative to the curriculum achievement outcomes, for levels 2 to 6 and national norms of performance for students in years 4 to 12.


\textsuperscript{59} The ARBs consist of curriculum-based assessment resources designed for students working at levels 2-5 for use in New Zealand schools.
calculates ‘grades’ within each level in its “Best Fit” calculation. If the schools’ curriculum ‘best fit’ levels were accurate they would be similar to the sample group’s curriculum levels results in asTTle. Outcomes of these three comparisons across both schools are shown next.

Table 26 shows the comparison of our school-developed Informal Prose Inventory reading levels with those of the PROBE (Prose Reading, Observation, Behaviour and Evaluation of Comprehension) tests. Both tests use teacher observation of reading behaviour on graded text and so provide an appropriate basis for comparison. Table 26 shows that there is a very close alignment of reading levels across both tests.

**Table 26: Comparison of School-developed Informal Prose Inventory Reading Level with PROBE: 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 8 Student Sample</th>
<th>School-developed Informal Prose Inventory Reading Level</th>
<th>PROBE Prose Reading Observation, Behaviour and Evaluation of Comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>11.5 - 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 - 11</td>
<td>10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14 - 15</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>14.5 - 15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td>13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 - 12</td>
<td>11.5 - 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 shows the comparison of one aspect of the asTTle tests, “Thinking Critically” with our school’s assessments of the English curriculum strand ‘Thinking Critically.’ The eTAP calculation of the student’s ‘best fit’ level is based on assessments from all teachers in that curriculum strand to date. This provides a further useful benchmarking check which shows that the curriculum level results are also very similar. This cohort of Year 9 students are those who were also in the sample group in Year 8.

---

60. ‘Thinking Critically’ was a strand in the previous New Zealand Curriculum, which was still in use in both schools in 2008. In 2009 the schools have changed to use the new curriculum objectives which are organised differently.
Table 27: Comparison of school-based teacher curriculum levels with asTTle levels: 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AsTTle Curriculum Level</th>
<th>Teacher-assessed eTAP “Best Fit” Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3P</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5P</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcomes in the asTTle testing (Figure 46) consistent over both schools over two consecutive years, with sample groups of Year 8 students in 2008 and Years 8 and 9 in 2009 show the effectiveness of the schools’ curriculum emphasis on critical pedagogy starting with student-driven questioning. The outcomes are reflective of the curriculum-wide emphasis on critical thinking. The outcomes reflect also the focus on learning that builds on Māori and Pasifika students’ prior knowledge.

The school-developed reading tests are specifically designed to fit students’ experiences, in the understanding that comprehension depends on integrating new knowledge with a network of prior knowledge. The importance of prior knowledge in the cognitive process is the reason why the integrated Power Lenses learning model draws students’ questions from their background experiences and uses this knowledge to provide a scaffold for new learning.

Figure 46: Clover Park Middle School asTTle Results, compared with all NZ Schools: Year 8, August 2009
Te Whānau o Tupuranga was reviewed by the Education Review Office in 2009 and Clover Park Middle School was reviewed in 2010. In each of these years further asTTle testing was done with a representative sample group. The patterns shown above in the 2008 data were found to be consistent in 2009 and 2010. Student achievement as understood through the school-learning lens was found by the Education Review officers to be an area of strength:

**Areas of strength**

**Achievement of students.** The school has a holistic approach to defining student achievement. This is demonstrated through the assessment of students’ performance in the areas of academic, cultural, and global learning. These three dimensions are used by the school to identify how student achievement in the school contributes to students becoming what the school calls “Warrior-Scholars”.

Senior managers and staff have developed school-based assessment tools that are aligned to national assessment resources. Teachers have developed their understanding of analysing and comparing assessment data so that information about student achievement is valid. ... Recent analysed data indicates that in English literacy and numeracy from 2009 to 2010 most students in Years 7 to 10 are achieving at and above national expectations in reading and mathematics. (Education Review Office, 2010)

However, learning outcomes as seen through the school-learning lens provide only one part of the picture and must be understood alongside self-lens or self-learning outcomes which were described in Chapter 4. Nevertheless, all successful learning achievement and progress are celebrated, but in ways that are not ‘usual’ school practice as can be seen in the following description of the combined schools’ annual Celebration Day:

The day starts with a pōwhiri at 9.30 a.m. for families and guests. In the first half of the morning the more “traditional” acknowledgements are made, of achievement in learning, sports and service to the school. However the receiving of these awards is far from traditional in the expected school sense, yet very traditional in terms of our school’s cultures. On the announcement of the winner (and there are as many “winners” as possible) that student’s whole Area acknowledges the award with a haka or a traditional chant or Cook Island drumming, depending on the cultural group. Parents run from the crowd to bestow a lei or garland of sweets around the neck of their child – and often the neck of the person presenting the award and the principal! Mothers, aunts or older sisters dance with their child in front of the school. Guests are invariably astonished and captured by the atmosphere of the day. (Milne, 2004, p.181)
Coloured Learning Spaces

The story presented at the beginning of this thesis of the Samoan girl who followed Samoan custom with visitors in the principal’s office posed the following questions:

1. What were the conditions that existed in the school that made it both acceptable and comfortable to empower the student to follow her cultural norms, even in the palagi principal’s office and to a group who were not Samoan?
2. Why was this important?
3. How would this confidence and cultural competence benefit her?

This chapter has answered these questions by describing the schools’ programme in detail and describing practice in terms of ‘school lens’ and by illustrating some of the academic learning benefits of this approach. It has shown how Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School work within the mandated national curriculum, but develop and utilise contexts for learning that promote a critical, oppositional, scholarship that names and makes visible the white spaces in the overt and hidden curriculum and in school practice. McLaren (1998) describes naming (emphasis in original) as “simply identifying and defining those social and economic relationships that most clearly affect students’ lives, particularly the inequitable distribution of power and resources.”

Unfortunately, in most schools the act of naming—of identifying and defining the oppressive social and cultural facts of life—is deemed ‘dangerous conversation.’ It runs counter to the politically laundered beliefs about equity and meritocracy that dominate public schooling. Not naming, however, constitutes an active refusal to create reflective citizens, it is quite simply a means of silencing students. (p.247, emphasis in original)

McLaren attributes the concept of naming to Fine (2003) who states, “To not name is to systematically alienate, cut off from home, from heritage and from lived experience and ultimately severs these students from their educational process” (Fine & Weis, 2003, p.22).

This chapter has named the white spaces that systematically alienate Māori and Pasifika students in New Zealand schools from their own identities, and has described the pedagogical practices within these two schools that intentionally ‘colour in’ the school learning white space.
Chapter Six

Wider Spaces

We, the Indigenous peoples of the world, assert our inherent right to self-determination in all matters. Self-determination is about making informed choices and decisions and creating appropriate structures for the transmission of culture, knowledge and wisdom for the benefit of each of our respective cultures. Education for our communities and each individual is central to the preservation of our cultures and for the development of the skills and expertise we need in order to be a vital part of the twenty-first century.

(The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights in Education, 1999)

Findings: Global Learning

The previous chapters have detailed the schools’ practice and outcomes in the school learning and self-learning lenses. The development of a secure cultural identity which allows young people to live and learn as who they are has been a fundamental premise. Developing a strong cultural identity however, does not ignore the complex, multiple, shared, and fluid identities our young people navigate both in and beyond school—and that’s the purpose of the third lens, the global learning lens. Knowing who they are in terms of their cultural identity is not to sentence young people to be forever trapped in a traditional cultural time warp. In fact, in order to effectively integrate all those other identities, the schools’ philosophy believes young people first have to have a strong sense of self, and cultural identity is seen as the thread that weaves through, and acts as their compass, in all of the other pathways our young people walk. The global lens therefore is designed to connect students’ self and school learning to the many worlds beyond school—including international and future spaces. This chapter examines two aspects of the global learning lens—social justice (international), and new skills and knowledge for the 21st Century.

The first section of the chapter describes social justice initiatives outside New Zealand. Although these exist in many countries, I will focus specifically on three programmes in the United States because these are communities and initiatives I have personally visited and with whom our two schools have an ongoing association. The connection with these programmes show our youth that they are not alone in the struggle for social justice and educational sovereignty, and that injustice, colonisation, assimilation, racism and white spaces transcend borders to marginalise and pathologise young people the world over. This section identifies seven principles that these initiatives and the philosophy and practice of the two schools in this research have in common.
The second section of this chapter looks at the new skills and knowledges needed for 21st Century learners and describes the development of the first Computer Clubhouse in New Zealand on the schools’ campus. This section examines the network of Clubhouses world-wide, the interaction of our students with youth from all over the world and the benefits the Clubhouse is bringing to the learning programme and the community of both schools.

Both sections in this chapter add to the strategies outlined in the previous two chapters; to develop new ways to address our education system’s ‘white spaces’ that are not framed by, or limited to, Eurocentric norms that view Māori, Pasifika, indigenous and minoritised students’ education from a deficit viewpoint.

At the Hui Taumata Mātauranga in 2001, Mason Durie set three goals for Māori education policies: that they should aim to equip Māori children and rangatahi (youth) to be citizens of world, to live as Māori, and to enjoy a high standard of living. As noted earlier, Durie’s goals have been incorporated into the Māori Education Strategy, Ka Hikitia which identifies, as a broad student outcome that, “Māori learners gain the universal skills and knowledge needed to successfully participate in and contribute to Aotearoa New Zealand and the world” (Ministry of Education, 2008a, p.20). In the introduction to Ka Hikitia, Apryll Parata, Deputy Secretary—Māori Education, speaks of a future for Māori youth who are, “confident, capable and connected learners who are supported by their respective education communities, at home, in te Ao Māori, in Aotearoa New Zealand and in the global world” (p.9). However, Māori or Pasifika youth can’t learn how to become effective and participating global citizens if we do not connect them to the rest of the world in ways that enable them to see how their experiences fit into the big picture, and if we don’t genuinely care about them or value their history.

Solidarity in the White Space

In Chapter 1 I described the three prolonged efforts by parents in the Clover Park community, over a span of 20 years, to resist and reject alienating school environments in favour of a relevant culturally-located, bilingual model of schooling. Two of these campaigns have been successful after many years of active protest. The outcome of the third is detailed in Chapter 8. I commented that each has been met with exactly the same opposition from our education authorities, an obstruction that has very little to do with the education of this community’s youth and everything to do with maintaining the status quo in the ‘network’ of existing schools. In official minds the country’s network of state-funded schools already provide an education relevant to all students and a heavy investment in that concept makes the mindset resistant to change.
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61 The first Hui Taumata Matauranga: Māori Education Summit was convened in Turangi and Taupo 23-25 February 2001 at the invitation of Tuwharetoa paramount chief Tumu Te Heuheu.
The protest for educational equity and social justice may have different contexts, different ethnic communities, and different schooling systems and regulations to negotiate, but the following three examples from the United States resonate with the struggle and the solutions we have developed in Otara, New Zealand. Together they provide a powerful example of ‘audacious hope’ (Duncan-Andrade, 2009) and a model that challenges and resists the white spaces in our schools.

‘Doc Ur Block’: Stepping to College and Consciousness in East Oakland Community High School

I first encountered “The Definite Dozen” (Figure 47) on the wall in Dr. Jeff Duncan-Andrade’s and Dr. Wayne Yang’s classroom at East Oakland Community High School in 2007. Students in this class were not able to participate in the programme until they had committed The Definite Dozen to memory and their rendition had been approved by their classmates. Every lesson ended with the whole class saying The Definite Dozen in unison. At the end of our visit one of the gifts presented to us by the young people in the class was a framed copy of “The Definite Dozen” which I brought back to students in our two schools, and which now is displayed in our school Wharenui. Staff have subsequently translated this into Māori, and composed as a waiata (song) based on these principles.

Figure 47: “The Definite Dozen” (Duncan-Andrade, 2005)

THE DEFINITE DOZEN

“Discipline yourself so that no one else has to.”

TO ENTER YOUR REVOLUTIONARY STATE OF MIND

1. Be responsible (To yourself, to your family, to your community, to our world.)
2. Be respected, be respectful (Respect yourself. Demand that others respect you. Respect others.)
3. Be honest (Leaders don’t make excuses, they make improvements.)
4. Be loyal (Stand alongside those who have the least.)

TO DISCIPLINE YOUR REVOLUTIONARY STATE OF MIND

5. Work (Every day, everywhere.)
6. Study (To study is a revolutionary duty.)
7. Character over reputation (Character is who you are when no one else is looking. Reputation is who other people say you are.)
8. Believe (Doubters never win, revolutionaries never doubt.)

TO BUILD A SUCCESSFUL REVOLUTION

9. Be self-critical (No revolution is complete without a culture of self-improvement. There is no culture of self-improvement without a culture of self-reflection.)
10. Acknowledge the knowledge (Teach and be teachable.)
11. Build with allies, influence the enemy (Execute the 5 phases: identify, analyze, plan, implement, evaluate.)
12. Be relentless (Never, ever give up.)
The Definite Dozen epitomises the spirit of the 11th Grade youth and the teachers I met that day. I sat in on their urban sociology class where they were studying the ancient Chinese philosophy of the I Ching. I rode the BART with them from East Oakland into San Francisco and attended their class at the university. A few days later I met up with a group of these young people again in Chicago where they presented the results of their research to a large audience of critical educators for social justice at the American Education Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting in a session entitled, Doc Your Block: Critical Pedagogy Through Youth Participatory Action Research. This was their 10th Grade (New Zealand Year 11) research.

This group of students was part of the “Step to College” (STC) programme, initiated by San Francisco State University's (SFSU) College of Education “as a response to the disturbingly low levels of academic engagement, achievement, graduation, and college eligibility among poor and working class youth of color” (Hidalgo & Duncan-Andrade, 2009, p.2). The STC programme partnered a university professor with a local high school, allowing students to cross-enrol each semester in a high school class and a university seminar class. By exposing these young people to the rigor and culture of university courses the STC programme hoped to prepare them for college success (p.3). In the video greetings the East Oakland Community High School class made to introduce themselves to senior students in Te Whānau o Tupuranga, almost every student proudly stated they were a ‘junior’ at EOC and a ‘freshman’ at San Francisco State University.

The urban sociology class was made up of 30 students—16 Latino and 14 African American. The overwhelming majority of the group would have been considered low achievers by conventional measures and approximately half of the class had been recruited due to their reputation as some of the school’s most challenging students. (Hidalgo and Duncan-Andrade, 2009, p.6; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008, p.144). The class met, with Dr. Duncan-Andrade as their teacher, for a ninety minute block, three times a week and after school three times a week, for two and a half hours. Hidalgo and Duncan-Andrade argue that, “the results produced by STC must be understood as the outcomes of an intense commitment to the development of pedagogy and curriculum that create meaningful relationships between teachers and students, while maintaining a high level of critical intellectual rigor” (p.6). The Doc Ur Block research was an example of this commitment.

The Doc Ur Block project took student sociologists through the five stages of critical praxis: 1) identify a problem, 2) analyze the problem, 3) develop a plan to address the problem, 4)
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63 Grade 10 is the equivalent of New Zealand’s Year 11, when NZ students begin NCEA Level 1. In the USA grade levels are often referred to as follows: Grade 9 – Freshman Year, Grade 10 – Sophomore Year, Grade 11 – Junior Year, Grade 12 – Senior Year. When students begin college (university) these names are again used to describe each year, in the same sequence.

64 The federal United States Government defines Latino as a person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.
implement the plan, and 5) evaluate the impact of the plan (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008, (see Figure 41).

In the first stage students were introduced to three key sociological terms, hegemony, counter-hegemony and habitus, through readings, films and lectures. They then used those terms to analyse elements of popular youth culture, such as television shows, music, advertisements, video games, fashion and sports. Students then identified their own homes on a map of the community and were divided into groups of five, based on their own neighbourhoods. Each group chose a fourth guiding sociological term that they had investigated through their reading and discussion, to add to the original three. Each group presented their research, explaining the absence or presence of these four terms in the aspect of popular culture they had studied. This presentation, to members of the school community, included a literature review that forced them to explain the academic language they had encountered so it was understood by their audience.

In Stage 2 the research moved to the community. Groups developed an hypothesis about what they would find when they studied their respective neighbourhoods and then were trained in the basic use of the tools of ethnographic research: digital video, still photography, observational field notes, formal and informal interviews, basic surveys and artefact collection. They then spent three weeks, during lunch and after school, conducting field research in the community. The requirements of the final presentation of their findings, at a research conference again attended by key stakeholders in the school community were:

To prepare three main products for the conference: a twenty minute PowerPoint presentation, an eight-to-ten minute “Blocumentary” (documentary) film, and a twelve- to fifteen-page research report. The division of labor for these products was the decision of the research group. The minimum requirements for each of the assignments were as follows: 1) the PowerPoint presentation needed to have slides covering their literature review of social theoretical terms, research methods, hypothesis, findings, and reconstructed theory, 2) the research report needed to have sections covering the same topics as the PowerPoint, and 3) The “Blocumentary” film needed to have visual examples of the social theoretical terms, counter-instances, and reconstructed theory (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008, p.146).

Having seen both the “blocumentaries” and the presentations of their research to “a standing-room-only audience of more than 150 graduate students and professors” (p.148), who gave these young scholars a standing ovation at the AERA Conference in Chicago in 2007, I can attest to the raw honesty and academic rigour of this work. Duncan-Andrade (p.149) comments, “The real value of this project rests in the way it helped students re-envision their communities and their roles in creating and contributing to counter-narratives that promote hope and self-determination.” As Assata, told the AERA audience:

To be completely honest ... we didn’t think we were going to see any counter-hegemony in our community because we believed the hegemony just like everybody else. That’s
why our key data, the stuff we just [presented], is so important because it proves us wrong about our own community (p.147).

In Grade 11, their Junior year, the research by this same group was to develop an East Oakland Youth SARC (School Accountability Report Card). California public schools annually provide information about themselves for these reports to the community allowing the public to evaluate and compare schools for student achievement environment, resources and demographics. The sociology class provided their own SARC based on their perceptions of their school and created a plan for school improvement. Again these young people presented their findings at the AERA Annual Meeting in New York in 2008. During their 12th-grade year they researched the presence and/or absence of human rights in classic literature and popular films, as well as within their schools and the Oakland community, analysing why these human rights are essential to a person’s quality of life and how to fight to gain access for those who are denied their basic rights (Hidalgo & Duncan-Andrade, 2009, p.22).

**Beginning— and Ending**

The East Oakland Community High School (EOC) opened in 2004, part of a wider community school reform movement, initiated by a group of mothers from the “flatlands” of Oakland who saw that their children, in large, overcrowded, poorly resourced schools were receiving a vastly different education from children in the affluent hills suburbs where schools were smaller. In May 2000 the Oakland Unified School Board unanimously adopted the New Small Autonomous Schools (NSAS) policy. BayCES (the Bay Area Collaborative for Equitable Schools) received a $15.7 million grant from the Gates Foundation to support the Oakland small schools’ work. From 2000 to 2005 BayCES led the incubation of 26 new small schools, one of which was East Oakland Community High School.

By 2007-2008 the Oakland Unified School District, under state control since its bankruptcy in 2003, had opened 49 new small schools and closed three “because of low enrolment and other problems” (Vasudeva, Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Montgomery, 2009, p.5). One of those three was East Oakland Community High School. Maharaj (2007) reports, “Students, faculty and parents claim there are political motivations behind the shut down. School district officials point to hard numbers.” Yang, a co-founder of EOC, while agreeing there was room for improvement, asked for time to embed the changes already making a difference. The closure meant that the STC class, embarked on such a transformational trajectory to college, were ousted from their successful environment, unable to complete their important senior year, and their junior year was disrupted by the threat of closure hanging over their heads:

> We’ve finally created the conditions for which students are actually invested in school...They’re investing because they actually have hope. They have faith that these adults will not let them down,” Yang says. “I appreciate the challenge the district is throwing at us....Whether or not we believe in test scores, it’s still telling. We believe
those test scores should go up. They’ll never be comparable to the population for which
the tests were designed to measure, but our students will get into college and that’s
the difference. (Yang, quoted in Maharaj, 2007)

Marching for Justice

The decision to close EOC devastated students, staff and the community and they took action. On
28 February, 2007, the school closed at 2.00pm and an estimated 250 students, teachers, and
community members rallied to march over eight miles to the Oakland Unified School District
administrator/trustee meeting where the decision was to be made about the school’s closure. La
Paperson describes the march:

Their journey transgressed lines of representation, drawn by a state administration that
had depicted the youth as disorderly, anti-school savages. It also transgressed colorlines
and hood-lines, very real social divides that structured ghetto space. On Macarthur
Boulevard and 63rd Avenue, a group of DMBs (Dirty Mackin Boyz) locked arms to block
the march as it crossed through their turf. The vice principal ran up to one young man,
a former student. She said urgently, “They’re closing EOC. We’re marching for the
school.” The youth motioned, his set dropped their arms, and the marchers passed.
State turf also had its gang. Police were hired in extra numbers to protect the
administration from the community. But sometime near midnight, the cops joined
hands with the youth to pray and weep in the hallways of central office after the
decision to close the school was finalized. (Paperson, 2010)

In spite of eloquent speeches from some 30 students, staff, parents and community members, the
Board did not change their decision, and finally announced very late in the evening, that the school
would officially close in June, 2007, the end of the school year. Maharaj (2007) quotes Duncan-
Andrade’s words to the youth immediately after the decision:

The people that made the decision are not from our community. They don’t live in this
community. And they pass judgment on us?” Duncan-Andrade says. “I’m not surprised
by the decision tonight. I’m reaffirmed.”
“I grew up as an athlete and I always wanted that final score. But freedom is not a final
score. Freedom is a journey... Our freedom is in our decision to fight forever,” he says.
“This march will be in the history book. Look in any history book for hundreds of
students marching for freedom and education, and you’ll see that chapter is lacking.
You have written it here today.” (Maharaj, 2007)

Parents were then left with difficult decisions about their children’s education choices. Yang
(Paperson, 2010) explains that, in “the EOC ghostlife” some parents chose to leave the district,
enrolling their children in charter schools, and some chose not to send them to school at all. Some
(specifically, the parents of students working in the STC programme) chose to enrol in a charter
school and to send them each morning to class in a converted house in the westside ghetto. Paperson (2010) states:

> It is difficult to express without understatement, the risk taken by these students and their parents, the trust they had to muster in the volunteer adults staffing the program, and their total distrust of the Oakland school district. The state administrator saw these actions as irrational. Denouncing of colonial education, in both its aspects of dispossession and false generosity, appears completely irrational within the colonial epistemology.

This determination to continue with their programme in spite of the obstacles was not only an extreme risk, it required significant adjustment and commitment from the youth themselves to move out of their community where they knew the rules and the risks to a new community where they were unknown. Paperson describes this process:

> On school days, they crisscrossed from Oakland’s eastside ghetto to its westside one, over water to San Francisco State University, and through economic zones to a downtown charter school. They rode the Black Star Line, county buses, and the expensive commuter monorail train named BART. Eclectic transit was a necessity of living across fractured spaces. In between, they were not there, black65 bodies in white space. Students often spoke of a peculiar absence-presence, of feeling hypervisible yet invisible in modes of ‘public’ transportation not meant for them, in stores where they could not buy, in universities where they were curiosities - in moral geographies whose purity was predicated on their not-being-there. By skipping over or passing under white space, youth disappeared from one place, and reappeared somewhere else. Theirs was a black space travel akin to quantum tunneling, rather than a smooth commute on a contiguous freeway. This teleportation trick connected otherwise discontiguous space, and in the process defragmented the ghetto. (Paperson, 2010)

One measurable outcome of that commitment and the programme’s success is college entry. Of the 30 students in the original 10th grade cohort, 24 (80%) continued to 12th grade (16 stayed with the Step to College program all three years; 8 additional students were enrolled in 12th grade but were no longer in Step to College). Eighteen of the original 30 (60%) enrolled in 4-year universities after graduating from high school (with at least one additional student enrolling in a two-year community college). Twenty four of the 26 students (92%) in the STC senior class (which included 16 from the original cohort, plus four who joined in year 2 and six who joined in year 3) graduated from high school and continued to four-year universities.66 By comparison, in the 2007-2008 school year in the Oakland Unified School District, the rates for 12th Grade graduates completing all

---
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courses required for University of California and/or California State University entrance were Latino students 42.1% and African American students 30.9% (California Department of Education, 2009).

‘Born Out of Struggle’: Little Village Lawndale Social Justice High School, Chicago

Little Village in Chicago is the largest Mexican community in the U.S. Midwest. Since the late 1970s it has been steeped in community action and resistance, including a struggle to develop bilingual education in public schools. From as early as 1995 the community had put pressure on Chicago Public Schools (CPS) to build a neighbourhood, open enrolment, high school to address overcrowding in the only local public high school which had a roll of over 2,000 in a community where there were 4,000 school-aged youths (Cortez, 2008, p.20). This lobbying was eventually successful with $30 million allocated for the school in 1998.

Subsequently however, CPS overlooked parent requests and diverted the funding towards the creation of four selective-enrolment schools in other neighbourhoods in the city. Selective-enrolment schools require applicants to have a particular composite test score in order to gain entry and are mostly populated by students from white middle-income and affluent families (Stovall, 2007, p.683). With no sign of ground being broken by fall of 2000, and outraged at the decision to build the four other schools, Little Village residents attended a CPS central board meeting to be told that the funds originally allocated to their school had been spent and that CPS had made a final decision not to build the school at all (p.684).

Starving for Justice

On 13 May, 2001, Mother’s Day, four women and one man initiated a hunger strike to protest this decision. These five were joined over the following days by a further 12 residents, mostly mothers, and including one 71 year old grandmother (Cortez, 2008, p.17), one high school student and one college student, both under the age of 20. Rather than an act of desperation or outrage, Stovall (2007, p.683) describes the hunger strike as “an intensely planned strategy to alert CPS to the community’s power to resist and demand quality education.” Cortez (p.17) says, “Their act was a show of force by brave ordinary mothers who confronted a patronage political platform dominated by men in the name of community empowerment and democratic principles.”

The hunger strike took place on the corner of the vacant land set aside for the original school. The group called their camp site “Camp César Chávez” in honour of the famous Mexican-American civil rights leader. They had two demands: that construction begin on the school by the summer of 2001, and that there be community participation at all levels of planning, design, curriculum development and implementation. By 15 May, with the hunger strike gaining state and national media attention the strikers issued a public statement:
On Mother’s day, a mother’s aspirations are focused on her family and especially her children ... the most important concern is the education and safety of her children. How long will the children of Little Village be further punished with poor schools? What happened to the money budgeted for our school? Northside Preparatory and Walter Payton Academy are beautiful schools; what happened to ours? No other community has as many children. No other community has a greater need for day-care. No other community has a greater need for green recreational space. Mayor Daley, why is it that you won’t make this project a reality? We believe peaceful non-violent protests can overcome greed and arrogance. It is in this spirit that we raise the banner of the future of our children as a cause to be championed on this Mother’s Day. Long live the strike! We can do it!!! (Cortez, 2008, p.24)

The hunger strike lasted 19 days from 13 May to 1 June. Over 500 people attended the closing event held on 2 June. Strikers vowed to continue to fight. During the strike the strikers and media attention had forced a reluctant visit to the site by the chief executive of CPS who had originally stated “he did not want to come to Little Village to meet with a few women who are refusing to eat” (Friedman, 2007), and negotiated a verbal agreement from him that the high school would be built. However supporters and strikers knew they couldn’t stop the campaign until there was signed agreement from CPS and over the ensuing weeks Camp Chávez continued to be a focal site, with ‘open-mike’ sessions and festivals for youth, rallies, church services, a town meeting and even a planned “Incomplete Graduation” ceremony which was abandoned when the Camp Chávez wooden stage was mysteriously burned down. Instead, organisers placed graduation gowns and caps on a nearby fence to demonstrate how many students could have graduated had the school been opened in 1999 as promised (Cortez, 2008, p.47). Cortez (p.54) comments that Camp Chávez, “truly was a special place that embodied a force of hope by a wide range of people.”

Finally, almost four years after the end of the hunger strike, the Little Village Lawndale High School Campus opened its doors to four hundred students in the fall of 2005. The campus comprises four independent, autonomous, small schools: Multicultural Arts High School, World Language High School, Social Justice High School, and Infinity: Math, Science, and Technology High School. Each school has its own principal and teaching staff. Each school houses approximately 385 to 400 students from the neighbourhoods of North Lawndale and Little Village. At the time of construction the building was the most expensive high school built in the state of Illinois, with final construction costs of $63 million (USD) (Stovall, 2007, p.684). African-American residents in the neighbouring community of North Lawndale were included in the school formation process. To comply with the federal government’s desegregation mandate each high school is required to maintain a population that is at least 30% African-American and no more than 70% Latino/a (p.685).
Originally the activists of the hunger strike, continuing to advocate for control of the school model, went door-to-door asking parents what they considered would be the ideal situation for their children to learn in. Parents wanted a safe, small, and academically rigorous place for their children. They wanted the school to value bilingualism and biculturalism, to celebrate art, dance, and music as part of the curriculum, and to prepare students for the ever increasing jobs requiring strong math, science, and technological skills. These aspirations shaped three of the schools on the site. What surprised some educators and activists the most from the surveys was the concept of “keeping the values of peace and equity” that came out of the hunger strike alive. Parents wanted all the children who graduated from the new high school never to forget the physical, spiritual, and communal struggle it took to achieve justice. Out of this desire came the fourth school, the Social Justice High School. The core beliefs of the school are explained on the school website:

- **Truth and Transparency**
  We will practice honesty and authenticity in our communication and relationships with students, our community, peers, and ourselves.

- **Struggle and Sacrifice**
  Our struggle is against systems of power that have been historically used to deny, regulate, and prohibit access to the most basic human rights that should be granted freely to members of society regardless of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, or religious belief. We accept the reality that such struggle will require sacrifice from all involved.

- **Ownership and Agency**
  We will take responsibility as agents and catalysts of change to expose the truth about the functions of power, work (unite) to interrupt their operations, and operate as producers of power to meet the needs of the Greater Lawndale community.

- **Collective and Community Power**
  Through collective community power, we commit to a conscious effort to overcome the intended historical obstacles that have been designed to disempower and divide our communities, and thereby meet the needs of all members of Greater Lawndale for continual betterment and progress.

Stovall (2007, p.688), a member of the design team, and “one of the first persons outside the hunger strikers to be consulted on issues of curriculum” (Stovall, 2006, p.100) describes the curriculum of the Social Justice High School, which is organised around four sets of ‘knowledges’ critical to the concept of social justice: community, critical, classical, and behavioural knowledge. Community knowledge recognises that the curriculum had to be relevant to the lived experiences of the students and their families. Critical knowledge seeks to enable students to analyse aspects of injustice that are meaningful and relevant to their lives so they are equipped to challenge and address these. Classical knowledge includes the information that students need to ‘pass gate-

keeping exams and to access content-area knowledge often denied to poor students and students of color” (p.688). Behavioural knowledge, added later as staff were appointed, planned to develop knowledge of the behaviours that were conducive to learning. Stovall adds that this concept was the most difficult to communicate in the first year of the school’s operation.

Stovall (p.682) calls the process of creating a public high school centred in community accountability, “the politics of interruption” and aligns this “politically relevant pedagogy” (Beauboeuf-Lafontant, 1999 p.705) which “recognizes political, social and economic factors as relevant to the political experiences of inequity and disenfranchisement,” with Ladson-Billings’s (1999) concept of culturally relevant pedagogy.

**Symbols and Environment**

In her book *The Power of Place*, Hayden (1995) writes, “Many cultures have... attempted to embed memory in narrative elements of buildings... Common urban places like union halls, schools, and residences have the power to evoke visual, social memory” (pp.46-47). Reminiscent of the process described in Chapter 5 to develop a relevant learning environment in Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s design, the Little Village Lawndale High School Campus has incorporated traditional signs and symbols that are reflective of both communities and are permanent reminders of the struggle to build the school (Image 10).

The final design chosen is a numerological representation of the hunger strike and the Aztec story of the five worlds. The Aztec legend speaks of the elements of fire, air, water, and earth. In the school building design each element is represented by a colour shown in the bricks in each of the schools. The bricks in the multicultural arts school are green, representing the earth. The bricks in the School of Social Justice are red, representing the world of fire (also representing the colour of change). Bricks in the mathematics, science, and technology building are blue, representing water.

Image 10: A classroom mural, ‘Born out of Struggle’ in the Social Justice High School reminds students of the community’s commitment and is the motto of the school.
The world language school has purple bricks, representative of the air. Stovall (2007) describes the feature in the centre of the four schools:

The fifth world is represented in a 60-foot sundial structure in the middle of the building. To commemorate the hunger strike, points are marked in the interior of the cone. From 13 May to 1 June (the original 19 days of the strike) the sun (by way of a skylight) hits a dot marked on the interior of the cone on each of the 19 days. On 1 June, the dot reaches the center of the cone and is reflected as a beam of light on a compass on the floor of the dial. (p.687)
The sundial (Image 12) is used as collective meeting space for all four schools. Schools use the space for project displays, art projects, student meetings, and community forum. The main entrance to the four schools features bays between classrooms skewed at 19 degrees to represent the 19 days of the strike. Fourteen trees have been placed at the south end of the school to represent the 14 hunger-strikers who lasted the duration of the 19 days. A patch of tall grass rests on the north end of the campus, acknowledging the original site of Camp César Chávez (Image 11).

Visiting Little Village Lawndale Social Justice High School in 2007, standing beneath the sundial, and hearing the story of the hunger strike was a powerful experience. As well as the architectural design features, the environment is rich with student murals, mosaics, and the central space windows when we visited hosted a display of silhouettes of civil rights leaders and images for social justice (Image 13).68

“Tú eres mi otro yo/You are my other me”: Raza Studies, Tucson Unified School District

In 2009 I spent a week in Tucson, Arizona, hosted by Dr Augustine Romero, Director of Student Equity for the Tucson Unified School District (TUSD). I was specifically interested in the work of the Raza Studies Department and their “Critically Compassionate Intellectualism Model of Transformative Education” (CCI), (Cammarota & Romero, 2006, p.22, Romero, Arce & Cammarota, 2009), developed through research within the Social Justice Education Project (SJEP) at the University of Arizona. I was able to meet and speak with many youths, teachers, Raza Studies and Ethnic Studies departmental staff, parents. I visited high schools, a middle school, two elementary (primary) schools and a parent education class. I also spent time with graduates from different cohorts of the Social Justice Project, now undergraduates at the University of Arizona and working as student-workers and mentors in the programme’s schools. The experience made a lasting positive impression.

Unlike the previous two examples, the Raza Studies programme is not based in one specific school, rather it is a district programme that operates across several school sites using itinerating Raza Studies tutors who partner with and resource the classroom teachers. Another difference from the previous examples is that this programme is not limited to high school students, but now involves younger middle and elementary students as well. However, the focus on Chicano culture and identity through critical pedagogy and critical race theory counter-storytelling closely aligns this programme with the goals and the practice of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School.

68 Photographs in this section were taken by me during my visit in 2007

69 La Raza is a Spanish phrase that may be translated as "the race" or "the people." In the United States, "La Raza" is sometimes used to denote people of Chicano (i.e. Mexican American) and Mexican descent. In 2010 this programme was renamed Mexican American Studies (MAS).
The Social Justice Education Project began in 2003 in a class at Cholla High School in Tucson with a group of 16 students who had largely been disengaged from school and on the verge of dropping out.

The premise was straightforward: teach students research skills and allow them to use their research to address inequities that students of color experience in public schools. The results astounded everyone. [The students] all graduated from high school, and 12 of them went on to college. They gave presentations at academic conferences to standing ovations. (University of Arizona, 2007)

At Cholla High School at that time, Dr. Julio Cammarota, from the University of Arizona and Augustine Romero, with another teacher at the high school, teamed up to develop the programme. They expanded the curriculum of a history course to include Chicano studies and qualitative social science methods. Again, as with the other groups in all of the programmes described here, students were taught the techniques they needed to engage in ethnographic research—a mix of new and traditional, media and academic, critical literacies. Again, the students chose the issues they wanted to study, initially media representation of students of colour, stereotypes, critical thinking vs passivity in education and loss of culture. Again, they produced written reports and videos and presented their findings to their school, community, school board, and city and state officials, and again, students’ engagement in their education was completely turned around.

Research topics in the programme’s schools have included the racial hierarchy and “patterns of unevenness and injustice” (Cammarota, 2008, p.52), the conditions in the special education programme, the over-representation of white students in advanced placement classes, timetabling (scheduling) that acted as a barrier to academic progress, and the physical conditions of their schools. I watched one student presentation during my visit that had documented a 2009 school environment that certainly pulled no punches and was stark evidence of inequality within the school. From 16 students in 2003, the programme grew to include 125 students at three high schools: Cholla, Tucson High and Rincon by 2007. In 2009, I visited high school, middle school and elementary school classes.

Cammarota (Romero, Cammarota, et al., 2008, p.136 ) explains that in many respects the Social Justice Education Project draws from the “Funds of Knowledge” approach (González & Moll, 2002). This approach holds that, “instruction must be linked to students’ lives and that the details of effective pedagogy should be linked to local histories and community contexts” (González & Moll, 2002 p.623) and that students’ learning is bound up within larger contextual historical, political, and ideological frameworks that impact their lives. The simple underlying premise of the “Funds of Knowledge” concept is that people are competent and have knowledge that comes from their life experiences. However, knowledge is not neutral and particular types of knowledge are academically validated in school, while the social and cultural capital of students with different funds of knowledge is negated in this process. The goals of the Social Justice Education Project are
to provide students with, “a truly equitable education, academic rigor, the opportunity to develop a critical consciousness, the social and academic scaffolds necessary to dramatically increase the level of student success, assistance to enter the world independently, and preparation to provide leadership to their world.”

The Ethnic Studies Department in the Tucson Unified School District has, since 2004, brought together the Raza Studies, Pan-Asian Studies, African-American Studies and Native-American Studies programmes under one umbrella. Although I met some staff from the other three programmes my specific interest, and the focus of the information in this section is the Raza Studies programme, which was developed out of the Social Justice Education Project. The approach developed by the Raza Studies programme combines the essential characteristics of critical pedagogy, compassionate student/teacher relationships, and social justice content (Figure 48). This model, co-constructed and defined by the students from the SJEP’s first cohort, is called, “critically compassionate intellectualism” (CCI) (Romero, Arce, & Cammarota, 2009).

Figure 48: Critically Compassionate Intellectualism Model of Transformative Education. (Romero, Arce, & Cammarota, 2009, p.222)

---

70 Raza Studies Department, Tucson Unified School District website: http://instech.tusd.k12.az.us/Raza/justice.asp
In Chapter 4, I explained that the intent of our schools’ self-lens was never to be a stepping stone to perpetuate the western academic hegemony that has relegated Māori and Pasifika learners to the margins in our education system. Intentionally counter-hegemonic, the self-lens exists to legitimate and validate Māori and Pasifika knowledges and values as valid in their own right. Similarly, Romero, et al. (2009) state that the primary intent of the SJEP was not to foster academic proficiency or an academic identity, but, rather, to help students develop their critical consciousness and, through this process, to help the students develop a strong sense of organic intellectualism:

Very seldom, if ever, did we dialogue about doing better in this class, much less other classes. The same is true about the notion of academic identity; the dialogue regarding identity is that of the social, cultural and historic self. In essence we discussed who the students are, where they come from, and what this means in the present day context, as well as how this understanding could transform their lives and help them engage their epistemology today and transform the ontology they will carry into tomorrow.

(p.231)

Cammarota (2008 p.48) cites Freire (1998), who contends that marginalized communities must act to change their lived social context, and it is through conscious, organized actions that they produce or create new cultural forms. The SJEP and CCI are two forms that have evolved in this programme. Through ongoing interaction with their students and from the students’ own feedback came a need to explain more explicitly the essence of critically compassionate intellectualism, and how this was experienced by the students. Romero, et al (2009, p.219) call this the “Third Dimension” of the programme. The six elements of CCI’s Third Dimension are:

1. The nurturing of blossoming intellectualism (Xinachtli) through authentic caring.
2. Pedagogy de los barrios (barrio pedagogy).
3. Students as creators of knowledge.
4. Focus on collective and individual agency.
5. Organic intellectualism.
6. Academic and personal transformation.

The most powerful demonstration of the Third Dimension came from a 12th Grade class of students at Tucson High School when I questioned them about the value of the Raza Studies programme. After several responses around the class one young man, without any prompting from the teacher, suggested they should say “In Lak’ech” for me and, just as the East Oakland class had delivered “The Definite Dozen,” the Tucson class recited the philosophy in unison (Figure 49).

There are many parallels between this indigenous philosophy and a Māori worldview. The Māori pepeha (traditional saying), ‘Ko au ko koe, ko koe ko au - I am you and you are me’ (Macfarlane et al, 2008, p.119) is a direct example. So too is Te Whānau o Tupuranga's whakataukī (proverb) which refers to planting the seeds in the young so they will grow to bear fruit to provide nourishment for future generations. The first element of the Tezkatlipokas, Xinachtli (Chee-nach-
tlee) is a Chicano indigenous concept meaning a process of nurturing the *semillas* (seeds) of knowledge. This element deals with authentic caring and love—again similar to Māori concepts of whānau. Students commented their teachers were like *tios* (uncles) and one said, “There was that love, there was that *cariño*, there was that touch; you guys could relate to us, it was a relief. Finally, somebody that understood where we were coming from.” (Romero et al., 2009, p.221)

Figure 49: *In Lak'ech* and the Four *Tezkatlipocas*: Raza Studies Programme, Tucson

**In Lak’ech**

- Tú eres mi otro yo / You are my other me.
- Si te hago daño a ti / If I do harm to you,
- Me hago daño a mí mismo / I do harm to myself;
- Se tea mo y respeto / If I love and respect you,
- Me amo y respeto yo / I love and respect myself.

**The Four Tezkatlipocas**

1. **Tezkatlipoka**—self-reflection. Smoking mirror.
   We must vigorously search within ourselves, by silencing the distractions and obstacles in our lives, in order to be warriors for our *gente* and justice.

2. **Quetzalkoatl**—precious and beautiful knowledge.
   Gaining perspective on events and experiences that our ancestors endured, allows us to become more fully realized human beings. We must listen to each other and our elders with humility and love in order to hear the indigenous wisdom in our hearts.

3. **Huitzilopochtli**—the will to act.
   As we grow in consciousness, we must be willing to act with a revolutionary spirit that is positive, progressive and creative.

4. **Xipe Totek**—transformation.
   Our source of strength that allows us to transform and renew. We must have the strength to shed the old which may hinder us, while embracing and accepting our new consciousness in order to transform the world.

The second element in CCI’s Third Dimension is *Pedagogy de los barrios* or “barrio pedagogy,” a term defined by Jeff Duncan-Andrade in his work with the Raza Studies department in Tucson. This pedagogy changes community and school and converges both in a ‘third space’ that challenges and changes the ‘white spaces’:

Within this pedagogy are the Freirean elements of problematization, true words, and tri-dimensionalization (Freire 1994). It is also crucial that we define these critical intellectual engagements as taking place both in the barrio and in the school. Moreover, the third space that is created in our classrooms is a convergence of the barrio and the institution. This third space challenges the status quo and the stereotypes that exist within our educational institutions. This is a newly created
pedagogical space that is driven by the need to challenge the epistemological and ontological understandings of our students and in many case their parents. (Romero et al., 2009, p.227)

The role of students as creators of knowledge is an important Third Dimension element and a theme that is consistent across the three examples in this chapter and in our two Otara schools. The fourth element, a focus on collective and individual agency, is again a common theme; the concept that acting upon and countering injustice benefits the individual but also benefits the community, the whānau, and future generations. This concept, framed in CCI within a Chicano indigenous framework of Huitzilopochtli (Weet-zee-lo-poch-tlee) - (see Figure 49), or within Māori or Pasifika epistemology, the idea of the collective, of whanaungatanga, and the continuity of past, present, and future is a strong influence. This in turn creates the fifth element, organic intellectualism. Romero et al, (p. 229), cite Gramsci’s (1999) definition, “the means by which the oppressed do for themselves, for their own good,” the development of a critical consciousness—the ‘Warrior-Scholars or intellectuals’ described in Chapter 5.

The final element of the Third Dimension of CCI is the academic and personal transformation that again, each of the schools in this chapter can attest to. Romero, in an interview for the Latino Perspectives magazine (March 2008) described the three basic stages in this process: “One, we hope to develop a sense of identity in our students. Two, we hope to develop a sense of purpose. Those two things together then allow them to develop a stronger sense of hope.” Olivia, an Social Justice Education Project student, describes her transformation this way:

Your class got me really interested in learning and like education because, like before, I probably wouldn’t have graduated on time because I was already really behind... I had a lot of family problems and I ended up not going to school for a whole year. After I became involved with the project, I had a lot of motivation to get finished, and, like the class, really made on impression on me that without education, without a high school diploma and going on to college, you really wouldn’t be successful in life. I did better in all my classes; I think I knew that if I could do all the college assignments in our class, I could do the other BS stuff in my other class. I realized that I wanted an education. (Romero 2008, p.186, cited in Romero et al, 2009, p.231)

In 2008 the students in the Social Justice Education Project who experienced the CCI passed Arizona’s high stakes exit exam at a higher rate than all other similarly situated non-SJEP/CCI students at the four high school sites which are involved in the SJEP and use the CCI. Also, over the last four years’ graduating classes the SJEP/CCI students graduated at a higher rate than similarly situated non SJEP/CCI Anglo students in the four schools (Romero, Arce, & Cammarota, 2009, p.219).
However, for me, an even more important evaluation was observing the work being done and listening to the young people involved in the programme. In all of the schools I saw culturally, politically and critically rich environments. Students’ work, slogans, posters and Chicano philosophy and cultural artefacts were present in every room. I visited two elementary school classes, two middle school classes, who combined for our visit, and four different high school classes in two high schools. In each one I asked questions about what they were learning and why, and about the impact the Raza Studies class or classes on their other learning. In the elementary schools children told me about learning, reading and writing in Spanish, and about learning stories from their ancestors. They explained traditional stories and I watched a class rehearsing a traditional story as a play and learning traditional dance. In the middle school, I was invited to present a lesson to the students so this dialogue was more about their questions, than mine. They asked about culture and identity and working as a family and drew comparisons between their programme and ours.

At one elementary school I visited a Family Centre and sat in on a class for mothers, who were learning about their culture from the TUSD Raza Studies staff. In a conversation that had to be translated from English to Spanish and vice versa, mothers, some with tears in their eyes, told me they were learning and now understanding how their culture had been lost. One mother said:

They are teaching us about our true history, how it is that when Europeans came over, the colonisation templates that they placed here made our ancestors look like savages, unintelligent and uncivilised—so it’s looking at our history from our perspective as indigenous people.  

In the high schools I saw students studying a 17-year-old legal battle over how Arizona treats students who are still learning English, which had been argued the week before the U.S. Supreme Court. I watched students studying a Martin Luther King speech about war and identifying elements of pathos and ethos in the text. I sat in a class where, in the middle of the Arizona desert, the school was holding a theme ‘Beach Day’ and students were wearing water wings and carrying inflatable beach toys, and also preparing for the end of their final school year and their senior prom just a few days away. I saw this same class however, present serious documentaries about inequalities in their school. Students spoke of how the two year (11th and 12th Grade, junior and senior years) programme had changed lives. Some of their comments speak to their achievement and learning far better than any test score could, and they exemplify all of the elements of the critically compassionate intellectualism that is the project’s goal. Each of the following comments is made by a different student:

---

71 Quotes in this section are spoken comments transcribed from video footage filmed during personal visits and meetings.
These classes really opened my eyes to a lot of things. They taught me humanisation and that’s a really big part now of how I try to live my life. I want to become a teacher so I want to keep this going.

My theory is that although some people classify these classes as racist, that’s the opposite of what we do in this space. I think these classes help us connect with other people and other cultures. Because we have respect for our culture now we should show respect for other cultures, so it helps us to interact more.

In these classes we learn concepts that our ancestors used to use in their lives (points to posters on wall). One of the main ones we’ve learned is ‘In La’kech’ which is about treating everybody the way you like to be treated. That helps us a lot in life and that connects us to people and that’s how we became like a big family.

This class has built up my level of confidence to where I feel like I can do anything, because this class is much more challenging than other ones. It presents information to you, but it’s your choice to go out and get more of it. In other classes, it’s given to you whether you want it or not.

It’s a very effective programme. It helps open up students’ minds and helps them see clearly. You’re not fed information here, you’ve got to go out and search for it.

It develops your critical thinking skills and instead of just taking what you’ve learned and not even applying it to life, with classes like this you can take different tools, learning methods, research—it just broadens your intellectual side of you—like it brings out the best of you.

It’s very empowering. You learn a lot about your culture that regular text books don’t even mention, or they say it in one paragraph and that’s usually negative.

What I think is different is that in here we can actually express our true feelings and we won’t get into trouble for it. In other classes, like the class across the hall [there is laughter all around the room as everyone understands], if you say certain things you get put down.

What I get from this class is that I like that we get our own voice and that we don’t have to follow what everyone has just told us like, “It’s this way, this way.” No. You can work any way you want and you can learn anything. I like how our teachers work for us—so hard—they go out and look for our stories so we can feel at home.

I also spent a morning with graduates of the Raza Studies programme, now giving back to the programme as mentors and co-workers in the Social Justice Education Project while continuing with their own study. One young woman summed up the whole programme this way:
The mesquite tree is native to Tucson and it can’t grow without roots. I would say this gives a perfect explanation of the last two years in the project where you are just laying down the ground area and allowing us to grow roots in our culture and, once the students have roots in their culture and know who they are, they can grow. Before that, they can’t grow. They can’t grow academically or socially but when they learn to love themselves and they grow, they learn to love other people, and their culture, and their community, and they want to take care of it. All of that takes place in their two years and it’s like a transformation.

Running for Justice

It could be expected that, with the academic achievement of the SJEP students, together with the strong committed support of families, the advocacy of eminent educators and universities, and the calibre of the passionate, articulate, confident, young people I met, and whose learning I witnessed, that this programme would receive the highest support and praise from education authorities. Unfortunately, as with all the other examples in this section, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the opposition to the SEJP and the Raza Studies programmes has been sustained and vitriolic—vehemently supported, in fact spearheaded, by the Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tom Horne, and attacked in a string of negative media reports over several years.

On 11 June, 2007. Horne wrote an open letter to the citizens of Tucson (Horne, 2007) which started with the heading, “The TUSD Ethnic Studies Program Should be Terminated.” Labelling the programme as, ‘destructive ethnic chauvinism” Horne stated his belief that, “people are individuals, not exemplars of racial groups. What is important about people is what they know, what they can do, their ability to appreciate beauty, their character, and not what race into which they are born.” He urged the citizens of Tucson to bring pressure on the school board to close down Ethnic Studies, however his specific target, made clear in the letter, was Raza Studies.

The ensuing media attention included headlines like, “Raza Studies Defy American Values,”72 “Secretive Raza studies in Tucson district need close look,”73 “Horne takes to task Raza Studies teachers,”74 and “TUSD’s Raza Studies called divisive.”75 Commonly-used phrases in these articles called the programme “anti-American” and accused it of teaching young people to “hate whites.” In June 2009 the campaign to close the programme was again escalated by Horne, who was quoted in the Arizona Daily Star as saying, “I have tried for two years, using publicity and persuasion, to attempt to convince the Tucson Unified School District to put a stop to this dysfunctional program.

72 CNN: 2 July, 2008
73 The Arizona Republic, 20 January, 2008
75 The Arizona Daily Star, 1 January, 2008
They have refused. The next step is legislation” (Scarpinato, 2009). His proposal was to amend a State Senate Bill (SB1069), with two additions which read:

15-110. Declaration of policy
The legislature finds and declares that public school pupils should be taught to treat and value each other as individuals and not based on ethnic background.
15-111. Prohibited courses and classes; enforcement
A school district or charter school in this state shall not include in the program of instruction any courses or classes that either:
1. are designed primarily for pupils of a particular ethnic group.
2. advocate ethnic solidarity instead of the treatment of PUPILS as individuals.
(Arizona State Legislature, 2009)

Sponsored by Senator Jonathon Paton, SB1069 proposed a 10% cut to the Tucson Unified School District’s overall funding if they persisted with the Ethnic Studies programmes. In an editorial in The State Press, Ben Berkley wrote:

“The job of the public schools is to develop the student’s identity as Americans and as strong individuals,” Horne said in a Friday news release supporting the passage of the bill.
“It’s not the job of the public schools to promote ethnic chauvinism,” he said. And amazingly, just like that, Horne, showed in 30 words how we have remained among the nation’s worst in education rankings during his 7-year tenure. (Berkley, 2009)

SB1069 was approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee, chaired by Senator Paton, with a 4-3 vote on 16 June, 2009, and needed final approval from both chambers of the Legislature and the Arizona State Governor to become law, but the community took action. On 27 June, 2009, over 50 young people ran over 190 kilometres in heat of up to 45 degrees celsius, across the desert from Tucson to Phoenix. It took them two days and they were joined by hundreds of supporters from the barrios and communities of Tucson, Eloy, Casa Blanca, Guadalupe and Phoenix, both as the run progressed, and on arrival in Phoenix where they marched to the State Capitol Building. It also involved the spiritual support from the Native-American Yoeme and Akimel O’odham nations when runners passed through their territory.

Faced with this opposition, Senator Paton had withdrawn the bill before the runners arrived in Phoenix. However, the following day, Horne said that he would try again to eliminate ethnic studies next year. Roberto Rodriguez described the run in Arizona Watch (7 July, 2009):

There is not enough room on this page to convey the actual story of this run. Everyone who participated came back with historias sagradas, profound truths. This run will one day rank as an event akin to Cesar Chavez’s fasts or the student walkouts of a generation ago: a monument of what people are capable of when they believe in something. As one of the
young people noted, “We went to fight against an anti-ethnic studies bill, but what we really came for was to know ourselves. (Rodriguez, 2009)

Augustine Romero explains that the run was about healing and it was linked to indigenous traditional practice:

The Run was used as a channel to carry out positive change in our communities, and in our State. The Run was not a march, a rally, or a race; but rather, an opportunity for our people to work united with all the rest of creation to bring about healing.

In addition, the Run was a reflection of a historical Indigenous tradition that brings about change through prayer. It is believed that the energy that is projected from the momentum of the run, its runners and their intentions and their constant connection to the earth will be reciprocated in the form of a healing and ultimately a blessing.76

However the run, along with further protest action the following year, was in vain. The bill was reintroduced and passed, and on 1 January 2011 the ban on the Ethnic Studies programme became law in Arizona, with the Tucon Unified School District (TUSD) facing a penalty of the loss of 10 percent of its state funding (approx. $15 million USD) if its schools do not comply. Despite an independently commissioned study, which validated the success of the district’s Mexican American Studies programme, State Schools’ superintendent John Huppenthal still found the district out of compliance with the state’s anti-Ethnic Studies law (Grado, 2011). On 10 January, 2012 the Tucson Unified School District board voted to suspend Mexican American studies classes to avoid losing state aid. One legal challenge to the state’s decision remains: a federal lawsuit filed by 11 teachers and two students who contend that the state law violates their 1st Amendment rights. After the appeal hearing in Phoenix Dr. Roberto Rodriguez, a professor at the University of Arizona, commented:

This six-year war against MAS (Mexican American Studies) is about what is permissible knowledge vs. banned knowledge. It is about banned books and about banned curriculums. In this instance, it is a war against Indigenous Knowledge. (Rodriguez, 2011)

While this situation and the extreme protest actions these communities have felt were necessary might seem outrageous to New Zealand readers there are stark similarities in our own educational history and practice in New Zealand schools, which the schools in this study show.

“Sitting-In” for Justice

The Clover Park Middle School Board of Trustees was once accused, by a senior Ministry of Education official, that simply keeping the first group of senior students on our campus, in spite of

76 Personal email from Dr. Augustine Romero, 1 September, 2009.
the Minister of Education’s specific instructions they should be enrolled in other schools, was tantamount to staging a “sit-in.” The Board agreed, and kept sitting. By comparison with the protest action taken in East Oakland, Little Village and Tucson, sitting-in may seem relatively innocuous, however, protest, in the form of simply going ahead and carrying out the community’s wishes in the face of prolonged and bitter resistance from education authorities, has been sustained by the Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga communities over three separate struggles spread over 25 years. Whatever the type of action taken, each of the communities described has refused to accept the status quo for their children and has gone to extraordinary lengths, in the face of extreme opposition, to achieve an educational model that is relevant to their values and beliefs about learning, achievement, culture and identity.

**Challenged Spaces**

Each of these contexts is different, across different ethnic groups, school systems, legislation and international borders however, there are remarkable similarities across the solutions each of these four communities has developed to challenge the system’s white space. These fall into seven broad categories (Figure 50):

1. Race, ethnicity and cultural identity are central to their curriculum and practice. Each school or programme works successfully across different ethnic groups on the same sites or in the same classes.

2. The programmes developed in each context have been strongly supported and driven by parents and community, who often become strong advocates for the initiatives due to the engagement they see in their children. Parents have been prepared to take risks and to trust the programmes. All programmes have been developed in underserved communities with youth who have been minoritised by their respective societies. The community has been actively involved in the design of environments, the curriculum, and in discussing the historical significance of cultural leaders, artefacts, symbols and sites.

3. The programmes are based in authentic caring, love, whānau, cariño, or compassion. Across all sites the young people are not seen as “other people’s children” (Delpit 1999) and the building of relationships of trust and care is crucial and genuine. There is a clear continuum across cohorts and generations and an expectation of reciprocity. Young people see their connectivity to each other and to their past and future, and their responsibility to advocate for change that will better the collective.

4. All these programmes are informed by critical theory and the work of Paulo Freire. They are based in critical pedagogy and critical race theory which see racism as a ‘given,’ and are driven by social justice goals for humanisation, conscientisation and transformation through critical praxis. The curriculum is based in the community and in the realities youth experience in education, and in society. Examples of this curriculum and delivery are the
pedagogy of whānau in Te Whānau of Tupuranga, the barrio and Raza Studies pedagogies developed in Tucson.

Figure 50: Seven key principles common to three U.S.A. programmes, and Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga

5. Students are involved in the identification of issues and the production of knowledge through participatory action research. All four programmes draw heavily on other knowledges—traditional cultural knowledge and practices, youth knowledge and culture, and community knowledge, that are usually considered irrelevant or peripheral to core or national curricula. Contexts for study are youth-centred. Students are highly engaged with new media literacies through the use of information and communications technology and
digital resources, as well as learning advanced traditional literacies. All four programmes have extremely high expectations for the achievement of academic standards and outcomes and the development of “Warrior-Scholars.”

6. There is a high stakes ‘end result’ that gives students a purpose for their learning. Students present their research to well-informed and critical peers, to parents and families, to staff, administration, educators and academics outside the school, legislators, members of parliament, and city councils. They speak at highly-regarded conferences alongside adult academics and answer questions about their research.

7. Each community has faced resistance and barriers over sustained time but has not allowed these to dictate or change their direction. The programmes are all intentionally counter-hegemonic.

These programmes provide the counter-narrative to the rhetoric of school reform and the intense focus on technical knowledge and high stakes testing and standards. They don’t try to change the children, they aim to change the white spaces so that children can flourish. Cammarota explains why this works:

My personal experience as an educator within the SJEP tells me that a social justice alternative is far more successful than the dominant strategy of high stakes testing and remedial education. The latter disconnects learning from social context, and the former links learning to the student’s lived experience so that he or she can realize how education can be a tool to transform one’s existence. (Cammarota 2007 p.95)

The global lens connects our students to knowledge and learning beyond the school. This section had made the connection between our programme and those of other indigenous and ethnic minority youth, engaged in the same struggle. The key principles that are working effectively across all four sites have been identified. These key principles are also clearly visible in the project described in the next section—an initiative that is connecting students in Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga to the future and to the community through critical media literacy and the development of advanced information technology.

**Digital Spaces**

So it was an instrument of radical change—that’s what they thought it was. And then around about the middle of the 1980s ...this computer got into the hands of school administrations and the ministries and the commissioners of education, state education departments. And now look what they did with them; no longer are there computers in the hands of visionary teachers in the classrooms. The establishment pulls together and now they've got a computer classroom, there's a computer curriculum, and there's a special computer teacher. In other words, the computer has been thoroughly assimilated to the way you do things in school. (Papert, in Papert & Freire, late 1980s)
In this conversation with Paulo Freire in the late 1980s, Seymour Papert signals the potential dangers inherent in the rapid expansion of technology in schools. The predominant response of governments and educators has been to attempt to bridge or close the so-called “digital divide” by providing more equitable access to information and communications technology in schools.

Even when the issue of access and the ratio of students to computers is addressed, with the provision of information technology hardware and infrastructure in schools, other problems surface. Warschauer, Knobel, and Stone (2004, p.574) find important differences in the quality of computer equipment and in the way computers are used between low and high-SES schools. They identify three overall patterns of access and use which they label, “performativity,” “workability,” and “complexity.” The pattern of performativity, or technology as a checklist, where teachers see the completion of technology tasks as an end in itself, was common across all schools regardless of their socio-economic status. However, the effect of this pattern on low-SES students was exacerbated when reinforced by teachers’ low expectations and assumptions about their students and tasks were set at the most basic levels. The pattern of workability, concerns about the stability or robustness of digital networks in schools, was also consistent across both types of school, however wealthier schools were able to afford better technical support and more professional development of staff, which in turn created more widespread teacher use of the new technologies. In the third pattern, complexity, greater differences became much more evident in low-SES schools. Complexity refers to the difficulty teachers faced in actually integrating computers in their teaching. Teachers in low-SES schools identified major differences: the pressure of high stakes testing which caused them to focus on raising test scores, limited home computer access which meant students did not have the same level of familiarity with computers and had to spend more in-class time on these skills, and a disproportionate number of students who were English language learners which made it more difficult for them to access the English-based digital environment. All of these patterns and issues are relevant to low-decile New Zealand schools such as the two in this study.

Kucukaydin & Tisdell (2008) examine the implicit assumptions underpinning the inequitable access discourse. They point out that increased access to technology cannot cure historically embedded social ills such as racism, classism, injustice, inequality, and discrimination:

The digital divide discourse has been employed and successfully utilized in such a way that an intellectual army has been created to serve to maintain dominant hegemony and its new form. Consciously or unconsciously, by participating in a discourse that emphasizes “closing” and “bridging”, we educators are neglecting other social inequities and have served to maintain the hegemonic dominance. . . . If we frankly care about closing the digital divide and creating a chance for dominated groups to find their voices and be able to participate equitably in society, we need to work for liberation by creating a ground for change. . . . Without sincere attempts at elimination of historical inequities, uncritically digitizing schools only
serves the interest of the dominant culture and continues to perpetuate the status quo. (Kucukaydin and Tisdell 2008)

Yang (2007) also warns that digital spaces can reproduce the same racist relations that suppress the subjectivities of poor people and people of colour and that “democracy is an oft-touted ideal in wiring poor communities of color” (p.11). However, he also points out that the availability of instant communication through hand-held new media to marginalised youth is completely unprecedented in history and it provides youth with the ability to mobilise at a speed and in ways that have not previously been possible.

On one hand, charitable educators and government agencies seek to increase access to the information highway in order to produce compliant citizens for a global economy. On the other hand, youth subvert these resources to become counter-citizens, indulging in pleasure, resisting the “civilizing” project of education, and in some cases, organizing for the disruption of that very global economy. (Yang, 2007 p.12)

The development of social networking sites such as Myspace, Bebo and Facebook, all heavily used by youth, are examples of this. Yang describes the use of Myspace and text messaging by East Oakland Community High School youth in March 2006 to organise the entire student body within 48 hours to become the largest participant group in the walkout of over 40,000 students from across Southern California to protest proposed immigration legislation.

Ciro: And what I found really impressive is that teachers didn't give them those tools. It wasn't something that the school really talked about a lot. It’s that they were so creative enough, to use technology to mobilize. (Yang, 2007, p.20)

As stated in Chapter 2, this high use of media by youth is consistent with New Zealand findings. Fryer & Palmer, 2009, found that Māori aged 15-24 years are over-represented amongst a group of New Zealanders who are heavy and extensive users of electronic media devices. However, a comparison of just one aspect of these data (the percentage of households nationally with internet access) with the findings of a survey of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School students and families in 2009, clearly shows how wide the divide is when broken down into specific communities (Figure 51). The response of the two schools and the community to address the issues of access and skills, as well as the hegemony and social inequities, is the development of Clubhouse 274.

---

Myspace is a social networking service which launched in August 2003 and is headquartered in Beverly Hills, California. From 2005 until early 2008, Myspace was the most visited social networking site in the world. Bebo is a social networking website launched in July 2005 and is currently owned and operated by Criterion Capital Partners after taking over from AOL in June 2010. As of January, 2012, Facebook has more than 800 million active users. A January 2009 Compete.com study ranked Facebook as the most used social networking service by worldwide monthly active users. (Wikipedia, 2012).
Clubhouse 274: Community Empowerment through ICT

*Student interviewer:* How has Clubhouse 274 impacted on your child’s life?
*Parent:* It has impacted positively on her because she has gained a lot of knowledge in the use of technology.

*Student interviewer:* Do you think these skills will help her in the future?
*Parent:* It will help her a lot in any career pathway she chooses. I know this because I am not familiar with using the computer but she helps me a lot. I hope she knows how fortunate she is because back then we never had a computer.

*Student interviewer:* How do you feel when your child attends Clubhouse?
*Parent:* I feel happy because I know my child is in a safe environment where she is learning heaps of new stuff every day.

*Student interviewer:* What is your opinion of Clubhouse 274?
*Parent:* I believe Clubhouse 274 is an awesome learning environment because I’ve seen the change in my child since the day she has started Clubhouse—her life and education are getting better and better.  

This exchange aptly sums up the vision of Clubhouse 274: to engage young people in advanced level technology to give them the skills they need for the future and, through their knowledge and experience, to empower their families and the wider community. A student Clubhouse 274 member, when interviewed on a national Pasifika television programme on her return from her participation in a global “Youth Voices” forum, shows her understanding of the wider issues:

---

78 This quote has been transcribed from a video made by Clubhouse 274 students especially for the launch of Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi’s “Tech Pā” initiative. A group of Clubhouse 274 members travelled to Whakatane for this event and their video was screened for dignitaries, staff and youth at the launch in September, 2009.

79 Two Clubhouse 274 members travelled to Stanford University in California to attend the Adobe Youth Voices Summit in 2009. The purpose of the AYV project is to empower youth to create media for social change and foster a deeper sense of social and civic engagement.
I think it’s important for Pacific Island youth - like, our voices aren’t heard and, for example, the media, they change our point of view. In the Clubhouse they can’t do that because we produce our own media and we voice our own concerns, and we get to hear it back without the media changing our stories. (Maxwell, 2009)

Clubhouse 274 is located on the Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga campus. The Clubhouse is run by a charitable trust made up of representatives of the school, the community and business and information technology advisers. I am the schools’ representative on the Computer Clubhouse Trust Board where I hold the position of secretary. I am also one of two designated ‘Kaitiaki’ (caretakers or guardians) on the board, charged with ensuring the direction of the board stays true to its original vision of empowering a whole community through Information and communications technology, in ways that are relevant to Māori and Pasifika learners. I have been actively involved in this project since its inception in 2004. The Trust Board has granted me full access to all Clubhouse 274 documents, videos, minutes and records for the purpose of this thesis.  

The Clubhouse 274 Journey

Early in 2004 an approach was made to the Clover Park Middle School Board of Trustees by an Otara community organisation, Houhanga Rongo, to propose we work together to provide an after-school programme. Houhanga Rongo had a vision for reconciliation and community development, and a strong commitment to empowering individuals and families (Rethinking Crime and Punishment, 2006). One of the programmes they had initiated involved after-school tutoring to children in literacy and computer skills, reading, maths, art and drama, with the help of volunteer tutors from the community. They were seeking a new venue for this programme.

Over several meetings we discussed possibilities and one that captured our interest was the work of the Intel Computer Clubhouse Network, based in Boston, U.S.A. The proposal to pursue this initiative was approved by the Clover Park Board of Trustees on 3 May, 2004. The name, “Clubhouse 274” represents the phone number prefix of the Otara community and is a term often used by youth to refer to the neighbourhood. At this very early stage none of us could have dreamed of the benefits this decision and partnership would bring to young people in our schools and community.

The proposal gathered momentum through the next few months. As there were no other Computer Clubhouses in New Zealand, four of us visited the only one in Australia, in Fitzroy, Melbourne. We signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Computer Clubhouse Network in Boston, the first step in the formal licensing process. We formed an official Charitable Trust, which then signed a

---

80 Computer Clubhouse Trust Board Minutes, 29 May, 2009
81 This chapter has been given to Board members for their input and feedback as members of this “whānau of interest.”
82 The name, Clubhouse 274 has been changed to Studio 274 since October, 2012 (see Footnote 22)
Third Part Occupancy Agreement with the Ministry of Education agreeing to the Clubhouse use of part of the school site. The venture was launched with a civic reception, hosted on the school marae on 19 August 2004, by Manukau City’s Mayor, Sir Barry Curtis, who also agreed to become the Trust’s first Kairangi (Patron). In his foreword to the three year evaluation of Clubhouse 274, chairman of the Trust Board, Max Purdy, describes Clubhouse 274 project “as a very pragmatic set of interventions that has seen a unique spirit of cooperation across a multitude of private, charitable, public and industry partnerships (Clubhouse Trust Board, 2009). The project has certainly brought all these groups together as advocates and supporters of the Clubhouse. It has also brought into the schools’ campus people from industry and business who had never previously set foot in South Auckland, let alone in Otara.

The Intel Computer Clubhouse Network

The Intel Computer Clubhouse Network is an international community of over 123 Computer Clubhouses located in 23 different countries around the world. Computer Clubhouses provide a creative and safe out-of-school learning environment where young people from underserved communities work with adult mentors to explore their own ideas, develop skills, and build confidence in themselves through the use of technology. Independent research (Kafai, Peppler, & Chapman, 2009, p.xi) describes the Computer Clubhouse as a place that is, “both intellectually and emotionally safe, a highly challenging learning environment that takes into account the home, school, and social worlds members are part of and builds bridges to their futures.”

This preparation of youth members to take leadership roles in their lives and communities in the future is a goal equally as valuable as technological and design skills. Four key guiding principles help facilitate this development (Kafai et al., 2009, pp 20-24). Firstly, youth participate in the Clubhouse from choice. They come and go as they please and as often as they choose. Once in the Clubhouse they choose their own projects and learning is self-directed. Secondly, Clubhouse design facilitates youth working together as an emergent community of learners, alongside adult mentors who model creativity and innovative learning. Thirdly, the Clubhouse approach puts a high priority on developing a culture of respect and trust. In the Clubhouse “respect” includes respect for people, ideas, tools and equipment and a reciprocal relationship of trust and respect between adults and youth members that allows youth freedom to experiment, take time, make mistakes and finally to meet high expectations and high standards in their designs and creations. The fourth principle is to do with the fundamental model of learning and education in the Clubhouse where the focus is on construction rather than the instruction (emphasis in original) often prevalent in schooling models. This theoretical underpinning of the Clubhouse learning approach is explained in more detail in the next section.
Constructionism

The Clubhouse constructionist learning model is informed by the work of Papert and subsequent research into technology in the inner city (Kafai & Resnick, 1996; Resnick, Rusk, & Cooke 1999; Sanyal, Mitchell & Schön,1999). “Constructionism views learning as building relationships between old and new learning in interactions with others, while creating artefacts of social relevance” (Kafai et al., 2009, p.3). Papert’s theory of learning is based on Piaget’s (1954) notion of constructivism, however Papert makes the following distinction between the two:

Constructionism—the N word as opposed to the V word – shares constructivism’s view of learning as ‘building knowledge structures’ through progressive internalization of actions… It then adds the idea that this happens especially felicitously in a context where the learner is consciously engaged in constructing a public entity, whether it’s a sand castle on the beach or a theory of the universe. (Papert, 1991, p.1)

Constructionism is based on two types of construction: the active construction of knowledge by people from their own experiences, and engagement in constructing and creating personally meaningful products (Kafai et al., 2009, p.19). In the Clubhouse setting this means youth are engaged in learning through design. Rather than simply interacting with technology, playing computer games, watching media, browsing the internet, Clubhouse members create their own games, videos, animations, learning not only how to use the tools, but how to express themselves through their use. However, bringing Clubhouse members’ cultural and community backgrounds and experiences into this engagement so they can actively construct knowledge that is meaningful and relevant to them, could well have been overlooked in the sheer enthusiasm of youth for the technology. To counter this, school and Clubhouse staff have intentionally developed practice that is focused on sociocultural constructionism.

Sociocultural constructionism

Pinkett (2000, 2002) synthesises social constructionism (Shaw, 1995) and cultural constructionism (Hooper, 1998) into a theory of sociocultural constructionism which argues that “individual and community development are reciprocally enhanced by independent and shared constructive activity that is resonant with both the social setting that encompasses a community of learners, as well as the cultural identity of the learners themselves” (Pinkett, 2002, p.29).

Pinkett’s work in the development of a community technological infrastructure in Camfield Estates in Boston, Massachusetts, engaged the residents of this low to medium socio-economic community as active participants in using technology to create connections and relationships between residents, local associations and institutions such as libraries, schools, and local businesses. Rather than focusing on deficits about access and capability or the perceived high needs of the
community, the project aimed to achieve a social and cultural resonance that integrated both community technology and community building by leveraging on the indigenous assets that existed in the community (Pinkett, 2002, p.29). Social resonance is developed by activities that facilitate connections and relationships between people (or between people and their environment), and cultural resonance can only be manifested by activities that are consistent with existing values, beliefs, and practices.

Sociocultural constructionism therefore is an asset-based approach to community technology that sees community members as the active producers of community content, rather than passive consumers or recipients. This is directly and specifically relevant to the work of Clubhouse 274.

### The Clubhouse and Critical Pedagogy

The sociocultural constructionist learning in Clubhouse 274 is closely aligned to the learning model used in the two schools in this study, and that has been developed over time to build specifically on the assets and knowledges of Māori and Pasifika learners.

Pinkett (2002, pp.82,83) identifies four characteristics of Feire's (1972) work that underpin sociocultural constructionist theory: that education should be learner-centred, empowering, liberating and grounded in praxis, “reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it” (p.33). This aim, that education should be transformative, liberating, and empowering, links sociocultural constructionism directly to critical theory and critical pedagogy. This is further explained in the Youth Spaces section later in this chapter.

### Clubhouse 274 Goals

The Computer Clubhouse Trust Board’s Strategic Plan (2009) states that project seeks to increase community social and cultural capital through the integration of a community technology and community-building initiative in a low-income community and its surrounding environs. The Trust Board’s Deed of Trust makes explicit that the intent of the Computer Clubhouse is “to encourage in young people the development of a positive identity and belief in their potential, through linking cultural knowledges and values with technology.” The board sets broad goals for this direction: the facilitation of meaningful higher learning and career pathways for youth in our local community, the development of a local community engaged in learning through ICT, greater levels of empowerment and self-sufficiency among residents and connections between residents, local organisations, community businesses, and other community members, and enabling residents in Otara to be the creators and producers of their own information and content on the Internet. The Trust Board’s plans to establish this project as a model for other communities across the country is already being realised. As the original and lead Clubhouse in New Zealand, Clubhouse 274 is able to share models for, and approaches to; Clubhouse venues, programmes, youth engagement,
leadership, training/mentoring, governance, funding and lobbying, marketing and research. This is a valuable resource to other New Zealand communities as well as underserved communities in the Pacific.

The Strategic Plan defines specific social outcomes in terms of expanding local social networks, and cultural outcomes in the development of community content and practice that is relevant to participants’ cultural norms. It recognises that providing devices and conduits alone is not enough to make a difference in social inclusion for those not previously involved in information technology or connected to the Internet (Warschauer, 2002), because the absence of the sort of social and cultural capital necessary to take advantage of the benefits. Goals for youth members of Clubhouse 274 include the capacity to have confidence in their abilities and knowledge, become empowered drivers of their own learning, work collaboratively to develop relationships of trust, and be able to locate their learning experience within their cultural experience and knowledge. The fact that these goals have little to do with a checklist of technological skills is intentional. “In the context of community we take the digitally fluent person and link them to the multiplicity of social networks & relationships that are embedded in the social and cultural forms of that community (Clubhouse Trust Board, 2009, p.29). This is reinforced by the research of those involved in founding the Intel Computer Clubhouse Network:

Technological fluency means much more than the ability to use technological tools; that would be equivalent to understanding a few common phrases in a language. To become truly fluent in a language (like English or French), you must be able to articulate a complex idea or tell an engaging story—that is, you must be able to “make things” with language….The Computer Clubhouse aims to help inner-city youth gain that type of technological fluency. The Computer Clubhouse is designed to provide inner-city youth with access to new technologies. But access alone is not enough. The Clubhouse is based not only on new technology, but on new ideas about learning and community. (Resnick, Rusk, & Cooke, 1999)

Clubhouse 274 Development

The best practices of community building see community members as active change agents. In the first stage of development the catalyst for community participation in Clubhouse 274 was through the empowerment of Clubhouse members who are students at Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga. The first phase was about capacity building, establishing credibility and developing the way the Clubhouse operated. This stage included regular training for staff working in the Clubhouse, interaction with international peers, and the building of a purpose-built Clubhouse on the combined school campus. The new Clubhouse was opened in February, 2009. In 2009 The Clubhouse Trust Board identified that the challenge for the second phase would be growth and sustainability.
In this stage a number of developments enabled us to engage families in shaping the expansion of the Clubhouse into the local community (Figure 52). In this phase it was important to have a common purpose centred on community and youth. This common purpose is the focus on community asset-building based on the existing social and cultural strengths of the community. Asset-based community development assumes that neighbourhood revitalisation starts with what is already present in the community - not only the capacities of residents as individuals, but also the existing commercial, associational and institutional foundations (Pinkett, 2000).

Kretzmann and McKnight (1993) identify five steps toward whole community mobilisation: asset-mapping, building internal relationships, asset-mobilisation, building a vision, and establishing external connections. These steps include mapping the capacities and assets of individuals, and community associations, building relationships for mutually beneficial problem solving within the community, mobilising the community's assets fully for economic development and information sharing purposes, bringing together a representative group to develop a community vision and plan, and leveraging activities, investments and resources from outside the community to support asset-based, locally defined development.

These steps are evident in Clubhouse 274's second stage strategic planning (Figure 52). The three specific strands of development were continuing to develop Clubhouse 274 programmes and capacity within the Otara community in partnership with our two schools and families, progressing the development of the wider Network of Aotearoa Clubhouses (NOAC) 83 - sharing expertise and leadership with other communities, and maintaining existing, and establishing new, partnerships and external connections to support asset-based, locally defined, development.

Phase 3 of the Clubhouse development was about continued expansion and evaluation. In 2011 Clubhouse 274 was the lead Clubhouse for the established and expanding Network of Aotearoa Clubhouses (NOAC). The second Computer Clubhouse in New Zealand opened at Enderley in Hamilton East in March, 2010, a third has opened in Naenae, Wellington, a fourth in Whanganui, and the Tech Pā initiative at Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi in Whakatane, is also affiliated to the Computer Clubhouse network. A further seven Community Clubhouses are planned to be fully completed in New Zealand by 2012 and Trust Board strategic planning projects that these 12 Clubhouses will serve 27,360 young people and their families. There is also planned expansion into the Pacific region, in Samoa, Tonga and Fiji initially.

---

83 NOAC has become renamed The High Tech Youth Network since October 2012.
Also integrated into the third phase of development of the Clubhouse is the evaluation of the impact of the Clubhouse experience through the Clubhouse “Connected Community Project.” In a community where extended family members, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, often live in the same household, or can also be located in rural New Zealand communities or the Pacific Islands this impact reaches far beyond the experience of individual Clubhouse youth members. This project is developing research that is grounded both within the emergent field of community informatics and the social and cultural world view of the predominantly Māori and Pacific community the project serves.

**The High Tech Youth Network (HYTN): Reclaiming Indigenous Spaces**

In October 2012 the Computer Clubhouse Trust embarked on a rebranding process to signal the unique position and goals of the programme that make it specific to New Zealand and the Pacific region. The HTYN, operated by the Computer Clubhouse Trust, is a connected learning & development network of affiliated High Tech Youth Studios and people that target underserved young people and communities within New Zealand and the Pacific region. Clubhouse 274, now known as Studio 274, is seen as the lead Studio of this expanding network. The development of a positive cultural identity and the alignment of cultural knowledges and values with technology, continues to be explicit the Network’s core objectives.

The CEO of the HYTN, explains that there were two reasons for the name change, both about restoring the mauri (life principle, special nature) of the original intent of the New Zealand
Computer Clubhouse Trust. Firstly, as we developed sites around the country there were distinct features that were born out of different ideas from each community. At times these ideas were at odds with the Intel Computer Clubhouse Network, which had a prescriptive view that Clubhouses were required to fit within, to maintain the integrity of their ‘brand.’ This view did not include a cultural perspective or cultural identity goals. Secondly, the ownership of the Intel Computer Clubhouse brand remained in the U.S.A and therefore we were unable to grow the brand or the concept on our own terms. This one-size-fits-all approach expected the New Zealand Clubhouse Trust to agree to assimilate our worldviews into those of the wider Clubhouse Network model.

Without sounding too dramatic the Computer Clubhouse name became a slave name for us. What I find interesting is even though we entered into this with eyes open and all good intentions, we were colonised and in that space there is no freedom. …Our journey, and indeed the name change, are about naming the white spaces, and then standing strong on our own whakapapa. (Usmar, 2013)\(^84\)

This view is expressed very clearly in the email from the Chairperson of the New Zealand Computer Clubhouse Trust to the Director of the Intel Computer Clubhouse Network in May, 2012,\(^85\) explaining the Trust’s position:

In Washington DC we shared with you about our hopes for the Pacific Region. In our mind, the term Pacific Region referred to all the peoples of the Pacific, including Māori. I think it is important to know that the origin of this hope comes from generations of inter-relationships as peoples of the Pacific. It comes out of our whakapapa, our genealogy. We have been engaged culturally, socially, economically and especially in education and technology for many years and continue to engage with each other.

Aspirations for greater technology and efforts to provide these opportunities have existed for a long time. Our philosophy and approach to our work in transformational development has come out of our own tikanga or Māori world view, which is similar and may be compared to that of the great ancient Chinese philosopher Lao Tzu: \(^86\)

Go to the people. Live with them. Learn from them. Love them. Start with what they know. Build with what they have. But with the best leaders, when the work is done, the task accomplished, the people will say ‘We have done it ourselves.’

The HYTN and Studio 274 name and brand changes signal very strongly a determination to reclaim Māori and Pasifika spaces from the white spaces in Information and Communications Technology. This stand is closely aligned to the position the schools in this study have taken against the white

\(^{84}\) Personal email to Ann Milne on 7 January, 2013

\(^{85}\) Email from Haami Chapman, Chairperson, NZ Computer Clubhouse Trust, to the Director, Intel Computer Clubhouse Network, 19 May, 2012.

\(^{86}\) Lao Tzu (also known as Laozi) was an ancient Chinese philosopher, traditionally considered the founder of philosophical Taoism
spaces in our education system. The decision affirms the critical view of the schools and the HYTN that education should be transformative, liberating, and empowering. The need for the type of statement the HYTN decision signals is also evident in the wider ICT community. The field of Community Informatics is an example of this space.

Community Informatics

Community Informatics is an emerging field of investigation and practice concerned with “the application of information and communications technology (ICT) to enable and empower community processes” (Gurstein, 2007 p.11). However Gurstein (2010) observes, community informatics is a research and academic discipline which “draws extensively from the creativity and generosity of communities in sharing their experiences and knowledge” but where “the relationship is however, often or most generally not an equal one.” From a Māori perspective Kamira (2003 p.472) finds that “technology still happens ‘at’ Māori,” and she discusses the danger that information technology becomes a further instrument of colonisation when the coloniser has control of information and when the technology makes the extraction and exploitation of knowledge more sophisticated and covert.

The Te Rongo Haeata Centre for Community Informatics Research, is a joint venture between Clubhouse 274, Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School, and the indigenous Māori university, Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi (Milne & Usmar, 2011). The Te Rongo Haeata Centre sits within the Tokorau Institute for Indigenous Innovation based at Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi. The purpose of the Tokorau Institute is to unlock the potential of indigenous people, their knowledge and their resources, by connecting indigenous or traditional knowledge systems with new, advanced and emerging information and communication technologies. The Te Rongo Haeata Centre is ideally placed therefore to align Community Informatics with an indigenous research paradigm. To this end, in 2012 the Centre has initiated a joint venture with First Nations researchers in Canada to develop an indigenous Community Informatics project and to disseminate emerging indigenous research in this field.

Youth Spaces

An important link between the solutions and principles that challenge the system’s white space, described in the first section of this chapter, and the effectiveness of Clubhouse 274, can be found in the work of Akom, Cammarota, & Ginwright, (2008), in their concept of “Youthtopias.” This term describes, “the processes of creating systematic, formal and informal, traditional and non-traditional educational spaces that produce pedagogies of love, resistance, resiliency, hope and healing” (p.125). Akom et al. see this as an alternative asset-based approach for confronting the challenges of teaching and learning for social justice in the twenty-first century. This certainly
describes the Clubhouse 274 philosophy and is also aligned with the youth participatory action research approach to learning used in the two schools in this study.

...this understanding of the vital role that young people play, not just in the consumption of social capital, but in the production of social and cultural capital, is important precisely because it highlights the importance of critical consciousness, youth agency, and youth activism in the development of effective social networks and neighborhood change. ... More often than not, a Youthtopian framework facilitates a process that develops critical consciousness and builds the capacity for young people to respond and change oppressive conditions in their environment. In other words, Youthtopias are simultaneously individual and organizational processes that promote civic engagement among youth and elevate their critical consciousness and capacities for social justice and community activism. (Akom et al, 2008, p.115)

Youthtopias merge the frameworks of Critical Race Theory, Youth Participatory Action Research and critical media studies. Akom et al. identify the five elements that distinguish Youthtopias from other theories and methods in critical youth studies and beyond, and form its basic core, and state that the essential features of Youthtopias are created when these five conditions are met: (1) An explicit commitment to understand how race intersects with other forms of social oppression such as class, gender, religion, nationality, sexuality, phenotype, accent, immigration status, and special needs, (2) Challenging traditional paradigms, texts, and theories used to explain the experiences of students of color, (3) Fore-grounding the experiential knowledge of students so that young people and adults are “co-constructing” the learning environment, (4) A commitment to developing critical consciousness, and finally, (5) A commitment to social justice. These are aligned with specific Clubhouse 274’s goals and practice (Clubhouse Trust Board, 2009) in the following table (Table 28):

Table 28: “Youthtopias” Elements and Clubhouse 274 Goals and Practice. (Akom, Cammarotta, & Ginwright, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youthtopia Elements</th>
<th>Clubhouse 274 Goals and Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An explicit commitment to understand how race intersects with other forms of social oppression such as class, gender, religion, nationality, sexuality, phenotype, accent, immigration status, and special needs.</td>
<td>Members actively engaged in social justice, critical projects, including international programmes - creating media with a critical message, interaction with youth world-wide through the Clubhouse Village and as Teen Summit delegates. Bringing together the educational expertise in Māori and Pasifika education and the expertise of the Clubhouse to give this community the opportunity to not only improve social capital but to develop cultural capital through reconnecting with cultural norms and competencies through ICT. Cultural identity development is explicit. Research is culturally responsive. Greater levels of empowerment and self-sufficiency among residents of our local community. Participation in research on the impact of the Clubhouse on youth, families and the wider community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Young people are able to locate their learning experience within their cultural...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional paradigms, texts, and theories used to explain the experiences of students of color.</td>
<td>experience and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth acquiring a 21st skill base that matches NZ’s emergent economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather than focusing on deficits about access and capability or the perceived high needs of the community the project aimed to achieve a social and cultural resonance that integrated both community technology and community building by leveraging on the indigenous assets that existed in the community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociocultural constructionism as an asset-based approach to community technology that sees community members as the active producers of community content, rather than passive consumers or recipients.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community wireless network is a key feature of a digital fluent community, as it enables ubiquitous connectivity and ensures learning and online activities are able to occur anytime and anywhere within the community of Clover Park.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fore-grounding the experiential knowledge of students so that young people and adults are “co-constructing” the learning environment</th>
<th>Young people are empowered drivers of their own learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young people can learn and work collaboratively and develop relationships of trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is greater engagement in learning through ICT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents in Otara are enabled to be the creators and producers of their own information and content on the Internet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding needed for apprenticeship learning to take place in a safe, supported way. This happens in a community where learners and experts together observe and imitate, model, appropriate and experiment, then provide and receive feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuakana/teina relationships based on support from able learners for those who are learning is a natural and authentic way for this community to access knowledge and comes only from relationships where there is a high level of trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of social networking site, “The Haps” as a forum for all of the information about and produced by the Clubhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Haps provides the vehicle for publication of community developed content KaumātuaNet (online community of elders)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technically fluent person with ICT forms a seamless set of digital empowered tools and skills that act as a modern enabler of expression, engagement and transference of ideas and pursuits. In the context of community we take the digitally fluent person and link them to the multiplicity of social networks and relationships that are embedded in the social and cultural of that community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Clubhouse Network online Global Village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A commitment to developing critical consciousness,</th>
<th>Adobe Youth Voices projects - creating 'media with purpose’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical media literacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth participatory action research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A commitment to social justice.</th>
<th>Commitment to work in underserved communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset-building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access - homes in the community with free wireless internet access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology for social inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Connected Community Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hanh (cited in Akom et al., p.125) speaks of creating homeplaces as “communities of resistance” whose work would go far beyond political protest:

> It is a resistance against all kinds of things that are like war…. So perhaps resistance means opposition to being invaded, occupied, assaulted, and destroyed by the system. I think that communities of resistance should be places where people can return to
themselves more easily, where the conditions are such that they can heal themselves and recover their wholeness. (in Berrigan & Nhat Hanh, 2001, p. 129)

The ultimate test of the effectiveness of the spaces changed by Clubhouse 274 are the voices and experiences of its youth members. Does the combined experience of the schools’ philosophy and pedagogy and the Clubhouse “Youthtopia” achieve this healing and hope? Some of the outcomes are described by independent research and by youth themselves in the next section.

**Youth Engagement**

In 2006 Clubhouse 274 was limited to two old prefabricated buildings on the school site. With the opening of the new facility in February 2009 the attendance rate of members increased significantly. The number of young people impacted by their membership of Clubhouse 274, from 2006 to 2009 is shown in Table 29. The figures refer to the number of members and mentors signing in on arrival at the Clubhouse each night. The gender imbalance in these earlier years has been reduced in subsequent years to less than 10% in favour of boys.

Table 29: Number of youth members who come to Clubhouse 274: 2006-2009 (Clubhouse Trust Board, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Adult Mentors</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Boys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;87&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>11387</strong></td>
<td><strong>629</strong></td>
<td><strong>4166</strong></td>
<td><strong>7221</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest population base of Clubhouse 274 is from age 11-14 years. The experience of Clubhouses internationally is that youth typically enter a Clubhouse at 10-11 years old and a high level of retention through to the ‘age-out’ level of 18 years is apparent.

---

<sup>87</sup> As at 20 July 2009 – not a full Quarter
To evaluate the impact of the Clubhouse on youth members a Youth Impact Survey developed by SRI International (Michalchik, 2005), is conducted annually across all Clubhouses. Previously known as the Stanford University Research Institute, SRI International is an independent, non-profit research institute conducting client-sponsored research and development for government agencies, commercial businesses, foundations, and other organisations. In 2005 SRI International developed a survey instrument, the Youth Impact Survey, designed to show the impact of Clubhouses on the youth they serve. The online survey includes scales to measure: collaboration, problem solving, social competence, sense of belonging, sense of the future, technology use and proficiency, and attitudes towards school.

Additionally, SRI developed items to measure levels of participation and types of activities in which members engage when at the Clubhouses. The resulting instruments targeted two major sets of intended outcomes for Clubhouse youth: key abilities of youth, such as the ability to work in teams, solve complex problems, and develop, plan and execute complex projects, and key attitudinal characteristics of youth, such as their sense of self-esteem and competence.

Clubhouse 274 is open from 3.00 p.m. to 7.00 p.m. every week night during the school year. In 2011 53 Clubhouse members participated in the online SRI survey. The SRI data show that 26% of Clubhouse girl members and 38% of boys visited Clubhouse 274 once or twice a week, while 74% of girls and 41% of boys visited every day. Not only did members visit frequently, but they stayed for extended periods of time with and 33% staying longer than three hours on each visit.

The Youth Impact Survey measures five aspects of members’ social or emotional development: collaboration, relationship with adults, sense of belonging, sense of future and social competence. Overall Clubhouse 274 social-emotional attitudes are very positive in all aspects. Relationship with adults and a sense of belonging are higher in Clubhouse 274 than in all Clubhouses internationally. This is in keeping with a strong sense of whānau engendered in both the Clubhouse and the two schools. Three survey scales measure aspects of members’ academic attitudes, problem solving competence, and school engagement. Clubhouse 274 members have generally high scores in these dimensions, with higher school engagement attitudes than Clubhouses internationally.

The Youth Impact Survey also asks members about the educational aspirations. In 2011, 90% of Clubhouse 274 members said they “definitely” or “probably” intended to graduate from secondary school, 96% believed they would continue their education and 98% felt they would either “definitely” or “probably” use skills acquired in the Clubhouse in their future careers. Of those Clubhouse 274 members continuing their education, 77% indicated they were planning to attend university.

---

88 Member Survey Report for Individual Clubhouses from survey conducted in May, 2011.
Youth Voices

While the SRI quantitative data tell one side of the story of the impact of Clubhouse 274, the voice of youth members themselves is even stronger. In 2010, three members produced videos which were shown at the launch of the second New Zealand Clubhouse in Enderley, Hamilton, before the Prime Minister, John Key, the Mayor of Hamilton, members of parliament, and both business and community representatives. The three videos are now featured on the New Zealand Clubhouses website and on YouTube, and are therefore in the public domain. Entitled, “I will be...” each video is the young person’s own story about their Clubhouse experience, their dreams, and ambitions. The following transcripts from the videos, written by the students themselves are very powerful examples of the changes they have experienced.

Video 1

Your culture and your identity is who you are and you have to take it everywhere you go. The Clubhouse allows me to be Tongan. … My parents thought that it wasn’t a good idea. In the Tongan culture the girls are expected to go to school and come back straight home and do all the cleaning and the washing, but then they saw the improvement in me and then they liked how I always came to the Clubhouse. The Clubhouse is important to me, like how I use the computer and all that and all my skills have improved. They [my family] like it because I help my Mum [on the computer] as well. All my projects that I do, they stick up in my room, and in the lounge. I have cool as friends at Clubhouse. They support me with everything I do. We just learn from each other. It challenges me to do harder stuff, try harder things, learn how to use new programmes. …I see my future as being colourful and bright, happy. In the Clubhouse it’s really important to be who you are, be who you want to be, not who others want to see, just letting out your true colours. …

Malo e lelei. My name is Veisinia, and I will be famous. (Veisinia, Year 11)

Video 2

Michael then was someone that never used to take on many options, just used to stay in his own world and stuff, but now, he’s a more out there person, always taking on any opportunities that come his way, and he’s ready for anything.

When my grandmother died, and she was really close to me, she said, “Lift your game up and go hard in life,” and that just really stuck into my head. It really bugged me and bugged me, and I knew why, because she wanted me to really do something with my life and become a success.

The biggest key would be the Clubhouse. They always help me do projects, and the skills I learn here have helped me with my schoolwork as well. All my projects are not simple, they’re more advanced.

…Succeeding in school, that’s really big, and me making it in my computing business or career is pretty big, and my family, they will be proud, and they’ll know, “Oh yeah, that’s my boy.”

http://www.computerclubhouse.org.nz
It makes me feel more responsible, and that’s what I’ve learned here, I’m more responsible for myself and what I do and yeah, it makes me feel good, that I’m in control - no one else. Clubhouse, I just love it. It is mean.
My name is Michael, and I will be successful. (Michael, Year 13)

**Video 3**

The time that I’ve been coming to Clubhouse has been solid. I think I’d be like a little “g-homey” walking the streets, getting influenced by stupid drugs and stuff. Because of Clubhouse, I don’t have the time to get in trouble, like make stupid choices and stuff. You can kick back and do things that nowadays teenagers are into. Sometimes we stay at the Clubhouse for a couple of nights, or just a night, to work on special projects.
I’ve been to Nextspace\(^{90}\) to do some projects with them and to do the holiday programme. I got chosen to go to Whakatane, and to show them what we do in our Clubhouse, and I felt special. I felt like I was famous. Clubhouse helps me to get my credits and I’m only Year 10 \(^{91}\) so that’s a good head start for me. For next year I really, really, really, really, want to upgrade on my Photoshop skills, and my designing skills. Going to uni [university] and finding a course on designing skills, because I want to be a magazine designer.
Kia ora, I’m Stormy-Girl, and I will be a magazine designer. (Storm, Year 10)

Because anonymity cannot be assured, it is not possible to provide details of the circumstances these young people have overcome in these journeys. Suffice to say that, with tacit knowledge of the specific backgrounds of these young people, these stories and aspirations are remarkable.

**Combining the Spaces**

This chapter has examined the “global lens” in the learning model of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga. It has firstly identified seven principles common to the schools’ journey and to the experiences and practice of three other examples of transformative learning models in the United States, connecting our youth to indigenous and marginalised youth globally. Secondly, the chapter has discussed the skills and learning needed to connect our young people to the digital world of the present and the future, through examining the establishment of the Computer Clubhouse and the journey of student members participating in the Clubhouse programme.

The following two examples of transformative educational practice reconnect this global lens learning to the previous two chapters about self (Chapter 4) and school (Chapter 5) learning, to show how all these strands work together to challenge education’s white spaces.

---

\(^{90}\) Nextspace is a not-for-profit 3D visualisation industry catalyst and consultancy based in New Zealand and created with government support.

\(^{91}\) Achieving “credits” towards the NZ senior secondary school National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) qualification, traditionally begins in Year 11.
The first activity was initiated by young people after school hours through a global Computer Clubhouse project. Youth members made all the decisions about the context and shape of the project. They chose a topic highly relevant to Māori and Pasifika families. Tobacco is a leading cause of preventable death in New Zealand, 46% of Māori are regular smokers compared to 21% of non-Māori. The median age of Māori smoking initiation is 11.6 years. (Ministry of Health, 2009). Pasifika people have the second highest smoking prevalence in New Zealand with 31.4% more likely to smoke (Ministry of Social Development, 2009, p.27). Some youth members of the AYV Project group were smokers themselves. These factors place this context in the ‘self learning’ lens.

The group followed Freire’s (1972) cycle of critical praxis: (1) identify a problem, (2) research the problem, (3) develop a collective plan of action to address the problem, (4) implement the plan of action, (5) evaluate the action, assess its efficacy, and re-examine the state of the problem (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008, p.12). Duncan-Andrade and Morrell find this cycle identifies popular youth culture as a legitimate site for engagement and curriculum development (p.13). This is certainly the case for this project which utilised advanced information technology skills, but also is linked to the mandated “school learning” lens. Students involved in this project were able to achieve credits towards national achievement standards in English, Media Studies, and Communication Skills. The following excerpt from my Principal’s Blog (25 February, 2010) tells the story:

“Now we are activists”

One morning in February, 2010, we all arrived at school to find that we had been “poster-bombed” overnight. Luckily, I had some inside knowledge, but staff and students wandered around unsure about what they should do.

Hundreds of copies of a clever photo-shopped poster had been placed everywhere, both inside and outside the buildings. A data projector beamed the poster through a hidden window on to the side of the main school entrance way. When teachers and students turned on their computers the poster was now the screensaver, when they lifted the lid on the photocopier, it was there too, and it kept appearing in unexpected places all day.

The “non-destructive” Graffiti-Bomb was the brainchild of the Adobe Youth Voices (AYV) group in the Computer Clubhouse. AYV is a project that aims to empower youth in underserved communities around the globe with real-world experiences and 21st century tools to communicate their ideas, exhibit their potential, and take action in their communities. In 2009, and again in 2011, two of our Clubhouse members have attended the World AYV Summit at Stanford and Santa Clara Universities in the U.S.A.

Photoshop, is a graphics editing program developed and published by Adobe Systems.
The 2010 group decided on the Graffiti-Bomb as a method of sending a powerful anti-smoking message to our school community. As everyone arrived at school the AYV crew unobtrusively filmed their reaction. The group's work resulted in a documentary which showed the idea's development from its inception through to the final reactions and their evaluation.

In a debrief in the afternoon the group reported they felt they had seen the benefit of making their message so visible, particularly in terms of the way it had people asking questions and discussing it. However, the group felt that simply highlighting the issue wasn't enough, their new question was, "What now'? How could they provide support for young people who smoke and wanted to stop?

Finally the group's evaluation email message said, "Thanks again. It’s such a cool thing to have such a supporting school that the members can do this kind of thing without too much fear of reprisals. As one AYV group member said yesterday, ‘Now we are activists.’"

The second example of transformative educational practice also shows the seamless integration of Clubhouse and students’ self and school learning lenses. In the first half of the 2011 school year the two focus concepts which drove the learning context for the whole campus were colonisation and assimilation. Some of our senior Pasifika students chose to investigate the government’s changes to the Pasifika Education Plan and the decision to cease production of Pasifika bilingual readers, as a current example of assimilationist practice. A group of these students who were members of the Computer Clubhouse Youth Voices media team, attended a large community meeting of Pasifika educators about this issue. Having sat politely through the entire meeting the team leader, a 16 year old Tongan student, asked for permission to speak - in itself a culturally brave move for a young Tongan girl in an adult, predominantly Pasifika, forum such as this. In her completely impromptu speech she introduced herself fluently in Tongan and then said:

I don’t have the authority to join this organisation or commit our Computer Clubhouse to this organisation, but I do have the authority to use our media unit to create media to help voice our concerns and get all your voices and opinions out there to be heard.

I’m from Kia Aroha College. Our College helps to develop us students into Warrior-Scholars. Warrior-Scholars are people who are able to identify the issues that surround us in our society and community and who are able to stand up and speak up for our rights and speak out against social injustice. So I and our media unit are willing to help in any way we can to help because we disagree with government. What I’ve learned is that government is based around white people so we Pasifika people need to speak up. If we do not speak up we will continue to be marginalised and assimilated and have to adapt to the dominant language, in this case, English. No!
I have interviewed John Key a few times. He has visited us a few times. Every time John Key visits us there is always an issue. I can’t think of any decisions he has made that are positive - they all impact negatively on us.

The first time he visited us was before he was prime minister. I asked him, “What can you offer us as P.I. people?” The second time he visited us was when he introduced National Standards. I asked him, “Whose norms and values are these? Are we Pacific Islanders acknowledged, or are these Pākehā-based norms?” He answered that question in a way I could not understand. I think he did it on purpose. But from his answer and his reaction, I think he said it’s Pākehā-based. And now, I cannot wait for his third visit so I can ask him what are you cutting Pasifika resources for? If he cuts our Pasifika resources, it’s like he is cutting out us Pasifika people totally.

...Language defines who I am. As Professor Geneva Gay said, she did not become an academic until she became black.

He‘ikai teu hoko au ko ha aketemika kae oua leva kou hoko ko ha Tonga

If my language is taken away, I do not know who I am, therefore I cannot be an academic, but I want to become an academic so we can influence government to make decisions that benefit all of us, not only white people.(Ofoi, 2011)

The clear understanding of the issues and the critical thinking evident in Ofoi’s speech epitomise the goal of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga to develop “Warrior-Scholars”. Her statement, “I’m from Kia Aroha College.” also signals the realisation of the goal to retain all of our students, Māori and Pasifika through to Year 13 by merging the two schools into one from the beginning of 2011. This is explained in detail in Chapter 8.

An understanding of the political spaces and the major resistance to changing a system that favours the dominant culture is a fundamental requirement for those who seek to work in schools and with youth in communities of colour. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 have explained the extensive efforts of the Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga to ensure learning is holistic, is specifically located in the cultures of the community, and integrates self, school and the global learning our young people need beyond home and formal school learning. The last two examples demonstrate how these three areas work seamlessly together to develop leadership and a critical understanding of major social issues that impact on our youth and their families. The next chapter identifies themes arising from the previous three chapters and examines independent data to provide evidence of the effectiveness of the practice developed by these two schools.

---

93 Pacific Island
94 Tongan language: I can’t become an academic until I become Tongan.
Chapter Seven

Examining the Evidence

The rights of Indigenous peoples to access education - even when these rights are recognized in treaties and other instruments - are often interpreted to read that Indigenous peoples only want access to non-Indigenous education. Presumably it is considered that the core of Indigenous cultural values, standards and wisdom is abandoned or withering in the wilderness of Indigenous societies.

Yet, Indigenous peoples across the world are demanding and, in some cases, achieving the establishment of systems of education which reflect, respect and embrace Indigenous cultural values, philosophies and ideologies - the same values, philosophies and ideologies which shaped, nurtured and sustained Indigenous peoples for tens of thousands of years (The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights in Education, 1999).

This chapter reflects on the main themes emerging from the findings described in the previous three chapters. It explores a range of independent data to validate the information presented in these chapters. Chapter 6 linked seven key pedagogical principles common to three international sites with the learning model and journey of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga. The credibility of these findings was enhanced by asking those leading the international programmes for their feedback on the draft chapter. This feedback was highly positive:

It was beautiful to see these four stories in print, in the same text, written by such a caring hand. You really do our respective communities a great honor. The framing is perfect, "Marching for Justice", "Starving for Justice", "Running for Justice", "Sitting-in for Justice". (K.W Yang, personal communication, 20 October, 2009)

I enjoyed reading it and found the content and analysis on point and precisely the kind of discourse that we need in our field. I can’t wait to see the whole project in book form so I can use it in my classes. Thank you. (J. Duncan-Andrade, personal communication, 31 October, 2009)

Four themes emerging from the narrative of the previous chapters, cultural identity, culturally responsive, critical, pedagogy, whānau/whanaungatanga, and community, have been aligned to the seven principles identified in Chapter 6 (Table 30).
Table 30: Key Principles and Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seven Key Principles</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race, ethnicity and culture are central</td>
<td>Cultural Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Pedagogy</td>
<td>Culturally responsive, critical, pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-driven “Warrior-Scholars”</td>
<td>Whānau / Whanaungatanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposeful Learning</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic, critical, caring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community driven and supported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance in the face of strong opposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chapter provides evidence of the centrality of these themes to the practice of the two schools in this study. The story of the Samoan girl at the principal’s office door introduced and motivated this research. It asked the questions:

- What were the conditions that existed in the school that made it both acceptable and comfortable to empower the student to follow her cultural norms, even in the palagi principal’s office and in the presence of a group who were not Samoan?
- Had the school contributed to the development of her knowledge in this area in any way or was this purely attributable to her home background?

The answers to these questions are embedded in the four identified themes. Anderson, Herr, and Nihlen, (1994), discuss the complexities of practitioner research and in particular the challenges of studying your own school. They ask, “If the goal of educational research is to produce knowledge about educational practice that will bring about improvements in practice, who knows educational practice better than those who act daily in educational settings?” (p.178). Merriam et al., (2001) suggest it has “commonly been assumed that being an insider means easy access, the ability to ask more meaningful questions and read non-verbal cues, and most importantly be able to project a more truthful, authentic understanding of the culture under study” (p. 411). However, insiders are also accused of being too close to the issue or the research to be impartial and to ask critical questions. My own position as a participant researcher and as a member of the “whānau of interest” (Bishop & Glynn, 1999, p.174, 175), is discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

Sources

Chapter 3 described the sorting and categorising of school documents and the use of the wide range of documentation to assist with the development of themes. The documents that are relevant to the triangulation process have been further grouped into four sets using the NVivo9 computer programme. The sets are: official school documents, independent voices, student/staff voices and community voice. This process has narrowed down the range of documentation.
The data used to triangulate the four themes come from four sources (Figure 53), two of which are independent of and external to the schools. These independent sources include Education Review Office reports from the cycle of scheduled effectiveness reviews of Te Whānau o Tupuranga in 2009 and Clover Park Middle School in 2007 and 2010. Due to the major restructuring of the two schools over the last five years there has been significant community consultation which required the Board of Trustees each time to seek community involvement in the schools’ direction. This documentation includes anonymous comment from members of students’ families and the wider community.

Figure 53: Sources used in evidential searches for each theme

![Diagram showing sources used in evidential searches for each theme](image)

NVivo computer software has been used to support coding and searching. Firstly official school documents were examined to determine the extent each theme is embedded in school policy and practice. The documents used to determine this included Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s combined policies and procedures, the schools’ Charter, the Strategic Plan 2007-2011, Annual Reports, the schools’ Curriculum Statement, Learning Model documentation, and Teachers’ Job Descriptions. Secondly, current staff and former students’ contributions from surveys and interviews and current students’ work already in the public domain were searched. Finally independent and external data were examined. All of these data were searched for confirming or disconfirming evidence on each of the four themes.
Themes

Theme One: Culturally Responsive, Critical, Pedagogy

References to the schools’ Learning Model include specific characteristics, such as culturally responsive, critical, social justice, pedagogy and the support needed for teachers to professionally develop these strategies and skills. These references also take into account what the schools have come to refer to as “white spaces” as we have collaboratively developed this research - that systemic backdrop that serves as a barrier to making change in our schools. Both students and teachers have used this term in the sources examined. Taking all of these different aspects into account, there are 80 references to the schools’ Learning Model in official school documentation, 59 in current staff and student sources, 27 references from community and former students and 24 in Education Review Office reports on both schools in 2009 and 2010. These references are shown in Table 31:

Table 31: References Coded to the Schools’ Learning Model in all Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMES</th>
<th>Official School Documentation</th>
<th>Current Staff Student Voice</th>
<th>Community Voice</th>
<th>Independent Voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Model</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Pedagogy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Responsive Pedagogy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expectations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Justice</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Spaces</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alignment with Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

Sleeter (2010, p.6) attributes what she describes as the marginalisation of culturally responsive pedagogy to three primary reasons, “1) a persistence of faulty and simplistic conceptions of what culturally responsive pedagogy is, 2) too little research connecting its use with student achievement, and 3) elite and white fear of losing national and global hegemony.” Sleeter discusses the problems associated with trivialising, simplifying, or essentialising culture and states that, “Oversimplified and distorted conceptions of culturally responsive pedagogy, which do not necessarily improve student learning, lend themselves to dismissal of the entire concept.” (p.14). Sleeter believes it is important to find “rich descriptions” as important counters to these simplistic models.
One such study is the analysis of Morrison, Robbins and Rose (2008, p.435), of culturally relevant pedagogy as enacted in classrooms in 45 classroom-based research studies from 1995 to the present. In the first stage of their analysis they coded specific teacher actions under one of Ladson-Billings’ (1995) three tenets of culturally relevant pedagogy—high expectations, cultural competence, and critical consciousness. In the next stage they gave each of these classifications further subcategories, resulting in 12 categories of culturally relevant teacher actions.

These subcategories (Table 32) are closely aligned to the references to the Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School Learning Model in all the documentation and sources examined.

Table 32: Culturally responsive pedagogy references aligned to Ladson-Billings’(1995) and Morrison et al. (2008) categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories (Ladson-Billings (1995))</th>
<th>Subcategories (Morrison et al. 2008)</th>
<th>References found in Learning Model sources from the two schools in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Expectations</td>
<td>1. Modelling, scaffolding, &amp; clarification of the challenging curriculum</td>
<td>High Expectations Professional Development Teachers Leadership Whānau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Using students’ strength starting points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Investing and taking personal responsibility for students’ successes, going above and beyond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Creating and nurturing cooperative environments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Having high behavioural expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Competence</td>
<td>1. Reshaping the prescribed curriculum</td>
<td>Culturally Responsive Pedagogy Cultural Identity Whānau Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Building on students’ funds of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Encouraging relationships between school and communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Engaging students in social justice work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Making explicit the power dynamics of mainstream society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Sharing power in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School documentation
The theme of culturally responsive pedagogy is thoroughly embedded in all official school documentation (Table 31), in the Charter and Strategic Plan, in school policy, in staff job descriptions and in the Curriculum Statement developed within the mandatory requirements of the implementation of the revised national curriculum in 2010. It is encapsulated in the designated character goals for Te Whānau o Tupuranga and in the Combined Board of Trustees’ Annual Reports on the Charter and Strategic Plan and in the combined schools’ Mission Statement, where the vision is:

To be a learning whānau, committed to excellence, where the potential of all whānau members, as active, empowered, contributing members of society, secure in their own cultural identity and with a wide variety of options for their future, is unlimited. (Te Whānau o Tupuranga & Clover Park Middle School Board of Trustees, 2007)

Independent voices
The theme is also confirmed in independent reviews. The Education Review Office (ERO) reviewed Clover Park Middle School in 2007 and again in 2010. Te Whānau o Tupuranga was reviewed in 2009. In 2007 and 2009 the Education Review Office process allowed school boards and the Review Office team to have input into an agreed focus for the review. In both these years the Board of Trustees chose a focus specifically relevant to the school’s Learning Model. In 2007 the agreed focus for the Clover Park Middle School review was, “the impact of school initiatives in ensuring learning is relevant to Māori and Pacific learners, and their achievement in relation to cultural competencies and skills.” In 2009 the specific focus for the inaugural Te Whānau o Tupuranga review was “Māori students enjoying success as Māori.” These two focus areas have ensured that the Education Review Office reviewers looked closely at culturally responsive, critical pedagogy and cultural competencies.

The Clover Park Middle School 2007 Education Review Office report (Education Review Office, 2007) states, “Senior leaders have developed a learning model that acknowledges and validates cultural competencies and places equal importance on curriculum knowledge and achievement.” Referring to the previous report the review finds that:

Since 2003 Clover Park Middle School has engaged in defining learning that acknowledges and validates cultural competencies.
. . . The school’s learning model is highly relevant to Māori and Pacific students as there is recognition that students’ cultural values, protocols and practices are enhanced through their learning experiences. (Education Review Office 2007)

The development of the “Self lens” assessment tool was given particular attention during this review and the report found that:
Senior managers and teachers have successfully developed an assessment tool to measure the cultural competencies of students. The tool assesses the extent to which students demonstrate positive attitudes to their own culture and have appropriate knowledge and understanding of this. It also assesses students' participation in cultural activities and events, and their ability to communicate in their own language. The assessment tool is providing teachers and students with useful information to identify strengths and weaknesses, and providing teachers with information to plan programmes that will enhance students' cultural competencies. (Education Review Office 2007)

In the 2009 review of Te Whānau o Tupuranga, again the Self lens assessment tool came under close scrutiny. This was the first review of Te Whānau o Tupuranga since its opening as a designated-character school in 2006. The reviewers commented on the need to improve the quality of some teachers’ practice but acknowledged that, “The board and principal have identified this as a priority and are implementing support systems for teachers to meet the expectations defined within their philosophy.”

The focus for this review was derived specifically from the goal of Ka Hikitia, “Māori students enjoying success as Māori” (Ministry of Education 2008a). The reviewers found the Learning Model an “area of good performance”:

Te Whānau o Tupuranga has defined its learning model through the concept of Power Lenses, which are used to classify three domains of learning - self learning (red lens), school learning (blue lens) and global learning (green lens). Each lens represents a crucial, interdependent element of student learning that supports the potential of students to make a difference in the world. The principal, board and staff are steadfast in their commitment to developing and implementing this learning model. Students learn in an environment that recognises and affirms their cultural context. (Education Review Office 2009)

In 2010 the Education Review Office process changed and the option for schools to negotiate a specific focus was no longer available for the 2010 Clover Park Middle School review. However the review design now states, “ERO’s review is responsive to the school’s context. When ERO reviews a school, it takes into account the characteristics of the community from which it draws its students, its aspirations for its young people, and other relevant local factors.”

The implementation of the revised national curriculum became mandatory in 2010 and the Education Review process reflects the changes in the new document. The New Zealand Curriculum is now less prescriptive in terms of content and contexts. It recognises that individual schools and communities are best placed to determine these in order to engage their young people in learning and requires schools to design curriculum that is relevant to their own community, within national guidelines. This greater flexibility to design and implement curriculum that is tailored to the learning needs of their students and the expectations of their communities is a direction that Te
Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School had been moving in for many years prior to the development and implementation of the new curriculum. In the 2010 review of Clover Park Middle School, the Education Review Office reviewers found the curriculum design an area of strength:

The curriculum design is distinctive. It focuses on developing what the school calls ‘the warrior scholar’ - a student who confidently understands and uses their cultural knowledge, heritage language, values and beliefs to achieve their potential. The framework of the three lenses skilfully blends with the key competencies and principles of the New Zealand Curriculum and focuses on supporting students to realise their potential and to understand that it is unlimited.

. . . Learning opportunities allow students to recognise the links between their culture and learning and the connections between self identity, self management and successful educational outcomes. The school’s philosophy promotes an open exploration of the ways that thinking, teaching, learning, social justice and power are reflected in decisions about education. (Education Review Office, 2010)

The comprehensive notes taken by a senior staff member at the feedback meeting between the Education reviewers and the Board of Trustees record statements about the framework of the school’s philosophy as “unique” with an “in depth understanding of social and cultural capital and unlocking self-potential so children realise what they can do and who they are.”

The reviewers commented that they found the school’s learning model to be culturally located and about social justice, unlocking the pathway to a just education aligned to the board’s philosophy and vision. They reported they found another whole dimension of thinking, in the classroom, in teachers’ planning, and at all levels, including the community/parent level and commented that this alignment was “what’s good about this.” Reviewers also spoke about the feeling they experienced as soon as they came in to the campus and described the school campus as the heartbeat of the community.

Staff/Student Voices

Coded references to teacher professional development and empowerment are aligned with the culturally responsive pedagogy category, High Expectations (Table 32). The depth and extent of the professional learning and personal journeys teachers have undertaken in making changes to their previous thinking, or in finding relevance to their own experiences in the philosophy of the school, has been discussed in Chapter 5, where staff quotes from interviews and surveys have been used. Further evidence is included in the following comments:95

It is essential to be able to provide a learning environment in which non-Pākehā students are able to experience success to the same degree as Pākehā students. It is

---

95 Comments are quoted from two different sources: (1) an unstructured group interview with 11 senior staff members in July, 2010, and (2) an online survey a further four current teachers chose to participate in during 2010.
also important to redefine the criteria for achievement, as even with a culturally responsive approach to teaching and learning, we have still been constrained by the requirement to assess against a Pākehā set of rules. (Kirsten)

Having spent time in more traditional teaching environments and being very uncomfortable in them I find that our way of working fits a lot better with my personal beliefs, pedagogical beliefs and social beliefs. (Steph P)

We look at our students as not the children of others, but they’re our students, our children. That concept is played out in the planning, the delivering of our curriculum subjects based on the reality of our students and that’s the difference - we run with them from there. It’s a difficult task, but it’s a challenge and we walk with them on sacred ground with them allowing us to move in. (Sinai)

We use overseas research to enhance what we have on site as well, so we invite overseas academics to present to us and we take on board what they have in their presentations and whether it relates to the educators we have onsite, whether it relates to the actual kaupapa that we have in both our schools and all of that enhances our students’ learning. With that comes of course all the challenges, and we discuss that as well as a staff. We’ve spoken at length about the fact that where mainstream schools are at is the same process that our people have had to undertake in terms of imperialism and colonisation. There is no such word as post-colonialism for Māori. (Judith)

Due to the power relations inherent in my position as Principal in the school, current students were not formally interviewed or surveyed for this research. However, several current students have made speeches, produced videos or taken part in presentations to audiences about their experiences of learning. These are all available publicly on websites or in forums such as the Computer Clubhouse resources. The following comment is from a Year 12 student in 2010, one of a group of former Clover Park Middle School students who enrolled in Te Whānau o Tupuranga, rather than move away from the campus at the end of Year 10:

I really enjoyed being in both schools because the philosophy of the school is based on the whānau concept where I and my language and culture are welcomed and nurtured. Being in these two schools helped me develop into a mature and responsible Tongan student. Being in the Tongan bilingual unit further enhances my learning academically because our subjects are taught using both the English and the Tongan languages. Fonuamalu is an extension of home and I realised how important it is to be a Tongan first, before becoming an academic. (Ofoi)

Community Voice

Sources coded to community are classified in three categories: results of official consultation with the community regarding the restructuring and direction of the schools, unsolicited letters from
individuals regarding the school's direction and structure and survey results from former students (Figure 54).

In 2002 and 2003 the Board of Trustees carried out extensive consultation with all families and the wider community to determine the reaction to their proposal to establish Te Whānau o Tupuranga as a separate school. The consultation included questionnaires completed during home visits, parents’ meetings and information disseminated to the community in a variety of forms. The outcome of this consultation is summarised in the report of the Working Party facilitated by Te Puni Kōkiri, which was convened to prepare the report for the Minister, and Associate Minister of Education. The Working Party was comprised of representatives from the Auckland Ministry of Education, Te Puni Kōkiri Counties Manukau, parents of Clover Park Middle School, the chairperson of the Clover Park Middle School Board of Trustees, the principal of Clover Park Middle School, a representative of the Otara Boards’ Forum, and two student representatives.  

Figure 54: Community Sources

In 2007 and 2008, again the Board of Trustees was required to consult with the community regarding the Board of Trustees’ proposal to extend the range of year levels at Clover Park Middle School from Years 7 to 10, to Years 7 to 13. When this application was declined by the Minister of Education in 2009, the Board applied instead to merge the two schools. Again consultation with the school community regarding this change was mandatory. The Board’s official applications, the

---

96 The Ministry for Māori Development

97 A collective of the Chairpersons of Otara schools’ Boards of Trustees, initially established in 1998 as part of the Strengthening Education in Mangere and Otara (SEMO) schooling improvement initiative. Not all Otara board chairpersons are members however and the two schools in this study chose to withdraw from the Forum in 2002.
consultation responses from the community, as well as letters of support from individuals have been examined as community sources.

Throughout these sources the reasons for the community’s initiative in seeking the changes to the school’s structure are very clearly stated, particularly in the application to the Ministry of Education to extend the range of year levels at Clover Park Middle School, where parents made specific reference to the learning model:

Parents gave the board a number of reasons for their request. The most frequent reasons were:

- To be able to continue to learn bilingually (in Samoan, Tongan) for those students already in bilingual programmes. Parents pointed out there are no Pasifika bilingual programmes available at senior level in other schools in our community.
- To continue with the ‘wrap-around’ family environment – including the multi-aged, multi-levelled organisation that is the school’s philosophy.
- To maintain strong relationships between teachers and students and families.

This is also affirmed in the letter sent from the Manukau City Councillor, who met on several occasions with the parents’ group, to the Schools’ Network Planning Manager in the Auckland Regional Office of the Ministry of Education:

The parents are seeking a meeting with you to discuss their wishes to retain their children in the bilingual Samoan, Tonga, and Cook Islands Māori programme at Clover Park in Year 11 in 2008. The parents feel that they are unable to access this type of education at senior secondary schools anywhere else and want their children to continue in this cultural environment locally. (W. Sio, personal communication, 8 October 2007)

Former Students

Former students of Te Whānau o Tupuranga were invited to participate in a survey regarding their experience of the school since its establishment as a separate school in 2006. This was a relatively small group and all former students from this time period whose contact details were known were invited to participate, initially in face-to-face unstructured group interviews. However, several members of the group asked if they could complete a survey online as an alternative and this was set up (Appendix D) and left open from February 2010 to January 2011. Members of the group then advised others of the survey and some former students of Te Whānau o Tupuranga, during the period when it was still a bilingual unit within Clover Park Middle School, then chose to complete the survey. Five of these participants had been students in the early 1990s and had left Tupuranga between 1989 and 1995. The participants were students whose experiences spanned the three distinct periods of the school’s history, (1) the early struggle between 1990 and 1995 to allow Years
9 and 10 students to remain in Te Whānau o Tupuranga, (2) the struggle to establish the senior levels of Te Whānau o Tupuranga between 2001 and 2004, and (3) the struggle to finally establish the school as a stand-alone designated-character secondary school after 2006. The input of these 18 former students, now members of the school’s wider community, provides a rich narrative and a valuable source of evidence in this chapter.

The former students’ responses mention specifically the importance of Te Whānau o Tupuranga in terms of the development of their identity as Māori, and around concepts of whānau and whanaungatanga. These themes are discussed in later sections of this chapter. A number of the former students had either come to Tupuranga after attending conventional whitestream schools, or had enrolled in other schools after completing Year 10 during the time there was no option to remain. The references to the school’s response to culture and way of learning are mentioned mostly in terms of Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s difference from their whitestream schools. The school names have been omitted from the following comments:

I attended . . . High School in Form 4. I must say it was a good school to attend if you wanted to become white and be like everyone else, and forget your culture. This is the norm. This is what you do now - if you don’t no one cares. Attending that kura there was always a part of me that they could never fill. It’s like a part of who you are is being forgotten and fading away. You become a part of one big melting pot. (Lawrence)

I went to . . . from my 3rd form year to the beginning of the 6th form. ..was very different compared to Tupuranga, as it was a mainstream school and you moved from class to class every 45 minutes. Your teachers sometimes didn’t even know your name, yet you had been in their class for the whole year. You NEVER saw your principal unless there was a very special assembly going on. Tupuranga was the complete opposite. You stayed in one class for the whole day, your teachers know you so well you swear they could be your friends, and Nanny Ann was down in the classroom every chance she could, even though she was running two schools at the same time! (Lita)

The supportive environment I had at Tupuranga became almost like a distant memory during my later years at high school as it came to be all about the survival of the fittest! Not a ‘whānau’ or tupuranga mentality at all. (Medadane)

Moving from Tupuranga to . . . the first thing I noticed was the difference in how things worked as far as learning goes. One, the school was much bigger so you felt as though you were one among many. You were not able to get to know everyone properly because everyone was stuck in their age groups. And there was less focus on whānau-based learning and it seemed as if every man was there for themselves. (Clifford)

The backdrop of “white spaces” and environments unresponsive and hostile to Māori learners is evident in all of these responses, and contrasted with the learning the participants experienced in
Te Whānau o Tupuranga. This is described most graphically in the following survey response from a former student who left Te Whānau o Tupuranga at the end of Year 10 (Form 4) in 2003 to go on to senior secondary school:

My experiences were totally different! I had to sit a test at the beginning of my fifth form year to see what class I would be put into. I must have done well in that test because I was told that I shouldn’t have a mark like that and that I cheated, so then I was put into a “dumb” class. When they put me in that class I changed because I knew that I didn’t cheat.

I would sit at the back of the class and disrupt the teachers, talk on my cell phone in my economics class because the teacher did nothing, have a smoke in my science class because the teacher wouldn’t help me, sleep in my English class because all that teacher would do is read us books, argue with my Māori teacher because all she did was give us a picture and tell us to write down what we saw in Māori and I threw a chair at my accounting teacher because she said that I was a dumb Māori. So what I found with secondary schools was that the teachers there are only there to teach what they have planned and that they won’t help anyone unless they are sitting at the front of the class. And that they really don’t care what is happening with you outside of their classroom. (Kylie)

Theme Two: Cultural Identity

The practice of the two schools has been discussed in the previous section. What are the conditions that exist in the schools that empower students to follow their own cultural norms? How do the schools contribute to the development of this knowledge? What are the students’ staff and community’s experiences of this model? These questions are all relevant to the structure and organisation of the learning programme, the philosophy it is underpinned by, and actual pedagogy and classroom practice.

This section deals with the outcomes of this approach. Culturally responsive, critical, social justice pedagogy designed to empower learners might be embedded in all sources examined, but does this practice actually result in the development of a positive cultural identity?

School documentation

Text references to culture, cultural and/or identity, are found 603 times in the range of school documentation examined (Table 33).

Table 33: Text References to Culture, Cultural and/or Identity in School Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report 2007</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report 2008</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goal of a secure, positive, cultural identity is clear in the graduate profiles developed for each ethnic group at Year 8, Year 10 and Year 13 (Te Whānau o Tupuranga). Expectations for students by the end of each of these year levels, in both schools, include: “develop and strengthen knowledge in their cultural identity and language,” “have a strong sense of identity,” “know his/her own identity/ethnicity,” and “have developed an understanding of their own cultural heritage.” By the time students graduate from Year 13 in Te Whānau o Tupuranga the expectation is that they have developed a strong cultural identity, know who they are as Māori, and be able to work confidently in their cultural situations as well as in other settings.

The designated-character statement for Te Whānau o Tupuranga includes the objectives: to provide a learning environment where cultural identity, custom, language and knowledge is the norm, to enable children to live as who they are at school, to develop the skills and knowledge to participate actively as citizens of the world, to enjoy good health and a high standard of living, and to ensure that children will be secure in their knowledge about their culture and identity so that they will have a strong base from which to participate in the wider world. These objectives have now been adopted as the special character of both schools when they merged in 2011 (see Chapter 8). They are also aligned to the aspirations of *Ka Hikitia* (Ministry of Education 2008a).

It is clear that, embedded in all of the school documentation are references to the indicators of the self lens assessment tool, itself built on four broad identity markers (Durie, 1998) of identification, knowledge and understanding, access and participation, and communication.
Independent voices

Again the independent reviews of both schools by the Education Review Office provide a valid source of independent opinion. Findings in the three reviews examined consistently refer to the development of cultural identity (Table 34).

Table 34: Cultural Identity Coded in Independent Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>References coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park Middle School ERO Report 2007</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park Middle School ERO Report 2010</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO Field Notes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whānau o Tupuranga ERO Report 2009</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2007 review of Clover Park Middle School reviewers found that, “Tuakana-teina relationships (older and younger sibling) are used as a way of fostering learning. As a result students are developing as confident young adults secure in themselves and in their cultural identity.” In the school whānau tuakana/teina relationships were not limited to siblings but also used to provide support and leadership across a wide range of partnerships, older/younger, able/less able, staff/students, where those with knowledge were able to take the lead.

These ERO findings were echoed three years later in the 2010 Clover Park Middle School report where specific references include:

They [students] are secure in their different cultural identities and have a strong affinity with the school and their whānau area.
Senior managers have also begun to analyse the impact of cultural identity on student achievement (Education Review Office, 2010).

Similarly, the review of Te Whānau o Tupuranga in 2009 found the “firm commitment to excellence and providing students with opportunities to learn as Māori and to affirm their identity as Māori,” to be an area of good performance.

This review focus area has strong links to the concept of Māori Potential - an approach where the desired outcome is Māori achieving success as Māori. It is implicit in this approach that all activities will be focussed on affirming students self knowledge, that is, their cultural knowledge, language and identity. Te Whānau o Tupuranga incorporates this approach throughout their philosophy and learning model.

Students are developing confidence and feel secure in their identity as Māori at Te Whānau o Tupuranga. They are provided with a wide range of learning experiences that expose them to Māori culture, tikanga, values and beliefs. (Education Review Office, 2009)
Staff/Student Voices

Presentations and work produced by current students also consistently refer to their cultural identity (Table 35), most often using statements about “knowing who they are.”

Table 35: Cultural Identity Coded in Current Student Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>References coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex Presentation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Will Be - Clubhouse Video Transcripts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kataraina Presentation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Presentation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui Presentation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofoi Speech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Presentation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, as was the case with former students, and due to the transient nature of the community, some of these young people had experienced other schools also and describe their experience in Te Whānau o Tupuranga or Clover Park Middle School in contrast with those experiences. A Year 11 student refers to feeling that he was losing his identity when he spent some time in a traditional secondary school, before returning to Te Whānau o Tupuranga:

I must admit I liked that I could study music for my main subject but it didn’t feel the same at school. It was like being a robot in a big nation where everything happens but nothing can change, that robotism (I like to call it Robotism). Also it made me feel like I was losing my culture, my identity that I had created at Tupuranga, because of robotism. (Maui)

By the time students graduate from Year 13 the expectation is that they will have a strong, secure cultural identity, know who they are “as Māori”, be articulate thinkers, speakers and activists, and be advocates for social justice. These attributes are evident in the presentation of a Year 13 student to a conference of school principals in Auckland in 2010. He describes a creed developed by senior students in 2010:

We have a creed called Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga - the Pathway to Self-Determination. It talks about individual and collective responsibility and reminds us that, “Me tu hei Māori tuturu,” or “I can’t experience success in anything else until I experience success in being Māori.

...Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga is a set of beliefs we live by. It takes us through the stages of Oho Ake (Conscientisation), Tu Motuhake (Resistance) and Te Hurihanga (Transformation) - that’s our pathway and our journey as young Māori. (Leonard)
Staff who participated in the group interview or chose to take part in the online survey also refer to cultural identity in all responses (Table 36).

Table 36: Cultural Identity Coded in Current Staff Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eneli</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured Interview with 10 Senior Staff, Sept 09</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many comments refer to the “red lens” self-learning assessment tool and the importance of being able to describe growth in the development of students’ cultural identity. Staff members detail their experiences of the impact of this on students and families. The following comments from two long term staff members illustrate the advocacy evident in all responses for the schools’ philosophy and practice:

With the self-lens learning students are not stripped of their cultural identity, norms, values, language, customs and traditions - instead students’ cultural identities are embraced, valued and accepted. This makes our students feel pretty special, however my view is that it should not be viewed as a privilege but a right! Because their cultural identity has been valued and accepted, relationships strengthen - between student and student, teachers and students, parents, teachers and students and goes beyond the confines of the school into the community, giving birth to a generation of students that are confident and positive and learning becomes authentic and meaningful. The red [self] lens assessment tool - which in my opinion is real ‘ground-breaking stuff’ - is an indicator of a child’s progress in terms of their cultural identity. (Cindy)

Tupuranga and Clover Park provide an environment where the cultural identity, language and cultural competencies of the students (Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Island) are recognised as the norm. From this standpoint, students’ own cultures are validated and seen as just as important, or more important, than a Pākehā way of doing everything.

The fact that students wanted to come back to Tupuranga showed that the culturally responsive philosophy of the school has to be working for Māori. It reinforced the importance of putting the kids first in our planning and constantly looking for ways in which to support and build their cultural identity. (Kirsten)

A second prevalent theme expressed by staff is the frustration with the feeling it was still necessary to justify why cultural identity is crucial. In the interview with the group of ten senior staff members there was considerable discussion around this topic. On one side of the discussion was
the idea that we see evidence every day that what we do here works for our young people, so why
do we have to keep justifying our practice? Who is this justification for? On the other side staff
spoke about the need for systemic change for all Māori and Pasifika children and therefore the need
to be able to explain what we do in terms that are understood by whitestream educators. This
dilemma, around the topic of assessment as a White Space was discussed more fully in Chapter 4,
and is one that is revisited regularly as staff reflect on practice and pedagogy:

How do you justify success though – on someone else’s benchmark? In terms of Māori &
Pasifika kids it’s almost as if it doesn’t matter what they do because until everybody in
their community identifies that need and figures out what success is for their kids,
you’re always going to be benchmarked by that principal, or that adult thinking the
blue [school] lens is the only way to go. (Allison)

In the same way that students spoke of their experiences in other schools to contrast their
experiences in Te Whānau o Tupuranga or Clover Park Middle School, staff and parents spoke of the
differences between teaching in these two schools and their teaching experiences elsewhere, or
from their personal involvement as Māori or Pasifika parents by way of comparison:

As a Māori parent, if my child was at a mainstream school and all they told her about
was her academic ability, success or failure, for me as a Māori person, that’s not
enough. I wouldn’t be happy with her being the top of the class for this and that, if she
can’t manage the other side of who she is. It’s what measure is used for success. I don’t
believe that academic success is enough but that’s all schools measure. For me
personally that’s the wrong measuring stick. (Haley)

I’m talking about Samoan kids – they were very good when they were in kindergarten
learning in their own language and when they go into the primary school they are given
a test in palagi then they fail the kids, and they label those kids as failures straight
away
... Unless we look at the system and make alterations to the system to cater for our
specific needs, our kids will still fail, because the system will fail them. That is how we
are different from other schools. (Eliu)

**Community Voice**

In the report of the Working Party regarding the establishment of Te Whānau o Tupuranga, and
again in the application to extend the range of year levels at Clover Park, there are specific
references to cultural identity:

Parents report that the benefits for their children staying in Clover Park Middle School
include that the identity of the students remains intact and that teachers and other
members of their whānau support them. (Working Party Report, 2002)\(^{98}\)

The application to extend the range of year levels at Clover Park was very specific about culture and identity. The application, made public to parents and the wider community through face-to-face meetings as well as letters and brochures delivered to every family, gave statistics from the 2006 Census (Statistics New Zealand 2009b) regarding Samoan, Tongan and Cook Islands Māori language and population trends in Manukau city. It also provided excerpts from a literature review commissioned by the Ministry of Education to support the more effective engagement of schools and Pasifika parents and communities in whitestream New Zealand schools. (Gorinski & Fraser, 2006). One excerpt referred to the process of acculturation, the internalising of the dominant culture’s values and identity, and the acute difficulties this process could cause in school contexts.

There could be no doubt therefore that the community perceived one of the strongest tenets of the proposed restructuring, was the preservation of students’ cultural identity.

Data from the community’s responses were analysed by ethnicity. Responses were received from 96% of all school families. All Samoan families (51 families), 93% of Cook Island families (39 families) and 91% of Tongan families (21 families) supported the application.

**Former Students**

The online survey completed by former Māori students of Te Whānau o Tupuranga contained two specific questions about Māori identity:

1. This study is about identity. Thinking about your experience as a student in Te Whānau o Tupuranga, please tick ALL of the statements below that you think apply to you, and comment further if you want to.
2. Did your experience as a student in Te Whānau o Tupuranga have an impact on how you feel about your identity as Māori? If so, how?

Responses to the first question are presented in Figure 55. Given that 42% of respondents state they knew nothing about their Māori identity prior to enrolling in Te Whānau o Tupuranga, and that 25% of the group felt negatively about identifying as Māori, these data are a strong indicator of the value of impact of the school.

The extent and depth of the impact of Te Whānau o Tupuranga on these former students’ identity as Māori is captured in many of the comments made in answer to the second question. These responses represent different students’ experiences reported over a period of 19 years. The date each respondent left the school is shown following each quote:

I wouldn’t be where I am today if it weren’t for my experiences at Tupuranga. I owe a huge debt of gratitude to Whaea Ann and those who blazed a trail for bilingual education and am SO blessed to have been in the right place at the right time to take up that opportunity. I have gone on to further studies with te reo Māori and also up until quite recently, kapa haka continued to be a huge part of my life ...bringing me
more joy and positive life experiences than can be put into these few words here. (Medadane) 1989

**Figure 55: Former students’ survey responses regarding Māori identity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former students’ survey question: Māori Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had little understanding of my Māori identity before I went to Tupuranga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt negative about my Māori identity before I went to Tupuranga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was secure in my Māori identity before I went to Tupuranga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My time in Tupuranga strengthened my identity as Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have continued to grow in my Māori identity and knowledge since leaving Tupuranga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being part of a whānau in Tupuranga helped shape my identity as Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapa Haka taught me about my identity as Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way we learned in Tupuranga taught me about whānau and my identity as Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with teachers helped shape my identity as Māori</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Being a student in Te Whānau o Tupuranga had a huge impact on how I feel about being Māori. I see and know a lot of people my age, and younger and older than me, who don’t know a lot about their identity as Māori only to realise now that they wish they had the same experience I had being a part of Te Whānau o Tupuranga. Given the knowledge I have due to being a student of Te Whānau o Tupuranga I am able to incorporate all I know into everyday living at home and with my kids. (Natasha) 1994

Yes very much so. It made me understand where I was from and it is very important for one’s self to know this. You feel inspired to go further and to help others that are doing the same. This also influenced with my own immediate whānau, external to the school, and made my whānau (the older ones) take Te Reo classes and investigate our true whakapapa. (Mereana) 1995

Most definitely. A proud one at that. Everything in Tupuranga revolved around Māori principles. You cannot be a part of this whānau and not come away identifying yourself as Māori. (Clifford) 1995

Yes! It did have an impact on me as to how I feel about being Māori. Te Whānau o Tupuranga has a mana and history that would make anyone who is Māori be proud to be Māori. To be Māori is not a right it is an honour. (Kylie) 2003
Tupuranga taught me not to shy away from being who I am. To be proud and stand up for what you believe in. Setting a goal is easy, it's the challenge of achieving higher than the goal that's more rewarding. Don't just aim to be the truck driver, it's aiming to own the trucking company that's the goal! (Kingi) 2004

Yes it did have an impact. From a past experience I thought of myself as a useless Māori, waiting to turn 18 so I could jump straight on the benefit like the “rest of them”. I realised from going to Tupuranga that this had become the “norm” for many Māori all over NZ and how silly I was thinking that I was going to end up the same way. As a Māori student, no one has expectations of you throughout your education, but at Tupuranga you strive to do your best and not become another statistic, making you feel proud to be Māori, and to be Māori 24/7. (Lita) 2007

YES! Tupuranga has had, and still has, a major impact on my identity as Māori. Tupuranga has given me and my family many Māori experiences. I have been able to travel up and down the country doing things Māori, kapa haka, Māori conferences, wānanga and so on. From the first time you walk in the Tupuranga doors you are taught that to have a good education is to be, and know your identity as, a Māori rangatahi. (Former Student B) 2008

**Theme Three: Whānau**

This theme was explored in detail in Chapter 5 and many of the comments from teachers and former students in their surveys and interviews have been quoted in the sections in that chapter entitled, “Pedagogy of Whānau: Whanaungatanga in Practice” (see p. 171), “Authentic, Critical Caring” (see p. 173), and “Students’ Experiences of Whanaungatanga” (see p. 175). References coded to whānau or whanungatanga/relationships are consistent across all sources and prevalent in staff and former student comments (Table 37).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Documentation</th>
<th>Student &amp; Staff Voice</th>
<th>Community Voice</th>
<th>Independent Voices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanaungatanga or Relationships</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School documentation**

Smith (1995) aligns the concept of whānau with knowledge, pedagogy, discipline and curriculum in the school setting. In 2009 Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School used Smith’s framework as a starting point for the development of a document to explain how the concept of
whānau was embedded in the schools’ philosophy, practice, curriculum, policy, and every aspect of school life. This document was presented for the first time at an inaugural national *Schools, Families and Communities Workshop* in Wellington, on 9 November, 2009. The event was organised by the New Zealand Families Commission, to bring together “a group of innovative school and community leaders to explore the active contribution of schools in achieving resilient families and communities.”

Following this event a Schools, Families, and Communities Cluster was established in Auckland and continued to meet during 2010. The paper, *A Pedagogy of Whānau*, (Table 38) was widely distributed through these events and ongoing meetings. In 2010 the framework was embedded in the schools’ Curriculum Statement, developed in line with the introduction of the revised New Zealand Curriculum. As official school policy, the Curriculum Statement and the Pedagogy of Whānau framework is now part of our regular cycle of self-review, and independent review from the Education Review Office.

The *Pedagogy of Whānau* framework (Table 38) is an effective indicator of the references coded to whānau and whanungatanga in all school documentation examined.

Table 38: A Pedagogy of Whānau in Practice: Activities that support whanungatanga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHĀNAU</th>
<th>ACTIVITIES THAT SUPPORT WHANAUNGATANGA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Whānau Empowerment | Free wireless internet to all homes - laptops for all students  
Parent learning through Whānau Centre and Computer Clubhouse  
Memorandum of Understanding with Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi to deliver tertiary study opportunities (Indigenous, Media Studies, Māori, Graphic Design) on our campus from 2011  
Parenting courses  
Health initiatives |
| Whānau and Resistance | Parents initiated three separate struggles over 20 years to challenge the system  
Critical pedagogy, social justice foundation and practice  
Setting goals for “Warrior-Scholars”  
Intentionally counter-hegemonic school practice and curriculum |
| Whānau and Identity | Culturally responsive, culturally preferred, pedagogy and practice  
Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Is. Māori bilingual education  
Authentic caring (our kids, not ‘other people’s children’ (Delpit 1995)  
Appreciative Inquiry - positive futures approach  
Whānau, Māori and Pasifika potential approach  
Māori and Pasifika taken as ‘normal’ |
| Whānau in School Organisation | Organisation for practice of authentic whānau  
Vertically grouped Ys 7-9 & Ys 10-13  
Inclusive - accept all students, no withdrawal or streaming  
Unrealised to Unlimited Potential model – no other ‘labels’ (e.g. special needs, gifted & talented, ESOL, at risk, at/above/below standards) |

---

99 Invitation from the Families Commission to the event
### Whānau in School Curriculum

| Three ‘lenses’ through which we view learning: school, self, global, - developed assessment tool for ‘self-knowledge’ - Cultural identity |
| Integrated curriculum across all year levels (Y7-13) |
| Integrated with students’ lives and realities |
| Grounded in social justice |
| Student-driven contexts for study |
| Critical Praxis - youth participatory action research |
| Students involved in co-construction and production of knowledge |
| Intensive & flexible use of time |
| NCEA standards come out of these contexts - no ‘course prescriptions’ |
| High level Information Technology - Computer Clubhouse - laptops for all students |
| Kapa Haka and Pasifika Performing Arts curriculum in itself - not an ‘add-on’ |
| Graduate Profiles |

### Whānau in School Policy

| Whanaungatanga - embedded in policy and funded in Budget |
| Learning Model - Three ‘lenses’ embedded in policy |
| No stand downs or suspensions |
| Whānau first in all interventions and support |
| Extensive Whānau consultation |
| Experienced, stable, Board of Trustees |

### Whānau in School Facilities

| New school facilities opened October 2008 & Clover Park buildings modernised in 2009 to facilitate whānau involvement |
| Open plan design - no walls, no doors - support our learning model |
| Māori/ Pasifika symbols, artefacts throughout and prominent |
| External environment designed for Māori/Pasifika learning |
| Whānau Centre - School Social Worker and Youth Health Nurse |
| Kia Aroha School Marae |
| Fale Pasifika |
| Computer Clubhouse |

### Whānau in School Community

| Reciprocal, mutually beneficial, relationships of trust - basis of all interaction |
| Very strong former-students’ involvement - as role models, tutors, mentors |
| Active parent participation - in own ethnic groups and languages |
| School Social Worker, Youth Health Nurse, Health Clinics |
| Clubhouse 274 - after school drop-in Computer Clubhouse - expanded to other communities in 2010. |
| Clubhouse Connected Community Project and research |

---

### Independent voices

In 2010 the Education Review Office, reviewed the *Pedagogy of Whānau* document, and the practice it describes, as part of the review’s specific focus on the schools’ curriculum design. The report found the curriculum design to be “distinctive” and “clearly located in the cultural context of the Otara community.” The reviewers considered that, “it promotes pathways to further learning and engages whānau, families and the wider community in considering these pathways.”

In the notes taken at the feedback meeting from the 2010 review team to the Board of Trustees a reviewer states that they found, through their observations and meetings with students, staff and parents, that when a child enrolls in the school, “so does his home and so does his community -
whereas in mainstream schools the child comes to the school, and it’s just the child. In this school, behind the child are the parents and his/her whakapapa.”

Excerpts from Education Review Office reports in 2007, 2009 and 2010 consistently find whānau and whanaungatanga in the practice of both schools:

The school has maintained its whānau organisation. With the establishment of Te Whānau o Tupuranga there are now three whānau areas that represent the largest student groups: Samoan, Tongan, and Cook Island Māori. (Education Review Office, 2007)

The concept of whanaungatanga is reflected in the positive interactions and relationships between students and others in the school. Students have opportunities to learn about and fulfil their respective roles within Te Whānau o Tupuranga as tuakana and teina, as peers and as students. (Education Review Office, 2009)

Teachers have positive and respectful relationships with students. Teachers have a sense of moral responsibility towards students and understand their cultural backgrounds and use this knowledge in ways that enrich students’ learning. (Education Review Office, 2010)

Staff/Student and Community Voices

This section has been previously covered in detail in Chapter 5. However, the last words in this context are from the former students’ group and provide further evidence of whanaungatanga in practice, as it was experienced by young people during their time in the school, and since. Again these quotes span some 18 years:

You just need to look at the name - ‘whānau’ and ‘tupuranga’. These words may appear to some to be simple however the embodiment of them – and the far-reaching positive outcomes when they are effectively implemented – is far from it! This is exactly what Tupuranga was for me! (Medadane, emphasis in original)

Te Whānau o Tupuranga works with the whānau for the whānau. The curriculum is based around what the students want to learn about, the kaikō are like your parents, you can ask them for anything day or night and they will do all that they can to give you what you need. (Former Student B)

I know if it weren’t for Tupuranga, things could have been a lot different for us! I have nothing but love and respect for the place, and will always have a soft spot for the many cool memories we have made. (Kingi)

Stauch kaiaoko who never lost sight of the kaupapa even if we didn’t [always] give them the respect they deserved. No matter how many excuses or lies, no matter how
ungrateful we were, we always knew our kaiako were there for us whenever we needed them, no questions asked. Even today having left school just over two years ago we can still go back. Once you’re a part of a whānau there’s no getting out of it - knowing there’s always a place you can call home. How many students in the world can call their school, home? --- Knowing that you have people in your life that love you and show you love, especially from the rough background I had to live, you always knew you had someone that would listen and be there. (Lawrence)

[Whanaungatanga is] very important and fundamental to the life of my family. The whānau model teaches you that everyone is important and we must understand each other’s roles, as opposed to seeing who is more important than the other. (Clifford)

Theme Four: Community

All Sources

It is more difficult to find explicit references to this theme in the sources examined, not because they are not there, (Table 39) but because the theme is an undercurrent, and the backdrop to many of the other references already discussed. Because of this, in the examination of this theme all sources are discussed together.

Table 39: Community Coded in all Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>School Documentation</th>
<th>Independent Voices</th>
<th>Community Voice</th>
<th>Student &amp; Staff Voice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the story of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School it is impossible to ignore the theme of resistance. That could have been the title for this section. However, to allow the resistance to define this journey, or to regard the schools solely as a site of struggle, is to negate the significant achievements that are the result of that prolonged effort, and seems to ignore the people, whose collective will and power drove these changes. The resistance and struggle over more than two decades were driven by the community of Māori and Pasifika parents and families, for the community, and for the future community to come. In fact in all three struggles the parents immediately involved knew that they would probably not see the change happen before their child or children left the school, yet they were undeterred. The theme ‘community’ therefore, represents the community’s efforts over a period of 25 years to develop a different model of education for their children.

Whereas the previous theme was discussed within the framework of a pedagogy of whānau, the community theme is more about a pedagogy of indignation (Freire, 2004) or a pedagogy of freedom (Freire, 1998). Freire wrote that a sense of just ire is a source of motivation to act (2004, p.59). This was certainly the case for parents in each of the two schools’ struggles, who were motivated to seek change and express their complete dissatisfaction with the status quo within the New
Zealand education system. Their struggle and determination that, collectively, we could achieve change was born in the desire of Māori parents to retain their children in Te Whānau o Tupuranga through to the end of Year 10. Having achieved this goal, after five years of battling officialdom, they saw the possibility, as Freire states (1998, p.72), that the world was not finished, but always in the state of becoming. The knowledge that they could make change empowered the community to seek the subsequent changes. Hooks (1994) describes this collective imagining of ways to move beyond boundaries and to transgress, as “education as the practice of freedom.” (p.207)

Evidence supporting the coding for this theme therefore was limited to evidence of the community’s resistance and to the three separate struggles over the history of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga, and to the impact of these struggles on the school community. Sometimes the theme is explicit, sometimes it is implied, or is included in a reference to something else. School documentation includes many references to the restructuring of the campus, the applications to the Minister of Education and the extensive consultation process each change required. Annual Reports and Board of Trustees minutes record ongoing progress as well as many setbacks and barriers.

As is to be expected references are harder to find within the independent sources, but they are also there. In 2007 the Education Review Office found that, “Trustees take ownership of decisions and have shown determination in responding to their community’s aspirations for a senior pathway for learning.” Although not in the written formal Education Review Office reports, verbal feedback to the Board of Trustees often included references to the community’s resistance, and in meetings between reviewers and parents, the extent of community ownership of the current issue was regularly tested.

In the feedback to the Board following the 2010 review of Clover Park reviewers spoke of the community and school as “stepping outside the status quo,” and thinking “outside the square.” There was specific mention of the attention to research and the dissemination of this which “puts yourselves and the community in the seat of academia, empowering students - but also empowering community to challenge their own thinking, and to think globally.”

Again however, the most powerful voices are those of the students who were at the centre of the battles. The experience is aptly described by three former students, the first two who were part of the process to change from an intermediate to a middle school in the early 1990s, and the third who chose to return to Te Whānau o Tupuranga in the struggle to retain senior students to Year 13 in 2002.

I felt proud to be a part of a great cause. We knew if we just kept on fighting for what we knew was a good cause that we would eventually accomplish our goals. There were hard times amongst it all, but all in all it was a great journey that taught us
perseverance and staying true to the cause. When the Ministry made it official that year 9 and 10 would go ahead, there was a great sense of relief and accomplishment. (Clifford)

To begin with I was in awe, unsure of what was happening. But we talked all the time about what was going on, why this person was doing this and why this roopu was doing that, and we were asked all the time how did you feel about that, what do you want to do? Being an active part of the struggle made it real, made me feel like an agent of change instead of a cog in the wheel. I had a voice and it was being heard loud and clear. (Steph)

It felt awesome to be a part of a movement that was started with a group of students who all believed that we could do better for ourselves. I'll never forget what we had to go through to get to where we are. Being called ‘Alienated Students,’ having Correspondence School work, finding schools that would put our names on their rolls, and the Ministry of Education trying to close us down and put us somewhere else. One of the biggest things that was important to me at the time was being comfortable with who I was and where I came from, and the best thing about it was everyone in the senior class was there for the same reasons too, so we weren’t going anywhere else. The feeling of being cared for and looked after is what we missed in other schools, and we knew the kaiako would be there to keep us on track if we needed it. All young people want is to be loved and be assured that their futures are going to be bright. That is what we found in Te Whānau o Tupuranga. (Kingi)

Returning to the questions asked at the beginning of this chapter, the analysis of the evidence presented confirms that appropriate and effective conditions did exist in the two schools to empower the students to follow their cultural norms. These conditions were intentional on the part of the two schools and are embedded in school policy and practice, in all official school documentation and confirmed by independent sources. The voices of current staff and students, and former students whose experience of the school spans twenty years, also strongly support the themes of cultural identity, culturally responsive, critical, pedagogy, whānau, and community.

At the time the data were gathered for inclusion as evidence in this chapter, in late 2009 and 2010, Te Whānau o Tupuranga had won the battle to become a designated-character secondary school in its own right, and Clover Park Middle School parents were in a process of applying, consulting, and re-applying to extend the range of year levels in the school to give their children the same opportunity to remain in their bilingual learning environments through to Year 13. The respondents therefore were aware of yet another challenge ahead, but no one knew the outcome. The Board of Trustees’ 2009 Annual Report explains:

The Combined Board of Trustees of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School, at an extraordinary meeting held on Friday 11 December, 2009, resolved to formally advise the Minister of Education that we wish to merge these two schools.
This decision followed the receipt of a letter from the Hon. Anne Tolley dated 3 December, 2009, declining our original application and suggesting we form one school, “with two streams” which could be either a designated character school or a mainstream school.

The Board of Trustees has a long history of responding to our community. We felt that to deny our Pasifika families this pathway negated our past achievements. The Board believed a merger would honour the shared history and strong partnership of the two schools.

In September 2010 the Board of Trustees was advised of the outcome of this prolonged third struggle. The merger of the two schools had been approved. On 28 January 2011, Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga ceased to exist as two separate schools, and merged to become a designated-character, Year 7 to 13, secondary school, with a new name, Kia Aroha College.

This change and its implementation are explained and discussed in Chapter 8 in the context of the wider implications of the research undertaken and presented in this thesis.
Chapter Eight

Self-Determining Spaces

Meaningful, empowering and culturally sustainable education for Indigenous peoples will be possible only when Indigenous peoples have the control (a fundamental right) and the resources (an inarguable responsibility of States/governments) to develop educational theories, curriculum and practices that are indigenous and are able to determine the environment within which this education can best occur. (The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights in Education, 1999)

This thesis hypothesises that it is possible to connect young people to their cultural identity and all facets of their learning and to support this learning with pedagogies that ‘colour in’ the white school spaces. In the schools in this study ‘colouring in the white spaces’ empowers Māori and Pasifika students to learn ‘as’ Māori, Samoan, Tongan, or Cook Islands Māori. It allows Māori and Pasifika learners to experience the same quality of educational sovereignty as Pākehā students, to be secure in their cultural identity, critically conscious, and be equal partners in the construction of knowledge that is relevant to their past, their present, and their future.

The thesis began its life as a study of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga and the practice that has evolved over time on this shared site to develop students’ secure cultural identities. However, it became much more than this, changing direction as the study progressed and the issues became clearer. As my understanding of the issues developed through this study, the questions moved from how can schools strengthen and support the development of a strong cultural identity in their Māori and Pasifika students, to why don’t they do this already and why does this seem so problematic? These questions brought into sharp focus the barriers Māori and Pasifika youth face every day in our Eurocentric education system that perpetuates and reproduces systemic racism under the guise of mandated “sameness” masquerading as equality for all (Gutiérrez, Asato, Santos & Gotanda, 2002, cited in Sleeter, 2010, p.21). The original questions however, posed in Chapter 1 in regard to the story of the Samoan girl at the principal’s office door remained relevant to the new directions the study took. Chapter 1 linked these questions about cultural identity to resistance and the struggle to wrestle knowledge from the coloniser (Dei (2011, p.168). In Chapter 1 the hypothesis for this thesis used Penetito’s explanation that being Māori “goes all the way down” (2010, p.269) to suggest that the development of a cultural identity for Māori and Pasifika learners in New Zealand schools also has to “go all the way back” to develop a critical awareness of
the role of schooling as a tool of colonisation and assimilation, “all the way across” to understand events, policies and thinking that shape contemporary whitestream schooling in the present, and “all the way forward” to develop new knowledge and pedagogies to co-construct a different educational pathway for the future. This understanding underpins the research questions:

1. What were the conditions that existed in the school that made it both acceptable and comfortable to empower the student to follow her cultural norms, even in the palagi principal’s office and to a group who were not Samoan?
2. Why was this important?
3. How would this confidence and cultural competence benefit her?
4. Had the school contributed to the development of her knowledge in this area in any way or was this purely due to her home background?
5. How could the school ensure all students had this same strength in their own cultural identity?
6. How would we know this was developing?
7. What would be the Māori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Island Māori ways of knowing young people were developing these skills?
8. How can schools recognise, and address, barriers that exist in their practice to the development of a secure cultural identity?

This final chapter returns to the students of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga, now merged in 2011 under the new name, Kia Aroha College. It begins with an explanation for the change of name and structure in 2011, which brings readers to the end of the schools’ current journey to provide a relevant education for Māori and Pasifika learners in this community. The chapter takes its structure from a set of twelve guiding principles developed by senior students in 2010 and aligns these with the three lenses through which the schools view learning, and which formed the basis of Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Each of the sections in this chapter provide answers to the questions which drove this study and links these answers to the schools’ expectations for students by the time they graduate. An overview of the thesis is also provided in the form of a diagram (Figure 56)

Self-Determining Space: Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga

In 2010 a group of senior students worked together in a two-day seminar, to develop a set of critical messages, following the example of the “Definite Dozen” (Duncan-Andrade, 2010, p.180), which was introduced and discussed in Chapter 6. Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga, The Pathway to Self-Determination, is the result of the senior students’ thinking. Duncan-Andrade (2010) explains that the idea of a set of principles such as the Definite Dozen is not about the principles themselves, but about the importance of creating scaffolding tools for young people that they can draw on in other situations and in their future lives. The Definite Dozen creates a common
language and a core set of values that take students through three stages: to enter your revolutionary state of mind, to discipline your revolutionary state of mind and to build a successful revolution (Duncan-Andrade, 2010, Appendix C).

Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga provides the framework for this chapter to summarise the pedagogy and practice of Clover Park Middle School, Te Whānau o Tupuranga, and Kia Aroha College. Like the Definite Dozen, “Te Ara” is many things - a rite of passage, a common language, a set of principles or a creed to live by. In Te Whānau o Tupuranga it is the morning karakia, recited by all students and it has also inspired the composition of waiata and haka. A similar set of principles, used in the same way, was also developed by senior Samoan, Tongan and Cook Island Māori students using their traditional values and in their languages. The English statements in Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga are not direct translations of the Māori text. They reflect the essence of the Māori statements, which are the most important. The final statement is the whakatauākī which gave Te Whānau o Tupuranga its name. Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga is the pathway we hope our young people will walk and therefore is therefore a fitting end to this journey.

To develop Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga students studied traditional Māori whakatauākī, they looked at some of the sayings students and staff had developed in Tupuranga about Māori values. They incorporated statements from the Definite Dozen and beliefs from other indigenous people. Finally, having decided on what was really important to them, students shaped the statements in a framework that follows Smith’s (2004, p.51) cycle of conscientisation, resistance and transformative action. This cycle was discussed in detail in Chapter 2 where it was compared with Feire’s (1972) concept of conscientisation as a more linear process of change. The Definite Dozen follows a three stage linear progression (although the elements of the three stages inevitably overlap), Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga however, is an ongoing cycle of awareness and action that you enter at different places and where the stages may occur in any order, or at the same time.

Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga acts as the central core and strength of the metaphorical “brown” spaces developed in these schools to counter the pervasive hegemonic white spaces in our education system. Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga is provided in its entirety below:

Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga: The Pathway to Self Determination.

Oho ake: Conscientisation (Becoming aware)

1. Ki te āwhina i ētahi atu, me arotahi ki au i te tuatahi (In order to help others, we need to help ourselves).
2. Ko au, ko koe. Ko koe, ko au (I am you. You are me).
3. Kia tū hei Māori tūturu (I can’t experience success in anything else, until I experience success in being Māori).
4. Waiho mā te tangata kē koe e mihi (Let someone else acknowledge your virtues, be humble).

Tū Motuhake: Resistance (Saying ‘no more’)
5. Ehara taku toa it e toa takitahi, engari he toa takitini (our unity is our strength).
6. Whakapono. (Believe - we can make a change).
7. Mahia, akongaia, i a rā, i ngā wā katoa (work and study every day, everywhere)
8. Papahūeke (Never, ever, give up).

Te Hurihanga: (Transformation)
9. Whakanuia i te puna mātauranga (Acknowledge the knowledge, teach and be teachable).
10. Me whakawetewete i āu mahi (Be self-critical).
11. Whāia te iti kahurangi, ki te tūohu koe me he maunga teitei (Have the highest expectations of yourself).
12. Pai rawa atu i ngā mea katoa (Aim for the very best in all things).

Ka rūia te kākano, kei ngā rangatahi, kia tipu ai ngā hua, whangāia ki ngā tupuranga. (We are the leaders of the future).

In the following sections of this chapter each of the elements of Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga is revisited to summarise the findings of this study and the practice of the schools involved. Figure 56 brings together all of the sections in a summary / overview of the study.

Thesis Overview Diagram

Figure 56 begins in the centre with the two schools, and their merger in 2011 to become Kia Aroha College. This change is explained in the next section. Surrounding the schools are the eight questions which were the catalyst for this study, and which shaped the research. The three arrows surrounding the questions represent the three lenses which underpin the culturally responsive, critically conscious, social justice learning model developed by the schools - the red self-learning lens (Chapter 4) the blue school-learning lens (Chapter 5), and the green global-learning lens (Chapter 6). The three arrows also represent the three stages of the cycle of conscientisation, resistance and transformation (Smith 2004, p.51), which are used in Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga - the set of core beliefs developed by senior students in 2010. The headings each stage of Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga serve as the text boxes which list the components and practice of each lens and each stage. The bold text in these boxes present the key principles common to the schools in this study and the three international sites of struggle described in Chapter 6. Finally, the four themes which arose from this research: cultural identity, whānau/whanaungatanga, culturally responsive, critical pedagogy and community are placed in red text at the base of the diagram to signify their fundamental importance to the whole structure. Evidence supporting the importance of these themes was presented and discussed in Chapter 7.
New Spaces: Kia Aroha College

The two prolonged efforts of the community to establish Clover Park Middle School in the early 1990s and to finally open Te Whānau o Tupuranga in 2006 were described in Chapter 1. The third struggle to extend the range of year levels at Clover Park Middle School from Years 7 to 10, to Years 7 to 13, to enable Pasifika students to remain in their bilingual learning environments right through their senior years was also introduced in Chapter 1.

At the beginning of this study the outcome of this third struggle was unknown. The commitment of the school’s community to achieve their goals throughout these three sustained struggles, spread over 25 years was described as “sitting-in for justice” in Chapter 6. Over these 25 years, there
have been only six years when the school community was not involved in one of these battles against education authorities and bureaucracy. The community applications, in all three cases, were based on achieving educational, cultural and linguistic sovereignty - the right of parents to demand a relevant education that valued Māori and Pasifika cultural norms and languages.

When a board applies to establish a school’s designated or special character, they have to specify how the proposed school will be different from general whitestream schools. In the first application to establish Te Whānau o Tupuranga one of the board of trustees’ goals was “To honour the Treaty of Waitangi and uphold tino rangatiratanga.” The board was advised by the Ministry of Education to remove any reference to tino rangatiratanga to ensure the first application would succeed.

In the third application, to extend the range of year levels at Clover Park Middle School, two of the proposed goals were (1) to give students participation in decision-making in curriculum content and planning to address real world issues through the lenses of empowerment and social justice and, (2) to empower students to become catalysts of change in their communities and society. It was of no surprise however, when an email arrived from a Ministry of Education official, advising the board that:

“...national office have slightly reworked the designated character statement to more clearly define the difference between yourselves and a regular state school.”

Empowerment and social justice were removed and these goals reworded. The goal of empowering students to become catalysts of change was deleted completely. In other changes in the 12 goals references to cultural identity were narrowed down to specific Māori, Samoan, Tongan and Cook Islands “cultural practices.” The goal, “to enable children to live as who they are at school, to develop the skills and knowledge to actively participate as citizens of the world to enjoy good health and a high standard of living,” based on Durie’s (2001) research was not acceptable, even though Durie’s recommendations are the cornerstone of the goals of the Ministry of Education’s Strategic Plan for Māori Education. Ka Hikitia. In the revised form, required by the Ministry of Education, the school’s designated-character objective states that Māori and Pasifika children will draw on their cultures, identities and languages, so that they “gain the knowledge and skills necessary to do well for themselves, their communities, Aotearoa New Zealand, the Pacific region and the world.”

The revised objectives, supposedly changed “to more clearly define the difference between yourselves and a regular state school” left us with goals one would hope would be the intent of any regular New Zealand school that was serious about valuing Māori and Pasifika learners. Over 25 years of resistance however, the Board of Trustees had learned to concede some battles in order to

---
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win the war. The board therefore opted to agree to the Ministry-revised designated-character statement on paper, so as not to further delay an outcome to the application, in the knowledge this would not change our actual philosophy or practice in the school at all.

In September 2010 the combined board of trustees of Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School received approval from the Minister of Education to merge to become one Year 7 to 13 designated-character school. This third battle, initiated by Pasifika parents in August 2007, had been sustained through rejections by two phases of Ministerial rejections, opposition from other secondary schools in the local community, a change of government, and the consequential change of the Minister of Education.

**Powerful Spaces – Through Aroha**

The choice of the name *Kia Aroha* (through aroha) was an intentional statement about what the community and the Board of Trustees strongly believe about education. Firstly, “Kia Aroha” was the motto of Clover Park Intermediate School when it opened in 1981, and the motto was retained when the school became Clover Park Middle School in 1995. It was the name chosen by kaumātua in 1998 as the name of the school marae, so is an integral part of Te Whānau o Tupuranga’s history as well. Using this name therefore took a piece of all three former schools into the merger. Much more important though, is the meaning of the name.

Manulani Aluli-Meyer’s work in Hawaiian epistemology describes the intelligence of *aloha*, “the intelligence of compassion, empathy and care” (2008, p.221). Aluli-Meyer says true intelligence, comes from self-knowledge, not from a test score. In an unpublished paper, she cites the view of Halemakua (2004), that “truth is the highest goal, and *aloha* is the greatest truth.”

The Māori word denoting *aloha* is aroha. The full meaning of the word does not exist in an equivalent English word. The online *Ngata Māori Dictionary* (Learning Media, 2004) provides 44 results for the meaning of aroha, but the meaning below, that most closely fits the reason for the school’s choice of this name, explains that the scope of the word aroha requires an exploration, not a translation:

> Aroha as an operational principle presumes the universe to be abundant, with more opportunities than there are people. In social interaction, it seeks the best in people, draws it out, yet is firm in not accepting aggression, greed, recycled ignorance or other behaviours that damage. Aroha in action is generous. Aroha in group meetings seeks unity and balance. Aroha in practice is intelligent, a unified intelligence of the heart, soul and mind. (Renaissance Aotearoa Foundation, n.d.)

---

This profound, authentic, love and care is one of the seven principles my research finds that our school practice holds in common with the other communities and programmes described in Chapter 6. Its essence, and its relationship to power, is encapsulated in the words of Dr. Martin Luther King:

The problem of transforming the ghetto, therefore, is a problem of power—confrontation of the forces of power demanding change and the forces of power dedicated to the preserving of the status quo. Now power properly understood is nothing but the ability to achieve purpose. It is the strength required to bring about social, political and economic change. There is nothing wrong with power if power is used correctly.

What is needed is a realization that power without love is reckless and abusive, and love without power is sentimental and anemic. Power at its best is love implementing the demands of justice, and justice at its best is power correcting everything that stands against love. (King, 1967)

Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga: Oho Ake (Conscientisation)

1. Ki te āwhina i ētahi atu, me arotahi ki au i te tuatahi (In order to help others, we need to help ourselves).
2. Ko au, ko koe, Ko koe, ko au (I am you, you are me).
3. Kia tū hei Māori tūturu (I can’t experience success in anything else, until I experience success in being Māori).
4. Waiho mā te tangata kē koe e mihi (Let someone else acknowledge your virtues, be humble).

In New Zealand, from the 1980s onwards, radical changes have occurred in respect of Māori education and schooling. This developed out of Māori communities who were so concerned with the loss of Māori language, knowledge and culture that they took matters into their own hands and set up their own learning institutions, beginning with Kōhanga Reo (pre-school language nests) followed by Kura Kaupapa Māori, (schools where students are totally immersed in Māori language and customs), and most recently followed by the establishment of three wānanga, (Māori tribal universities). These occupy an important place in the New Zealand education landscape, though unfortunately still catering for a relatively small number of children in elementary/primary school and even fewer at secondary school levels. The establishment of schools like Kia Aroha College is a further model that has emerged as a consequence of the conscientisation of a people and a community.

The `real' revolution of the 1980’s was a shift in mindset of large numbers of Māori people - a shift away from waiting for things to be done to them, to doing things for themselves; a shift away from an emphasis on reactive politics to and an emphasis on being more proactive; a shift from negative motivation to positive motivation. These
shifts can be described as a move away from talking simplistically about ‘de-colonization’ (which puts the colonizer at the center of attention) to talking about ‘conscientization’ or ‘consciousness-raising’ (which puts Māori at the center). These ways of thinking illustrate a reawakening of the Māori imagination that had been stifled and diminished by colonization processes. (Smith, 2003, p.2)

In the early 1990s, following the establishment of Te Whānau o Tupuranga as a Māori bilingual unit within Clover Park school, we soon realised that simply changing the language of instruction did not, of itself, make the school a better fit for Māori learners. We began to explore the reasons why. Schooling had been a negative experience for the majority of Māori families for generations. How could we reconnect parents and grandparents with their children’s learning? We turned to the Māori concepts embodied in the first four principles above. These concepts signalled a return to authentic Māori values such as aroha, identity, whānau, humility, manaakitanga (caring for others) and reciprocity. As Smith (2003) explains, the changes we needed to make were shifts in thinking, being proactive, rather than reactive, and raising the community’s awareness and consciousness – reawakening imaginations and countering hegemonic thinking. This process has been fundamental in the changes the school’s community has fought for, and been successful in achieving, over the last 25 years.

Chapter 5 described the concept of whanaungatanga in practice in Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School. Restructuring the schools as a whānau has driven the way learning is delivered and how the school is organised. An explanation of a pedagogy of whānau (Table 38) listed the specific activities and structures within the two schools that support whanaungatanga - in the categories of whānau empowerment, whānau and resistance, whānau and identity, whānau in school organisation, in the schools’ curriculum design and learning model, in school policy and in the schools’ decisions about building design and facilities.

When we restructured the school as a whānau we had to explore the significant disconnect between what happens in whānau, and what happens in school. In your whānau at home the adults don’t usually change every year, and members of a family work together, not in separated age levels. When family members make a mistake you don’t usually suspend them from the whānau. Our thinking about these realities led to multi-levelled classes, teachers remaining with the same students for three to four years, siblings and cousins placed together in classes, teachers referred to as whaea and matua (aunts and uncles), a policy of inclusion and not suspending or withdrawing students from class.

The importance of these concepts is confirmed in the identification of whānau and whanaungatanga as one of the four themes to emerge from this study and in the independent evidence provided in support of this theme in Chapter 7. It is also very evident in the voices of students in research carried out by the New Zealand Families Commission in 2011. Huia O’Sullivan, a Māori engagement
adviser, who spent almost two years observing and participating in the life of the school, writes, “In this school, teachers treat students as if they were their nieces or nephews and students regard teachers like their second mum or dad. A pedagogy of whānau creates a conducive learning environment in which students can succeed.” (O’Sullivan, 2011). Student voices in her research have been presented in the form of a poem. Students told her:

We’re about whānau
Whether it’s your whānau kura (school whānau)
Or your whānau at home
Your up-north whānau (tribal whānau)
Or the whānau you never met
When you’re together, that’s whānau
That’s the connection

At Tupuranga, we’re treated like people.
This kura is our haven; here, we feel safe
I leave my house, walk down the road
And I’m home again

Restructuring school as a whānau also meant conscientising teachers. Chapters 4 and 5 describe the development of practice based in whānau and the action research by staff to develop different assessment methodology. Sleeter (2008, p.82) states, “There is ample evidence that White people enter the teaching profession bringing little or no understanding of race and racism, but well-armed with misinformation and stereotypes learned over the years.” This misinformation is not only the domain of White teachers. Penetito (2002, p.182) comments, “Pākehā teachers and a significant proportion of Māori teachers have habitually steered away from doing anything that was too seriously Māori.”

The requirements for teachers in the two schools, and in Kia Aroha College, included raising their own awareness of their own cultures so they could better understand others, exploring their knowledge and experience of social justice, and culturally responsive, critical, pedagogy. That soul-searching is necessary for the fundamental shifts teachers need to make to work in our school. That requires reading, talking, reflecting, questioning, researching and higher level study. The outcome of this conscientisation of teachers is the Critically Conscious, Culturally Responsive, Teacher Profile developed by our teachers in 2008 and adopted by all as their job description. Alongside the mandated national professional teaching criteria, the Critically Conscious, Culturally Responsive, Teacher Profile includes requirements that a teacher:

- practices a critically conscious, culturally responsive, pedagogy that understands the relationship between power and knowledge;
- shows evidence of ongoing learning and developing their pedagogy in the areas of social justice and critical thinking;
• shows commitment to becoming secure in their own cultural identity;
• understands the cultural backgrounds of students;
• understands of the concept of whānau and its importance as the fundamental concept underpinning all school organisation and practice; and
• is visibly involved in the cultural aspects of the school’s programme and practices including hosting and looking after visitors, parents, and whānau.

Conscientising teachers also meant helping teachers to reject deficit thinking and replace that with a model that envisages unlimited potential in all children. This fits with the principles of authentic deep caring, and a pedagogy of whānau which carry with them the implicit understanding that these are “our kids,’ not “other people’s children” (Delpit, 1995). This change in thinking shifts the focus from low, self-fulfilling, expectations of youth of colour, to expectations of high academic goals.

The changes required to curriculum design are explained in detail in in Chapter 1, in the section, “Changing the Lens: The ‘Power Lenses’ Learning Model.” Chapter 5 extends this learning model and details the academic achievement of students, above national norms in NCEA and in literacy and numeracy. The development of a learning approach centred on whānau and whanaungatanga, and the six strong relationships we considered to be central were also explained in Chapter 1. These are a young person’s relationships with self (a secure cultural identity, who am I, where do I ‘fit’), their learning (its relevance to the student’s backgrounds and experiences), the teacher (mutual respect, trust, high expectations, and support), other students (positive peer influence and support), the wider world beyond home and school (critical, emancipatory, anti-racist, and tolerant of other beliefs), and a reciprocal relationship between home and school (that stems from a mutually beneficial, authentic partnership).

Placing culture at the centre of curriculum design meant changing to a curriculum that is integrated, not just across subject disciplines, but across students’ lives and realities (Beane, 1997). In the last five years this integrated curriculum approach, already built around issues of social concern which are specifically relevant to students’ families, communities and cultures, has widened to incorporate youth participatory action research (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008, p.126; Romero, Cammarota, & al., 2008; Akom, Cammarotta, & Ginwright, 2008, p.110), and learning through a critical, social justice framework. This critical lens has in itself been instrumental in raising teacher awareness of the need to reflect on their practice and particularly to consider the pervasiveness of white privilege in their training and in their experience, regardless of their own ethnicity.
Questions answered
This first section of Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga: Oho Ake (Conscientisation) has described the conditions that existed in the school that made it both acceptable and comfortable to empower the student to follow her cultural norms, why was this important, and how this confidence and cultural competence were of benefit. The answers lie in reclaiming Māori and Pasifika values and structures as the absolute foundation for decisions that determined pedagogy and practice and school organisation, and that placed a central focus on developing an authentic whānau to enable whanaungatanga to flourish. These actions formed the basis of the more critical practice which develops in the second stage of the pathway to self-determination.

The expectations for our graduating students are spelled in the Kia Aroha College (Te Whānau o Tupuranga) Graduate Profile (Figure 57). The expectations that are developed in this stage of Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga, and through the school-learning lens are that students will have a confirmed future learning pathway, high academic achievement which includes NCEA Level 3 and university entrance requirements, will be role models, have a strong work ethic, be articulate speakers, have a respect for knowledge in all its forms and be conscientised to inequities and injustice in education and wider society. They will understand they have the absolute right to learn at school “as Māori” or as who they are, without compromising their cultural identity. They will also understand and model values such as whakaiti (humility) reciprocity and whānau. These Māori and Pasifika values are further developed through the second cycle of Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga: Tū Motuhake (Resistance)

Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga: Tū Motuhake (Resistance)

5. Ehara taku toa i te toa takitahi, engari he toa takitini (our unity is our strength).
6. Whakapono. (Believe - we can make a change).
7. Mahia, akongia, i a rā, i ngā wā katoa (work and study every day, everywhere).
8. Papahueke (Never, ever, give up).

The resistance of Te Whānau o Tupuranga, Clover Park Middle School and Kia Aroha College to dominant ideologies of school practice and reform has been one of trial and exploration over many years. It required commitment and hard work from the board of trustees, school leadership, staff, students, and families. Every new intake of students, every new staff member requires us to revisit and restate our position. The four principles above have been essential to this process of making and then sustaining change.

Duncan-Andrade and Morrell (2008) identify three goals of critical pedagogy as empowered identity development, academic achievement and action for social change. We believed we could make a change, and we did, developing a strong academic identity and work ethic which resulted in high academic achievement. We also however, realised that a single focus on academic achievement
that ignores, or even negates, the other two goals couldn’t possibly be ‘success’ or excellence for Māori and Pasifika learners in Kia Aroha College. In our “Power Lenses” learning model “empowered identity development” is the goal of the self-learning lens. This lens includes the rich resources children learn at home about whānau, language, cultural norms, and identity - about being Māori, and learning ‘as Māori.’

In this “resistance” cycle of Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga we have fundamentally questioned and resisted the whole field of assessment and evaluation, and its limited focus on technical achievement and success determined by white knowledge and white ways of knowing (see Chapter 4). We have challenged our national pursuit of literacy and numeracy as the primary indicator of success in school and the sole aim of “solutions” to the inequity of outcomes for Māori and Pasifika learners. The schools in this study have believed emphatically that being able to put a reading result alongside a Māori child’s name, or showing that Māori children are meeting or exceeding a national norm or standard in reading or writing or mathematics, or being able to analyse these data and make comparisons with the achievement of other ethnic groups does not make it “Māori achievement.” It is reading, writing or math achievement - but there is nothing specifically Māori about it. Similarly, reducing Māori or Pasifika students’ truancy, or suspensions, or any other interventions which start from a position of deficit, may signal a school’s achievement in changing its practice, but is not any measure of our children’s success. If achievement “as Māori” is exactly the same as achievement “as Pākehā”, there seems to be little point in the stated intent of Ka Hikitia - “Māori children enjoying education success as Māori.” If we use no indicators of Māori knowledge whatsoever and we define Māori achievement in Pākehā terms, which we determine for our Māori learners, how can that possibly be achievement “as Māori’?

These questions in 2007 led us to develop a two-year action research project, involving Māori and Pasifika staff steeped in their own cultural knowledge. The research, described in detail in Chapter 4, developed indicators based on Durie’s (2006) four key ‘markers’ for Māori cultural identity: identification as Māori, cultural knowledge and understanding, access to and participation in Māori society and communication - in Te Reo Māori (Māori language). Similar indicators were developed for our different Pasifika identities. Using these indicators, we can show progress in the self-learning/identity lens for the whole school, by gender, by year level or as individuals. With this information, we can then show very high Māori and Pasifika achievement that is based on cultural knowledge and competencies. These data are shown in Chapter 4. We are very clear that learning in the self, identity lens is legitimate, high-status, end-point learning in its own right. The intent of the self-learning lens is to develop Māori and Pasifika knowledge. This is an intentional counter-hegemonic choice. We believe that a single goal of academic achievement, without knowledge “as Māori” demeans our Māori and Pasifika learners, who deserve better. The minute we define our students’ success in those terms, we negate all the other learning we believe is equally important.
Questions answered
In terms of the central questions to this study, this section of Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga: Tū Motuhake (Resistance) has answered questions about the intentional contribution of the school to the development of a student’s cultural knowledge and identity, and the schools’ goal to complement and support our young people’s self and home or heritage learning, in partnership with whānau. The action research and the development of a tool to measure this growth, described in detail in Chapter 6, and the five years of data gathered through the use of this measure give us very good information about how students are developing their cultural identity and how we can identify each student’s strengths in their own cultural knowledge and in whanaungatanga (relationships). The specific indicators for each ethnic group, developed by those with experience and knowledge of these different cultures, ensure that we are using Māori, Samoan, Tongan, and Cook Island Māori norms to show that young people are developing these skills.

The elements of the Kia Aroha College Graduate Profile which are developed during this stage of Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga, and through the self-learning lens, are that students are able to live and learn “as Māori”, that their cultural identity is secure, that they are strong cultural leaders, as competent on the marae or in cultural events, as they are in academic learning situations. They have learned that resistance to conventional structures and organisations that come from a dominant, Eurocentric perspective is hard work and a lifelong commitment that requires resilience, but that change is possible. This change or transformation is the work of the next element of Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga: Tu Hurihanga (Transformation).

Te Hurihanga: (Transformation)

| 9. Whakanuia i te puna mātauranga (Acknowledge the knowledge, teach and be teachable). |
| 10. Me whakawetewete i āu mahi (Be self-critical). |
| 11. Whāia te iti kahurangi, ki te tūohu koe me he maunga teitei (Have the highest expectations of yourself). |
| 12. Pai rawa atu i ngā mea katoa (Aim for the very best in all things). |

Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity or it becomes the practice of freedom, the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world. (Freire, 1972)

The four principles in this third element of the cycle encourage our young people to have the highest expectations of themselves, to be prepared for learning in all its forms, to be self-reflective and to understand the responsibility to pass knowledge on to others. The ultimate goal of Kia Aroha College, in fact the sub-title in the school’s letterhead and signage, is to develop Warrior-
Scholars – young people with high academic skills, secure, empowered identity as Māori, as comfortable and competent on the traditional marae and in contemporary Māori settings as they are in the classroom, with all the tools they need to challenge and change inequity in their whānau, in their communities and in the wider world. This section of Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga: Tu Hurihanga is about action for social change and the further development of critical thinking. It prepares our young people for the worlds beyond school and home, with 21st Century skills and knowledge which gives them the “kete” or toolkit they need in order to challenge injustice and seek equity for themselves, their families, their communities and society. This toolkit includes advanced computer skills, information technology, and critical media literacy skills. “Warrior-Scholars” are self-determining and always transforming. They are informed advocates for social justice, critical thinkers, activists for social change and empowerment and are competent in all three of the power lenses. The complete Kia Aroha College Graduate Profile for Māori learners, which ties all of the stages of the Te Ara Tino Rangatiratanga cycle and the three lenses together, is provided in Figure 57. Similar profiles have been developed for Samoan, Tongan and Cook Island students.

Figure 57: Kia Aroha College Year 13 Graduate Profile - Te Whānau o Tupuranga

Coloured Spaces

Questions answered

The last of the eight question central to this research asks how can schools recognise, and address, barriers that exist in their practice to the development of a secure cultural identity? The final two sections of this chapter address this question. The first section returns to the concept of hope, originally introduced in Chapter 1 with the statement that:

Middle class white children tend to come to school with faith that the system will reproduce itself to their benefit, a sense of purpose in the larger society and a sense of
hope that their purpose will be fulfilled. Non-white children tend to come to school with big questions in each of those areas. (Duncan-Andrade, 2006)

The restoration of genuine “audacious hope” (Duncan-Andrade, 2009), “radical hope” (Freire, 1998) and “radical healing” (Ginwright, 2009, 2010a, 2010b) are crucial to the reclamation of educational sovereignty and cultural identity of non-white learners in our schools. This is a key understanding for schools who seek to identify and address barriers in their own practice that prevent this development.

The second and final section of the chapter asks what did the three schools in this study learn from this journey and the changes that they have developed? As described in Chapter 3, this research is an intrinsic case study, which Stake (2000, p.437) explains is undertaken primarily because “in all its particularity and ordinariness, [the] case itself is of interest.” The research uncovers what is seen to be the case’s own issues, contexts and interpretations, its thick description (Stake, 2000, p.439, emphasis in original) and its stories. In doing so the lessons learned are made available to others who might explore the same issues and embark on a similar pathway, which they in turn will make their own.

### Hopeful and Healing Spaces – Critical Hope and Radical Healing

Akom (2007) argues that all spaces are “politicized, racialized, and gendered, insofar as they are infused with questions of power and privilege. He uses the concept of ‘free spaces’ as an important site for the development of theory and practice around youth activism, teacher development, and the transformation of public and private space in urban schools and communities. He defines free spaces as:

Places that share some of the following characteristics: a sense of shared bonds, places to revive one’s culture, places to rejuvenate our spirits, participatory and democratic spaces, places to civicly engage—debate—dialogue, places to form social networks, places to educationally achieve, places to form democratic and revolutionary visions of social change, places to recover and enjoy group identity, places to cultivate self and community respect, cooperation and community uplift. (pp.612, 613)

Spaces that are transformative are free spaces in that they give youth of colour choice and most importantly they give them hope. It would be easy to feel despair that the problems facing indigenous and ethnic minority youth, due to social conditions and circumstances far beyond their control, are too difficult, at least at the school and community level, to address. How can we possibly tackle the impact of colonisation, assimilation and continued institutional racism, if this seems beyond the government’s ability to even begin to change? Duncan-Andrade (2009) believes the answer lies in hope, and he categorises this hope into two broad areas: false hope and critical hope. He cautions educators against the all too prevalent false hope of school reform, which he
further classifies as “hokey hope,” “mythical hope,” and “hope deferred.” These are the “enemies of hope.”

Hokey hope places the responsibility on urban youth that if they just work hard and play by the rules they will succeed academically, but is “hokey” in that it ignores the “laundry list of inequities” (p.182) they face daily in their lives and in school. Duncan-Andrade states, “It is a false hope informed by privilege and rooted in the optimism of the spectator who needs not suffer—a ‘let them eat cake’ utterance that reveals a fundamental incomprehension of suffering” (p.182).

Mythical hope, uses U.S. President, Barack Obama, as an example of where “individuals are used to construct a myth of meritocracy that simultaneously fetishizes them as objects of that myth.” Hope deferred comes when we ask students to set distant and highly unlikely goals but then as educators are unwilling to help them meet those goals. Hope deferred justifies poor teaching and in the long term equates to hope denied.

The enemy of hopelessness and the opposite of false hope is critical hope, and again there are three elements: material, Socratic, and audacious hope. Unlike false hope, where each type can occur independently, all the elements of critical hope work together. Like Tupac Shakur’s (1999) “roses that grow in concrete,” educators committed to material hope don’t pretend there are ideal conditions, but strive to help students achieve by finding the cracks in the concrete - quality teaching, resources and networks. Drawing on Socrates’ statement that “the unexamined life is not worth living,” Socratic hope treats the “righteous indignation” of youth to their socially toxic environments as a strength, and works in solidarity with them (p.188,187).

Finally, critical hope is audacious - in two ways. It grows out of, then stands firmly in solidarity with, our students’ communities, sharing their suffering, and it defies the marginalisation of underserved youth:

Audacious hope stares down the painful path, and despite the overwhelming odds against us making it down that path to change, we make the journey, again and again. There is no other choice. Acceptance of this fact allows us to find the courage and the commitment to cajole our students to join us on that journey. This makes us better people as it makes us better teachers, and it models for our students that the painful path is the hopeful path (191).

Freire (1998) call this “radical hope,” the knowledge that, although I know things can get worse, I also know I am able to intervene to improve them, and the understanding that, “my destiny is not a given, but something that needs to be constructed and for which I must assume responsibility.” Freire describes the need to be aware of one’s conditioning, so that once “conscious of such conditioning, I know I can go beyond it, which is the essential difference between conditioned and determined existence” (p.54).
The notion of radical, critical and audacious hope provides a foundation for practice in school classrooms to provide our young people with the tools they need to challenge the status quo and to change their worlds. In the schools in this study audacious hope is sustained through critical pedagogy, whanaungatanga and aroha. The restoration and building capacity for audacious, critical hope requires new pedagogies that focus on “radical healing” to transform white spaces into “right” or ethical spaces that understand education is a matter of life and death for marginalised and minoritised youth:

Pedagogical spaces of resistance and resiliency that lead to improvements in teaching and learning for youth of colour in the midst of structural inequity, as well as building the capacity of young people and adults to create the types of communities in which they want to live. (Akom, Duncan-Andrade & Ginwright, 2011).

Radical healing involves developing pedagogical spaces of resistance and resiliency that lead to improvements in teaching and learning for youth of colour in the midst of structural inequity, as well as building the capacity of young people and adults to create the types of communities in which they want to live. (Akom, Duncan-Andrade & Ginwright, 2011). Ginwright (2010b, p.31) defines the four “Cs” of radical healing as “Caring relationships, Consciousness, Community, and Culture.” In Kia Aroha College’s pedagogy these concepts are closely linked to the restoration of indigenous knowledge, which is even more essential than ever for the future of indigenous communities, but which get left out of our conversations about 21st Century learning. The importance of this understanding is described by Aluli-Meyer (2008, p.230) when she explains that, “To realize that all ideas, all histories, all laws, all facts, and all theories are simply interpretations, helps us see where to go from here. To understand this one idea has brought me to this point of liberation” (emphasis in original).

What did these schools learn?

The solutions described by the schools in this case study show that an intentional focus on developing a secure, conscientised, cultural identity, drove and underpinned subsequent pedagogical and structural changes, which further supported achievement and success “as” Māori, as Samoan, as Tongan, and as Cook Islands Māori. This achievement is multi-faceted and holistic. One component of it is academic achievement. Other, equally important, achievements are the continuing development of cultural identity and competence, conscientisation, and transformation - the “Warrior-Scholars” this chapter describes.

The work of the schools highlights the schools’ determination to give Māori and Pasifika parents authentic choices in the education of their children. For Clover Park Middle School, Te Whānau o Tupuranga and Kia Aroha College this meant asking different questions of our Māori and Pasifika communities about their aspirations for their children, then not allowing a prevalent Eurocentric,
white-space agenda to influence the answers, or reinterpret the answers to fit the preconceived ideas about what school looks like. The reason why this Otara community has managed to achieve three major changes to school structure over this prolonged period of time stems from the fact they were listened to the first time they asked for change. The school did not see their request for change as opposition or an expression of dissatisfaction with the status quo. They saw it as a partnership and a journey to take together. The success of the first restructuring empowered the community to go on to seek further change. Chapter 7 provided evidence of the centrality of the themes of cultural identity, culturally responsive, critical, pedagogy, whānau/whanaungatanga, and community to the practice of the two schools in this study and what this practice meant to students, families and community.

The study has also focused on wider, holistic, definitions of success and achievement. The three schools seriously questioned the narrow focus on literacy, numeracy and technical academic achievement as the primary measures of “success” and developed additional, culturally relevant assessment practice. Staff took into account the negligible impact of whitestream approaches on equitable outcomes for indigenous and non-white learners internationally, and from our national focus on these limited measures over decades of schooling “improvement” initiatives in New Zealand (see Chapter 5).

Our experience was that this is a systemic issue, therefore apportioning sectoral blame was counter-productive to finding meaningful solutions. We also realised that the systemic change we felt was necessary was unlikely to happen overnight, if at all. Our self-governing education system however, gives us an autonomy that international educators I visited in the course of this research simply could not believe. The schools and the community, through the leadership of the Board of Trustees, have exercised this autonomy and flexibility. The greatest barrier to each one of us making this sort of change in our own school is our own thinking – which we do have the power to change. The schools in this study did think differently about learning and the outcome of this reflection was the critically conscious, culturally responsive approach this thesis describes. This model addresses the issues of power and social justice, through a critical pedagogy based in whānau and Māori and Pasifika values and beliefs.

Each chapter in this thesis has started with a quote from The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights in Education, (1999). The Statement concludes:

We, the Indigenous peoples of the world, assert our inherent right to self-determination in all matters. Self-determination is about making informed choices and decisions and creating appropriate structures for the transmission of culture, knowledge and wisdom for the benefit of each of our respective cultures. Education for our communities and each individual is central to the preservation of our cultures and for the development of the skills and expertise we need in order to be a vital part of the twenty-first century.
The resources to challenge every school to empower non-white students to become self-determining learners exist in the community itself. The barriers that make this so difficult to achieve are inherent in the systemic, institutionally racist, white spaces this thesis identifies and names. However, Clover Park Middle School, Te Whānau o Tupuranga, and Kia Aroha College have proven that it is possible, in spite of significant odds, to give our children the educational sovereignty that should rightfully be theirs. There is no single, easy solution. The achievements of this community have been the result of long years of extremely hard work on the part of everyone involved. There is no miracle “recipe” that can be picked up and placed in another community or another school. Each community is different and each school needs to work to remove their own barriers and to develop relationships of trust and reciprocity with their families and students.

There are however, lessons to be learned by schools and communities in the journey of these three schools to develop a counter-narrative to a dominant white system where most interventions and solutions have their origin in paradigms imbued with deficits, and which alienate Māori and Pasifika learners. These lessons are identified in the seven core principles common to the practice of these three schools and the three U.S.A. programmes described in Chapter 6. These principles include making race, ethnicity and cultural identity central to curriculum and practice, and ensuring that the programmes are strongly supported and driven by parents and community. The programmes are based in authentic caring, aroha, and whanaungatanga, and in critical pedagogy, kaupapa Māori, and critical race theory. Students are involved in the identification of issues and the production of knowledge through participatory action research and learning draws heavily on other knowledges—traditional cultural knowledge and practices, youth knowledge and culture, and community knowledge. There is a high stakes ‘end result’ that gives students a purpose for their learning. Finally, and most importantly, the programmes are intentionally counter-hegemonic.

The collective, lived, experiences of everyone involved in the journey and achievements of Clover Park Middle School, Te Whānau o Tupuranga, and Kia Aroha College serve to show indigenous and marginalised learners in whitestream contexts everywhere, that there is a pathway forward to self-determination. Our education system’s white spaces can be coloured in by practice that gives a community voice, that listens, that responds, and that is underpinned by the cultural knowledge and beliefs of its people. This practice conscientises whānau to resist the status quo, to demand more, and to transform the educational experiences of our children.

*Ka rūia te kākano, kei ngā rangatahi, kia tipu ai ngā hua, whangāia ki ngā tupuranga.*

Plant the seed in the young. It will grow and bear fruit to nourish future generations.
Glossary

Notes on the Glossary

Where it is necessary to understand a concept or sentence at the time of reading, meanings of Māori words have also been provided in the text. Meanings of Māori words have been provided in parentheses after their first use, unless they appear in a quotation. Other languages used in the text have had the meaning provided in parenthesis after the word or in a footnote.

The English meanings of Māori words in the following list are taken primarily from the *Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index* (Moorfield, 2011, online version). Many words have a range of meanings. Those provided below are the meanings relevant to the context within which the word is used in this text. Māori titles of some of the literature, organisations, and/or programmes are also included in the glossary.

- ako: learn, teach
- ao Māori: the Māori world
- Aotearoa: common Māori name for New Zealand, often translated as “the land of the long white cloud”
- ara: path
- aroha: deep caring, love, compassion, empathy
- aroha tētahi ki tētahi: look after each other
- āwhina: to assist, help
- haka: war dance
- hākinakina: sport
- hapū: kinship group, sub-tribe
- harakeke: New Zealand flax
- haututū: mischievous
- *He Kākano*: professional learning programme for secondary and area school leadership teams.
- hikitia: to lift up, raise
- hīmene: hymn
- *Hui Taumata Matāuranga*: Māori Education Summit
- hui whakatika: culturally responsive, self-determining interventions for restoring harmony
- hūmārie: gentle, pleasant, peaceful, kind
hurihanga  changing, turning
iwi  extended kinship group, tribe, nation, people

Ka Hikitia  The Māori Education Strategy 2008 - 2012
Ka whawai tonu mātou mō ake tonu atu  We will keep fighting forever
kaha  ability, power, strength
kai  food
kaiaka  be adept, proficient, skilled. In Tupuranga the ripene for achieving NCEA Level 2. From Te Aka (in Māori cosmogony) signifying a creeper or vine
kaiako  teacher
kāinga  home
kairangi  anything held in high esteem, highest level. In Tupuranga the ripene for achieving NCEA Level 3.
kairea  In Tupuranga the ripene for achieving NCEA Level 1. From Te Rea (in Māori cosmogony) signifying growth
kaitiaki  custodian, guardian
kaitito  composer
kākahu  clothing
Kāore te kūmara e kōrero mo tōna ake reka  Proverb: “the kumara does not speak of its own sweetness” - do not boast of your own endeavours
kapa haka  Māori cultural performing arts group
karakia  to recite ritual chants, say grace, pray
karanga  to call, a ceremonial call of welcome to visitors
kaumātua  male elder
kaupapa  philosophy, policy, plan, topic
Kaupapa Māori  Māori ideology - a philosophical doctrine, incorporating the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of Māori society.
kaupapa whānau  Group of people linked with a common association
Kōhanga Reo  “language nest” - Māori language preschool.
kōrero  to speak, a speech, story
kōrero o nehe ra  stories from the past
koru  coil, curled shoot, spiral
kotahitanga  unity
kuia  female elder
kura  school
Kura Kaupapa Māori  school operating under Māori custom and using Māori as the medium of instruction
mahi  
  to work, job, employment

mahi tahi  
  To work as one, work together

mahi toi  
  art, craft

mana  
  prestige, authority, control, power, influence

mana motuhake  
  separate identity, autonomy

manaaki  
  to support, take care of

manaakitanga  
  hospitality, kindness

manuhiri  
  visitor, guest

Māori  
  indigenous person of Aotearoa New Zealand.

Māoritanga  
  Māori culture, practices and beliefs

marae  
  courtyard - the open area in front of the wharenui, the complex of buildings around the marae

mārama  
  be clear, easy to understand

marautanga  
  curriculum

mātāmua  
  first-born, oldest child. The name used for senior students in Te Whānau o Tupuranga

matua  
  father, parent, uncle

mauri  
  life principle, special nature, a material symbol of a life principle, source of emotions.

mihi  
  to greet, pay tribute, acknowledge, thank.

mōhio  
  to know, understand

mokopuna  
  grandchild

motuhake  
  be separate, special, distinct,

Ngai Tahu (Kai Tahu)  
  Māori tribal group of much of the South Island

oho  
  to wake up

oranga  
  welfare, health, living.

pā  
  stockade, fortified village,

Pākehā  
  New Zealander of European descent, white person

pakeke  
  be grown up, adult, mature, used as the name for Years 9 and 10 students in Te Whānau o Tupuranga

Papatūānuku  
  Earth mother

pepeha  
  tribal saying, proverb (especially about a tribe)

pohō  
  chest, bosom, seat of affections

poutama  
  the stepped pattern of tukutuku panels symbolising genealogies and the various levels of learning and intellectual achievement

pōwhiri  
  to welcome, welcome ceremony on a marae.

rākau  
  tree
rangatahi youth, younger generation
rangatiratanga sovereignty, chieftainship, right to exercise authority,
raranga to weave, plait (mats, baskets, etc.). Weaving
reo Māori The Māori language
ripene ribbon
Rōpu, roopu group
rorohiko computer
tāhuhu ridge pole (of a house)
taiohi youth, young person
taitamariki youth, teenager, adolescent	
tamariki children
tangata man, human being
tangata whenua local people, hosts, indigenous people of the land
tangihanga funeral
tāniko to finger weave, embroider
taniwha water spirit, monster, chief, something or someone awesome
tapu be sacred, prohibited, restricted, set apart, protected
taumata summit, top of a hill, level, grade.
taurapa stern-post (of a canoe).
tautoko to support, agree

The name given to the partnership between The University of Waikato and Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi to lead the He Kākano Project

Te Hoe Nuku Roa a longitudinal Māori household project with a focus on Māori cultural, social and economic development.

Te Kauhua Ministry of Education professional learning programme that uses action research to enhance outcomes for Māori students

Te Marautanga o Aotearoa the NZ national curriculum for Māori-medium schools

Te Tere Auraki Ministry of Education professional development project to improve Māori students’ outcomes in English-medium schools

Te Tiriti o Waitangi Treaty of Waitangi – treaty signed in February 1840 by representatives of the British Crown and various Māori chiefs from the North Island of NZ

teina younger brother (of a male), younger sister (of a female), younger cousin (of the same gender). Used as the name for Years 7 students in Te Whānau o Tupuranga

tiaki to guard, keep.
tikanga correct procedure, custom
timata to begin, start
timatanga beginning, starting.
tinana the body, self, person
tino rangatiratanga self determination
tipuna / tupuna ancestors, grandparents
tuakana elder brother (of a male), elder sister (of a female), older cousin (of the same gender). Used as the name for Year 8 students in Te Whānau o Tupuranga
tuakiritanga identity
Tūhoe tribal group of the Bay of Plenty, NZ
tukutuku traditional ornamental lattice-work
tupuna ancestor
tupuranga future generations, growth
tūrangawaewae place where one has rights of belonging through kinship and whakapapa.
waharoa entrance to a pā, gateway, main entranceway
waiata to sing. A song, chant
wairua spirit, spirituality
waka canoe, vehicle
wānanga to meet and discuss. Seminar, conference, forum, a tertiary institution, school
whaea mother, aunt, aunty, a respectful term of address to a woman
whakapapa genealogy
whakapapa whānau group of people linked by kinship
whakatauākī , whakataukī proverb, saying
whakawhanaungatanga to build or maintain relationships
whānau to be born, extended family group
whanaungatanga relationship, kinship, sense of family connection
whangāia feed, nourish
whare house, building
wharekai dining hall
whareniwi meeting house, large house - main building of a marae
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Appendix A

Information Letter and Consent Form

Date

Dear _______________

I am the principal of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga and am currently a student at the University of Waikato, studying for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD).

The purpose of my study is to examine the initiatives in place in these two schools that enable students to develop a secure cultural identity. I intend to use international and national research and theory and look at the practice of these two schools in light of this knowledge.

Participation

Information will be gathered through documentation and practices that already exist in the schools’ regular timetable and programmes. These will include various meetings of staff, board members, past students and families and the wider community. Verbal consent will be obtained from meeting participants prior to these meetings and, where specific comments are used, written consent from those participants will be obtained. Where it might be useful to have more detailed comment participants will be asked, prior to the meeting, to agree to audio recordings of these meetings and discussions. Where these regular meetings are relevant to this study, participants will be advised beforehand and anyone not participating in the study will be given the opportunity to withdraw. Staff and former students who are over 18 years of age will also be invited to participate in unstructured face to face interviews and/or confidential online surveys. Participation in these interviews or surveys will be completely voluntary. Staff who are participating will be advised of their right to withdraw at any time up to six weeks following the final sharing back of the information.

Confidentiality

Each participant has the right to be anonymous and to use a pseudonym, however names will be used if participants prefer to do so. All raw data and evidence will observe requirements of confidentiality. Participants are informed that despite the best efforts of the researcher, absolute anonymity and confidentiality cannot be guaranteed. The setting of the research within a dual
school campus, where participants are known to each other may result in participants being identifiable in the final report. Audio tapes used will be transcribed by the researcher. Any raw research data, including audio tapes or digital recordings, will be archived indefinitely in accordance with the University of Waikato’s Ethics Committee guidelines.

Findings
Findings will be submitted to the University of Waikato as a doctoral thesis and may be subsequently submitted to journals for publication or as papers for conference presentations. Findings will be shared with the community of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whānau o Tupuranga.

Your Rights
If you agree to participate your rights are as follows:

- to refuse to answer any question at any time
- to ask questions about the study at any time
- to provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used (unless you give permission to the researcher)
- to be given access to a summary of the findings of the study when it is finished
- to be given a copy of any material, including audio recordings if you ask for one
- to have the right to withdraw up to six weeks following the final sharing back of the information with you

Yours sincerely

Ann Milne
Clover Park Middle School & Te Whānau o Tupuranga,
51 Othello Drive, Otara, Manukau City

Contact:
Email: ann@tupuranga.school.nz

Supervisors:
Professor Russell Bishop PhD
University of Waikato
Hamilton
Phone 07 838 4500, Fax 07 838 4555

Professor Ted Glynn PhD
University of Waikato
Hamilton
Phone 07 838 4500, Fax 07 838 4555
Consent Form

I have read the covering information letter and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I know that my participation is entirely voluntary. I understand I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time up to six weeks following the final sharing back of the information with me, and to decline to answer any particular questions.

☐ I agree to provide information to the researcher on the understanding that my name will not be used without my permission. The information will be used only for this research and publications arising from this research project.

☐ I understand that it is not possible for anonymity and confidentiality to be guaranteed in the final thesis.

OR

☐ I prefer to have my real name used in any quoted references in this study

I understand that this information will be gathered during normal regular meeting times, and at a range of hui that discuss existing initiatives and practice within the two schools.

I understand that whenever a meeting is being recorded I will be advised prior to the meeting.

I understand that any interviews or surveys I am invited to participate in will be voluntary

Audio recording:

☐ I agree ☐ I do not agree

- to certain meetings or interviews where I am a participant being audio-recorded but understand this will be made clear and approval sought prior to the meeting or interview taking place.

I also understand that I have the right to ask for the audio recorder to be turned off at any time during interviews.

I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the information sheet.

Signed __________________________

Name __________________________

Date __________________________
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Semi-structured Interview with Staff Group. (July, 2010)

Information

The consent and information letter I’ve given you tells you, you can chose not to have your voices or your comments recorded and, once I’ve fed back to you what everybody said, you can withdraw comments and choose not to be involved at any time.

There is no predetermined structure to this interview. All of my questions are open ended so I’m interested in you contributing your own thoughts. I have some really general headings if we need them, but whatever you want to say will be valid and useful to me. If you feel that today you didn’t get a chance to say everything you wanted to, or you thought of something later you wish you had said, you can go on to the online survey, click your way through to the consent screen again and just add anything in any of the boxes.

Agenda for discussion if needed

1. The headings that I thought about for today were just to talk around our blue/school learning lens, and the changes we have made within that lens, the red/self learning lens and the implications that both of those areas have had on our rangatahi and on you as teachers. Perhaps we can start with any comments about the way we deliver learning through the blue lens in our two schools?

2. With the new curriculum what is it that you do that is different from other schools who are now picking up the new curriculum? Does the new curriculum allow schools to work the way that we do? Do you think other schools implementing the new curriculum would choose to do what we are doing?

3. How do we know what we do works? In terms of what is generally seen as learning and achievement, and what we see as being successful Māori Samoan, Cook Island Māori, and Tongan students, what are your indicators that it work for our students?

4. Is this a model other schools could adopt or is this just relevant to our schools?

5. What do teachers need to work this way?

6. You have seen the latest red/self lens data analysis. Do you have any comments about what these data show?
Appendix C

Staff Online Survey

1. Name

2. Email Address:

3. I have read the covering letter and understand the details of the study. I understand that I may ask questions at any time. I know that my participation is entirely voluntary. I understand I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time up to six weeks following the final sharing back of the information with me, and to decline to answer any particular questions.
   - Yes
   - No

4. I agree to provide information to the researcher on the understanding the information will be used only for this research and publications arising from this research project.
   - Yes
   - No

5. I understand I have a choice about the use of my name. If I choose not to use my real name I understand that it is not possible for anonymity and confidentiality to be guaranteed in the final thesis.
   - I prefer to use my real name (note this may only be your first name)
   - I do not want my real name to be used

6. I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the information sheet and on this page.
   - Yes
   - No

7. Please enter the date you are giving this consent

8. How many years altogether have you worked as a teacher on this campus?

Please comment on any or all of the following:


10. The critical and social justice aspects of our learning model - and the implications for all concerned.

11. The value of the “red lens” learning from your perspective - cultural identity, language, cultural competencies...

12. The red lens tool - including the development process if you were part of that. Does it inform your teaching and if so, how?

13. The change from Intermediate to Middle School status (if you were a staff member at that time)
14. The current application to include senior students in their bilingual environments at Clover Park

15. Your own personal/professional journey - possible comparisons with previous teaching experiences, difficulties, achievements etc. Please continue to next box if you need more space.

16. The type of professional development that you think is necessary to work in this way - what do you think is successful or not?

17. What you see in terms of learning and development (socially, culturally, academically, emotionally etc) of our young people in our schools. (Some of you might have personal experiences to relate about your own whānau members or may have specific examples of change, or can comment in comparison with other teaching experiences. How does our learning approach impact on young people from your perspective?)

18. Examples of community interaction and involvement in our programmes and/or events. From your perspective of meeting and talking with parents and whānau please comment either generally or specifically on examples of community ownership of our learning model

19. If other schools wanted to work in this way what would you tell them is needed to make these changes?

20. Is there anything else you want to add about Te Whānau o Tupuranga or Clover Park Middle School?
Appendix D

Former Students’ Online Survey

1. Name

2. Email Address:

3. I have read the covering letter and understand the details of the study. I understand that I may ask questions at any time. I know that my participation is entirely voluntary. I understand I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time up to six weeks following the final sharing back of the information with me, and to decline to answer any particular questions.
   - Yes
   - No

4. I agree to provide information to the researcher on the understanding the information will be used only for this research and publications arising from this research project.
   - Yes
   - No

5. I understand I have a choice about the use of my name. If I choose not to use my real name I understand that it is not possible for anonymity and confidentiality to be guaranteed in the final thesis.
   - I prefer to use my real name (note this may only be your first name)
   - I do not want my real name to be used

6. I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the information sheet and on this page.
   - Yes
   - No

7. Please enter the date you are giving this consent

8. What years were you a student in Te Whānau o Tupuranga? (year started and year left - for some of you there might be two different times)

9. What were some of the key events or learning you remember about your years in Te Whānau o Tupuranga and why are these important?

10. What do you think are the key features in the way Te Whānau o Tupuranga works?

11. Did your experience as a student in Te Whānau o Tupuranga have an impact on how you feel about your identity as Māori? If so, how?

12. If you attended other secondary schools, how were those experiences different?

13. If you were a member of the first senior classes from 2002 - 2006 explain how you felt about that experience and that responsibility. What do you remember that was important to you?

14. If you were a student during the struggle to establish the first Years 9 and 10 classes in the early 1990s, explain how you felt and what you remember about that experience
15. Has your experience in Te Whānau o Tupuranga influenced how you think and feel as adults? How?

16. How do you see your role in the whānau now you are adults?

17. How do you feel Te Whānau o Tupuranga prepared you for what you are doing now? (academically, socially, in terms of ‘being’ Māori, in your values, beliefs, as parents, etc).

18. Looking back on your years as a student in Te Whānau o Tupuranga, how would you rate your experience?

- Didn’t enjoy any of it
- OK but not all that important
- Some good, some bad times
- Great most of the time
- Had a long-lasting positive impact on me

19. This study is about identity. Thinking about your experience as a student in Te Whānau o Tupuranga, please tick ALL of the statements below that you think apply to you, and comment further if you want to.

- I had little understanding of my Māori identity before I went to Tupuranga
- I felt negative about my Māori identity before I went to Tupuranga
- I was secure in my Māori identity before I went to Tupuranga
- My time in Tupuranga strengthened my identity as Māori
- I have continued to grow in my Māori identity and knowledge since leaving Tupuranga
- Being part of a whānau in Tupuranga helped shape my identity as Māori
- The way we learned in Tupuranga taught me about whānau and my identity as Māori
- Relationships with teachers helped shape my identity as Māori
- Other (please specify)

20. Is there anything else you want to say about Te Whānau o Tupuranga?
### Appendix E

**Summary of Sources, Coding References and Nodes (NVivo9)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Name</th>
<th>Number Of Coding References</th>
<th>Number Of Nodes Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex's Presentation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report 2007</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report 2008</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report 2009</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to Change Year Levels of Clover Park</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chey</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park Graduate Student Profiles 2010</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park Middle School ERO Report 2007</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover Park Middle School ERO Report 2010</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Schools' Strategic Plan Charter 2010</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Member's Letter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically Conscious, Culturally Responsive, Teacher Profile Registered Teacher Job Description</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically Conscious, Culturally Responsive, Teacher Profile Provisional Teacher Job Description</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically Conscious, Culturally Responsive, Teacher Profile Experienced Teacher Job Description</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Statement 2010</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>special Statement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eneli</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO Field Notes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Student A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Student B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Students' Survey Responses</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Will Be - Clubhouse Video Transcripts</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kataraina Presentation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingi</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirsten</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kylie</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Presentation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Name</td>
<td>Number Of Coding References</td>
<td>Number Of Nodes Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lita</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manukau City Councillor Letter to MOE Oct 2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui Presentation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medadane</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Parliament Letter to MOE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mereana T</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngahine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngawai</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngawai &amp; Te Raiwhara</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofoi Presentation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofoi Speech</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Letter</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Group Letter to MOE Sept 07</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy of Whānau Overview</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Manual Combined Schools 2010</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Learning Identity Relationships Indicators</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph H</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph P</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Presentation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whānau o Tupuranga ERO Report 2009</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whānau o Tupuranga Graduate Student Profiles</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured Interview with Senior Staff - Sept 09</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Party Report</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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