BUILDING BRIDGES

Seeking Collaboration with a Māori Community

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree
of

Master of Education
at
The University of Waikato
by

DEBORAH JANE HOHNECK

The University of Waikato
2013

Abstract

The context for this thesis is the pressing need to help mainstream schools become more proactive and culturally responsive in how they engage with the whānau of their Māori pupils.

The thesis examines how the author, a facilitator within the Te Kotahitanga Professional Development project, established a responsive and dialogic relationship with a local Māori community, so that the school could more fully support the educational achievements of its Māori students in mainstream classes. She explored ways to build "educationally powerful connections" with whānau. Initially, there was little interaction with Māori families through the traditional formats that this school was employing. She describes her personal journey of learning to engage with whānau members outside of the school context, and to work collaboratively with them to find more effective solutions.

In the first part of the thesis the author examines literature which helps to understand important differences between Pākehā and Māori 'World Views', and the reluctance that many Māori feel to engage with Pākehā institutions. She documents how she and whānau members, working together, identified contexts and cultural processes (tikanga) that enabled this collaborative research project to proceed in a culturally responsive way.

In the second part of the thesis the author examines the particular culturally-grounded learning events and experiences that she encountered along the way. Concurrently with this identification and reporting of events and experiences, she reflects on how these events and experiences impacted on her professional practice, and on her professional and personal identities. The author also considers what implications her collaborative research journey with Māori colleagues and friends and learning might have for school leaders and whānau members in other schools.

Throughout the thesis, the author sustains a metaphor of bridge building. This metaphor helps to appreciate how, although starting from quite different cultural locations and positions at either end of the bridge, members of both cultures were able to meet in the middle and find respectful and trusting ways of working together.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.0 Introduction

It was as a Lead Facilitator of Te Kotahitanga that I embarked on the project of community consultation that this thesis describes. My role required that I report in Milestone reports each term to the Principal, the Board of Trustees and the Ministry of Education. The reports asked us to look at the on the successes and challenges that we faced in implementing the reform, under the headings of Teacher shift, Student achievement and Community consultation. It was gratifying to be able to report each time, on gains made in terms of teacher positioning, of discursive interactions in the classroom, improvements in pedagogy and increased Māori student achievement. On the other hand, it was dispiriting to have to report each time that community engagement remained a challenge.

This research seeks to understand and describe the learning that one Te Kotahitanga facilitator experienced in working with members of the local Māori community in an attempt to develop "educationally powerful connections with family, whānau, and communities" (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009, p. 142) and their local secondary school. In so doing this research seeks to identify, understand and explain some of the ways that connections with the immediate and extended families (whānau) of Māori pupils, in a particular secondary school setting might be improved. My approach was guided by understandings that I have developed in my role and training as a Te Kotahitanga facilitator by reference to research literature, and by the advice and guidance that I have received from colleagues and importantly by kuia and kaumatua from this community.

Context of the study

This thesis reports on efforts to engage with the whānau of Māori children in a New Zealand secondary school. It involves the use of culturally responsive methods and the principle of reciprocity in learning as understood in the Māori concept of ako. It is about an inquiry that

began as an investigation and developed, through application of culturally responsive practices, into a mutually respectful and considerate relationship of trust.

The story that I want to tell is about the journey taken by myself as a Te Kotahitanga Lead Facilitator in seeking to uncover effective ways of consulting with whānau in this particular secondary school setting (other than those involved with the bilingual unit, who are already very much involved in their children's schooling). The research is about the practical application of theoretical knowledge and the development of understanding and social legitimacy that begins as a result. The story is the learning of this facilitator about the grass roots reality of the aspects of culturally responsive methodology that I read about when I began to work in the Te Kotahitanga programme. All educators can, if they are open to the suggestion, find these aspects at the base of the documents that schools can use to guide policy and action, if they look with eyes that have been made culturally aware. Culturally responsive practice and methodologies inform Ka Hikitia, the New Zealand Curriculum, and the many reports into the effectiveness of our management of Māori student achievement in New Zealand, These in turn, are all informed by the Treaty of Waitangi.

Research questions

The over-arching research question is:

In what ways should schools seek to interact more effectively with their local Māori communities in order to collaborate with the families of Maori students?

In examining this question, the following sub – questions arise:

- What does working to accomplish reciprocal, educationally powerful connections look like, for the Māori community and for the school?
- Who can help me to find the most correct or most appropriate ways to proceed?
- What changes are needed in my own professional practice in order to establish more effective communication and collaboration with whanau?
- What can we learn from this?

The working title for my thesis is Building Bridges. Leaders, at this school, acknowledge that efforts to consult with the whānau of Māori students other than those in the bilingual unit have largely failed and are likely to continue to do so, and therefore a new approach is needed. I have attempted, metaphorically, to build a bridge that will be safe for all parties to cross, or, at first, to meet in the middle. There is a need to find ways to convince all parties that communication is a two way process, people need to cross the bridge in both directions and that 'bridge' needs to have a firm foundation on both banks. This issue has been especially problematic and both school and community can fall into a deficit model of thinking, spiralling down to a situation where each blames the other for the lack of progress.

1.1 Thesis Overview

Literature Review

In Chapter 2 literature that is important to answering the research questions is reviewed. Specifically, the importance and benefits of schools working with whānau is considered in research literature both here in New Zealand and overseas.

Methodology

Chapter 3 describes the methodology for this research. The processes for undertaking the research and my role within these processes are explained, as are the methods for data collection and analysis. Important characteristics of the community, school, and the particular setting, within which this study focuses, are explained. Ethical considerations are explained in view of the context, the nature of the inquiry and the methodologies used.

Findings

Chapter 4 presents important findings from the literature and outlines the ways that the research experiences of this project support and exemplify some of those findings.

Discussion

In Chapter 5, I discuss the themes that emerged along the way as I sought to create meaningful connections with kuia and kaumātua at the Marae, with parents and grandparents, uncles, aunts and neighbours of our Māori students.

Conclusion

In the conclusion I reconsider the emerging themes and discuss their implications for other schools and their communities.

1.2 Guiding metaphor

In each chapter I have taken a Māori metaphor from my relationships and interactions with the various groups with whom I have engaged to guide me. The whakataukī for each chapter is related to the learning or to the people with whom I was engaged at the time.

The whakataukī that I chose as an overall encouragement and guide in introducing and setting out on this work came from a very early meeting that I had with the local Māori Women's Welfare league. **He manga ā wai koia, kia kore e whikitia** (It is a big river indeed that cannot be crossed).This captures the idea that the task of finding ways to effectively communicate with the families of all of our students, particularly those most in need, is indeed a big and difficult task. It is not insurmountable though, if we are courageous and careful in our planning and if we use all the resources at our disposal. This idea gave rise to the working Title for my thesis – Building Bridges. By working together, we hoped to at least begin the work of building a bridge to cross that challenging river which keeps so many of our Māori pupils from achieving their educational potential in our schools.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.0 Introduction

"He waka eke noa"

(It is a canoe which belongs to everyone)

This whakataukī was used by 19th Century Māori to denote common ownership. One kaumātua from Manurewa marae used this as simple explanation to me when I thanked him for his willingness to share his stories and knowledge of the local area with our students. He spoke of the Māori understanding that learning is only important when it is shared with others and that the wisdom of generations belongs to all. Similarly, Berryman (2008), aligned with Kruger (1998) reminds us that according to the Māori world, "knowledge is a quality you can represent, not a commodity you can have or own. One may discover knowledge but there is no individual ownership of knowledge, rather it is a collective enterprise." The Pākehā or European view is often different. A western world view is often individualist in focus. Power and control are sought after by those who often become known as leaders and heroes. Knowledge is seen as a route to power and control and often jealously guarded by the individual or by the institution that individual represents. Even within families, there is sometimes a fear of the diluting effect of too wide a spread. King (1978) describes this fear "… a lot of people… would sooner take a knowledge of their own traditions with them than pass them on to the present generation. They believe that if it goes out to another person outside the family, in a short time it will have dissolved, absorbed by all the other people who have access to it" (p. 13).

It is because of this emphasis on the importance of sharing and understanding that I have chosen this whakatauki as my guide for this chapter, which is my review of the wisdom of other educators. In this chapter, research literature that I have found helpful in answering the research questions posed by this thesis is reviewed. The importance and benefits of schools working collaboratively with whānau to create educationally powerful connections with their communities is considered in research literature from New Zealand and overseas.

The research that I have used and which supports and informs the work that I have undertaken in investigating how to approach this issue for the school where I work, falls into the following broad categories some of the history of education in New Zealand and the failure of education for Māori: Government systems and policies that attempt to address this issue; Collaboration with community and whānau; Te Kotahitanga and a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations; Leadership needed to support and model collaboration ; and various research methodologies.

As part of these discussions it was necessary also to consider Critical Theory; Epistemological Positioning and Repositioning is also important. Being aware of how we view the world and the ways that other peoples' world views might differ from our own generates understanding and empathy, and these are essential in any collaborative communication. We need to understand the tensions that can arise between groups that hold firm to one view and are intolerant of the other, as well as the difficulties that some people can have in walking the path between (Webber, 2008). Changing the positioning of Partners and meeting the particular needs of minority and disadvantaged groups with regard to the ways that schools work when attempting to consult or collaborate with them are examined in the light of culturally responsive methodology, leadership theory and the evidence gathered in the various Ministry of Education Best Evidence syntheses.

This is the situation:

It is already well acknowledged in Research literature, (Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Bishop, O'Sullivan & Berryman, 2010) and is widely held in many cultures that education is most successful when there is a clear link and understanding with the child's family and the school. That link appears to be neither clear nor understood between New Zealand secondary schools and the families of a great number of Māori students. It is certainly the case in the secondary school that I work in, where there has been, for many years, a struggle to "get" parents and families communicating with the school.

A reluctance or inability to participate in school-based consultation with teachers about their children's progress may well be, in part, due to social and economic constraints on the families. But it is also due, in a large part, to the long conditioning of whānau by the

education sector that could be termed societal, civilizational and epistemological racism (Scheurich & Young, 1997).

Education of Māori has been linked with difficulty and failure for a long while. In the late 1800s non-Māori educators found difficulty in getting Māori to attend the Pākehā schools, and to behave at school according to the strict norms expected in a Victorian colonial and Christian society, speaking and thinking in English rather than in Te Reo. Native schools were set up and were initially responsive to the Māori pupils needs, but ultimately were 'Europeanised' so that Māori withdrew their support. Statistics began to accumulate around Māori failure and truancy from schools as early as 1876 when the Reverend J.W. Sack expressed his concern in a letter to the Native Minister that Māori were resisting State efforts to educate them (Hemara, 2000).

As time went by, successive New Zealand governments began to recognise that education policies and systems were not addressing the 'problem' of Māori lack of achievement at school. As the population has grown, so has the tail of underachieving young Māori. Urbanisation, social drift and creeping capitalism have all helped to legitimise and intensify the dominant, hegemonic discourses of (often well intentioned) middle class Pākehā, leaders and educators. Ultimately though, that achievement 'tail' has been recognised, not just as a social concern, but as a threat to the stability of 21st century New Zealand society. Mason Durie, in several presentations, has identified not only the tail, but also the disturbing links between Māori demographics and economy and education. He goes further, and puts the deficit model of "dysfunction, deviance, diminished expectation, disparity and difficult past" into more positive terms – a model of Unrealised Potential.

That model of the potential, particularly of rangatahi (Māori youth), will be realised according to Durie (1999), by "an integrated approach to education, training, employment, whānau and community development" (2006.). A similarly integrated approach has been recommended for psychological wellbeing, by Macfarlane, Blampied and Macfarlane (2011) which they have termed He Awa Whiria, the Braided Rivers model. This metaphor explains the way that a Kaupapa Māori perspective should be interwoven with a generic principle of ethics in order to improve outcomes. Meanwhile, in government circles, Māori student under- achievement has become an issue that educators must address, and must recognise

as their responsibility to counter (Ka Hikitia, 2010). Government policy makers have recognised the need to involve and engage with whānau respectfully and collaboratively. In order to find out how to do this one must turn to research to uncover not only why this problem exists but also to try to find a way to counter it.

2.1 The History of Education in New Zealand

The history of the education of Māori has been usefully traced by Wharehuia Hemara in 2000. He summarises Māori attitudes to schooling and the Pākehā, (western, colonising and [still] the dominant hegemony in New Zealand) responses to them, from ancient times to modern. He acknowledges that it is difficult to precisely define ancient Māori ways of educating their young because of the subjective nature of the reports that were collected and written by the early Europeans. They recorded the attitudes and ways that they had observed or heard about among the tāngata whenua (people of the land). Despite the possibly unreliable nature of some of the accounts, sufficient information from various points of view have been recorded from reputable early sources, for Hemara (2000) and other researchers to draw similar conclusions namely, that the Māori who first arrived in New Zealand had an education system well established (whare wānanga) which had at its centre a philosophy of education which we are just beginning to get close to trying to replicate today in our modern secondary schools. In his key findings Hemara (2000) lists such features of traditional Māori schooling as: Students and teachers at the centre of the educative process; lifelong inter-generational learning; gradual learning from familiar starting points; mixed and complementary curricula; recognition and encouragement of giftedness; one on one interaction; small ratio of students to teacher; teaching and learning based on students' strengths.

In line with Nepe, Joyce (2012) describes a tāngata whenua system of education in which children were guided with affection by a range of people other than their parents. She cites Nepe (1991) who identifies that the grandparent grandchild (tipuna whaea/ tipuna matua) relationship was one of the most important or "intimately bonded" and that the elders were valued for their wisdom and contribution to the education and mentoring of the young. Hemara (2000) also describes an intergenerational system of education that had at its heart an understanding of the importance of passing knowledge and understanding down through

the ages, much of it captured in whakataukī, with the young people being considered the tribe's greatest resource.

> It was crucial that children learn various skills, positive attitudes to work, and moral codes that ensured the wellbeing of the iwi and hapū. Kaumatua took on the important roles of teachers and guardians (Hemara, 2000, p. 11).

Salmond (1983) and Smith (1995) suggest that, at this time, the tāngata whenua practised a functional and sophisticated system of education that was supported by complex knowledge structures, education principles and practices. Smith (1995) writes that this system involved a complex oral tradition and a dynamic ability to respond to new challenges and changing needs. The traditional system of education, while complex and diverse, was also fully integrated in that skills, teaching and learning were rationalised and sanctioned through a highly intricate knowledge base.

We are now looking for ways for educators to re-engage and tap into that traditional, respectful learning relationship. This is the rationale for this particular research.

Most importantly for the purpose of my research is the history of the relationship between members of the education system and Māori parents. In his chapter on the Māori/Pākehā Interface, Hemara cites Grace, (1895) and details how the early Christian missionaries viewed with disapproval the way that Māori parents brought their children up, "[they] exercise no control….the child is cock of the walk. This is a true and real obstacle in the way of those who want to instruct them." (Hemara, 2000, p. 46).

He further identifies that the "Māori experiences of education over the last 150 years have created a range of attitudes towards and perceptions of education. Meanwhile Pākehā attitudes to and perceptions of Māori generally and Māori students in particular have been formed within this context" (Hemara, 2000, p. 49). Thus, the origin and nature of the universe and all who lived there-in were explained and understood through their relationships with their environment (Marsden, 2003; Orbell, 1985). This is the 'Māori World View' referred to earlier which was (and still is) so at odds with the western, empirical and individualist one held by so many of the new immigrants and by the majority people today.

An essential part of that world view is collectivism, the idea that property (including intellectual, emotional and spiritual, is owned and shared by all. Māori families did not

expect any one person to know everything, nor to hold what they knew to themselves. They were each responsible for understanding some aspects of Māori knowing and then sharing that with others for the benefit of all. (Berryman, 2008). The learning was important not to the one, but to the many, the whole group benefited from any acquisition and conversely, the whole group suffered when something was not well, or was wrongly learned. This concept was and is, difficult for Pākehā to understand until it is framed in the context of team sports or military conflict. Consequently there was a strong desire on the part of educators, right up until the 1970s, to reframe the Māori way of thinking. To equalise, homogenise, sanitise or remediate by way of Europeanising.

Wally Penetito (2004) writes about Māori education in the 20th century being about socialisation rather than about education. The native schools set up in the late 19th century in order to "civilise and educate" Māori children were, according to Penetito, not about educating, learning, or acquiring knowledge, but instead were about socialising.

> Māori education, from its beginnings in the formal mission village schools has not been about learning through lifting the human spirit nor has it been about the acquisition of knowledge. Instead, Māori education has been about socialisation. ….. the balance is always tilted against knowledge and weighted towards the power inherent in the institutional and pedagogic structures of the mainstream (Penetito, 2004, p. 90).

Schooling became compulsory for Māori children in 1894. They were required to attend the Native schools, which were set up primarily to teach the natives English and manual skills. This would make them suitable for employment by the pākehā settlers who were short of labour and even make some of them suitable for marriage. This trend was not limited to the 19th century. Mihi Edwards (1990) writes first hand of growing up in rural New Zealand, and of being 'strapped' for speaking Te Reo Māori. Sadly, this practice continued throughout the first half of the 20th century and some of the people I spoke to shared similar experiences.

New Zealand was not alone in policies of assimilation through church and schooling. In the late 19th century in Canada 150,000 native American children were removed from their families and tribes and forced to attend Christian state boarding schools in an effort to assimilate them. Australia pursued similar policies toward their Aboriginal children and both countries have only recently "apologised" to their indigenous peoples for these destructive practices (BBC News, 2008, 2012).

Penetito (2010) tables a history of Māori education as part of a social control thesis which cites comments from Harker, Beeby, Butchers, Simon and Simon, and Snook (Table 3.1p.87 - 89) By the 1930s the process of assimilation that the Native schools were designed for had been supplanted. These schools became Māori schools – their policy was one of cultural adaption: the "best of Māoridom" (as defined by non-Māori education authorities) was incorporated into the curriculum. By the 1970s Government agencies were becoming concerned.

In 2004 Macfarlane wrote about the widening gap between Māori and non-Māori in New Zealand schools.

> In 1973 the Minister of Education, Phil Amos, commissioned a review to study the problems arising from suspensions in secondary schools, and the growing concern over the problem of effective communication between schools and parents. … Since that time, students have been presenting schools with increasingly severe and diverse learning and behaviour problems. Māori children continue to be over-represented at the negative end of the continuum (Macfarlane, 2004, p. 9).

By the year 2000, the national performance indicators for Māori and non-Māori demonstrated that gap clearly. 98% of non-Māori children were enrolled in Early Childhood education, compared with 68% of Māori. 5.4 per 1000 non–Māori males were suspended from school compared with 20.6 per 1000 Māori, and 12% of non–Māori left school with no formal qualifications compared to 38% of Māori (Penetito, 2004).

Education that fails Māori is alive and well. Although programmes such as Te Kotahitanga, the Ngati Whakaue Literacy Enrichment Unit and the Flaxmere Project, have done much to redress the power imbalances in the classroom, the statistics continue to tell a story that New Zealand as a nation has much to be ashamed of. Educational disparities are matched by social inequities of ill health, poor housing, poverty and crime, all over-subscribed by Māori.

New approaches are needed to find solutions to continuing problems. Culturally responsive approaches which acknowledge the issues and engage all parties in negotiating the ways ahead are needed.

The Treaty of Waitangi

The Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840. The migrating European settlers had through the first half of the 19th Century placed increasing burdens on the representatives of the British

colony. Competition for land and resources with the indigenous people and between each other, general lawlessness amongst some of the invaders and interest from other overseas colonists meant that the British holding the control were hard pressed to keep it. James Busby had been assigned the task of uniting the settlers with the people of the land in order to forge some stability. He drafted a declaration of Independence in 1835 – largely in order to protect the colony from the incursions of the French who were keen to win New Zealand for themselves. This document paved the way for the Treaty four years later. Economic and manpower considerations meant that the British were reluctant to commit further resources to maintaining order in an unruly colony. They did however wish to secure New Zealand for England. The competing French and American interests prompted action (King, 1983, 1997, 2003).

William Hobson, consul for the Crown, was required to negotiate a Treaty which would secure sovereignty (which in the Declaration of Independence just four years earlier, had been ceded to the Māori) for the Crown and yet deal fairly with the Māori people, maintaining their rights and integrity (Consedine & Consedine, 2005). Many of the Māori chiefs signed in good faith, but without fully understanding. The translation of Hobson's document into Māori resulted in two documents which capture different meanings, and Māori have felt victimised and disenfranchised ever since. However there were conditions in the Treaty, designed to protect the dignity of the Māori people and these still require that the governments of Aotearoa ensure that the rights and dignity of the partner to this bicultural document, the Māori, are respected.

Most 20th Century Pākehā related to the Treaty as a document about land ownership. It was not until the late 1970s that this document became meaningful to policy makers in education.

> The Treaty of Waitangi Act in 1975 saw the relationship between Māori and the Crown, as embodied in the Treaty, finally recognised by statute. Parliament gave to Māori the right to bring grievance claims against the Crown and to have their grievances heard by the bicultural Waitangi Tribunal. It also called for Crown agencies to have appropriate policies in place when dealing with Māori clients. (Berryman, 2008, p. 49)

Since the 1970s the articles of the Treaty have been increasingly understood as involving more than land claims. With the Education Act of the same year it became required that

educational leaders and managers not only demonstrate awareness of the treaty, but reference it in their strategic goal setting and analyses of variance. Teachers became required to openly consider the treaty partners in their lesson planning and pedagogical actions.

Once the Treaty was acknowledged, many people were unsure quite what to do about it. I remember teacher professional development sessions on the treaty in the early 1980s which aimed to make sure that all teachers were aware of the articles of the treaty that pertain to our role as teachers, but there was little conviction that any of this was relevant, and great uncertainty about how to respond to it. Worse, there were widespread feelings of resentment among many of my Pākehā colleagues, that Māori might be receiving preferential treatment. At best these efforts were met with boredom and little understanding.

The pendulum of public opinion swung the Ministerial advisers in the opposite direction and the direct referencing of the Treaty was removed. Spurred on by the public reaction to the Brash 'Orewa speech' in 2004, government documents were audited and policies were adjusted to be 'needs' rather than 'race' based. On the other hand, there was much resistance to the removal of the Treaty, by both Māori and non-Māori. A softly-softly approach to addressing racial imbalance and obligations to tāngata te whenua meant that in 2006 and 2013 further amendments were made to education policy documents.(Consedine & Consedine , 2005)

The latest revision of the New Zealand Curriculum (NZC) has cultural appropriateness and responsiveness fully embedded. Explicit references to the Treaty of Waitangi itself are no longer as important, in fact may still be interpreted as focusing too much on the gaps and disparities, thereby encouraging deficit thinking. What is more important in the latest curriculum document is the emphasis on the spirit of the treaty principles. The explicit references to the Treaty found in curriculum documents during the nineties, have been removed and replaced with embedded concepts reflecting 'Protection, Participation and Partnership'. The language of the latest version, which refers unapologetically, and without translation, to 'ākonga, kaiako, whanaungatanga, whakapapa, and whānau', demonstrates an important shift.

Education Failure for Māori

When the first Europeans arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand, they found an untamed and bountiful land inhabited by a "primitive people". The first missionaries observed the "nobility" of the people and reported the great love and care that they demonstrated for their children. An education system, though not set in a recognisable European context, was clearly in place, which involved the very young and the very old. (King, 2003)

As Berryman (2008) puts it, in line with Hemara (2000) traditionally the tāngata whenua clearly understood the centrality of students and teachers within the learning process and promoted the importance of life-long intergenerational learning and knowledge. Learning was based upon previous experiences and built on the students' strengths. Giftedness and special skills were identified early and nurtured specifically. Small student numbers and one-to-one interactions, grounded in lived experiences, were important and curricula were mixed and complementary (Berryman, 2008).

The way that the early Māori chose to teach their young and to live their lives, was based on the way that they as a society, saw the world and their place in it. This world view had evolved from the world view earliest Polynesian migrants brought with them, into the situation that they found themselves in. It was and is a very different world view from that of the Europeans, then and now. In the early days, the Māori world view was the dominant one in Aotearoa New Zealand. In the early 20th century, European historians used historical narratives to rewrite early New Zealand history, creating a more acceptable version of history, for Pākehā. (Berryman, 2008) This contributed to that Māori world view being now, largely subsumed by the dominant, western, individualised one, and many Māori hold both, (some comfortably and others feeling tension between the two).

For Māori, O'Sullivan (2007) and others (Maaka & Fleras, 2000; Tully, 2000) argue for a pathway beyond biculturalism, to a politics that does not continue to see indigenous peoples as a problem to be fixed or as a competitor to be removed but rather as equal partners with whom differences may be overcome by developing relationships of co-operation and co-existence. This is a position which is consistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. The very idea that a dominant hegemonic partner should or could impose solutions on the other contradicts any notion of partnership. The principles of Partnership, participation and protection however, sit well with the development of co-

operation, collaboration. While most ordinary new Zealanders recognise the justice in this, there is still widespread misunderstanding of the Treaty among both Pākehā and Māori, and even further difficulty in knowing how to go about fostering partnerships that demonstrate the treaty principles in convincing ways. Too often, behind efforts to work together in collaborative ways is the fear that one group or the other has the upper hand. This applies whether in terms of the management or allocation of a resource, or decision making and policy direction. The same difficulty applies to schools and communities.

The issue of how to go about creating meaningful connections between home and school is also difficult for other groups besides Māori and Pākehā. Most importantly, the question of how parents can have a say in how they interact with the education system that serves to shape their children is a political one, an issue of power and control. David Hood (1998) maintains that our secondary schools do not work, that they are not fitted for 21st century learning. He says that he meets people each day, many from within the secondary sector, but especially, including parents, who are concerned about today's secondary schooling. They are frustrated by their powerlessness to effect any change.

Reinforcement from overseas

Years of colonisation have resulted in the definition of what it is to be Māori being wrested from Māori hands. The dominant culture - that of the European New Zealander - has held and promoted an image of Māoridom, which has contributed to these indigenous people being marginalised, suppressed and oppressed. Sometimes this has been overt, but often it is the insidious attraction of all that the Pākehā world has to offer, along with the attendant message that everything Māori is of low worth, that has led to a devaluing of the culture.

There are parallels here with other indigenous and marginalised peoples. Bishop (1996) cites the work of Foucault (1972) to argue that the power that comes with knowledge is used to regulate people by "describing, defining and delivering the forms of normality and educability" (p. 13). This resulted in what constituted normality for some becoming marginalisation or oppression for others. Smith (1999) warns of the erosion of one's own intellectual and cultural knowledge, alongside being "fed messages about their worthlessness, laziness, dependence and lack of 'higher' order human qualities" (p. 4). Bourdieu (1977) also identifies the pervasive long term impacts of oppression on

minoritised groups, while Bruner (1990) notes the important influence of historical narratives on society and on culture when different versions of history are perpetuated.

2.2 Discourses – Positioning / repositioning

In 2012 the New Zealand Council for Educational Research published a report Kia Puāwaitia Ngā Tūmanako or Critical Issues for Whānau in Māori Education, (Hutchings, Barnes, Taupo and Bright, Pihama & Lee, 2012). The researchers used kaupapa Māori theory and culturally responsive methodology to consult with whānau about their aspirations for their children in education, what issues they felt would be important to research and what they felt was needed to improve experiences of Māori children at Kohanga Reo, and Kura Kaupapa. Whānau were also asked to explain their reasons for their responses.

Epistemological racism

Epistemological racism can be understood, on a simple level, as the arrogant assumption that the way that one's own social, cultural and educational background allows us to know and understand things, is the one right and true way. The attendant assumption that any other cultural or racial way of thinking is wrong and inferior. Such views are not confined to 18th and 19th century colonials, as a recent visitor from the Danish parliament proved when she reacted with disgust and horror to the powhiri given her when she was welcomed onto the New Zealand Navy Marae in Auckland (Gillie, 2013).

We speak of differences in world view. This is a broad phrase that captures how people see their own place in the world, the junctures of time and space, of the physical and metaphysical and how they know and understand these things. A European or Western world view tends to be empirical, and linear. Māori and other Indigenous peoples tend to have a much more fluid world view, which often has more in common with Eastern philosophies.

Manulani Meyer is an indigenous Hawaiian scholar. She suggests that in order to understand the indigenous mind we need to think in terms of what she calls "holographic epistemology". I heard her speak at a Social Justice Symposium at Kia Aroha College in South Auckland. She said:

> Indigenous scholarship is ….a call for critical consciousness and respect for other ways of knowing. It is what enduring practices-in-place have developed and processed: a knowledge ethic shaped by the needs of place and people. Here is cultural empiricism, so-to-speak, altered by seasons, the sharing of ideas with others, and with its own referential knowing steeped in ancestral memory. It is also real, alive and part of the external world – we just have different priorities and names for how we experience and express it (Meyer, 2011, n. p.).

She also spoke of the "agency of collective and individual *thinking.* Without paper and pencil, without clock, without competitive comparisons – a thinking that inspires what Māori have called aromatawai or self-reflection that instructs and transforms". This process could be called what Paulo Freire has termed *conscientization*. At least, he has linked his conscientization as a pre-requisite to this kind of process of re-claiming indigenous knowledge.

Indigenous epistemology accepts the simultaneity of the unseen and seen. (This is what Meyer means by holographic.) She speaks of simultaneity, in which knowledge production and exchange has "priorities in *practice, relevance, context, consciousness,* and *shared common sense.* It is knowledge through *experience,* individual or collective, and a way of being via site-specific familiarity through years, generations, and life-times." (Meyer, 2011)

2.3 Systems and Policies

Key documents to consider when looking at how we are attempting to address the issue of educational disparity in New Zealand are: the NZC; Ka Hikitia; The Auditor General report for Education; Kia tumanuko; Te Puni Kokeri; Education Review Office (ERO) reports; and the successive Education Acts. All of these documents have, in various ways, emphasised the need for schools or teachers to consider ways to make the experiences of the student in the school directly relevant to the world which he/she inhabits outside of school. A direct corollary of this is the need to collaborate with the families, connecting in culturally responsive and educationally powerful ways.

So what has emerged?

The Teachers' Council introduced new standards for measuring the performance of teachers as part of a three year round of teacher registration renewal. Teachers are required to self - reflect on their own performance against each of twelve criteria over a three year period.

They need to set goals for improvement, gather evidence as time goes on, measure their progress against the goals they have set and the evidential criteria set by the Teachers' Council. Once every three years, Principals have to sign off the application of each teacher to have their registration renewed. Some schools are beginning to incorporate these Registered Teacher Criteria (RTCs) into their teacher appraisal systems.

The school that I work in has redeveloped Appraisal around the RTCs and so are more and more schools so doing, especially as the Teachers Council rolls out its pilot programme on Teacher Appraisal which is designed to encourage this. The RTC descriptors, like the NZC, contain various explicit references to Māori. Students are referred to, without explanation or translation as "ākonga" (learners) and teachers as "kaiako". There is emphasis on culturally responsive pedagogy and requirement for teachers to engage in professional learning to become more culturally aware.

The elements of the Effective Teaching Profile (ETP) that practitioners in Te Kotahitanga work with align very nicely with the RTC criteria. The RTC document does make explicit reference to the Treaty of Waitangi in the second of the overarching statements: "The Treaty of Waitangi extends equal status and rights to Māori and Pākehā. This places a particular responsibility on all teachers in Aotearoa New Zealand to promote equitable learning outcomes." (New Zealand Teachers Council [NZTC], 2010, p. 9).

For each of the 12 criteria of the RTC, there is a set of indicators that teacher performance will be measured against. For all but three of the 12 criteria, there are indicators that refer to performance that will enhance the experience of Māori (and other) students. For example, the first criterion in the category for Professional Relationships and Standards is about being able to "establish and maintain effective professional relationships focused on the wellbeing of ākonga" (NZTC, 2010, p. 10). The key indicator is that they will "engage in ethical, respectful, positive and collaborative professional relationships with …. whānau and other carers of ākonga" (NZTC, 2010, p. 10). Criterion three requires teachers to "demonstrate commitment to bicultural partnership in Aotearoa" (NZTC, 2010, p. 11), and under criterion 10, in the Professional Knowledge in Practice section, they are asked to "work effectively within the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand" (NZTC, 2010, p. 14). As already stated, many of the indicators align with the Te Kotahitanga Effective

Teaching Profile. Several stand out as particularly relevant to the issue of collaborating with whānau. In particular, foster involvement of whānau in the collection and use information about the learning of ākonga and critically examine their own beliefs, including cultural beliefs, and how they impact on their professional practice and on the achievement of ākonga (NZTC, 2010). The practice exemplars found in the Self-Assessment tool show some awareness of such critical self- belief examination. The self-reflection question: *What do I do to establish effective working relationships with my ākonga, their whānau and my colleagues and others to support the learning of those I teach?*

Elicits the practice exemplar:

- *Engage with whānau to discuss student behaviour and achievement - regular personal communication with caregivers*

And the following of success indicator:

- *Whānau are actively involved and engaged across the learning. The teacher engages positively in discussion with whānau (including both good news and concerns) and uses the ideas derived from this to inform their practice and create learning experiences. Whānau are treated as partners in education, they are invited to make suggestions for teaching practice and offered suggestions as to how they can support learning. Whānau feel comfortable talking to the teacher about their child - they know that the teacher has their child's best interest at heart* (RTC Self-Assessment tool. NZTC 2010)

So what has emerged? A new curriculum and set of professional standards for teachers that show awareness of and responsiveness to Māori as tāngata whenua are required. Also required is a Ministerial strategic guide to managing for success for Māori, Ka Hikitea, which at least acknowledges the need to consult appropriately with whānau, and which holds the education system responsible for Māori success, rather than blaming the people themselves.

What is yet to emerge? Specific and meaningful policy direction, accompanied by proper funding and training to enable all schools and teachers to access these equitably on behalf of their students; an acceptance that collaborating with rather than just consulting and communicating with whānau is indeed the right thing to do, and will enhance student learning.

Culture Counts and Scaling Up

Bishop and Berryman (2006) asked Māori students in the early 2000s who told how schools were not safe or friendly places for them, that in order to succeed in secondary schools, they needed to 'leave their Māori selves at the school gates'. Bishop and Glynn (1999) looked at the dominant discourses that perpetuate the inequities in educational achievement that we continue to see in New Zealand schools. Power inequities and differing structures of power balance are examined. Bishop, O'sullivan and Berryman (2010) said that the reform needs to move beyond the classroom, into the management corridors, the Board rooms and the school halls. It also needs to move out into the community and into the fields of teacher education as well as into more schools. Collaboration and community inclusion are identified as key to the success of Māori students and research projects that have successfully demonstrated this are exampled.

Current systems and Policies

Current systems and policies reflect an awareness at ministerial and government level of the problem, and some understanding of the importance of culturally responsive practice to address this. However, they have little to offer in terms of the ways that this might be achieved on a practical day to day basis. Hemara (2000) writes of government positioning in the 1990s, "during the last decade the New Zealand Government and its education, health and welfare sectors have increasingly focused their attention on gaps between Māori and non-Māori, and on Māori failure within the education sector and society generally" (p. 3). Sadly, 20 years on in 2012 the focus is still on the perceived gaps.

Many New Zealand Government reports point to the need for schools to examine the question of how they consult with their parent communities. The engagement of Māori whānau in the education of their children, particularly in the secondary sector, is less frequent, meaningful or effective than either teachers, or parents would wish. Many teacher and leaders have given up trying, and many whānau groups think that the schools just don't care.

In 2009 the Ministry of Education commissioned an investigation and analysis of current educational research with particular emphasis on the practical application in New Zealand schools. The Best Evidence Syntheses (BES) is a series of publications which have focused

attention on the ways that School administrators and teachers can use the most current research to inform their practice. The BES iterations are divided into areas of practice, so Social Sciences, Mathematics, and so on as well as School Leadership and Student Outcomes, the latter of which is most specific about the need to seek to collaborate with families in order to create educationally powerful connections (Robinson, Hohepa, & Lloyd, 2009).

Various BES iterations identify that there is a lack of research into how to effectively engage parents (particularly Māori) with New Zealand Secondary schools. This is reiterated in ERO reports and in the Auditor General Review of Māori Education. The need is clearly acknowledged by all, it is the 'How' to successfully address this bit that is missing.

Ka Hikitia

Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy 2008 – 2012, was updated in 2009 and under review at the time of writing this thesis. The strategy was put in place by the Labour party government as part of its pledge to address issues of low educational achievement for Māori, and as a way to justify the policy makers decisions around allocation of funding. The review was needed because the new National government looked for ways to readjust spending priorities and although Ka Hikitia has been in schools since 2008 there has been little measurable impact. This policy framework has as its sub-title, Personalising Learning: A professional, parental, and learner responsibility 'Realising Māori potential'. As one of those professionals for whom the realising of potential is a responsibility, I have visited Ka Hikitia because I have had an understanding that this document provides for teachers and leaders in schools, a kind of road map for the successful management of Māori students in order to 'make a difference'.

What does Ka Hikitia seek to do?

The Ministry of Education seeks, through the Ka Hikitia policy document, a strategic approach to demonstrate awareness that the playing field in education is not level. It seeks to address responsibility to the Treaty of Waitangi as "a document that protects Māori learners' rights to achieve true citizenship" …enjoy educational success as Māori….it is a collective call to action" (Ministry of Education, 2008) for all in the education system to

work alongside whānau and iwi in taking responsibility for the success of Māori learners. Ka Hikitia claims to represent a move away from a deficit focus on problems, failures, and challenge each of us instead, to make the most of opportunities for success.

In outlining the strategic intent, Ka Hikitia (2008) identifies that "all Māori learners have unlimited potential and a Cultural Advantage and Inherent Capability" (p. 19) for success. The strategy outline focuses on all of the right things. 'Ako' is described as "a teaching and learning relationship where the educator is also learning from the student……is grounded in the principle of reciprocity and also recognises that the learner and whānau cannot be separated" (p. 20). It incorporates the belief that language, identity and culture count; and importantly for my study, of "**Productive Partnerships** – Māori students, whānau, hapū, iwi, iwi and educators sharing knowledge and expertise with each other to produce better mutual outcomes"

As a secondary teacher I learned from Ka Hikitia that Māori students in Years 9 – 10 were part of Focus Area Two: Young People Engaged in Learning which would concentrate on establishing a successful base for learning at secondary school through, among other things, "improved whānau -school partnerships focused on presence, engagement, and achievement." We were then told that schools are "**required**" to work more effectively with whānau.

What has Ka Hikitia done?

Ka Hikitia has identified what needs to be done, and it has acknowledged current research and development. It has held everyone in the education sector accountable for changing outcomes for Māori. It has set goals and described the actions needed (required) to achieve them. Despite the identification of reciprocity and of cultural awareness as crucial to Focus area two : Young People engaged in Learning, Ka Hikitia does not provide any real guidelines to the educator in the school; it is a policy document that provides a framework for planning strategic directions. It makes it clear that we are to be held accountable, but it does not guide us as to what to do, or where to find help. That is up to practitioners to find for themselves. Teachers, school leaders and Boards of Trustees are aware that they need to reference Ka Hikitia in their planning and management documents. They find little in it however to guide or support them in their work and consequently Ka Hikitia is considered

by most to be full of fine rhetoric, but little else (Goren, 2009; Milne, 2011). This is a little unfair because it never purports to be anything other than an indicator for direction, a framework for planning. What it does do, is continue to provide evidence that the direction that the government wishes schools to take is toward increasing collaboration with Māori whānau.

2.4 Collaboration with whānau/community

Macfarlane (2004) asks us to 'consider' the value of the resource that is the community, and to 'consider' the wisdom of involving parents and students in decision making on matters that affect them. Bishop and Glynn (1999) exhort us to look at the power imbalances in education and to address these when we attempt to collaborate with whānau. "Many teachers and Māori parents believe that young people do best when their families and whānau are actively involved in in their schools, and that more Māori involvement in schools is likely to lead to enhanced Māori achievement" (Bishop, O'Sullivan & Berryman, 2010, p. 121).

What do schools need to do?

It is important that schools engage their parent communities proactively in order to ensure student success at a planning stage, and responsively when things are going well, rather than simply as has been the norm, reactively, when things go wrong. As Mason Durie (2006) says,

> For many whānau, contact with school only comes when there is a crisis or a problem, or funds to raise or a hangi to prepare. Parents are often placed in a defensive position which all too often leads to a deteriorating relationship with the school…. it is more important that parents are also able to work with schools to identify potential and then jointly construct pathways that will enable potential to be realised (p. 10).

Parents have already identified that they want to be involved with their children's education, before things go wrong. That involvement only happens at the earliest stages when the family feels part of a genuine relationship. That means that they need to be involved in many different ways, and sometimes the smallest of things can provoke an opportunity for engagement. The NZC is a thoroughly researched and genuinely inclusive document. School leaders and teachers just need to understand how to enact it in its spirit,

rather than as a framework for the delivery of their subjects (but that is another issue). The important idea is captured by the parents consulted by curriculum writers. "It is often the small things, good and bad, that impact on how we feel about our children's school. It is important to us that they genuinely care about what we think and use that information when they make decisions about our children's learning." (Ministry of Education, 2010, n.p.)

This same idea of a need for genuine wanting to know, on the part of the schools is echoed in other countries. Wink (2008) recounts a tale of consultation, in which a school gathers a group of Hispanic parents to consult with. They, the teachers, felt that the consultation was successful, simply because people came. They did all the 'right' things sending invitations in the families' language, having the children perform and so on. However there was in Wink's opinion, no real dialogue and the one parent who spoke at the end asked a question in her own language, to which they had no answer. Her question was, *why were the children being taught in a language that they do not understand, and why do the schools then fail them?*

Critical Pedagogy/Freire

Inequities in education are, like discrimination against people on the grounds of gender, religious or sexual preference, culture or race, an issue of social justice. Schools and teachers have a moral obligation to ensure that their practices, policies and outcomes are not only socially just in themselves, but actually work to address inequities. Consultation and collaboration with communities that is not welcoming or accessible to all members of the school community is an act of social injustice, and in the New Zealand setting, contravenes the Treaty of Waitangi.

Paulo Freire (1998) and Giroux (2001) consider that dialogic action that confronts cultural oppression, enables the mutually beneficial growth of more inclusive alternatives. They and other critical theorists have emphasised the need to address social justice in education because of the link between knowledge and power. Bishop and Glynn (1999) identify a pattern of dominance and subordination in New Zealand education and promote the Treaty of Waitangi as "a model and a metaphor for power sharing and change" (p. 13) in order to implement "culturally relevant educational policies and practices within a context of cultural diversity" (p. 14). Penetito (2010) makes it clear that "the ideologies that have directly affected the development of Māori education are based upon a political philosophy of racial

and cultural superiority" (p. 49). He goes on to say "the experience of a majority of Māori parents is that there is a direct impact arising from the lived culture of Māori children and a school culture that typically contain basic contradictions of Māori culture" (p. 61). Some of this direct impact is the incipient way that the dominant culture can take hold, thus marginalising, trivialising, and disempowering the other, traditional ways of knowing.

Whether intentional or not this marginalisation is an act of oppression and contributes to an on- going cycle of deprivation and inequality. As long as school teachers and leaders continue to interact (or fail to) with their communities in the same way as they have been doing, Māori communities, except where they have been successfully assimilated (have relinquished their own into the dominant culture of the school) will remain at the edges. There is a social justice imperative for schools to seek more open, honest and dialogic ways to collaborate with the whānau of all students.

Why is Leadership important?

Chapter 7 of the Leadership BES is a synthesis of research literature that explains the importance of creating educationally powerful connections with family, whānau and communities. It focuses on the kinds of connections that work and the way that school leaders can work to create them. The authors of this chapter identify the lack of research material available on the issue of the impact of school leaders on home school connections and the scarcity of such research in New Zealand secondary schools (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009).

Importantly, their analysis of the Hattie research (Hattie, 2009) into factors relating to student achievement, identifies that there is great potential for leaders to counter patterns of under-achievement by building school-family connections that are explicitly related to the core business of teaching and learning (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009, p. 143.). This is why the leaders in schools which have been receiving Ministry of Education funding to assist in their participation in the Te Kotahitanga programme, have been required to report on their "consultation" with the community.

The authors of this section of the Leadership BES identified that the "highest overall effect [on student achievement]was reported for interventions that were designed to help parents

or community members support children's learning at home"[And] "simultaneously provided teacher professional development" (p. 144). Next highest was "interventions involving teacher –designed interactive homework that engaged parents in assisting their children with their learning" (p. 145) and then," those that incorporated family and community knowledge into curriculum and teaching". And "also key, the role played by school leaders in,…. keeping parents informed about their children's progress" (p. 145). At the secondary school level…."it was parent involvement in outreach activities ….and attendance at post-secondary planning workshops…"(p 146) that had the greatest impact. So this is a way to effect improvement in student results. Get the families involved in planning for their children's futures. Provide actual opportunities for engagement with intent to affect real outcomes. "One of the 10 main findings of the Quality Teaching for Diverse Students BES is that student outcomes are enhanced when there are effective links between the school and the various other contexts in which students are socialised"(p. 150).

Robinson, Hohepa and Lloyd (2009) identify the importance of recognising and building on a student's "cultural capital" which is a basic tenet of Te Kotahitanga. They cite the great gains in student achievement and the experiences reported by McNeight (1998) in working with Samoan students studying Year 13 Classical Studies on a project which engaged their relatives in linking their own cultural resource to the classroom learning about ancient Rome. Achievement rates were reportedly doubled as a result of this intervention, yet the project was not spread to other curriculum areas and other teachers. The intervention was not able to be embedded at a policy, systems or structures level in the school. This is a crucial point for school leaders, Te Kotahitanga facilitation teams, and those who choose where and how to allocate funding to support the improvement of education for Māori. Unless reforms are spread to all systems and structures in the school, their positive impact will be limited. The Te Kotahitanga research team have recognised this and examples such as the McNeight experiment serve to illustrate the need for this reform to be embedded at the widest levels. Senior and middle leadership, as well as pedagogical reform must work together with governance, to create a whole school focus which supports the students to link their learning with their own cultural capital.

While there is some discussion in the Leadership BES of the progress being made with indigenous schooling overseas (Inuit and Cypriot) harnessing the cultural capital by engaging

in out of school learning programmes that tap into funds of community knowledge – there is little to compare, at the secondary level in New Zealand. There are also significant projects detailed at the primary level. These include Whaia te iti Kahurangi; the Mangere Home and School Reading Project; and significantly the work of the Poutama Pounamu Research and Development Centre in developing the use of Smart Tools to assist parents in developing children's phonological awareness with reading, Tataari, Tautoko, Tauawhi; a training programme for whānau to assist with managing behavioural and learning difficulties, Hei Awhina Mātua and a programme to improve reading in Te Reo; Tuhi atu tuhi mai; These three projects tapped into the rich vein of community and whānau knowledge and gained the highest effect sizes for interventions with home and school to improve student achievement or behaviour. The focus was on reciprocal learning for all- students, teachers, parents, elders and the wider community. The Leadership BES attributes much of the success of these programmes to the reciprocity of the learning. The authors further identify this model of collaboration which puts the learning together of the parents and the teachers alongside that of the children as a demonstration of relational trust and effective leadership.

The McNeight work took place over a decade ago and the Leadership BES authors surmise that the missing factor in getting the same sort of initiative to take hold in secondary schools is a professional development component for teachers. This is one of the strengths of Te Kotahitanga. It is a teacher professional development programme designed to raise teacher awareness and understanding of cultural capital as one of the important elements of developing educationally sound interactions with Māori students in secondary schools. The on-going and situated nature of the professional development that participating teachers receive means that teachers are constantly being reminded, prompted and encouraged to accommodate and engage with the cultural contexts of their students.

The Leadership aspect identified as being a crucial component in the success of the Poutama Pounamu projects is also indicated as possibly the missing factor in the McNeight and other examples of teacher led initiatives which have engaged families in active participation in the learning of their children while at secondary school. The Jeanne Biddulph Reading Together programme, by contrast, has been sustained over two decades, perhaps because of the way that the researchers have been able to support school leaders to implement and maintain the programme. Alton–Lee identifies the establishment of

relational trust, involvement of the whole leadership team, alignment of the initiative with the rest of the school programme [curriculum integration in secondary situations] whole staff development to create ownership and positive engagement with parents, as crucial to the on-going success of the programme. I contend that the same features are components of Te Kotahitanga and that failure to address all of these considerations is largely what gets in the way of effective and powerful connection with their communities for many secondary schools. It was my intention to find ways to bridge that gap between the community and the school. There is a gap in the research in this area. We know that it should be done, but we do not know how to go about it.

> There is little in the New Zealand system to ensure that school leaders, teacher educators and policy makers are able to access and use this knowledge base [community and whānau knowledge or cultural capital].....Research and development is needed on initiatives to forge educationally powerful connections between English- medium schools and whānau, iwi and communities (Robinson, Hohepa & Lloyd, 2009, p. 168.)

Another important point that is made in closing chapter 7 of the BES, and which supports the work of my thesis, is that effective home school partnerships must be founded on mutual respect and trust; that building respectful relationships is an important role for all school leaders; and training in this is required for teachers.

How?

The 'how' of consultation in order to collaborate with Māori communities, necessitates an honest examination of the power balances in our society? Social Justice educator and activist Paul Kivel (2004) writes of a "culture of power". He points out that the dominant hegemony is pervasive and non-inclusive of people who differ from those who are at the locus of power. He talks of how the dominant (usually white and male) holders of the power can be unaware of the way this appears to others. He describes how limiting this dominance is on the contributions that others can or will make. Not least, Kivel (2004) points out how this simply reinforces the prevailing hierarchy and marginalises those who are not a part of it. Often, those who are in the privileged positions are not aware of the ways that they might exclude others and sometimes the best of intentioned interventions fail because they have not addressed the way that it feels to be on the margins. Kivel

suggests that we "look to people from those [marginalised] groups to provide leadership for us" (p. 5).

Hand in glove with the 'culture of power' is the culture of expectation. Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) have written extensively about the effect that teacher expectation can have on the achievement of students. Low expectations of students from marginalised, low equity groups tend as a rule lead to low achievements. The expectations of teachers of students from minority groups and the low socio–economic ranks are low and the prophecies are self-fulfilling. Just so, our expectations of parents and communities tend to be self-fulfilling prophecies. We get what we expect from them, which, unfortunately, is often very little. The relationship between the school and its community is more complex and there are more competing and differing agendas to contend with than there are in the classroom. Low expectations are rooted in what Sleeter (2011) terms deficit-oriented approaches which abound in the western world education of the 'others'. "Compensatory education has been the main deficit oriented solution to disparities" (p. 5). Our responsibility is to find the way to hold and articulate genuinely high expectations of ourselves, and our families, consulting and collaborating with whānau to see what they might require of us as partners.

Module 8

In their report to the Ministry of Education on Te Kotahitanga, Bishop, Berryman, Cavanagh and Teddy (2007) identify metaphor as a crucial way that Māori order their world. They call this Taonga Tuku Iho, or the collective treasures of our ancestors, and these serve to validate and legitimise Māori ways of knowing and doing. They identify six key metaphors which are important to the work of the Te Kotahitanga research whānau. They are Mana whenua, Kanohi te kitea, Whakawhānaungatanga, Koha, Mahi tahi and Kotahitanga.

Mana whenua captures the idea of the Māori link to the land and the strength that is thus held within iwi connections.

Kanohi te kitea is the value that is placed on the seen face, the importance of being known, recognised and engaging on a personal level.

Whakawhanaungatanga is the very important way of making culturally appropriate connections between people. These links can be based on whakapapa (tribal or ancestral) or through common interest. Kinship and the responsibilities that we have to those with whom we are connected in some way are reinforced through whanaungatanga.

Koha is a gift (maioha) which is offered as one's contribution toward expenses or obligations that come as part of participating in a relationship or event. It is important to understand that the accepting of koha is not obligatory on the hosts, but once accepted, there is an implication of entering into a relationship which continues and has no time constraints.

Mahi tahi is having all people united in purpose, and taking a hand. The strength of mahi tahi is in teamwork and solidarity.

Kotahitanga describes the collective group or purpose, the idea of working together toward a commonly shared goal. Again, each person's role in that is important and valued.

By holding these six key metaphors in mind when one works with Māori communities one can begin to work to build relational trust with them. That means that there must be a two way relationship. The people need to see that your commitment to them is real, on-going and reciprocal. They need to know you as a whole person, not just as a professional face. You need to listen before you talk, you need to respect and abide by, their cultural protocols.

The last point is a useful guide when working in any cultural space other than your own, but the whole is relevant particularly to any minoritised or disadvantaged group, but especially to colonised, indigenous, or First Nation peoples.

Culturally Responsive Methodology

I embarked on my investigations into 'How' to go about developing a more dialogic and discursive relationship between the school, teachers and leaders, and the community it tries to serve in order to try to engage with culturally responsive methodology that was used so successfully by Bishop and Berryman (2006). They consulted successfully with Māori students and their whānau about what worked and did not work for them in education. This investigation led to the very successful teacher reform programme known as Te Kotahitanga.

When I began my work in Te Kotahitanga, I did not understand a lot about culturally responsive methodology. I knew and understood about traditional qualitative and quantitative research. Most university graduates of my generation learned about and practised these as part of becoming educated. We did not learn about cultural responsiveness. It just seemed to make sense that what had worked so well for the early Te Kotahitanga researchers, *what works so well in the classrooms that I visit, when I suggest to teachers, ask the students; seek out their prior knowledge; acknowledge what they are able to bring into the learning; learn with them yourself*, and so on as part of my work as a Te Kotahitanga facilitator, would work equally well in consulting with their parents. When a lesson is going badly, we encourage a teacher to stand back, reflect on what is happening or not happening, and access the student opinion. We then also encourage them not to ignore or discount what the students tell them, but to seek out a path ahead together. It seemed to me that the business of consulting with whānau needed to be approached in the same way. My progress at that time was a lesson that was progressing badly. I took a leaf from Culture Speaks and decided to ask the people.

In order to justify this approach I had to examine the research, much of it very recent, into Culturally Responsive Methodology. I started, of course, with Bishop and Berryman's (2006) Culture Speaks, and with the many readings that the Waikato research team provided me with in the course of my induction and on-going training as a Te Kotahitanga facilitator.

Other Methodologies

Any research that involves accessing the privately held hopes, beliefs, regrets and dreams of any individual or group of people needs to be sensitive and responsive, regardless of which group they may be classified as. In 2006 Carolyn Lunsford Mears wrote a dissertation on the impact on a group of mid-west, middle class, white Americans of the Columbine shootings. She used an interview focused method which she called the Gateway approach (Mears, 2007; 2009). This approach had relevance to my research because of my position at the start, as an outsider, a Pākehā trying to uncover views of people from the Māori world. She describes her approach as "a means of connection, a way toward deeper understanding of a metaphorical 'community' of experience" (Mears, 2009, p. 9) .The important feature of this approach, for me, was that it gave the participants and the researcher a means of crossing boundaries and provided opportunities for personal reflection. This Gateway approach

involves the telling of stories, which helps the teller to make sense of experiences as well as an open ended interview approach. All of this leads to what Mears (2009) calls "a non - linear, and unpredictable design" (p. 20).

Similar importance on personal reflection as an outcome of human inquiry and the way that that can change the person and thus the professional, is placed on the interactions between research parties by those who practice hermeneutics. Schwandt (2004 as cited in Piper & Stronach, 2004) describes hermeneutics as a task of Inquiry which aims at humans understanding each other. He describes Inquiry as opposed to research, as "a kind of event in which one participates and is transformed in the process… I questioned my assumptions about what it means… I began to see my own beliefs in a new light: my self-understanding underwent a transformation and I now 'stood' in a different relation to…" (p.37). These are the sorts of statements that the hermeneutic makes about the ways that the research process can transform the researcher.

A lot of the time that I spent with people was not spent in interviews or other formal information gathering exercises, but in watching, observing and reflecting. The learning that occurs by simply watching the way that people interact, hearing the inflections in their speech, feeling the warmth or the coolness in their reactions can be more formally described, and thus quantified, by critical discourse analysis. This is the process by which one unpicks or unravels the entwined threads of human social interactions and is not a linear process.

Gunther Kress, writing about a multimodal social semiotic approach, talks about the importance of signs, symbols and stories. He further demonstrates that a multi–modal approach is needed to gain a closer approximation of meaning from social situations. He gives as an example the difficulties in understanding the nuances of conversation by way of the traditional research tool of transcription.

> Transcription proceeds usually by transduction. What exists in the world in one mode, *speech*, usually – is reproduced in another mode – *writing*, usually. In the process there is massive abstraction-as-selection: only that which serves as a means to answer the research question is transcribed (Kress, 2004, p. 205).

Each critical tradition locates domination in a slightly different place – racism, capitalist structures, discourse itself and patriarchy. But they all share a common set of principles and assumptions.

> Critical social theory assumes that oppression and liberation are twin pillars of concern … enacted across time, people and context [limiting] the full development of people [and harmful] to the human spirit not only for those who are oppressed, but for the oppressor as well (Rogers, 2004, p. 4).

Te Kotahitanga

Te Kotahitanga is the name given to the pedagogical reform initiative which aims to reduce disparities in our classrooms that are culturally located, by helping teachers to identify in their own practice, both deficit and agentic stances toward their Māori pupils; to focus on discursive interactions that are culturally responsive and appropriate; to treat their students with Manaakitanga (respect and consideration for the student as a culturally located individual); to articulate high expectations for each one's learning and behaviour; to acknowledge the worth of the student's prior experience and learning and to actively encourage that child to share that knowledge by engaging in reciprocal learning (ako).

GPILSEO

GPILSEO is the acronym coined by Russell Bishop for describing the process of embedding the reform that is Te Kotahitanga at all levels: classroom, school leadership and management, students and whānau, governance and community. It addresses the need to hold the achievement of Māori students at the forefront of our planning and consciousness in the way that we do all things in schools, for all children. Every pupil of every culture benefits from participation in an education that is culturally responsive, sets high standards and holds high expectations for the success of each individual that institutions must change in order to accommodate the needs of the pupil, rather than the other way around; that innovations in pedagogy at the classroom level must be replicated at all levels in the school; GPILSEO asserts the absolute necessity for everyone to actively and positively participate in the reform; that the school leaders must engage; not just point to what must be done; and that successes be shared, between teachers, schools, and with the community; The enactment of the spirit of GPILSEO demands that decisions and actions be evidence based;

and that everyone involved owns, not just the reform, but the responsibility for meeting the goal.

G = Goal, **P**= Pedagogy, **I** = Institution, **L** = Leadership, **S** = Spread, **E** = Evidence, and **O** = Ownership

The **Goal** is that of raising Māori student achievement, which must be a goal that schools actively plan to achieve. They must also share that goal with everyone involved. That is achieved through actively engaging in fostering an agentic position with regard to meeting the goal, and actively, positively rejecting deficit theorising. The common deficit position in this case (on the part of school leaders and teachers) is that the families do not wish to engage with the school, that they are not really interested, and that everything that schools do to try to encourage whānau will be doomed to fail. On the part of the community, the deficit is that the school is closed to them that no one cares and no one listens. It will not do any good to engage.

A **Pedagogy** of relations needs to be explored in depth at all levels – this essentially means that all parties need to examine their own Positioning in relation to the Goal and to each other. It is imperative that the **Institution** (Schools, Ministry) become actively and consciously involved in changing where needed, to better meet the Goal so that Te Kotahitanga is institutionalised. In order for this to happen, **Leadership** must examine all of the decision taking and value judgement making that occurs to ensure that it is agentic, positive, culturally responsive and aware. In short, supporting and actively promoting the Goal. It is important that the reform is **Spread** to include all, not confined to teachers and their students, but involving the whole school staff, the wider community, as well as the whānau of the Māori students concerned. **Evidence** of student data is used to inform teacher practice both for summative and formative purposes. Even more importantly, it means that all of those groups take **Ownership** of the reform. This achieves that "buy in" that makes any initiative more successful, and, ultimately, it means that, embedded in the people, the community as well as the school structures, Te Kotahitanga becomes, simply, the way that things are done.

The idea of GPILSEO was important to my research because I was looking for ways to achieve that spread beyond the school and to vest ownership of Te Kotahitanga in the

community. My hope was that of gaining whānau understanding and support in order to enhance student achievement further. In addition, I also hoped to help to ensure sustainability of the reform in the face of government funding withdrawal.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy of Relations

The need for schools to operate at every level in the deepest way, fully conscious of the needs of the individuals that it serves, at the classroom level and at administrative, Board room and community levels, is captured by the term a 'culturally responsive pedagogy of relations'. This term is explained in a practical way:

> within the school setting leaders and teachers also need to consider parents, whānau and the Māori community and create school contexts:
> 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; and
> where there is a common vision for what constitutes excellence in educational outcomes (Bishop et al., 2007, p. 15).

All of these descriptors are interdependent of each other and are as relevant to every school context as they are to engaging with the community. In particular, they are important to the ways that school leaders operate and engage with everyone in their school community. Being mindful of these key principles helps leaders to build relational trust at every level.

Build relational trust

'Relational trust' is a term that is now common in leadership theory. Many leaders in the education community have for some time, understood, and fostered relational trust in their organisations– albeit often intuitively- as part of an understood 'good leadership' model. Organisations that have a high degree of trust operating between the independent and inter-connecting individual who form its whole, are the most effective.

My leader is demonstrating relational trust in me when an issue, idea or concern is discussed with me. When my input is asked for; our knowledge and understandings shared; and we plan a way ahead together, that we both believe to be correct, we are operating in a sphere of relational trust. If I am then assigned a task that I am allowed the freedom and trust to undertake, while being given the proper supports and resources needed to do so, and when I have confidence in those - then that relational trust is secure and effective.

The process can and should be devolved to include all the groups we interact with. I work with my team, in a collaborative way and we are all sure of our roles and responsibilities and can trust each other to fulfil them. When in turn we include the students in our discourses, we ensure that they know and understand what we are trying to do and why, and that in turn we trust them to play their part. We are all participating in a process that is bedded in relational trust.

Such feelings of trust, ownership and belonging, contribute to organisational effectiveness, and also to improved student achievement. Roger Goddard from the University of Michigan speaks of "relational networks, norms, and trust as structural and functional forms of social capital that can facilitate student achievement" (Goddard, 2003, p. 59).

Bryk and Schneider (2003) completed a longitudinal study of 400 elementary schools in Chicago which demonstrated that relational trust is central to building effective education communities. They describe it thus:

> Distinct role relationships characterise the social exchanges of schooling: teachers with students, teachers with other teachers, teachers with parents, and all groups with the school principal. Each party in a relationship maintains an understanding of his or her role's obligations and holds some expectations about the obligations of the other parties. For a school community to work well, it must achieve agreement in each role relationship in terms of the understandings held about these personal obligations and expectations of others. (p. 40).

Bryk and Schneider further point out that schools build relational trust, through the small social exchanges that take place each and every day. This is at the heart of the 'P' in GPILSEO

Of course you cannot begin to build relational trust if you believe that everyone else has to conform to your point of view, if you do not know or understand the people with whom you are trying to form a relationship, and if you have not shared your own point of view, knowledge or understanding with those others. With Māori, it is important to first find a common ground, a connection that is often referred to as 'whanaungatanga'.

> Māori communities often exist within a complex network of interconnected relationships. It is important to understand that you need to invest in these relationships – you need to *contribute* before you *take out*. Māori people want to connect on a personal level and gain an understanding of what you as a principal, head of faculty, and/or teacher, bring to the whānau context: Where are you from (iwi)? Are you are parent? Are you are grandparent? The development of good

> relationships between the school and Māori elders is also desirable because these people can provide school leaders, researchers and teachers with legitimation within Māori communities (Bishop et al., 2007, p. 15).

2.5 Leadership to Support/Model collaboration

Once the need to collaborate with Māori communities on their own terms, in culturally responsive and appropriate ways, is recognised, there is still a need to ensure that this collaboration is participated in by all. There is urgent need to convince Principals and Boards of Trustees that collaborative engagement with the community that the school is situated in is not the responsibility of the HOD Māori, or the Bilingual unit, or the Te Kotahitanga facilitator. That responsibility belongs to all, which is the point that Ka Hikitia attempts to make. It is the message embedded in the NZC and at the heart of the Teachers' Council Registered Teacher Criteria.

The Leadership BES reiterates the point that training is needed for Leaders and that even successful initiatives will not last without there being an element of Teacher Professional development attached as well as proactive and engaged leadership and that training is needed for all of this. An important part of the professional learning that is needed for all, but especially for leaders, is the understanding that we all need to engage in learning conversations, and that those conversations are not just with fellow teaching professionals , but with all those we interact with. The conversations in themselves will not generate change, but when they lead to meaningful collaboration and the genuine use of the Inquiry process to inform practice, the locational specific needed change will occur. As Earl and Timely (2009) put it "the merging of the process of deep collaboration with evidence and inquiry can create conditions for generating new knowledge…. Knowledge is created through dialogue or conversations that make presuppositions, ideas, beliefs and feelings explicit and available for exploration." (p. 2).

Any initiative is only going to last if there is a significant 'buy in' from all of the interested parties and there is a need to ensure that the community owns the positive relationships with the school. Principals and teachers and Te Kotahitanga facilitators come and go. The community remains and that collective knowledge referred to by the opening whakataukī ,

holds the key to addressing the issues of disparity in education, particularly with reference to the issue of how to go about engaging schools and whānau with each other.

Chapter 3 Methodology

3.0 Introduction

Chapter 3 describes the methodology for this research. The processes for undertaking the research and my role within these processes are explained, as are the methods for data collection and analysis. Important characteristics of the community, school and the particular setting, within which this study focuses, are explained. Ethical considerations are explained in view of the context, the nature of the inquiry and the methodologies used.

The aim of this research project - to seek out of the most effective ways for this secondary school to interact with its local Māori community - in order to collaborate with the families of the Māori students, necessitated the use of a range of research methodologies.

3.1 Methodology

Methodology is the word that describes the theoretical underpinning of the methods used and the organising principles underlying a particular study or area of research. Methodologies fall into the categories of quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods. Many social scientists in the 21st century use an eclectic combination of methods - qualitative, quantitative, interpretive, and critical - in order to observe and comment on as broad a concept of social truth as possible (Mears, 2009; Piper & Stronach, 2004; Rogers, 2004). Within educational research, the methodology is often a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods, as well as cultural or critical theory and action research. Within the qualitative one may further categorise research approaches such as, 'Critical Theory', 'Culturally Responsive methodology' and 'Action Research' research which is sometimes referred to as a mixed methods methodology, but grounded in the qualitative (Piggot-Irvine 2009).

The work of seeking the ways to effectively engage with the local Māori community proceeded according to some of the elements of action research methodology in that there was a hypothesis, which was that the people themselves could best tell us how we might

most effectively collaborate with the families of our Māori students. Formulating the hypothesis was followed by a cyclic process of action which prompted reflection and further action in response. The researcher positioning and ways of proceeding, including the choice of methods used were grounded in culturally responsive methodology. The formation of the hypothesis itself and the ways that the quantitative data were used were influenced, in the case of the former, by critical theory and in the latter by interpretivism. Rather than simply judging, from our own hegemonic world view, that Māori parents in this community are not willing to be partners with this school in their children's' learning, we need to find out from them, what they think, and learn how to change what we do accordingly. This researcher positioning was borne out of thinking critically. The ways of proceeding were chosen as a result of looking critically at what we were doing and what had been done; interpreting what limited site specific data was available as well as the trends and directions in national policies in a qualitative but critical manner.

Quantitative Research

An investigation which sets out to examine a situation will necessarily quantify certain elements to enable the researcher to make rational, justifiable comment. In order to determine what, if any, intervention is needed, quantitative analysis will be undertaken. Comparisons will be made of the data gathered before, during and after any intervention, to determine possible outcomes. Finally, effect sizes of quantitative outcomes may be examined and compared to assist in determining the impact of the intervention.

The approaches that are used in quantitative research are able to be examined or expressed in numerical terms. These include various forms of statistical analysis. In the case of this particular investigation, the analysis of student achievement trends over a period of years compared the achievement of Māori students, with that of other ethnic groups in the same cohort and with the national cohort. Triangulation of different sets of statistical data can help to determine the reliability of results. Population studies, census data, government and council statistical data can all be examined alongside the data gathered in the smaller environment of the school.

Positive sciences generally use a wide range of established and recognised scientific methods to examine, gather and organise evidence of concrete and theoretical phenomena

or occurrences in ways that will test or prove an empirical or theoretical hypothesis. Positivist social scientists will make sense of the human social world through the use of methodology that will ensure clarity, trials that can be replicated, results independently verified. Clinical trials, population studies, political science and medical research will tend to rely on similar methods as those used by the natural science researchers.

Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is that which relies on the use of non-quantifiable data. Unlike quantitative research which is based on the principles of positivist, natural science and sets out to prove or disprove a hypothesis with objective and arbitrary processes, qualitative research acknowledges the value of the subjective and interpretative. Interpretivist methods, critical research theories which take account of differing cultural and psychological norms, value systems, epistemologies, and ontologies are more relevant to the study of the complex phenomena that make up human society. The tools used by qualitative research, will include qualitative and interactive social processes and may include aspects of critical theory.

Qualitative research involves collaboration and reflection, on the part of the researcher and of the participants. It is the examination of personal interactions and non- quantifiable data that can be gathered by a range of methods. These methods can include: interviews; opinion polls; surveys; transcripts of meetings; reviews of articles and reports. Often, qualitative methods are used to further inform the researcher on the findings of a quantitative investigation, and to determine the way ahead – as in action research processes.

Action Research

Action research is an approach that is driven by inquiry into a particular on-going problem, is informed by data, promotes reflection and is responsive to context. It is used in many sectors including health and education and in particular in promoting a critical approach as part of teacher development. Action research is, as the name implies, a research process that involves a continuing cycle of investigation as part of implementing a change or intervention to try to solve the problem. The cyclic or spiralling process of action research is one of inquiry and action as a result of reflection on the results of the inquiry and then

introducing further action or intervention as modified by further reflection. It is as Dick (2002, p. 159) describes, "A family of research methodologies that pursue the dual outcomes of action and research".

The 'Problem Resolving Action Research Model' (PRAR) was developed by Cardno and Piggot-Irvine in 1994 (see Cardno, 1994; Piggot-Irvine, 2001). This process is iterative or cyclical, experiential and context specific. Differing perspectives on the problem and the solution are checked by cross checking or triangulating data from multiple sources and from different data collection models. Action research focuses on development and change or transformation and promotes evidence or data based decision making. The data that are used by action researchers in general are often largely qualitative, as much of the work involves collaborative inquiry and reflection, but quantitative data are also used, particularly in the scoping part of the exercise (Piggot-Irvine, 2009), as well as in the evaluation of the effects of the action or intervention.

Critical Theory

Critical theory is a Marxist and Freudian inspired movement which began in Frankfurt University and has become increasingly influential over the last 50 years. Exponents maintain that social philosophers are obliged to examine the function of societal structures in creating and maintaining societal problems, and should take care to proceed in ways that do not perpetuate the power imbalances that exist, particularly when engaging with minority or oppressed peoples. They believe that ownership and control of knowledge is a powerful tool of oppression and that science has often been used as a means to further that. Paulo Freire (1970) was a critical theorist who has had a major influence on educationalists working within a culturally responsive paradigm. His view was that one cannot remain neutral as an educator, and that teachers have an obligation to act to correct imbalances in society. They (and researchers too) are in a position which means that they will influence young minds, either to accept the status quo, or to think critically and challenge it. To do this, teachers must be open to valuing the different world views or perspectives of others. "One cannot expect positive results from an educational or political action program which fails to respect the particular view of the world held by the people. Such a program constitutes cultural invasion, good intentions notwithstanding" (Freire, 1998).

An important development from critical theory within the context of education is critical pedagogy. Duncan-Andrade (2010) writes "[i]f hegemony includes the process by which mainstream social, economic, and political inequalities are made to appear normal, then counter- hegemony should include critique of those inequities and actions to improve them" (p. 108). He is speaking of the art of critical pedagogy which has grown out of critical theory.

In prefacing a collection of articles on Critical Discourse Analysis in Education, Collins states that critical discourse analysis provides a "search for views, concepts, and ways of inquiring that offer some purchase on broad questions of power, while also permitting the study of particulars, the situated activities and events in which life and learning occur." (Collins, 2010.)

Such research processes that employ critical discourse acknowledge and accommodate different cultural stances, the pressures and tensions of socio-cultural disparity, and work within the preferred mode of the people being studied can be seen in the work of many researchers in New Zealand. Within the New Zealand context the colonisation of Maori and epistemological racism has been identified as a cause of persisting social, economic and educational inequity.(Bishop, Berryman, 2006) Similar themes are found in the writings of influential American researchers also (Sleeter, 2009, 10, 11, Soo Hoo, 2012) and Australians (Freebody ,Goodwin,2011) and the British(Dale, 1996).

Culturally Responsive Research Methodology

Culturally Responsive Research Methodology describes a research approach that can employ either qualitative or quantitative approaches but further, has the particular intention, overtly expressed, of consulting and investigating social situations as negotiated and desired by the people who are the participants in the study. It is particularly characterised by collaboration and sharing on a direct and personal level with the researched group rather than the distanced objectivity that characterises the quantitative process. It may involve the use of a variety of both positivist and interpretive methods. If the researcher is working from a culturally responsive stance, all of these things will have been co-constructed with the participants. Culturally responsive methodology involves taking account of the point of view of all of the people involved in the study. Most importantly, as

suggested by the term itself, it is about being responsive to the cultural needs and stance of the group with whom one seeks to collaborate.

> These methodologies challenge all forms of traditional research paradigms that devalue or marginalize research participants. They encourage instead a research stance where establishing respectful relationships with participants is central to both human dignity and the research. This position requires researchers to develop relationships that will enable them to intimately come to know the 'Other' with whom they seek to study (Berryman, Soo Hoo & Nevin, 2013, p. 1).

Research into matters concerning the welfare of indigenous populations across the world has shown an increasing trend to utilising critical theory and further, to utilising culturally responsive methodologies. The reason for this is that the power differential in traditional research means that the 'subjects' of positivist enquiries can feel distanced , disempowered and even inferior to the owner or driver of the research – in this case the school. Clearly, when one is investigating personal attitudes and ways to change relationships between the individual and the public body, the power differential is an important consideration. This is an especially significant factor for this investigation, because the attitude of the people at home, towards the school and education, and the reverse, is the most important part of the home school partnership in terms of impacting on student achievement, as Hattie (2009) points out.

As part of that important power and ownership sharing, the methods used by the culturally responsive researcher may well have been chosen by the participants themselves, as might the research topic itself. At the least there will be collaboration between the researcher and the people in the study about the way that the research progresses. This is particularly the case where the indigenous group has become marginalised through the imposition of a dominating western imperial or colonising hegemony. American First Nation peoples, Inuit, Australian Aboriginals, Polynesian peoples, and New Zealand Māori have all encountered the effects of such hegemony. Other marginalised but not necessarily indigenous groups, Hispanic, African American and Latino groups in the United States, West Indian, North African, and Romany in Great Britain are similarly disregarded by education systems. Investigations into gender and race inequities across the western world in education demonstrate similar parallels. In the United States, Ladson–Billings & Tate, (1995) demonstrate the extent to which race remains a critical factor in educational equality.

Educators of adults also have demonstrated the extent to which dominated populations in the United States have become indoctrinated into believing themselves to be inferior. Mezirow (1981) says that,

> Helping adults construe experience in a way which they may more clearly understand the reasons for their problems and understand the options to them so that they may assume responsibility for decision making is the essence of education. Bringing psycho-cultural assumptions into critical consciousness to help a person understand how he or she has come into possession of conceptual categories, rules, tactics and criteria for judging implicit habits of perception, thought and behaviour involves perhaps the most significant kind of learning. It increases a crucial sense of agency over us and our lives (p. 20).

The critical theorist approaches these groups with an interest in sharing knowledge learning and understanding that is not based in the hegemonic belief system. "They do not come to teach or to transmit or to give anything, but rather to learn, with the people, about the people's world'' (Freire, 1998, p. 180). Conversely, the people/participants are not acted on by researchers; instead they are leaders ''reborn in new knowledge and new action'' (Freire, 1998, p. 181). Humility and self-awareness of our mutual incompleteness sustain our relationship and our work with each other. It is in this space that a language of possibilities is crafted and the ''work of resistance, critique, and empowerment can occur'' (Denzin et al., 2008, p. 5).

Berryman, Soo Hoo and Nevin (2013) describe a notion of "a responsive dialogic space" and use a culturally appropriate diagram to illustrate research as it occurs within this space (see figure 19:2). This diagram shows two separate interlocking, koru type shapes that are mirror images of each other, different but the same, spiralling and connecting. Each image, one representing the researcher, and the other the participant, maintains its own individual identity while also interlocked, interacting in a seamless collaboration. The two shapes are independent and interdependent, separate and united. The space in between is the dialogic space which remains unchanged and which Freire termed cultural synthesis. By this they accept that there can, within at any one time, be two truths to a situation that they can occur naturally and in listening responsively to each other, both sets of truths can be accepted, together working to create a new understanding. Both parties are free to move in and out of the dialogic space mutually created between at will.

The mainly qualitative nature of the investigation that this thesis describes has been driven largely by the deliberately culturally responsive stance taken by the researcher in order to try to find out the answers to that research sub question- W*hat changes are needed in my own professional practice to be able to establish more effective communications and collaboration with whānau?*

Biddulph, Biddulph and Biddulph (2003) in their Best Evidence Synthesis pointed out the negative impact that researchers had in the area of community and family influences on student learning outcomes. Positioning which identified deficit and difference in the families, and enhancement and empowerment through the research intervention, generally leads to a nil or even worse, a negative result. Accordingly, the process followed in this research has been one where there has been clarity of intent: the purpose and outcomes of the research have been negotiated in advance; people have been invited to participate in their own way and in their own choice of setting. The cultural protocols appropriate to that setting have been not only observed, but closely followed – indeed, have driven the project. Relational trust was formed by persistence and collaboration as well as by negotiating shared outcomes and developing relationships through whanaungatanga (connectedness) Berryman et al. (2002) describes the process of whakawhānaungatanga as that of establishing links and making connections with the people that one meets, in whatever context by identifying oneself and relating in culturally appropriate ways.

Mixed methods

Approaches to research that involve the use of some methods from several different methodologies are often described as a 'Mixed Methods' methodology. Social science, the study of human society and relationships does not confine itself to any one set of tools. Instead, the social scientist or researcher (educational research comes into this category) often benefits from the use of a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods to observe then measure and theorise about people and their roles within social systems.

The word 'research' can bring to mind an image of laboratory animals and scientists wearing white coats and wielding test tubes. The attendant message to this idea is that of the research subject as a non-responsive object, or even as a victim. An alternative image of

research is that of the mathematical theoriser, armed with a pen, chalk stick or bank of computers, testing complicated series of equations against various mathematical formulae, or creating such formulae to uncover or explore an esoteric abstract or theory – sometimes vastly removed from the subject. These caricatures of course are extremely simplistic, however, some of the people with whom I have sought to collaborate, have professed themselves to be the very ones most likely to view and critique all research in this way and this fact has had an impact on the choice of methods I have used.

I have used a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in seeking to answer the research questions. The qualitative has consisted of such methods as: Conversations as informal interviews; which have led to introductions to other people, who also wish to talk (snow-balling); semi- formal interviews when the participant has asked to share their views, and often taking control of the structure of the discussion; informal observations of the ways that people interact ; interpretative analyses of school and government documents in order to understand the stance taken by various parties; and, finally, my own researcher's on-going reflective diary .

The quantitative methods used in this study have been limited to those that have not been in any way invasive or intrusive on the lives of those people who comprise the research group. These include: correlation of the numbers of different groups of people attending school functions, parent hui or gathering (scant data is available on this, which point tells a story in itself); student achievement statistics and some local and national population and student achievement data. These data have been used to interrogate current practice, define the situation and determine the need for an innovation of approach.

The learning about how people feel and react to the school in terms of communication and collaboration has come from the qualitative, and the justification or rationale for the reasons to change comes from the quantitative data, so each are needed and are complementary in this project. Working agentically, (that is, acknowledging that barriers that I cannot control are there, but focusing on what I am able to control, what I have agency over, instead of the barriers) so as to try to accomplish reciprocal, "educationally powerful connections"(Alton-Lee, et al, p 142) has meant that I have taken a lead from the

people with whom I have talked. My interactions with them have been driven by their preferences, some explicit and others implicit as well as by my preferences as a researcher.

3.2 The Methods chosen

In order to examine the question of which ways schools should seek to interact more effectively with their local Māori communities in order to collaborate with the families of Māori students, I had to determine an ethical and rational way to proceed. I needed to examine the research methods available and decide which would ones would be appropriate to use given the situation, the question and the potential participants. Even before this, however, I had to examine my own discursive positioning. "Discourses can influence the researcher to see their participants in deficit or agentic terms. Therefore a critical consideration of our own discursive positioning is needed in culturally responsive research if we are to ensure participatory and or liberatory discourses that will promote new potential" (Berryman, SooHoo & Nevin, 2013, p. 30). I had to reach a point of saying, *So, the Maori parents are not engaging with the school – why might this be? And how might I find out how we might change this? And do they even want such change? And what can I learn from all this?*

Such examination of my own positioning (and the positioning of my colleagues within the school in which I worked –which is the group seeking to interact more effectively with Māori [and Pasifika] families at our school) came about quite naturally through my work as a facilitator of Te Kotahitanga. I had already learned the value of "asking the people" with whom one wanted to effect change, from my early reading of *Culture Speaks* (Bishop & Berryman, 2006). I had gained further practical experience of the wisdom of collaboration and the sharing of ownership of any learning, through my experiences watching teachers working with classes, and particularly with the Māori students in those classes. My training as a facilitator had directed me toward culturally responsive ways of thinking and acting. It was a natural progression for me to examine that which had not worked, in terms of previous attempts at consulting with families, and to look instead to find the ways that might, by seeking to reposition myself, and the school leaders, and then engage in that discovery journey with the people themselves.

Although it was clear that this research project needed to be grounded in culturally responsive methodology, it was also necessary to use a range of different methods. That examination of prior procedure, and the contrasting pictures from other schools involved comparison of documentation and the use of some numerical analysis. The establishment of need meant that records of student achievement and also of parental involvement needed to be correlated. Government strategic directions needed to be unpacked and cross referenced with school strategic plans and goals.

Document Analysis

The analysis of documents involved quantitative procedure as well as interpretative - which is a qualitative process. Purely statistical or numeric data needed to be viewed alongside the intent of the school's strategic plan; the aims and aspirations of such government documents as *Ka Hikitia* and the New Zealand Curriculum needed to be read in the light of reviews and reports from the Education Review Office (ERO) and the Auditor General. This was some of the "work before the work" – that investigation that establishes the need for some kind of intervention. Hence, quantitative methods were used to examine school records to determine student achievement trends. National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) results, Assessment Tool for Teaching and Learning (asTTle) reading and maths scores were triangulated with data about parent teacher interactions. These documents were read in the light of research that tells us how important the home school partnership is to student achievement.

Formal interviews

Formal interviews, at pre-appointed times, involving tape recorders and transcripts as a research method were discarded, on the advice of several of the respondents, as an inappropriate and unwelcome method. Such formal discussions, in the community in which this research is situated, commonly occur with reference to student discipline, the application for funds and similar situations, which, despite the best efforts of the school representatives, can be uncomfortable and demeaning (for the parent). The respondents that I spoke to indicated that there would be little interest from the community in participating in any consultation that was situated in a conventional western

methodological framework. There was a strong feeling that this was inappropriate and would not change anything, whereas a consultation process based on protocols that were appropriate to the Marae would be acceptable. A hui at the Marae, or at another venue outside of school, sharing of kai, establishing of whanaungatanga, an opportunity to network with other parents, the whole family involved – all of these were exampled.

When a group of Wellington researchers (Hutchings, Barnes, Taupo, Bright, Pihama & Lee) were commissioned to write a report into critical issues for whānau in Maori education, they used a Kaupapa Maori model and prefaced their report with these words:

> our research has not attempted to impose an external conceptual framework to make sense of whānau experiences. The voices of whānau appear as they were communicated to us. We have avoided "distilling" and layering our own analysis of whānau experiences of the education system. This has enabled the voices and intended meanings of whānau to remain intact, and has been a distinctive feature of the whanaungatanga methodology and kōrero ā-whānau method. The kaupapa Māori-driven methodology of whanaungatanga, the process of wānanga, and methods of gathering kōrero ā-whānau have enabled us to identify critical issues (Hutchings, Barnes, Taupo, Bright, with Pihama & Lee, 2012, p. 9)

This kind of approach is important, and the formal interview is unsuitable because of the context in which the research takes place. The Marae is the setting for the actual research activities because it is a community hub. It is a place that I can go to speak with whanau that is their own, where they are comfortable and where I am the outsider. In this place, the nature of the relationship is changed from the usual that Maori are accustomed to when dealing with secondary schools. By engaging in conversation and story sharing, instead of formal interviews, all parties are able to contribute as and when it suits them. This means that relationships are able to develop that then enables further depth of discussion.

Conversations as interviews

By contrast to the formal interview process, conversations as interviews were seen as appropriate and were acceptable to some. These conversations were conducted in naturally occurring settings or settings chosen by the participant and the discussions developed naturally along mutually acceptable lines. Respondents spoke to the researcher because they wanted to, and because they felt that they had a story to tell or advice that they wanted to offer. Sometimes they came to speak, seeking help and advice. The 'conversation as Interview' process was founded in relational trust and based on mutual understanding.

The power differential that usually operates between the people and the institution (school) was reduced by the choice of these methods. In this sense, the choice of research methods used reflected some elements of kaupapa Maori theory. "A Kaupapa Maori position seeks to operationalize Maori peoples' aspirations to restructure power relationships to the point where partners can be autonomous and interact from this position rather than from one of subordination or dominance and that this should take place at all levels of education. " (Bishop et al,2010, p.65). This is important because as McNaughton and Glynn (1998) wrote, "Where people are incorporated into the education of their children on terms they can understand and approve of, their children do better at school" and the whole purpose of this research exercise is to find out from the people, how we can best seek and encourage that involvement.

Snowballing

Once the purpose had been established, the methods of working were understood, and relationships formed, the research was underway. People who participated in discussions or shared their stories began to refer others to our discussions. Advice began to be sought and the connections formed became conduits for shared understandings to flow. As people shared their ideas and asked their questions, they tended to refer to others and bring them in, and so the participant group and the topics of discussion began to grow. This expansion of the participant group is termed snow balling. Once the intervention is begun, it gathers momentum and as it begins to roll, more and more people become involved – the snowball gets larger as it gathers momentum. This was a particularly appropriate method for this research into consultation and collaboration because it was entirely responsive to the wants, and interests of the people, and it was a practical and appropriate way for some people to gain the support that they needed to approach the school over matters that they may have been unwilling to discuss in the conventional ways.

Collaborative Storying

'Snow balling' of discussion relationships was only possible because of the early emphasis in this project - driven by the people (participants) whose advice I sought, and their emphasis on the importance of 'whakawhanaungatanga'. This was not so much stated as implied. It was up to the researcher to recognise the prompts as they were given. These prompts were often subtle; implications that attendance at a particular function might be interesting;

observations that other visitors to the marae had tried this or that; or had not been seen often; queries about family and experiences, personal health; sharing a joke.

The term 'Whanaungatanga' is often understood as describing family, or genealogical connections, tied in with 'whakapapa'. However it is in everyday life, used in practical ways to support social interaction and deliberate sharing of purpose. Whanaungatanga allows connections to be made which will support the aims of a common purpose or ideal. This can be achieved if the task is approached in a culturally responsive way, the Māori people will look for other ways than kinship to establish whanau –like connections. This leads to the development of relational trust which is imperative to progress. (Smith, Berryman, Bishop & Soo Hoo 2013)

Once whanaungatanga was established and relational trust existed, it was possible to begin to engage in 'collaborative storying'. This method entails the making of a story as partners in collaboration. The partnership is one of equals, and each take turns asking the questions and sharing the ideas. The researcher listens to the stories of the participants and together they find ways to continue that story, looking for the direction together and sharing the experiences as they journey toward a negotiated and mutually satisfying conclusion. This part of this particular research task is just begun – it is the action research component which will be continued.

Building Relational trust

Before the advice and guidance of the local Maori community could be sought, even before any questions could be asked, it was necessary to build relational trust. The people needed to be confident that the purpose of the research matched their own goals and aspirations, and they needed to have confidence in both the research process and in the researcher. This meant that the research was founded in culturally responsive process from the very beginning. Networking, continual repetition of the aims and intents of the research project, the forming of connecting links with many groups, the persistence and responsiveness of the researcher gradually built relationships of trust and understanding. Without this, none of the above methods would work, and the research project could only revert to traditional quantitative methods scantily informed by empiricism. This was the very situation that had initially prompted the research to look for new solutions.

Reflective diary

Throughout the whole research process, the researcher (I) maintained a reflective diary. It was important to understand and to record the things that the people were concerned about, and to record, in order to reflect on and understand the changes in positioning as the research relationships progressed. The researcher's (my) own positioning and understandings were dramatically impacted and enhanced by this project. The recording, after each visit to the marae, after each set of conversations, of the changes in my own perceptions, thoughts and feelings as well as some of the things that people said, enabled some solitary reflection which impacted on my practice as well as some shared reflection which in turn impacted on the practice of others. Ultimately this has begun to lead to some changes in school practice.

3.3 Context

The Research aim, to find ways to connect responsively with Maori families in order to improve educational outcomes for their children, reflects what Bottrell and Goodwin (2012) describe as a possible shift in the role of schools in society. An acknowledgement that schools do not stand alone and that the community also has an important role to play in educating young people is accompanied by a growing idea that communities can use the school as a resource, and that by working together schools and other community agencies can have a much more complex and influential role in shaping that community.

The Setting for the present Research Study

The school

This research takes place in an urban, decile[1] 1 secondary school. The student population fluctuates around approximately 50% Māori, 30% Samoan, the remainder being a mix of other Pacific peoples and various other ethnicities with only 5% being NZ European Pākehā. There are usually between 1420 and 1480 pupils where approximately 500 odd are

[1] School deciles range from 1 to 10. Decile 1 schools draw their students from low socio-economic communities and at the other end of the range, decile 10 schools draw their students from high socio-economic communities. Deciles are used to provide funding to state and state integrated schools. The lower the school's decile the more funding it receives. A school's decile is in no way linked to the quality of education it provides (Ministry of Education, 2011, p. 2).

mainstream Māori, distinguished from Māori students who have opted into the on-site bi-lingual unit.

The student population fluctuates because of the transiency of the people in the community, responding to various social, economic and civic pressures. The whole school population fits a pyramid model, that is the largest numbers of students are in the junior school being Year 9 to Year 11 class range, with relatively low numbers staying on to the Year 12 and particularly Year 13.

Many students leave at age 16 if they are able to obtain work, and many others go into job related pre-training before they reach the senior school years of study. Those who do stay on usually manage to achieve their goals, and many of the school alumni get to feature in University degree roll calls and other indicators of long term success.

The majority of Māori and Pasifika students entering into this high school at Year 9 are ranked significantly behind other students academically in the national cohort. According to asTTLe literacy and numeracy data gathered over the last five years, literacy and numeracy levels are typically two to three years below where they should be, according to national normative data (2011). This lag begins at entry level into the school system and continues throughout, only being caught up by those who remain in school to senior levels. Sadly, school data show significantly lower levels of retention of Māori student compared with the retention of other ethnic groups.

Te Kotahitanga

As discussed in Chapter 2, this school has been participating in the Te Kotahitanga initiative, since 2003. It was one of the 12 participating schools of the Phase 3 cohort of schools, that is it is one of the first group of schools to participate fully in the programme, with Ministry of Education (MOE) funding and with an intention to involve the whole of the teaching staff. This meant that a full time facilitator was employed to work with the teachers. Due to the conviction of the Principal that Māori student achievement was significantly improved by teacher participation in Te Kotahitanga, the school has continued to be involved ever since, with just an 18 month partial drop off period when the first lead facilitator left the school before a replacement could be found. Although the project is well entrenched with the majority of the teaching staff, there has not been a successful and lasting link made with the

parent community of the mainstream Māori pupils. This has been commented on in successive Milestone reports, in ERO reviews, and in independent research reviews of the school.

The community:

As stated earlier, this school and this research is situated in a decile one socio-economic area. It is distinguished nationally in several ways. The largest concentration of Urban Māori, the highest level of unemployment, the greatest percentage of a population under 25, highest ratio of dependent children to caregiving adults, the highest rate of domestic violence, highest levels of child abuse, high levels of transient truancy, problem gambling, alcohol and drug abuse, teenaged pregnancy, lowest level of enrolment in early childhood education, lowest uptake of internet, lowest involvement in social and educational initiatives and lowest awareness of whakapapa and tribal links. Despite all this, the area is also rich in the range of community initiatives and projects. The people who dwell here are not shy of acknowledging the problems and some groups have achieved impressive results.

Nevertheless, on the whole, school and whānau interaction in this area is low and often gets less with each year that the child progresses through school, frequently being at the lowest when the child reaches the secondary level. There is an urgent need to address the matter of effective and meaningful home and school connection, in particular for this school, but in all state secondary schools in general. This need has been identified by the school, the BOT, by ERO and it falls to the Te Kotahitanga team to try to find ways to meet this need.

3.4 Ethics

Ethical procedures as determined by the University of Waikato Research and Ethics committee have been followed. Formal approval was given for this research to go ahead on the 18th of October 2011. No one has been harmed by the research process; people have participated by their own free will. There has been no interruption to peoples' normal course of activities, and everyone has been fully informed and supportive of the intent of my work. Confidentiality has been protected by the use of pseudonyms except when people

have expressed a wish to be identified. The context and the nature of the inquiry have determined the methodologies used.

The participants

The participants included the members of the school community in which this research takes place, that is; Senior Leaders, teachers, pupils; members of the Board of Trustees, parents with whom I come into contact on a daily or occasional basis by way of my work as a Te Kotahitanga facilitator; Teachers and leaders and board members of some of our contributing schools; Community workers, councillors, members of political parties with whom I have interacted as part of my networking. Included also were Marae Kaumatua, kuia, committee members, visitors and PD workers; members of staff at the Whare Oranga (the marae based, holistic health hub which has resident Doctor, physiotherapist and a range of holistic and traditional healers permanently on site) as well as patients; and interested members of my own circle of friends, relatives and associates. The organisational leaders of the School and the Marae have granted their official and formal approval on behalf of their members. Information sheets and contact details in case of any questions or concerns that people may have, were made available to all by way of a poster displayed on the Marae notice board and business cards at the desk.

I have been engaged in this work alone, but with the approval of the Board of Trustees, the Principal and SMT, other members of the facilitation team and the staff of this school as a whole. All have understood the purpose and intent of my investigations and have participated willingly on an individual and informal basis. As time went by, I found that I had gained a high degree of support from an increasing number of the kuia and kaumatua of the local marae as well as from the Marae manager and the chairperson of the Marae committee. The numbers of people with whom I interacted continued to grow as more and more became aware of and began to understand my intentions.

There was an understanding that none of these parties be required to do anything other than share their stories or ideas with me, as they wished. All the people, with whom I consulted, engaged willingly and in our so doing, strong bonds were formed.

Confidentiality

Any research needs to protect the interests of the people who have been willing to contribute. This is particularly important where the learning is founded on the building of open and trusting relationships. Accordingly all ethical considerations as required by the University of Waikato have been followed. The research in this case has been designed to investigate ways to promote educationally powerful connections in one particular setting. Although it is hoped that the results may be generalised to other situations and groups of people it is important to note that the inquiry was begun in order to find ways to satisfy a particular need of a particular school.

Pseudonyms have been used in place of real names except when requested by participants. Participants' identities have been protected as far as possible, but confidentiality cannot be absolutely guaranteed since any data may be reported in the thesis - data shared will not remain confidential since it will remain in the project. All information collected including the researchers notes recorded as a journal from the beginning of this process have been stored securely in locked cabinets at my home.

Potential harm to participants:

All of the work of this investigation has been as part of my regular interactions with participants. It has not been necessary to disrupt any classroom activities, or require any students to do any work that would use their time or jeopardise their interests. At the marae I have not asked any person to do anything outside the realm of their normal duties, and I have made my discussions fit into the regular activities and events that are already taking place there. If important information has come up as a part of a conversation I have asked the person if I might take notes saying, "I am taking notes now" and then when my note making has ceased, "I am finishing note making now.".

No data of a personal nature has been sought from any participants however it is sometimes, especially as a relationship of trust is formed, difficult to avoid some personal data being given. When this has happened, I have ensured that identities are obscured or obliterated in order to protect the interests of individuals. I have also exercised some editorial discretion as to what has been recorded. I have explained to individuals that I cannot include data of a very personal nature for ethical reasons. As this research is based in

conversational sharing of ideas and stories, common social protocols have prevailed. Berryman, Soo Hoo & Nevin, (2013) suggest that when engaging in responsive research one must approach with an authentic respect and relational and dialogic consciousness. They offer a Table (Table 1.2, p 32) which sets out the guiding principles for such research and the implications that these have for the way that the researcher needs to work. My research has adhered to these principles.

1 I did the "work before the work" in that I found about the situational context, I investigated what had gone before and consulted with as many people as possible to find out how to proceed. I committed myself to a long term investigation and to building and maintaining an on-going relationship.
2 When I visited I went as a respectful visitor rather than as visiting expert. I watched and listened and joined in, and waited to be asked to respond, invited to contribute.
3 Once I had been, I made sure that there was clear understanding of my purpose, my intent and I shared my personal as well as my professional self with them. I sought their ideas and listened respectfully.
4 I was patient and flexible, I understood that my agenda would and did change in response to what they felt was important. We learned together. My own assumptions changed and I shared that new understanding with them. I expected that I would encounter resistance and when I did I was respectful, patient and brave.
5 The relationship has persisted and will remain, and I understand my commitment to that. The relational consciousness that emerged was valued and remains.

Discussions have been prompted by such opening questions /statements as:

"If, in order to do the best that we can for mainstream Māori pupils, we need to talk openly and regularly with whānau, how might we do this?"

"What have you found to be the most effective ways of communicating with your child's/mokopuna's teacher?"

"How much do you think you and others know about what goes on at school? How might you learn more?"

"What do you think that schools should do to in order to be active in their communities?"

The opportunities for these prompt questions have occurred informally and naturally. When I visit the marae people ask me how my work is going, they are willing to be drawn into a discussion. Participants are encouraged to share their thoughts by the fact that I have become a known and trusted face at the marae, with an understood and trusted purpose (working with the community to help to raise the achievement of mainstreamed Māori students by strengthening community links) and to a large extent the project has been founded in relationship building.

On other, more formal occasions, (Parent report evenings at the school, or Kapa Haka practice evenings at the marae) I have made myself available for discussions by taking up a 'discussion post' under the banner of Te Kotahitanga. At these evenings I make myself available to talk with people about the role of Te Kotahitanga in raising student achievement and again natural opportunities to ask these sorts of questions occur. On these occasions (as above) I ask the person for permission to take notes if they tell me something of importance and tell them when I am about to stop doing so.

When people have responded to an invitation to participate in an informal interview, they understand that I will make notes of the discussion and I always offer them a transcript of these.

I have also always told people that I will ultimately share the findings of my research with them.

3.5 Research procedure

The research procedure consisted of first of all establishing the need. Review of research literature in New Zealand and overseas around the desirability of schools having respectful and trusting relationships with the student's families helped to confirm what seemed obvious. –that is, that student achievement is enhanced by strong and effective home school partnerships. This was the "work before the work" (Berryman, Soo Hoo & Nevin, 2013). The investigation into what ways this school should try to collaborate with its Māori communities, sought to understand, on more than an intuitive and empirical basis, the importance of educationally powerful connections between home and school. This entailed an examination of research literature on that topic, as well as comparison and reflection on situations in similar schools both locally and further afield. Population studies founded in

empirical research provided the statistical data to justify the need for this project in this area.

Government and Ministry of Education policies were then examined which reinforced not only the need, but in fact the requirement, for schools to work proactively to develop these educationally powerful and effective relationships with whānau.

Certain policies and practices in place in other schools were observed, reflected upon, evaluated and ultimately rejected in terms of not being of direct relevance to this immediate school setting.

Quantitative analysis of student achievement data and school senior student retention levels over a number of years was then triangulated with records (such as existed) of parental involvement at the school in which the research was situated.

Secondly, it was necessary to investigate, using quantifiable means, what had already been tried, by whom, and with what degrees of success. The beauty of the quantifiable is that it is not corrupted by the passage of time or the change of personnel.

Anecdotal evidence, in the situation in which this research took place, painted a picture which indicated a need for the school leaders to change their ways of consulting with the families of mainstream Māori students in order to begin to collaborate with that group. (Mainstream Māori in this research context, are those who do not belong to the school bilingual unit, which is distinguished, contrary to the mainstream, as having strong and successful home school partnerships). Without the use of some quantifiable data though, anecdotal information remained mere unsubstantiated opinion.

Access to participants

Other than my normal everyday interactions as a Te Kotahitanga facilitator, this study has not involved any direct observations or interviews with the students or teachers at this or any other school, although my own opinions and judgements have inevitably been informed by such. I have worked to establish relationships with the people through regular contact with some members of the community at the local Marae and in various other community

networking groups. There was some important learning for me about the importance of connections, persistence and commitment in this work. I have also made myself available to speak with parents when they request this, which they have done from time to time for a wide range of reasons. Often, what has been required has been simply acting as an intermediary, or a conduit, putting people in touch with the right people in the school, making some introductions or explaining a problem.

The participants included members of the Marae community. Some of these were young mothers, fathers, uncles, cousins of our students. Many more were grandparents and great grandparents. Some members of local sheltered workshops with their caregivers attended as well as people on community detention, social workers, youth and age workers, health care providers. Many of these were interested and listened and spoke with me about their own experiences with schools and education, as well as their concerns for the youth of their community. Some parents who did regularly attend school functions were also participants. I always made myself available for discussion at these occasions with anyone who was interested.

An information sheet was made available and offered to all of those with whom I met and had discussions, in order that they were fully informed. I asked them to sign a participant sheet if they wished for their names to be included in a list of 'sources'.

The people I talked to were made aware of the purpose of our discussions, of my practice of 'writing it up as I go' and of my intention of sharing that learning with others involved by making the final report available to them all. All participants have (and I hope, will continue to) shared their stories willingly, consenting by participating. The conversations have been entirely voluntary and informal.

I informed the participants of my intent and purpose and my hopes of collaboration, through formal korero on the marae when I responded to an invitation to speak to a gathering of kaumatua and kuia. I followed this up by way of a covering panui (information letter) about the nature and intentions of the project. This panui was displayed on the marae notice board - it informed people of my purpose and of my practice. I sought and gained, the formal permission of the Marae committee who represent the interests of the people in general, and who safeguard the rights and obligations of Tāngata Whenua, by talking with them but also by writing to them – this letter was considered at one of their

governance committee meetings. As this project was about consulting with whānau in the ways that they feel are effective and most appropriate to them, I was also being guided by them in the ways of seeking consent and of conducting the 'interviews'. Hence, I avoided the use of audio and video recorders and transcripts, as in this context they tend to stifle the natural and collaborative conversations that would otherwise occur. I recorded names of participants only if they wished to have their names made public and wished to be included (Participant list). I took photos of people who wished to be photographed and made prints of these available to them.

Document analysis

Analysis of documents at a national level, particularly those which reflect government strategic direction, reveal that policy makers in this country are at least aware of the need to promote collaborative and inclusive home school partnerships. This awareness reflects the findings of the international research community, which is that "connectedness is fundamental to [effective] relations" that "teachers are inextricably connected to their students and the community" that school and home, or parental aspirations are complementary (Bishop et al p20). The analysis of these government documents revealed that although there is a clear mandate to schools, what is still missing, are concrete suggestions to schools, of how to achieve that positive and collaborative partnership in a way that is not only inclusive of all cultures, but in a particular way that acknowledges, accommodates and encourages those of the indigenous families.

Study of various school documents: Newsletters, BOT reports, statistical analyses, ERO reports, Te Kotahitanga milestone reports all reflected this same gap. They provide quantifiable and substantive evidence that there is a serious need for change in the ways that mainstream Māori families are involved in the education of their children. Head counts and demonstrated trends of parent attendance (or non-attendance) at various school gatherings provide further material against which to measure, not only the need, but at a future date, to assess the impact of any changes made to the practices of those who seek to engage with the community. These people include school leaders, as well as the school's Te Kotahitanga facilitation team.

These quantitative analyses provide the data to support the need for the work to be done, and in future will provide for the analysis of the impact, if any , of any change that might be put in place to try to meet this need. These data can also be used to some degree to describe the ways that this piece of largely qualitative research has been undertaken. The quantitative features of this particular research project are the number of times different people were interviewed, the number of occasions the researcher visited the marae, the amount of time invested in building relationships, the number of referrals made as a result of those relationships. The latter are also quantitative indicators of some success.

It was important, not only to acknowledge the need, but also to accept ownership of the problem. Te Kotahitanga milestone reports over a number of years continued to identify community consultation as a challenge to be overcome. In order to check that this was not an anomaly, or associated only with the current Te Kotahitanga team performance it was necessary to check the background.

Once the problem was seen to be serious and on-going, I needed to investigate possible ways to overcome it. Several traditional Eurocentric methods of consulting with parents were attempted and rejected as having little impact. I turned to the example of Bishop et al. (2007) and attempted to seek the opinions of the people with whom I needed to work more effectively. The more I progressed the more I found that cultural responsiveness was a key to being effective, that this investigation was only a beginning of finding a way to consult, that it would take time and persistence to begin to find some appropriate ways, and that issues of power and control would still need to be addressed.

Background study

A background study of consultation in the school was the first research strategy to be used (described earlier and discussed further under the Findings section). This study involved the analysis of school documents around consultation with students and whānau. It also necessitated conversations with various school leaders and BOT representatives to ascertain their understanding and positioning in terms of the school's role, rights and responsibilities towards its community.

Written correspondence

Because the obligation of Te Kotahitanga facilitation involved informing the parent community about what the school was doing to raise the achievement of Maori students, we first tried the traditional secondary school way of communicating – by written correspondence. Panui (letters) were posted to every Māori family – we wrote articles about Te Kotahitanga in school newsletters and created flyers and business cards which we handed out at every opportunity. When we needed to co-ordinate focus groups we sent panui home with individual students and we made phone calls.

Presentations

We made a big display and ensured that we, the school Te Kotahitanga team, were a very visible presence at parent report evenings. I personally welcomed each family at the door, handed out flyers, NCEA resources, National Standards information, and school support information. Student participation was increased by having the student leaders engaged in providing hot and cold drinks and kai. The head prefects were enlisted to head count at the door and a student made DVD explaining the way that Te Kotahitanga works in our school was shown on the media screen in the foyer. These improvements were all noted and appreciated by parents and were therefore maintained for the subsequent occasions.

As a lead facilitator I took every opportunity to present information about Te Kotahitanga and our work on behalf of Maori children in our school. I used a power point and discussion type of presentation whenever I was invited to speak to a group. People enjoyed and appreciated this, but it was only ever delivered to small groups of people who were generally those who were already engaging well with their schools.

Collaboration and networking

The overarching research question of how one should seek to engage with whanau, has embedded in it the sub question of - who to consult, who can help to find the ways? This was best answered by collaboration and networking. Berryman, Soo Hoo and Nevin (2013) suggests that one should begin by working alongside people from the community who could "help broker the relationship" and that the community needs to get to know you as a person.

Because some groups in the school and in the community do already have effective relationships with their parent communities, it seemed sensible to try to collaborate with them. Collaboration in this sense meant working together for a common purpose. It quickly became apparent that the events which parents attended at the school, were either already purpose specific, such as the cultural festival fund raiser and dress rehearsal evenings, or founded on long standing procedure such as the regular Friday afternoon wānanga (a gathering for learning centred and relational discourse) at the bilingual unit.

It was possible to piggy back to some degree on the synergy of the bi-lingual unit, which is founded and operates on whānau and school interaction. By holding our Te Kotahitanga Hui Whakarewa in that culturally appropriate venue, not only did we interact with the bilingual staff, and encourage our new teachers to join in, but we also engaged with that whānau group. We quite deliberately and openly used this hui as a way to try to connect with the wider community as well, by inviting members of the BOT, the local councils and local Kaumatua to join us.

Networking consisted of promoting and developing connections with other agencies and groups by sharing our agenda and resources. The real beginning of successful networking (and thus the beginning of this project) began when we offered use of our Te Kotahitanga professional learning space to the school Sports Co-ordinator for a weekly early morning breakfast meeting of the school's young sports leaders. I arranged to be there each week to unlock the rooms and welcome them. These sessions were run by a man who had been engaged by the Māori Women's Welfare League in a contract to encourage responsible role modelling and leadership in local youth. The ideals of the programme and the process of each meeting were embedded in tikanga Māori. As a leader of Te Kotahitanga I shared in informal discussions each week with the facilitator of this programme and we recognised similar aspirations. A relationship had begun and introductions began to be made.

I was invited to an inter–agency network meeting, which consisted of a number of community based groups all concerned with the issues around youth disengagement from education and employment, who meet regularly, communicating and collaborating in order to maximise their limited resource. The case for increasing parent participation with the school was presented and considered by this group of community network representatives.

They collaborated and came to a conclusion about the best way that we could proceed. This involved one of their members brokering an introduction for us, to the kuia and kaumatua at the local Marae. So, as a result of this introduction through networking, we began to build connection that would enable the beginnings of some collaboration. This was the start of the building of a bridge.

Other community agency networking was important too. A lot of groups which were found to have links with the marae had them also with the school. We built on these by networking with the Auckland Communities Foundation, making our space available to other groups, brokering meetings between students and various agencies.

Other schools in the area had links with the marae as well. Through the request of one of the nannies, we organised a collaborative hui Whakarewa with one of the local intermediate schools. This enabled us to share our resources with them and helped to maintain some of the connections that whanau had had with that school, which traditionally are severed when their tamariki make the transition to become rangatahi at High School.

Apart from the interagency and school collaboration and networking, the other important group that we consulted was the student body themselves. Accessing of student voice was an important component of our culturally responsive approach. When we could not ask the parents themselves, we began to ask the students what they thought their parents would like.

Identification of intent

When we responded to the invitation to meet the people at the marae I took my whole facilitation team. We were introduced in whakatau as “people who want to make a difference for the tamariki”. In response I introduced myself and my team and outlined our hopes and intentions – our purpose in coming. I talked about Te Kotahitanga, our need to consult, our difficulty in understanding how best to do this, our desire to learn and to build a bridge between our school and this marae. I reiterated the intention and purpose of my work at every opportunity in the succeeding weeks and months.

Persistence

I returned alone the following week, and the next, and the next. I sought and gained the school principal's approval to make a commitment. Persistence and commitment (Berryman, Soo Hoo & Nevin, 2013) are important and they needed to be demonstrated, proved. The relationships that enabled me to continue and to learn, were built through getting to know people and more importantly, by allowing them to know me if they wished to, sharing my own experiences, demonstrating trust. I asked questions that allowed them to tell me their stories.

Informal interviews

As well as the informal conversations, 'conversations as interviews' that occurred through the time spent on the Marae, I also offered to chat informally with parents in order to find out what would suit them best, what would make consultation with the school more comfortable than it has been. These offers were made at Parent evenings, BOT meetings, and at various informal locations and occasions. A few took this opportunity to share their thoughts and feelings. On these occasions, the interviewee directed the conversation and I took notes of these interviews. There is a willingness to continue these chats.

Snowballing

Throughout the project, I talked with whoever wanted to talk, regardless of whether the discussion was on the topic or not, regardless of whether the respondent was the parent or whanau of one of our students or not, regardless of their ethnicity. Nevertheless, it was the Maori kuia and kaumatua who were the most eager to talk – particularly as time goes by. Generally they are also people who are connected to my school, or if not, they find a way to make that connection. As time passed by, people started to seek me out, to ask my opinion and advice. Eventually I found myself recruited as a support person in school exchanges.

I also spoke with other visitors to the Marae such as the District Health Board, Work and Income New Zealand, etc., about the ways that the groups that they represented found useful to consult and what works for them. I was referred to still others.

Reciprocity

The relationship is on-going and has become reciprocal. Reciprocity is important. "What's really important about going into a Maori community…. You want them to engage with you,

you actually also bring with it, a responsibility back to that community" (Berryman, 2011, p.14). I arrange for others to visit, make introductions and ensure good koha. Our students visit and learn – we value the learning and the old people. Our Health Science students do presentations on Health that will help people and demonstrate their commitment to the community. Social Science students study sustainability issues and the marae is a case study – this demonstrates that they value the work that is being done there. The marae sends people to work with us at Hui and is open to any group that we like to send to them.

Listening to the experiences of people

Once the doors were opened to this research project, and in particular to the person conducting the research, the most important thing became the ability to engage in active listening. Conversations that had small beginnings frequently led to in depth recollections and discussions about an old person's experiences growing up. Shifting cultural values and the effects of the passage of time on the local community were often debated. The demise of old knowledge and ways mourned and the pleasures that technology can bring celebrated.

Reflective diary

As a Te Kotahitanga facilitator engaged in promoting learning and teaching interactions characterised by ako, and as a leader of teachers' professional learning, I was accustomed to encouraging my colleagues to engage in an inquiry process involving self- reflection – particularly when they were looking to affect some sort of change in their own practice. It was natural then that I use such processes myself and I therefore maintained a reflective journal. This meant that I reflected on visits, interactions, the stories that I was told, and particularly, on the shifting in my own understandings as time went by. The diary was a living document which was reflected by the research project itself. As I learned from the people, so I adjusted my stance and my methods, and so I learned more. This was how I addressed the third sub-question, that of "what changes are needed in my own professional practice?"

Whakataukī

The metaphor that guides me in this chapter is ***He ika kai ake raro, he rāpaki ake i raro*** –As a fish begins to nibble from below, so the ascent of a hill begins from the bottom. This was an important message, in that the work that I began was difficult and if one looked at the whole task, it seemed too huge to contend with. A little at a time though, the work is able to be done.

Actually the guiding metaphor I wanted to use is one that I cannot find. I was not in a situation where I could write it down when it was told to me, and the lovely man who used it is now deceased. It may well have been a whakataukī of his own.

I had a group of students at the marae, learning about holistic values and the kaitiaki of the marae, koro Te Tawhena, was guiding us through the gardens talking to us about Maori values and the ways of working with the land. He spoke of any task that needed to be done needing to have the right people to do it, choosing the right tools and picking the right time. The whakatauki he used was about planting the kumara. He translated to us along the lines of, "a good gardener wouldn't dig the kumara pit with a teaspoon would he? He would look around to find the right tools, and he wouldn't pull out the vines before they are ready."

I thought that this was an important message for my work. I was looking for the 'right tools' every time I spoke with people there, I was learning from them about the right times and places and tools, every time I visited and as time went by I was learning how to use them.

Chapter Four – Findings

4.0 Introduction

I begin this chapter by outlining the culturally responsive framework that I have used for this research. Next, I describe the setting in which this research takes place and examine the evidence that justifies the need to do it. Much of this is the 'work before the work' that I did before embarking on this study. In the next section I position myself in this research, both professionally and personally. This is done by briefly recounting my own experiences in education and reflecting on the ways that these professional experiences have served to shape my thinking and hence the ways that I have proceeded. I do this in order to establish my right to do this work and to consider why this work is important. In the following section the examples of effective collaboration that I did find in some areas of the school are described. Next I recount the ways that I sought to inform myself and the important learning that took place alongside those experiences. The chapter concludes with the identification of the important themes that have emerged as part of this investigation. I also present important findings from the literature that I used to inform me prior to attempting to answer the research questions and which continued to help me to understand what I was finding as the work continued.

I know that I have a lot more to learn, therefore the whakataukī for this chapter that I have chosen for myself to describe this part of the journey is:

Mai i te Kōpae ki te Urupa, tātou ako tonu ai.

From the cradle to the grave we are forever learning.

The over- arching research questions of this thesis are:

In what ways should schools seek to interact more effectively with their local Māori communities in order to collaborate with the families of Māori students?

In examining this question, the following sub – questions arise:

- What does working agentically, so as to accomplish reciprocal, educationally powerful connections look like, for the Māori community and for the school?
- What changes are needed in my own professional practice in order to establish more effective communication and collaboration with whanau?
- Who can help me to find the most correct or appropriate ways to proceed?
- What can we learn from this?

4.1 A Culturally responsive framework for this research

The five guiding principles of culturally responsive research (detailed in Table 1.2 Berryman, Soo Hoo and Nevin, 2012 p 32) provided an appropriate framework for this work.

1 The first guiding principle required me to "Do the work before the work" and "learn from multiple sources". This meant being prepared with some understanding of the people with whom I wished to consult, and understanding of the situation at school. I was also aware that this was likely to be a long journey and that I could not expect to find answers overnight, but needed to be prepared for a long commitment.

2 The second required me to not only "arrive as a respectful visitor", but also to "bring my authentic self". I had to wait to be invited, and once there, I had to be careful to follow the hosts' protocols and agenda. I needed to listen, to watch and to wait. I needed to let the people do the same, as they assessed me and my intentions.

3 Once I had gained access I needed to be sure that I had a relational and dialogical consciousness which meant that when I was invited to respond, I shared who I was, as a professional and as a person. I clarified my purpose and asked for their ideas. I listened respectfully and allowed my agenda to evolve, adapting and changing in response.

4 The research process was co-constructed with the participants. I understood that I needed to remain patient and flexible, to engage in on-going critical reflection, questioning any assumptions I may have made, and learning with the participants. I recognised and respected resistance when it occurred and learned from that.

5 I understood that once forged, my relationship with the group was on-going and that I had a responsibility to give back to them. My commitment extended beyond the period of the research itself.

Initial Steps – the work before the work:

This research took place in a large urban secondary school that has the highest number of Māori and Pacific Island students of any of New Zealand's State secondary schools. The community is of the lowest socio economic ranking and the school students have accordingly limited opportunities (or perceptions of opportunities) for success. Consultation and collaboration with parents is understood to be problematic because of many factors. Economic and social considerations mean that when we ask parents to come to the school, many may be: working late hours; lacking transport; at home with younger children; caring for elderly; unwell; or even living and working away from home, out of the area. Add any of these factors to any feelings of insecurity, lack of confidence or welcome around visiting the school and they will, and do, stay away in droves. The families of the mainstream (as distinguished from the Bilingual group) Māori students were identified as the least well represented at parent evenings or other school events.

When I arrived at this school and began to try to consult with whānau, senior managers and teachers held low expectations of success for any form of collaboration between the local community and the whānau of our mainstream students. It was understood that the Board of Trustees and the bilingual whānau group had more or less captured all of the willing, available and capable parents already. There was no Parent Teacher Association. Staff were by and large, resigned to expecting little from students' families. These low expectations were not unkind; they were the unintended consequence of understanding the difficult economic and social circumstances with which many of the families struggled, and of long experience of poor turnout at school functions from a large majority. Those whānau who did support the school, were on the other hand, loyal and committed. Anecdotal evidence suggested that any efforts to consult more widely with whānau were always of very limited effect and scope. It would always be the same few families who came along to parent teacher evenings, for example, and that these would invariably be the ones that the teachers needed to see the least.

However, when I looked to see if there was any evidence of whānau engagement, there was little related evidence to be found. For example there had been no formal attempt made to gather attendance numbers at parent evenings or other events. This lack of any data, other than anecdotal evidence, was a telling piece of evidence in itself. It implied that the matter of consultation was not of real importance, or that it was considered that parental attitudes were already entrenched.

In 2010, 2011, and 2012 we took head counts at the door on parent evenings. The room seemed busy, because the people who did come, often came in family groups, but when we broke the numbers down, they were representing only 8% of the student population. In 2011 the numbers rose slightly to 11% and levelled off again in 2012 to 8.4%. The school student population has for some time been close to one half Māori. Of these less than one third are in Puutake, the rest are in the mainstream classes. More than half of the Māori whānau who did come to the parent evenings were from this bilingual group which represents approximately one fifth of the total school population and appeared to be far better served in terms of communication opportunities than the rest of the school.

What did I do? I mailed a pānui (letter) to the family of every Māori child in the school, introducing myself, explaining my role and the purpose of Te Kotahitanga, and inviting questions. Out of 700 letters 20 were returned as "address unknown" and I had one telephone response. That response was from a person wanting to know if I could put the family in touch with the school uniform shop. Clearly then, this was not an effective way to establish a collaborative connection - as I was told later.

> *"Texting is the best way to get an invite. It is the best form of communication; it is non – judgemental – letters or newsletters? …Forget it! We ignore them - if we even get them." – (Māori parent)*

I consulted the Board chair and other BOT members. Everybody agreed that excellent community connections and real collaboration existed with the whānau group for the Māori bilingual unit. These were long standing relationships and were based on high expectations and acknowledged shared responsibilities as detailed earlier. All of this was part of the "work before the work"; Step One of the five stages of culturally responsive methodology recommended by Berryman, Soo Hoo and Nevin (2012, Table 1.2 p32)

Meanwhile, we had continued our efforts to ensure that school based consultation did take place following more culturally appropriate ways. For example, we maintained a Te Kotahitanga presence at Report Evenings and other functions; we introduced some kai (food) to evenings that had previously had none and involved the school prefects in that; we handed out NCEA and other information at the door; we counted heads and analysed just who was coming; we surveyed parents on how they found the format of the evening - these were all initiatives that we tried. Harking back to the success of the NCEA information evenings that I had hosted at my previous school, I contacted the same provider. We held an evening session and had student leaders hand out flyers advertising it at a school 'Culture Day' (which many people did already come to in order to watch the student culture groups rehearsing for the major cultural festival of the year). This evening was a success with those who came – a small group, but significantly larger than the numbers that anyone had predicted, and the report evening the following week was swelled by the same numbers as an outcome (this gave rise to the small percentage increase in numbers indicated earlier). We began to regularly analyse family attendance at various evenings. We looked at which families came, to talk with which teachers, on which occasions. We looked at the make -up of those visiting whānau groups- fathers, mothers, uncles, aunts, grandparents, sometimes older brothers or sisters or other caregivers. We asked teachers to keep a tally of who they spoke to each time, and which students came with their whānau. We asked the parents what they thought about the format, what else they wanted, and what improvements we could make.

That analysis indicated that those who came largely got what they expected. They were appreciative of the opportunity to talk to teachers and discuss their children's progress. Hot cross buns and hot drinks to all at the Easter gatherings as an innovation were also appreciated, and some suggestions were made as to the layout of the hall and the timing of the session. Other improvements which were commented on favourably by parents included: the simple kai being served and using student leaders (prefects) to provide this hospitality; Handing out information pamphlets on NCEA and Te Kotahitanga; gathering feedback from those parents who did come about the parent evening experience. These were all appreciated, including the opportunity to provide feedback and suggestions. Numbers though, indicated that this was the same motivated group of parents we always

got at these evenings. Of the Māori, many were from Puutake. We were still not reaching the large majority of mainstream Māori parents.

Positioning myself as a professional:

In order to do this research, I had to bring "my authentic self". First of all I established my right to do this work, as a professional, and in the next section I discuss the ways that my positioning as a person has prepared me. Both the professional and the personal are part of the authentic self that I brought to the work, and which enabled the people that I met to connect with me.

I am middle class, female Pākehā, and an educator. My interest in the topic has been shaped by my own immediate experiences with Māori in education over many years, growing up, and then teaching. These experiences are possibly typical of those of many other Pākehā of my generation in this country including other educators. My investigations into how to best communicate with the whānau and wider community at my current school have helped me to realise that those earliest shaping experiences continue to inform me. More importantly, my recent learning around the five main principles of culturally responsive research (especially the concept of whanaungatanga – making familial like connections) has helped me to understand what was happening then and to realise that it was indeed important and relevant to who and what I am now, as well as to how I interpret and react to what I see and learn now.

As an experienced secondary teacher I was always puzzled by what seemed my inability to really 'reach' the Māori students. I usually felt that I had good relationships with all of my students, but even so, something stopped me short of being able to get the Māori students in my classes to achieve what I and the school leaders considered to be, their full academic potential – whether in my own classes or in their other teachers' classes. This situation was largely accepted by most teachers at the school that I taught in at the time - even expected.

As a senior manager at that same school, I found that my efforts to help the Māori students who were having difficulties at school still fell short when I tried to assist them to 'fit in'. I tried mentoring programmes, accelerated learning groups, peer tutoring, homework and study centres. I even tried turning the detention rooms (over- populated by our Māori

students) into learning recovery rooms. All of these 'school based', 'teacher driven' initiatives had some impact albeit it was short lived. Only when I met and listened to, as well as spoke with their parents, did I begin to make progress and some of the barriers began to fall.

The school where I worked at that time had a Māori student population that ranged between 15 and 20% of the school total. Māori were a significant and disadvantaged minority in that particular school and community. Throughout my time at that school I had tried to break down the 'within school' barriers to Māori student achievement in many ways through my various roles (form teacher, sports coach, careers teacher, Dean and a senior manager) but with only limited success. It was not until I got involved in the Te Kotahitanga Professional Development programme that I began to understand the particular social, historical context of the barriers that those students faced, and the importance to all Māori students of schools consulting with their whānau.

In that community there were (or were perceived by the Pākehā majority to be), specific issues around how to consult properly with local Māori. Teachers and the school management tended to cite the fact that there were two iwi, two marae, each with conflicting protocols, needs and hierarchies as the reasons why consultation with local Māori was problematic and doomed to fail. Fear of making relationships worse by offending one group or the other, was often the reason given for not trying. Te Kotahitanga provided a framework from within which I could begin to try to break down such deficit theory.

By the time that I came to my present school (the immediate setting for this research) I had developed a clearer understanding of the importance of consultation with Māori whānau, and how to go about this respectfully. This was, however, a different school with its own set of traditions, preconceptions, historical discriminations and located within a different community with all of its own issues too. I very quickly found that everything that I had found difficult at my previous school was going to be even more so at this one. In the previous setting I had been working from the position of a member of the community, albeit a non-Māori, and there had been a lengthy period of time in which I had - as a mother, neighbour, teacher, been able to form many good relationships with a large number of students and their families, including some Māori. At the new school however, I was a

stranger, with no shared history, no reputation, or established relationships to fall back on. I had to start from the beginning and I had no idea where the beginning might be. The difficulty that this presented me with was one of the earliest indicators for me, of the importance in this investigation, of whanaungatanga (the concept of familial like ties). This continued to be borne out by the literature that I was reading and by the learning that I was experiencing.

I was appointed Lead Facilitator of Te Kotahitanga and Director of Professional Learning at this large urban, decile one school in South Auckland in July 2008. This school was among the first group of secondary schools (phase 3) to fully participate in Te Kotahitanga. I expected when I arrived at my new school, to find that the difficulties in engaging the community that I had experienced at the previous school earlier, would be less or even non-existent. I expected this because I had not yet fully understood the importance of whanaungatanga, and because of some assumptions that I had made on the ways that Te Kotahitanga might work.

This school had had an experienced, proactive (and Māori) Lead facilitator, for at least five years. The Principal was convinced of the value of this teacher professional development intervention as one that would improve the educational opportunities of all students and particularly Māori, and he frequently reiterated the impact that this programme had on the quality of teaching and learning at the school, both within the school environs and whenever he had an opportunity to speak or write to the public. The teachers spoke confidently and frequently about their school being "a Te Kotahitanga school". Nevertheless, I found that although Te Kotahitanga had been effectively implemented at the classroom level, sadly the reform had not yet impacted on the way that the school engaged with its Māori community.

At that time, Te Kotahitanga was still, at least partially funded by the MOE and there was an obligation, under that funding, to report three times a year to the Ministry, in Milestone Reports, on the effectiveness of the programme in terms of the impact it was having on students in the classroom, on student achievement, on teacher effectiveness, and on consultation with the Māori community. Successive Milestone reports recorded the matter

of consultation and collaboration as a challenge still to be met. For example an extract from a 2010 Milestone reported the following:

Spread *What opportunities will be created to involve the school, whānau and community in Te Kotahitanga?*	*Continuing to work WITH the staff of Puutake will gradually break down any barriers that may have existed between Puutake and Te Kotahitanga.* *By running Te Hui Whakarewa on the school marae, using the kapa haka group supporters as caterers and giving koha to their fund raising efforts we are reinforcing links with the whānau community of Puutake. (We still need to find a way of communicating effectively with the whānau of our Mainstreamed Māori students).* *Including local kaumatua and the leaders of the Community Board and council in our invitations to the Hui and specifically to the Hākari is an attempt to create links.*

In 2008 an independent evaluation of Te Kotahitanga in Phase 3 schools was commissioned by the MOE and conducted by a research team from Victoria University. According to that review, schools still needed to work harder to find ways to communicate with the families of their Māori students – whānau were still largely uninformed about Te Kotahitanga. According to Sleeter (2009):

> *The commitment of Māori whānau and the school community to Te Kotahitanga and to Māori student achievement in the mainstream requires on-going communication and information sharing. Present communication strategies with communities do not appear to be effective, nor are effective strategies for engaging with Māori whānau evident. Enhanced communication would further support sustainability, particularly in periods of change in school leadership* (p 158).

In 2011 an ERO review reported that the school still needed to address issues of Māori student achievement and needed to "adopt a more coordinated approach to meeting the needs of Māori students" and to "find better methods of consultation with our mainstream Māori parents". In short, as a Te Kotahitanga practitioner, and as a senior leader in a large secondary school, it was clear that I had a professional obligation to do this work. As well as these professional obligations, I developed personal convictions and responsibilities which emerged along the way as part of my developing understanding.

Positioning myself personally:

Those personal convictions which emerged as part of the research, had been informed by my own experiences growing up and in school myself, in a similar community to the one being researched. These experiences not only helped me to identify and empathise with people as I began to know them, but helped those people to see the real person inside the researcher – the authentic self.

I am a daughter and a sister, a wife, a mother, and within the period of this research, have become a grandmother. I have also, in recent years, cared for and then lost an adult disabled son, and a terminally ill father. I have, when it has been appropriate, shared these facts about my authentic self with people I have talked to, just as they have shared with me. This has meant that people have known the whole me, which has over time, built trust.

The development of deeper understanding which emerged from the conversations and the stories we shared, also caused me, through my reflective diaries, to engage in a type of spiralling discourse with myself. I recalled some of the events and relationships which have helped to shape me and which I had not consciously thought of for many years. My new learning helped me to understand and then realise that those earlier experiences, which have made me who I am, are relevant. I began to really understand that the personal self, is not just as important to the Māori community as the professional self, but even more so. This idea is borne out by the research literature (Berryman, 2007, Penetito, 2010) and also by the experiences of this research.

This spiralling reflection helped me to realise that my own experiences as a marginalised pupil in a South Auckland Secondary school, and my empathy for the disadvantaged Māori girls whose academic margins I was placed into; the stories of Mihipeka; of several of the

kuia at the marae; of my earliest school friend; even spanning three or four generations as they did, were all reflections of each other. These women could all recount similar experiences of oppression through education and socialisation. They all experienced loss of language, of culture and confusion of identity. Women such as these are our school children's grandmothers, mothers and aunties. These are the very people with whom the schools seek to consult, is it any wonder that consultation is so difficult - for both sides?

The cultural and social considerations of this piece of research are of paramount importance. I am a Pākehā working in a multicultural setting and leading a programme aimed at addressing issues of educational disparity for Māori students in mainstream secondary schools. I also live outside the community in which the school is situated. As a member of the dominant hegemonic group in this country, I began working and investigating from the position of an 'outsider'. In the next section I will detail the steps I took in order to find out how to move from that position of outsider".

4.2 Who can help me with this?

The first step was to establish where I could find some support, to "learn from multiple sources" (Berryman, Soo Hoo and Nevin, 2012 p 32). I detail these in this next section.

Areas of the school that do already have good whānau support are those which are of a special nature and cater to particular student needs or aspirations These include the Bilingual unit, a Services Academy, a Health Science academy and a Junior Integrated programme. While all of these particular and specific groups are very successful and have managed to collaborate to some degree with the families of their students, there remains the issue of the lack of the same with 'whānau' in the rest of the mainstream school. There is also particular need for collaboration between these specialist groups because quite often the students are the same ones. There is the sense of wasted opportunity when Whānau are called to the school and come, only to meet the consultative needs of one group and then are expected to come to another at a different time to meet a different set of needs.

The failure to coordinate and the lack of group or shared ownership of all of these initiatives mean that the goodwill and ability of whānau to connect with the school can be exhausted and fractured and ultimately the connection breaks down on the widest level.

> "*Don't expect us to come to one meeting one week and then to meet with another group the next! Man, that's just wasting our time, and ours is just as precious as yours…. You guys all think that you have got the most important things to say, but you got to learn to listen too….*" Māori parent

Even more important, is the fact that all of these specialist units which do interact well with their parent bodies are functioning independently of and in isolation from each other, as well as, apart from the wider body of the school, those ordinary, mainstream students and families whose needs are discounted by all of this. For the Te Kotahitanga team then, and importantly, for the school leadership teams, the question remains - how best to seek to collaborate with Māori whānau? And, what are some examples from these groups that can help to provide some of the answers?

Bi-lingual unit

The school has a highly successful and well established Māori bilingual unit which is on site and caters for 200-250 students from Years 9 to 13. The numbers catered for are limited by the number of teachers available who have the required knowledge and understanding of Te Reo and tikanga. The only entry criteria for students are: a genuine interest in tikanga Māori, the desire to learn Te Reo and the willingness of the student and family, to commit to the values of the unit.

Each school day in the bi-lingual unit begins at 8:30 with karakia, himene, whakatau and kōrero in the wharenui. Everyone shares a prayer followed by a hymn, any newcomers are welcomed and introduced. Important matters for the day are then discussed and this morning ritual often ends with another song or waiata. It all takes place with everyone gathered close together in the meeting house which is the spiritual heart of the unit. This wharenui houses all of the taonga (treasures) accumulated over the years. The carvings, done by previous students, depict all of the iwi and other peoples from whom the school population springs. There is a strong sense of ownership and belonging, a deliberate and conscious acknowledgement of place which connects all of the people who go there. All of the unit students and staff attend this Karakia each day. Whānau are always made welcome at this time, and indeed are frequently to be seen on site at all hours of the day. If any

student is in trouble, whanau will come to Puutake to discuss the matter with the teachers, with George, the head of the unit, and at times, with each other.

A student canteen operates out of the wharekai which is supported by whānau. This canteen is not open to mainstream students and sells different foods to the mainstream canteen. This is partly because it is whanau operated and driven. The decisions about which foods to sell are based on popular demand and family eating standards rather than being driven by the 'cost to supply plus profit' basis of the commercially driven canteen. Costs are cut down at the wharekai because there is no need to employ canteen staff, any necessary work being done by Puutake staff, students or whanau who happen to be available.

While Puutake families are often in school, to address concerns around their rangatahi, or to support the kaupapa of the unit, the same cannot be said of the families of the mainstream Māori students. This group do not visit the school as do the whānau of the bilingual students, possibly feeling estranged in the formal environment in which their children are educated.

Many, but by no means all of the Puutake students, come from the local Kura Kaupapa Māori. Most of their families have been heavily involved in their education from an early age and those links are maintained once the transition is made into the secondary system. Kaiako in the unit acknowledge that the role of whānau is a key to its success. "Matua" as the pupils call the leader, (George Pomana) holds and articulates extremely high expectations of students and their whānau. Failure, as exemplified by a lack of commitment is simply not tolerated.

George, or Matua, invests huge personal commitment in his unit. The whānau group is **his** whānau and he expects their commitment to the unit to be the same. Hence, if a student is having difficulties, he expects the family to come in to school to discuss the problems. He will also not hesitate to go **to** the home to support or engage with the families. Whānau afternoons are a regular and established weekly event. Caregivers come along to the Friday afternoon wānanga (discussion and learning gathering) at the unit for a shared meal, bringing their whole families and much of the discussion that is needed to support a child's learning happens in this familial, secure environment.

When I first approached George to ask him how we should go about attempting to collaborate with mainstream whānau he told me that school leaders need to go to the people. They need to be where the parents are, in the homes, on the sports fields, in churches, shopping malls, and marae. Then they need to open the school up to those same people - have regular whānau days so that they can come and go, call them in as soon as there are any worries, negotiate solutions together. He described to me whānau evenings in Puutake where groups of families and teachers worked together to identify issues and the strategies that all parties could use to overcome them.

Clearly, those who are effective in collaborating with whānau are modelling good practice, and if I talk with them I may learn from them. However, the situations are not the same. The students in Puutake are those whose parents have chosen a path that is steeped in their culture and in understanding and knowing who they are. It is framed around the rhetoric and ceremony of the marae and celebrates success with culturally appropriate performances that all can share in.

> *"Mainstream parents have almost no idea what is happening at school. Compare that with Friday afternoon at Puutake – 96% turn out." Puutake Parent*

For many of the Māori students in mainstream classes though, the situation is quite different. Some may have little or no understanding of their own cultural history or whakapapa, and many of their families are inclined to allocate the responsibility for the child's learning entirely to the school, even to abdicate from any involvement in it, for a wide range of reasons.

For the specific guidance in how to best seek to collaborate with mainstream and specifically Māori whānau in this community, my best model within the school was clearly going to be Puutake - the bilingual Māori unit. Throughout my time at this school, I have sought the advice and guidance of our Puutake kaumatua. George Pomana's knowledge of the local community and absolute authority in terms of all things pertaining to understanding Māori tikanga and world view have become a lodestone to me. Others who care to seek to understand by immersing themselves in the cultural experience of that unit have reported similar experiences.

I checked my understandings with him in all things pertaining to the Māori community or to tikanga within the school, or outside. I qualified my decisions in this regard according to his reactions. If I have asked questions, I have rarely been given a simple answer – rather, I have been given a response which has required me to go away and think, to listen and reflect, so that I can really 'hear' what is being said. George gave me advice, some of it specific, but most of the guidance that I have received there (which has been enormous) has been implicit, suggestive, esoteric, and world view shifting. He has said many times, that it is important to "just be there, to listen and to hear". This advice is given on the most basic of requests - that was what he told my colleague when she asked him for the words to one particularly lovely waiata that was frequently sung at the morning karakia session.

> *When you just come down here, be in this place, you are absorbing the wairua, and the knowing. Just be here. (George)*

At first I did not really understand this, my pākehā notions told me that he should just tell me what to do (or tell the teacher the words to the waiata) so that she and I could get on with the job. But we needed to understand that there are no short cuts - that we need to 'put in the time' in order that our ears and eyes might be opened.

I heard and read this same message from other Māori educators, philosophers and intellectuals. I listened to Mason Durie speaking about the purpose and role of pōwhiri, (2011). He explained that the rituals of pōwhiri provide the contexts where the people can determine the purpose and intentions of visitors and that there is a necessary stage of listening, watching and reflecting on both sides. When George told me that when he goes into a situation, a gathering of people, that is not in his own space, where he is the visitor, he will position himself at the sides, looking around and assessing, maybe saying nothing at all.

> *Look, Listen, reflect: "I go there, and I just stand at the side, I watch and I listen. I may not say anything, I just take it all in and I come back home. I will think about things and so will they. When the time is right, the right one will speak." (George)*

I began to understand. I needed to be in the places and the times that opportunities to talk might arise, and open to the suggestions whenever they came. I needed to have watched, listened and thought about all I saw, heard and felt, in order to be ready to understand and recognise the approach when it arrived.

The explicit message was simply, "You can't just expect the community to come to you. You have to get out there with them. Go to where they are." That though, was easier said than done. They were not in the school, and I was not of their community, so I had to find a way to get myself invited into their world. This was a challenge that required me to "develop relationships that [would] enable [me] to come to know the 'Other' with whom [I sought] to study". (Berryman, Soo Hoo, Nevin, 2012. P.21)

In order to develop those relationships which would enable me know and understand the people I was trying to reach, I tried to tap into other groups that I thought may already have connections to the community. It was not until our School Sports Co-ordinator approached us, to ask if our Te Kotahitanga room could be used as the venue for a weekly, early morning breakfast meeting of a Young Leaders group (sports code captains) that a successful connection began to be made.

> *Lauren has asked if the sports council can meet in our room - 7.30am each Tuesday! Whoa – early start! She says if I don't mind, they can just use the room and the kitchen facilities and be gone by the time we start work. She has two young men who will run it all and she will let them in. I think that if these students are sports leaders, they will have voices in their own and in other students' homes, and if I as leader of Te Kotahitanga show them some Manaakitanga I may be able to build on this. So I offer to be there to welcome them all and let them in each Tuesday. I hope that it is not just another job to do, or another dead end. (Diary entry)*

The local branch of the Māori Women's Welfare league had sponsored a programme aimed at building positive leadership capacity in the youth of the community, looking to promote good role modelling for other young people in the area. They had chosen two young men, both Māori, who had skills in sports, music and team building. These two, Warren and Vegas, came each week and ran meetings which adhered to Tainui hui protocols and

focused on positive and responsive ways for young people to manage or respond to various social pressures. The meetings combined Manaakitanga (caring, nurturing) with high expectations and the students responded well to them.

I had short, informal discussions with Warren and Vegas each week, and we recognised that we shared similar goals – in their case, securing students' focus on school, personal growth and success by giving them the skills to manage social pressures. I asked their advice on how to reach community and whānau. They suggested I attend a meeting of the Inter- Agency network, and offered to secure an invitation, which duly came.

In accordance with the five guiding principles of culturally responsive research, described by Berryman et al, we waited to be invited and then when we were, we arrived as respectful visitors, we identified ourselves, our intentions and hopes and made it clear that we were there to listen respectfully and take a lead from them.

Community Agencies

The whole facilitation team attended the next monthly interagency meeting of a group which included representatives from Child Youth and Family; Truancy and Social Services; Work and Income; Youth Workers; Police; Māori Women's Welfare League and others. I spoke after being invited to do so, (during whanaungatanga) about our wish and need to consult with community and whānau and our difficulties in reaching them. After whanaungatanga I was invited to elaborate more. (Principal 3 of the Berryman et al Guidelines for Culturally Responsive Research detailed previously) I identified myself as a person first of all, and then as a professional, sharing with them the personal reasons for my passion for the work that I do. I was open and honest about the needs for change in our school community and the reasons why I felt that Te Kotahitanga needed to be owned by the wider community. I outlined our wish to seek the most appropriate ways of establishing a school and community partnership, provided hand-outs of our community consultation power point presentation and pamphlets about Te Kotahitanga at our school. We offered this as our koha and asked nothing but the opportunity to be heard and to listen. (Module 8 p 5).

When we offered our rooms as a convenient central location for their meetings, and offered to host them, (with kai), we were making an effort to demonstrate manaakitanga. This is the concept of caring and nurturing which makes people feel valued, supported, wanted.

The offer to host, and the promise of kai, as well as the use of our room, was a demonstration, not only that we understood the importance to Māori of being a welcoming host, but also that we understood and valued the concept of Manaakitanga. The group appreciated this and agreed to come to us for their next meeting, to hear our presentation and network ways to support us in reaching whānau. The following month the group came to us as promised.

> *We opened hui with Karakia and whanaungatanga then gave the floor to them for their usual business, but they handed straight over to us so we put on our PowerPoint and I talked to it, taking questions as we went. All the people in this group of community workers were very interested. We reiterated our need to communicate with whānau and raised the question of How Best to do this? Truancy officers shared the difficulties they sometimes have and identified lack of parental guidance in attending school as an issue for children as early as year 6. All have difficulty in gaining support of whānau and community for their work. Some families are seen as downright disruptive and destructive of their children's educations. Everyone agrees that when family is engaged and on side the child stands the best chance and agency interventions are most effective.*
>
> *The group offers to support us in our efforts to bridge the gap between high school and whānau/community; they suggest that we attend the next hui which will be hosted by the truancy agency at their Otara rooms at Whaiora - the Otara community Marae. (Diary entry)*

4.3 Arriving as a respectful visitor

Once we had made contact with some community groups, it was important that we proceed in a suitable, culturally responsive way. This was where we needed to be respectful, follow our hosts' protocols and arrive as visitors who were prepared to listen, as well as be seen, sharing our own agenda, clarifying who we were and being prepared to be adaptive.
This meeting was to take place a little further from our school, and outside of our own local community. It would also last for most of the morning. We needed to be "patient, flexible and prepared to change". We had to "question our own assumptions", recognise that we

may be tested, and "be open to new relational consciousness" (Principle 4 –ibid) In the event, the meeting was cancelled due to a tangi. It was weeks later that the Community Network meeting was suddenly rescheduled, for a new date, at the same venue, but with very little advance notice.

> *We have arranged our timetable to allow for a whole morning at Whaiora. This is the community marae at Otara –not really our area, and I have copped a bit of flak at school for committing us to it …I am determined to trust the advice of these people – they are the first to give me anything definite to go on… Just received a txt – the truancy people have a Tangi, the meeting tomorrow is cancelled- UGhhh! WE have heard nothing and are just giving up hope, when an email arrives with the meeting agenda, for the next day! Could they not have given us more warning? I tell myself to stop thinking and responding the way that any pākehā would be expected to. We have full timetables, - but feeling that this is some kind of test; we simply cancel everything and go. (Diary Entry.)*

We had to adjust our schedule in order to attend. Our Pākehā notions suggested that we should get on with our work but the sense that we were being tested and the conscious thought, 'What would George do if he was in a similar situation?' prompted me to just drop everything to go. This was just as well, because this turned out to be a key stage in the journey. This was the point at which our intentions were examined; it was our 'powhiri' like opportunity and test.

When we arrived at the venue, we were met and shown great hospitality. The group was large, and included all of the original group as well as people from the Otara Community board. The meeting was run according to recognised Hui protocol – Karakia to open, food blessed, whanaungatanga and then down to business. The business consisted of a brief report, given by the Truancy services on their activities and identifying points of tension and conflict. I was asked to present my case again so I spoke about my belief that Te Kotahitanga needed to find a root in the community - sharing our concerns over cessation of funding and the longevity of the project, emphasising that the benefits of Te Kotahitanga can only be maximised, optimum, and sustained, if we communicate with whānau and

convince the community that what we are doing is not only worthwhile but working to address a social need.

The 'chair' of the Otara Community Board responded with warm support and encouragement. He outlined the history of Whaiora and the community Board, the success of which he attributes to community ownership. The group unanimously agreed that our work is important and needs to be supported by and vested in the community. They suggested that we go to our local marae and acknowledged that we needed an introduction in order to do this. A community worker agreed to set this up for us. She told us that the kuia and kaumatua all gather on Wednesdays for line dancing and Tai Chi before sharing Kai at lunch time. We were told, "Wear your badges and something comfortable," (my co-facilitator, who is a young man, was told to wear his "tight shorts – the kuia will love that!") "Go along, join in, and be prepared to talk to people over kai." She promised that she would meet us there and introduce us. I was worried about not having had a pōwhiri to go on to the Marae, but was told "no problem," as this is an urban marae, open to all, and the gathering was held in the wharekai, which is accessed from the side entrance , not through the wharenui.

4.4 When, or If you are asked to respond - (Marae Wednesdays)

On the appointed Wednesday we turned up at the Marae and we needed to be - as explained in the five principles of culturally responsive research outlined by Berryman et al, - "Prepared for a long term, rather than a momentary commitment" and "Arriving as respectful visitors, who have waited to be invited" and we were "ready to use all of our senses".

True to her word, Huia was there to meet us and introduced us to the Marae Manager, and the caretaker, who was the resident kaumatua. We were greeted warmly, but with caution, guardedly. People gathered around exchanging greetings. There was an interesting mix of ages, cultures and genders. This is an 'urban marae', with a focus on community engagement.

We are invited to simply join in and people nod and smile and make way for us. We both feel odd and out of place, however, we follow along as best we can. Tai chi lasts for close to an hour and then there is a move into Line Dancing, which lasts as long. Some of the old people sit down; some of the young ones do the same. Tai Chi is led by whaea Ella who blends an interesting mix of Te Reo, English and Asian references in her instructions. Some of those who had sat out the Tai chi get up for the line dancing and vice versa. The whaea, who had led the first session, now joins in as a participant. (Ako) (Diary entry)

We were introduced to the people as teachers from James Cook High school, who were "working with our rangatahi." The old people were very polite and welcoming and most found an opportunity to ask a question or two. There was a lunch organised after the exercise which was hosted by the marae committee and asked just a gold coin donation. This was provided in the interests of social networking, good nutrition and elder care. The kai was prepared by a team of PD workers who were employed mornings at the marae as part of their community service. The emphasis for them is on providing manaakitanga and service to the elderly. The whole of the Wednesday of each week is dedicated to a whānau ora focus on the elderly. The members of the marae committee are conscious of a need to work with youth as well, so they were willing to allow us to try to do what we can.

Karakia is said and then we sit to eat. Part way through the meal Maryanne calls for attention in order to introduce the guests. (There are a couple of other guests on this day also).She explains that we work at the `high school and that we are keen to talk with the elders and all the people at the marae in order to find ways to help to "stop the tamariki of Manurewa from falling through the cracks" – at which there is applause. I am given an opportunity to reply, so `I stand and introduce myself, with a simple 'Tena koutou katoa' and then in English and briefly outline the role of Te Kotahitanga at JCHS and my purpose in visiting the marae. This is "clarifying who I am and my purpose, asking for their ideas.") People smile and nod and clap when I finish. One lady leans across and says to me "Next time a waiata." (Diary entry.)

4.5 If you are asked to stay

Principle four of the guiding questions for culturally responsive research addresses what one should do if asked to stay to co-construct the research. The emphasis is on being patient, flexible and open to learning together.

I was learning all the time I spent in the company of these people, and was constantly having to question assumptions that I had made or understandings that I thought that I had. In the early days, I was openly challenged in some way each week.

> *Whaea Barbara I am told, is the knowledgeable one and one to be careful of, but she is also the one I should talk to. She is the clever one, and the intolerant one, the one who knows. She is amused by me at first, and a little scathing at my "good intentions". She clearly thinks that I am after something, or that I am misguided. She emphasises that my mission is likely to fail, and tells me that Māori, in this community, are their own worst enemy. Bit by bit, over time, she tells me of her own experiences, at this marae and elsewhere. She emphasises that she is not from here, that her people are Ngapuhe. She is also unimpressed by researchers. She talks of other research projects that have not been supported because they (the researchers) have not respected the participants.* *(Diary entry)*

I was left in no doubt that if I did anything wrong, I would get nowhere. I had no choice but to recognise and respect this resistance, which is part of developing a new relational consciousness.

I persisted in going along to the marae on a Wednesday morning. I often questioned myself, wondering how relevant this was to the work that I do, some at school were puzzled by my commitment, especially when it became evident that I was having to make up for the time used, after school, and over lunches and breaks. My Te Kotahitanga colleagues encouraged me. They could see that persistence, commitment to a cause and a determination not to be a one day wonder would be appreciated by the people, and ultimately benefit the children whose needs we all agree are paramount.

Pōwhiri

A couple of months into the first year, there was a special lunch. Often, I stayed to lunch – though not always as it involved another hour and I could not always take the time because of various obligations at school. It is important though, as participating in the kai is respectful, and is the reciprocal part of Manaakitanga. Over lunch there was always an opportunity to address the group, and or further some connections. On this occasion, the marae committee had recently elected a new chairman and he was going to speak to the elders. The preceding week several of the older ladies had said to me – "You should come to lunch next week. Rangi will be here." I had learned enough by now to read the "you should" from Kuia as a fairly clear directive and good advice, so `I made sure that my schedule at school allowed for me to spend an extra hour or so at the marae the following week. This was part of my developing a "Relational and Dialogical consciousness"; my senses were becoming attuned to listening and hearing that which is not said. This is what Hori means when he says "just be there, listen and watch and you will know what to do".

As time moved on I found that my presence at the marae was expected and valued. I knew this because of the increasing warmth of my reception as people got to know me and because more and more people referred me to others. I also found that the most guarded and suspicious of the elders were beginning to open (metaphorically) doors for me. At the lunch that I was advised to attend, I found myself and my work being given formal approval and welcome. I was also 'invited' to attend the powhiri for the in- coming Marae committee Chairperson. My ears by now were open, so that I could sense the response that was needed. (Relational and Dialogic consciousness and respect as a visitor)

> *It is a Wednesday like any other. I dip in and out of the "exercise" and talk with a range of people around the walls as I usually do. When it is time for lunch, Whaea ------ (who has already told me that she is the "watcher of the kawa, the keeper of the protocols") beckons me over to sit with her. She has the new chair person sitting opposite her. We talk of several things during lunch and Whaea introduces me- even though she knows we have met before- and explains that I am seeking ways of working with the community to better the achievements of the young people in our school…… He sums up by approving my aims and methodologies, and offering me the*

freedom of the marae and its full support for my purpose….. Whaea Barbara interrupts him to ask, if he had not better introduce me to all the other kaumatua? I am formally introduced to them all as a group – All but one of them, are men with whom I have had regular discussions and know by their first names. Nevertheless he introduces me formally and explains both my purpose and his offer of acceptance and support. They all nod and agree and shake my hand. Whaea then tells me that there had been a need for the invitation to be made by ALL of the Kaumatua……. As a quiet aside to me whaea says that there is to be a pōwhiri to welcome the `chairman' the following Friday and that I should come …. (Diary Entry)

We had established that the importance of youth and family to the marae, the importance of schools networking with community bodies, the necessity for whānau to be actively involved in the education of the tamariki are concerns that we share and we were at a point where we could co-construct ways forward together.

I had been given a lesson on the importance of following protocols, and an illustration that those protocols are there to protect the relationships between people and organisations, to prevent anyone rising above their station or abusing their positions. Everybody abides by them and they give an order and precision to interactions that enable people to be safe, and to speak out, to be heard. I had also been given a lesson on the ability of these people to think and act responsively. People had been watching me while I was watching them. They had read me and had seen that I was not going away, that I was remaining true to my stated intentions and so they have found a way to legitimise my work in a formal culturally appropriate and responsive way.

When I asked permission to conduct my research, I asked it of everyone at the Marae. The Marae committee considered my request, and granted their approval on the people's behalf, because I had made my intentions and purpose clear, and because we had co-constructed the shape of the research together. I was invited to share this powhiri in order that I had a formal welcome onto the marae so that all of the necessary protocols were covered. The approval, when it came, was delivered in person, 'kanohi te kanohi' even though my formal request was in a letter to the committee. They had considered this, and

decided that a face to face interaction was more real, than a written reply. By attending this pōwhiri, in person, along with the other guests who included representatives from most of the local Social and Government agencies, the Police and the Minister for Māori affairs, I was delivering a face to face response to their acceptance of me as representative of the school, and a friend of the marae and its' people.

> *Many of the kuia and Kaumatua that I meet on a regular Wednesday are seated there with the tāngata te whenua and when it is time to hongi I am embraced with laughter and recognition. Whaea Barbara when I hongi with her, squeezes my hand and says," Now you have had a pōwhiri too". (Diary entry)*

My position on the Marae was now official. I was accepted as whānau and greeted as such. The relationships continued to get stronger and more and more people acknowledged me and my work. People began to seek me out for discussion; this was the 'snow balling' aspect of my research. I get referred to other people and people sought me out because "someone at the marae" had mentioned my name.

From this point on, I found that my relationship at the marae with the elders did not change, but what did was the way that I was able to impact on the relationships that some of the people had with others at the school. I started to get phone calls from people I had never met, and with whom I had no official connection, seeking help in approaching another person at school; seeking advice on an issue with a mokopuna (grandchild) or child; seeking understanding of the way that schools (not only the one that I work in) and education work. I was now able too, to broker connections with other teachers and the marae. I help them to organise class visits and share learning both ways. This is appreciated by the teachers and students, but also by the Marae officials.

I knew that I was being accepted and my purpose under stood when I was pointed out one day, by the Marae manager to a visitor from another school, and indicated as one who was working to build connections with the marae, in the right way, to help to support tamariki. I was participating in the Tai Chi and Line Dancing at the time, which, although seemingly

distant from my usual professional responsibilities, was the catalyst that enabled me to form connections with people and them with me. At first our only real bond, was that I was showing them that I valued what they were doing enough to try to be a part of it, and that I valued my association with them. This gave us a kinship that we did not have in the usual sense, but which we were all able to build upon, and which allowed the development of the relationship around education and youth to begin to grow.

> *I am a real clutz so provide some entertainment for the other older ladies (and some men) who are nimble and fleet of foot. Still, they encourage me to return and each time I go I talk with someone new about Te Kotahitanga.*
> *Yesterday I was on the floor stepping out of time, and one of the marae committee pointed me out to another visitor - the DP from another school (which does not have Te Kotahitanga - he was asking the marae to look after 2 of the youngsters from their school who had got into trouble.) and said to him. "See that lady there, she's from JC. I need to introduce you so she can tell you how to help our kids* ***before*** *they get into trouble! "- She at least is understanding what we are about! Isn't that great?*
>
> *(Diary entry)*

I was given practical advice too, on how to conduct meetings with whānau - advice that echoes that which I have had from some of our parents – that of the importance of kai and allowing relationships to form. I was given an explanation and an example of how to solve a community problem, by offering kai, encouraging whanaungatanga and ownership.

> *. "Offer kai to those who come to talk - feed them, explain purpose or concerns, connect them and then leave them to it --- result? People took ownership of the problem. … Māori community do not relate to your coming in as an authority, not as a person in charge, or as someone with a pre-set agenda or to demanding that they go somewhere to discuss an issue. But set them together, go to them, give them some kai and set them talking - they will take ownership and the solutions will come." (Maryanne – Marae manager)*

Maryanne's examples were community based problem solving. She described to me an illustration. In the case of an untidy street corner, her action was to simply go there and

offer manaakitanga, in the shape of setting up a barbeque in the midst of the mess, cooking breakfast for anyone who came out to meet her. She asked nothing in return, simply let the people of the area see and own the problems for themselves. This was a demonstration of high expectations and afforded an opportunity for individuals who had not been known to each other to develop some connections. Once whanaungatanga was established in this way the community group took collective ownership of the area and the problem.

4.6 Whanaungatanga

When I first began to visit the marae, I knew no one and no one knew me. The introduction, by people who had scoped out my intentions and approved them, was the only connection I had. It was enough to start with, but I needed to be aware of the need that each person I spoke to had, to find a way to make their own personal connections with me, not only as a representative of the school, but importantly, as an individual who they could relate to.

When Berryman and Bishop (2011) discuss the development of relationships of trust through dialogue, they describe whanaungatanga as a wider concept than that ordinarily understood by Europeans as family. It is about linkages that may include points of engagement and other kinds of relationships as well as kinship through whānau. The important thing is finding or creating opportunities for people to get to know you as a person.

> *Sharing my own story helps. These people are impressed by my having raised my own family. My age and experience counts FOR me. When a well -dressed young woman turns up to offer social support, to "awhi" anyone who needs it, she is received politely but without conviction. Whaea Barbara tells me that she told her (the young woman) that she should be at home with her children._ "What does she think that she can do for the community? She should be home with her kids – they need her – That is what she should be doing to help. Look at her in her high heels, what kind of awhi can a Kid like her offer? Fetch a few groceries? Put out the washing? And who is going to pay for her petrol? Her heart is good, she means well, but she won't be back." - She also tells ME – "don't like your chances,.. but good luck to you" (Diary entry).*

My visits to Marae continued on reasonably regular basis. I would go alone, and many people after a time, greeted me as whānau. People looked to find connections and my husbands' surname is one that some were able to identify. Some knew it from his sporting (wood-chopping) exploits and others knew it because of family connections in the north and

in the `king country'. Others recognised the name through my sons' rugby playing. Over the weeks and months the connections grew stronger. One lady went home (up north) and asked her whānau, who recall my husband working there as a young man and having been 'adopted' by one of their aunties. She reported this to me and her friends with delight the next time she visited the marae and calls me 'cuzzy' thereafter. As time passed I became referred to as – "the lady from JC who is working with our youth" - to "Deb from JC" - to "our Deb" - to "Hine". They knew why I was there, the purpose of my questions, and though they could all find a way to connect to me through my official role in the school, they preferred that personal connect. The sharing of my own family, my experiences as a mother, and a daughter, a wife and a sister were all seen as the most important.
I maintained the relationship by being persistent and continuing to visit, week after week for two years, and into a third. As whaea May said to me, "Māori are a stubborn people. It all takes time and their trust is only won slowly".

> *At marae today - small group – it is raining.*
>
> *Research Nurse is back. Is coming once a month this year, just to make contact, retain the relationships, protect the trust.*
>
> *She is Māori, and was a public health nurse. She asks me how it is going and I tell her that I have made some useful contacts, that people talk to me now and sometimes tell their children and mokopuna about me. I tell her that I try to come each week, and if I can't come I let someone know why. I say that I think that I cannot let them down. She strokes my arm and tells me I am on the right path. "It can take 2 years to become a part of the community" she says. (Diary entry)*

When I visited the Marae to set up a science class visit on 'sustainability' I listened to Maryanne explaining how important it is to start with Whanaungatanga. She gave examples of how this works for her in the local community and reflecting on that I realised how much this had been a part of my own journey.

> *Problem of loud noisy group partying after RWC. She asked them to turn down music etc. – met with abuse until they saw her face – oh you are from the Marae, sorry whaea – noise ceased. Because her face is known as someone with whom there is a connect, a relationship, she was listened to – the importance of whanaungatanga. Maryanne - Marae manager (Diary entry.)*

In the example that I have described earlier, of Maryanne's street corner action, she was not known, but depended on the power of whanaungatanga to set people talking and creating

interdependency which would result in positive actions. Whereas in the following description of an action taken with people who recognised her from her role on the Marae, the importance of a known face is highlighted.

> *This is partly why I am greeted so well now. I am seen as someone who not only has a relationship now in my own standing, by virtue of my perseverance and attendance, by my growing of relationships with individuals, but importantly, as I start to bring more people down, to broker opportunities, as someone who will ENABLE whanaungatanga. – Which is SO important to them. This is huge learning for me and I see it as the crux of what is wrong with the relationships between schools as Pākehā institutions , peopled by Authority figures with a Pākehā model of operation and relating , failing consistently to make any space for whanaungatanga (Diary entry)*

Building connections through teaching

The area where I did already have influence, and where all teachers can work for change, is in the classroom. The NZC was introduced in 2010. Inclusion and community engagement are among the main principles that underpin this document. The values include Diversity, Equity, Community and Participation. Professional Learning programmes in schools are helping teachers to focus on teaching a curriculum that develops understanding through these Principles and Values. More and more teachers are learning to use the content that they teach as a vehicle to empower students rather than as an end in itself. Teachers who (such as the McNeight experiment in Classical studies detailed earlier, in Chapter 2) use the Element of Participation and Contribution to incorporate family knowledge into classroom learning, are already stepping onto that metaphorical bridge that I was hoping to be able to begin to build. The families who are engaging through the child's learning are setting foot on the other side.

In my school, I worked with a teacher to help her to become more culturally responsive in her lessons. I challenged her to find authentic ways to access each student's prior knowledge, rather than assuming a common starting point on a given topic for all of her students. She responded by co-constructing with her class, a homework task, in which each student discussed the topic (reading choices) with their families, to find out what they thought and to share their experiences. The students and the families responded positively. Pupils were surprised to learn about their families' reading knowledge and preference and families were pleased to be able to contribute to the school learning. The collected material was then returned to the classroom, for all students and teacher to all discuss together.

They surprised each other with the breadth of experience and understanding that they uncovered. Parents, siblings, uncles and aunts, grandparents, cousins, even family friends – all of these community voices found their way onto the learning table in the classroom. Interactions improved, the cognitive level of the learning was lifted and the teacher and the students all grew their fund of knowledge and understanding of each other as a result. This was what Alton–Lee would call, "an 'educationally powerful collaboration with whānau" (2010, p. 144).

Reciprocity and Responsibility

When I visited the marae and talked about the need to sustain Te Kotahitanga in our school as a way to ensure proactive and agentic responses from teachers and leaders to the needs of Māori students, and the attendant need to bed that initiative in the community, to share ownership of student achievement, I struck a chord that the people who work there understand.

This marae is an urban marae. It is situated on land that was historically a portage route to other places. Manurewa itself, as is much of the Manukau area, is contested land – not only because of the impact of European colonisation, but also because of historic tribal contentions. Both Ngami Te Ata and Tainui have claimed sovereignty, and the name Manurewa comes from a legend of filial dispute and competition.

The Marae itself has had a difficult past. As it stands now it is testament to the work that can be done by a group of urban Māori who all hark from different areas, but are conscious of the need to give the local, urban, often tribally lost or dislocated people a cultural centre. They are mindful of the cosmopolitan nature of Manurewa and are openly inclusive and welcoming to people of all cultures.

> *There are Kaumatua and kuia here on a Wednesday. There are also members of the Samoan and Chinese and European communities here. This is an Urban Marae. It is a community centre, open to all – operating and embodying inclusivity.*
>
> *Kaumatua and Kuia that I speak to are all from other Marae, some from the wider Auckland area and others from further afield. They (elders) are leading the line dancing and Tai Chi or watching and joining in. It is a time to sit around and talk too. Over lunch there is further discussion. (Diary notes).*

This is also a safe and non-judging place here for people from all social strata. The legal system uses the marae to enact social justice. Some young Māori offenders serve their Periodic detention doing community service in the Marae kitchen, and around the grounds, under the watchful eyes of the Marae manager and caretaker. The local sheltered workshop people bring their clients to join in the fun and learn coordination and social skills at the dancing mornings. School groups come to give their students a cultural experience.

Sustaining the language, the culture, the community itself and the environment is important to the people of this marae. Elder health and safety, youth welfare, cultural understanding and resilience, social reform, holistic well- being, second chance education and sustainable horticultural practices are all taught, modelled and promoted. We can all learn immensely from sharing our understandings, but for me the learning seems to be all one way. I have been able to do small things to help broker relationships in the school, and help individuals in small ways. I hope that by understanding better myself, I will be able to effect some change in the way that my school conducts its relationships with the Māori community (and other cultural groups too).

What is of absolute importance is that this relationship which has grown, be further developed, nurtured and maintained. I have a personal obligation to these people, and an imperative that I maintain this relationship even after the work of this thesis has reached an end. This is the last, and possibly the most important principle of culturally responsive research. Māori groups too often have been "let down" by well-meaning Pākehā, by researchers and by those seeking to gain from association.

My responsibility to the group remains.

Chapter 5 - Discussion

5.0 Introduction

In this chapter I discuss the important themes that emerged as part of this research. It is also about the importance of commitment, and of persisting. Advice that was given to me in this time by the people, was intended to encourage me, and was also an important part of the learning. It is captured by this whakataukī:

E tohe e taa te purihi.

Persistence has its rewards.

The over- arching research question of this thesis that I needed to persist in looking for answers to was: In what ways should schools seek to interact more effectively with their local Māori communities in order to collaborate with the families of Māori students?

In examining this question, I needed to address the sub-questions of what might effective collaboration look like? To whom could I go to seek the answers? What changes did I need to make in my own practice in order to bring this about? And what could be learned from all of this?

As part of the search for answers to my research questions I learned about my own researcher positioning, the reasons for it, and the ways that it changed; I began to understand something of the nature of consultation itself, especially the difference between consultation and collaboration. I learned how and why I should behave in culturally responsive ways; how to listen and really hear; and I learned how to trust.

5.1 What does it look like?

Working agentically so as to create educationally powerful connections with whanau is not something that I can yet describe as a situated practice. It is something that I can envision, and I have been able to observe it in practice, in small pockets. It is also something that is beginning to happen systemically at our school and I look forward to seeing it bloom.

Working agentically means approaching issues with a 'solutions'-focused mind rather than one set in a deficit-thinking mode. This is difficult when the problems are large, embedded, and historical and seem to be well beyond the realm of influence of individuals like myself. The key to solving such a large task as this has three teeth (bittings). The first bit, just as it is with learning, is to break the problem into small chunks and approach them with an open mind. The second is to acknowledge that over which one has no agency, but yet still address those parts in which one can effect change. And the third, is to seek help, again, as with learning, by engaging in ako (reciprocal learning), with whoever one can engage with. The last part, arguably most important, is to share the learning and the sense of agency that accompanies it, with others who may have not yet accepted that the problem is theirs to solve.

Educationally powerful connections are the next step after forming a culturally responsive relationship and stepping onto that metaphorical bridge that I have described. This is where we will really be able to impact positively on the achievements of our rangatahi in our secondary schools. What is needed is regular and on-going dialogue between school authorities and whānau groups and between families and the teachers of their children - dialogue that is positive, culturally responsive and achievement focused.

The groups that do get a higher rate of positive interaction with parent groups at this school seem to be those that are specific in nature, those that offer a specialised focus to the students. As a generalised rule, those who opt for a specialist course of education, be it Kaupapa Māori, Military Academy or other, are those who are behind their children, active and engaged in their education. I think though, that it is the fact that, although standards within these groups are high, even elitist, and some of the requirements of both students and families participating in those groups may appear rigid, there have been opportunities for the whānau voices to be heard and listened to. When issues arise, groups co-construct the solutions together. Whānau and school are joint owners of the problems and the solutions. Whānau are also in fact, the authors of some of those exacting requirements. The parents are proud and pleased to support their children, because even if they themselves have not enjoyed success in education, they can see in a very tangible way the evidence of success. The interactions with families which develop knowledge and understanding on both sides, and are centred on improving educational outcomes (such as the responsive

homework exercises described in chapter 4) are the positive and collaborative ones that will help to break down resistance and fear of engagement on a wider and systemic level.

Collaboration or consultation?

Consultation is seeking the permission and agreement of the people. The direction or action for which agreement is sought has already been decided. Collaboration on the other hand involves a much more active role for the participants. It involves working together in order to achieve an outcome. The ways in which the outcome might be achieved, or even the nature of the outcome desired, can be worked out together by several parties collaborating.

Schools have always been expected to consult with communities – they are users of public monies, and have traditionally, in a European model of schooling, been representative of the community that they serve. This has not always been for purely educational reasons, but often an economic necessity. Communities have supported their schools, and strong relationships between management and governance groups and the parent bodies such as Parent Teacher Associations (PTA) have been the basis of effective collaboration as well as consultation. This works well when the consultation is taking place between groups that share similar values and understandings. Usually when schools consult it is in order to gain ratification for a new programme, or system, or support for a process, or policy. Since 1990 and the advent of elected parent representative governance of schools (Boards of Trustees [BOT] are elected on a three year rotation, as part of what was, at the time, dubbed Tomorrow's Schools) the consultative process has been eroded somewhat. Most decisions are taken by the Principal and Leadership teams, and when they are matters of governance rather than management, decisions are made in consultation with the BOT as parent representatives. This formalising of the consultative process, while ensuring that consultation on a representative level does occur, has at the same time done much to stifle collaboration. Non-elected parent bodies have in many cases ceased to be as active as they were, seeing themselves as no longer active collaborators, but rather as fund raising bodies, or unpaid help. In many places, especially urban areas, parent bodies such as PTAs have simply ceased to exist. The demise of opportunities for parents to actively collaborate with schools is also a symptom of the economic pressures of modern society. Many families have both parents working and are fully engaged with the business of managing their families and jobs and have no time left for school events. Or, they have no work, and no resource to

support any active engagement. Privacy and safety factors also place limitations on how and what families are permitted to do in terms of collaborating with the schools. Teachers and those planning learning programmes need to be inventive to find ways to collaborate that do not necessarily involve actual physical presence in the school.

When consultation is required by the Ministry of Education or other public bodies, one need ask if it occurs to serve the interests of the people being consulted, as a simple compliance in order to meet review criteria, or to gather funds, or worse, to serve the interests of the state in controlling innovation. Penetito (2010 p181) views consultation in education as on a parallel with "the coercive measures of colonialism". The protection of Māori interests by a Governor and the implications of article three of the Treaty of Waitangi; the former well-intentioned native schools system; and the intervention of the state in the Kohanga Reo movement, are all cases that Penetito cites as examples of unintentional coercion. One must ask then, when engaging in consultation, whose needs does this serve? And what understanding do the people being asked to consult have of whose needs are being addressed by the process?

When I attempted to consult with the community as part of my Te Kotahitanga Lead facilitator role, I was addressing the needs of the school leadership to account to the Ministry of Education for the way that the Te Kotahitanga funding was being used in the school. I was addressing my own need to be able to fulfil the expectations of me as a professional. I was addressing the school management need to be able to comply with Ka Hikitia and an ERO report that had identified a need to communicate more effectively with the wider parent body. However, now with hindsight, I realise that I failed because I had not identified a need that the community itself had acknowledged.

'The Hegemony of Consent' is the chapter heading (p 184) for a section of Penetito's book which describes the consultative processes that he and his team followed in 1997. They were seeking to establish what Māori communities would be prepared to contribute to a new Education Strategy aimed at eliminating educational disparity between Māori and non-Māori.

> Any plan that wants to get at the heart of Māori education must start with the Māori people themselves and whatever it is that they aspire to for their young people. Any

> plan that does not articulate the voices of Māori is doomed to failure. A plan that assumes prior knowledge of the outcome goals and views consultation as the confirmatory exercise focusing mainly on issues of implementation foolishly believes in its own propaganda. (Penetito, 2004, p. 184)

This sits well with the "Guiding Principles for Culturally Responsive Research" (Berryman 2012) described earlier. The crucial questions to ask when undertaking any consultative process with Māori are: Who sets the agenda? Who determines which voices are heard? (Penetito, 2010, p. 200) In all the failed or marginally successful consultations that I have participated in with Māori communities, the agenda has been pre-set by the school.

Traditional school (Eurocentric) forms of consultation and communication have lacked the essential element of collaboration. They are ineffective and furthermore, often serve to actually disengage the parents of Māori students. Established and recognised ways for schools to communicate with families are often -as described in Chapter 4, and as indicated by the following two comments from Māori parents - lacking in any real cultural awareness, One parent described the report evening format as "unsafe" and not a venue where her friends and relatives felt that they wished to discuss their child's schooling.

> *"Do not sit across a desk. Too many have been in that situation before in a bad way – CYFS, IRD, police etc. Faced with faces in suits – can be very Scary, depending on your own experience."* *(Maori parent)*

More poignant from my point of view, but reflecting similar concerns was this anonymous comment:

> *"What difference does it make if i go? No one will listen to me." (Māori parent)*

These words are poignant to me because they echo those that I often hear from students, when they feel disengaged or marginalised in the classroom – they do not contribute because they do not feel that their voice will be heard. Very similar student and parent voices were heard in the Narratives in Culture Speaks (Bishop, Berryman, 2006) when non-engaged students repeatedly described teacher failure to 'listen to me' as ineffective teaching, and when whanau described schools as failing to acknowledge the culture of the children. The situation is not culturally safe, or responsive.

In order to define 'how' our schools should work with their communities we must first ask them and then be prepared to really listen. Penetito identifies the tension between the

Systemic and the Community view of this in his Table 6.1 (p200). The systemic question is, "how to elicit the voices of Māori parents" and the community version is "how to get the system to listen to what Māori are saying". At the beginning of this project, I had a systemic view. I wanted to find out how I could get more people engaged in the consultation process. My experiences as a Te Kotahitanga facilitator, and the research literature that I had read, had already taught me that I needed to speak to the people. What I had yet to find out, and what I have been learning throughout this project, was how to really listen.

The concerns that Penetito identified and addressed when he designed the consultative strategy for working with Māori communities to develop the Education Strategy for Māori (ES4M) in 1997 included an acknowledgement that the voices are more important that the words, and that the actions responding to the voices, are more important than the consultations themselves. This is a point which was mirrored by the advice given to me on the Marae.

> *"Maori communities do not relate to your coming in as an authority, not as a person in charge, or as someone with a pre-set agenda or to demanding that they go somewhere to discuss an issue. But set them together, go to them, give them some kai and set them talking - they will take ownership and the solutions will come…"*
>
> *Maryanne, - Marae Manager*

The Māori parents Penetito talked to also identified that importance of Kanohi te Kanohi (Face to face communication) and the expression of Manaakitanga (sharing food and drink and exchanging social pleasantries, being aware, in a caring way, of the person) as a means to engage them in discussions with schools and teachers. (p199) The concept of Manaakitanga is not well understood by many Pākehā. Western European convention is that the 'business and pleasure do not mix'. It is also generally considered that meal times should not be compromised by eating in between them. If a meeting is held close to a meal time, many Pākehā consider the offer of kai as unnecessary. They have not understood the cultural implications. Making food and drink available at hui with whānau, in itself, is not a demonstration of Manaakitanga. It is the way that this is done – the sharing of kai is evidence that you mean well, that no harm is intended and in accepting kai, that trust has been placed in the giver. This is why, when hot cross buns and hot drinks were offered

around at our parent evening by our student leaders, even though it was at tea time, parents appreciated the warmth of the gesture.

When the gesture of offering food and drink and helpful resources was continued on following occasions, and more importantly when people were given an opportunity to contribute their suggestions (by on the door surveys conducted by the student leaders) families responded positively to these small gestures. When they saw some of their suggestions reflected in the way that the new home /school partnership conferences were run recently the reaction was overwhelmingly positive.

We cannot expect change as a result of one intervention, we need to be persistent and demonstrate OUR commitment before we can expect theirs and then, once trust is established and a relationship is founded that is based on an on-going connection, you can expect to build knowledge, understanding and commitment from both sides.

5.2 What changes are needed?

What changes are needed in my own professional practice in order to establish more effective communication and collaboration with whānau?

I had tried and exhausted everything that I could think of, that was within my power in my role as Lead facilitator, to try to communicate and consult with the whānau of our mainstream Māori (see my detailed description in Chapters 3 and 4). I had become reasonably adept at creating a culturally appropriate context for whānau engagement (within the framework of what was already offered) and had had some increased engagement and encouraging remarks as a result. I was still not sure though, of how to be culturally **responsive** to the community or in what ways a school could seek to do this.

When talking with teachers who have difficulty in seeing the difference between their efforts to be culturally appropriate and what is needed in order to provide a culturally responsive context for learning, I had learned to say to them, "What have you asked the students about the way in which they wish to learn this? What have you asked them about their prior experiences relating to this topic? What can you learn from them?" I realised that just as I would suggest that teachers needed to talk to and ask the students, I needed to do the same with the community.

The first change that was needed then, for me, and which is needed for school leaders, is a repositioning in order to establish a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations. Collaboration rather than consultation means power sharing and responsive action, asking and discussing instead of telling, listening and hearing and then being accountable, responsible for following through on outcomes. In the words of Berryman et al "a critical consideration of our own discourse positioning is needed in culturally responsive research if we are to ensure participatory and or liberatory discourses that will promote new potential." (p 391) This same critical consideration is needed in generating culturally responsive action in schools to create an environment where 'educationally powerful' connections with the community can flourish.

Wait to be invited

It is interesting to examine the way that the nature of consultation in schools reflects our understandings of the 'Rituals of Encounter' and the way that we do, or do not account for differing cultural approaches to these. Durie (2003) explains the protocols around pōwhiri on the marae as rituals of encounter. However, the formal Pōwhiri is not the only place that these 'Rituals of Encounter" are important. Every culture has an understood way of conducting gatherings and meetings which is sometimes explicit, but is often only implicitly arranged. The understanding and comfort that each person has of these will impact on how welcome, comfortable or otherwise they feel.

When schools consult with their community, there is usually an expectation that the school will be the venue for the consultation and that the people will come to it. Most teachers would consider the school to be a fairly safe, and relatively neutral ground on which to meet. However, for many of the community, Māori and non-Māori, schools do not necessarily represent a safe and shared space. For many they simply represent compliance and civic obligation, a place where young people serve a period of time before being permitted to join the 'real world'. For others they represent opportunity and missed chances in their own pasts. Some see schools as a place where their children can be groomed to excel. Still others remember their own schools as places of difficulty, challenge and confrontation. This was already understood by the Principals interviewed by Bishop and Berryman. "Very few Māori parents are comfortable in the school environment (p178).. ….they seem to feel that they can't talk to us (Bishop & Berryman, 2006 p193)

Many Pākehā consider their home, and the community around their home to be their space, and not relevant, or open to the school. Their notions of collective ownership do not extend to their homes or other peoples, or to the community. They do consider the school itself to be jointly owned – to be public property, and therefore a place that they, as tax payers, have a right to be, if they choose. They also consider that the school is there to serve their interests in educating their children.

On the other hand, for many Māori, collective ownership applies to almost everything except the school. The school is owned by the State, and that State requires them to send their children along. The school agenda is pre-set and they have had no voice in it. A spirit of contribution and participation – of partnership, is yet to be fledged in ways that are authentic to a Māori world view in the average New Zealand Secondary school. Issues of belonging and ownership are quite different in Kura Kaupapa, and in many Immersion and Bi-lingual units.

Many Pākehā parents would be mortified to have the school teacher of their child, come to their door to meet with them, and recognising, identifying with this cultural convention, most Pākehā teachers are reluctant to visit homes. In secondary schools that I have taught in, if a home visit is made it is because of truancy or other challenging behaviour. It is the Guidance counsellor, social worker or the Deputy Principal who makes the home visits. Visits to the homes of Pākehā children tend to be viewed along similar lines to police calls – an unwelcome embarrassment and inconvenience which will sometimes jog the looked for response.

A similar reserve or reluctance can also extend to teachers visiting the cultural or community spaces which are not their own. One of the major benefits of the work that I have been engaged in has been that by having become a known face at the marae, I am able to broker relationships for others and reduce some of that reserve for other members of the Pākehā community in which I work. Teachers who would like to take their students to visit have felt unable to do so, but by having a connection, through me, have sometimes been able to break through that reserve.

Casual encounters: When teachers live in the community that the school is situated in, they will often shop in centres away from the school, in order to have some anonymity. If they meet up with parents of the children they teach, while at the gym, on sports fields, walking the dog, or in the supermarket, they may often avoid discussing the child, or the school, preferring to keep the school and the private worlds separate and distinct. They may refer the parent to the Principal, or suggest a meeting at the school, in school times. This is entirely understandable and makes sense to many within the Pākehā world. Teachers are entitled to their 'time out' and need to be able to 'live their own lives'.

In the Māori world, things are quite different. While they do understand these Pākehā conventions, and many appear quite happy to work with them, and do so successfully, it is not a convention that is necessarily shared and understood by all in that intuitive way that it is in the non- Māori world. The Māori teachers with whom I have worked have not hesitated to visit homes, they do interact with families on the playing fields, in the malls, in the social clubs, and the families do respond well to this personal level of interaction.

The tension between the differing understandings of how home and school connections should work is identified by one of the Principals interviewed by Bishop and Berryman as part of their research for the Te Kotahitanga project. The Principal was Māori and told how he "made the Guidance Counsellor go and visit the parents", but the Guidance Counsellor was reluctant to do so. The Principal went on to explain that he told him that it was his responsibility "as a member of the school whanau" to make face to face contact. (Bishop & Berryman, 2006, p.169.)

When (in the course of my own work as a senior manager) I have visited Māori homes, even when the cause of the visit is likely to result in difficult conversations, I have always been made welcome, accorded respect, and have had improved outcomes as a result. My theorising is that this is because these meetings happen on ground (in the widest sense) that is familiar, where the rituals of encounter are owned by the people, and where they have opted into the interaction. The child is likely to be central in these interactions and whanaungatanga between whānau and teachers is established, sometimes with the child as the connecting factor.

We do need to "wait to be invited" but we also have to learn how to do "the work before the work" before we are entitled to expect to receive an invitation.

When we approach a marae, we know that we need to gather outside, that we need to have a woman to answer the karanga (the call to enter) and we know that we need to identify who among our men will speak on our behalf; that we need to think about and prepare whatever koha (gift, tribute) we are offering. We also know that we cannot just stroll on alone, that we need to be allied with a group, and that we will be expected to follow the protocols of the place and the people while we are there. We will need to be respectful visitors. (Stafford, 1997)

Although I had known that the local Marae must play an important role in any consultation with the Māori community I did not have a way to get there. My own natural reserve prevented me from pushing myself forward, even though I knew that I had a moral imperative, and I knew that I needed to be invited if I wished to be able to build a meaningful relationship. If I had simply appeared, knocked on the door as it were, I would have been politely, respectfully received, but I would have been unlikely to have made much progress.

By working with community groups, having the suggestion that I visit the marae come from them, and then having a semi-formal invitation, and an ally prepared to vouch for me, I was able to cross that barrier. After the introduction, I was given a time of testing - an opportunity to show my respect for the people, for the ways that things were being done on this marae, and importantly, to demonstrate my perseverance and commitment. During this time, I was welcome in the wharekai (Food and activities building) and through the side gate, with all of the other community visitors. Then, a way was engineered for me to be welcomed onto the marae as a member of an important group of manuhiri (visitors). This satisfied the requirements of kawa (ceremony protocols) and enabled me to continue my work with the freedom of the marae, including the beautiful wharenui (the carved meeting and sleeping house) and the blessing of the kaumatua and kuia.

Be there, be seen

The first overt expression of the importance of the principle "be there, be seen", was when I sought formal permission from the Marae to pursue my research there. Conventional

University research ethics approval processes required that I seek the consent, and gain approval of all parties in writing. When asking approval of the Marae committee, I did so first of all in person, face to face, kanohi te kanohi and then I followed up with a formal letter. Verbal approval was granted to me in a warm and friendly, but solemn way at the end of year luncheon that I was invited to. All the Kaumatua were formally introduced to me and my purpose and intentions outlined to them, even though I had met and talked with these men many times. That formal permission was sealed the following week by pōwhiri.

The written letter that I had to send, asking for approval for the research project and the writing of this thesis through Waikato University, caused some discussion at the marae committee meeting. I had worried about this aspect of the ethics approval because it had been my contention that requiring a written letter granting approval was precisely the western European or colonially bureaucratic approach that I was contending alienated the people.

In the event, the Marae committee debated this letter – not over whether or not to grant approval, but over the best way to respond to it. They wondered if they should respond with a letter, because I had sent them one, but, rejected that idea as they felt that a personal response, 'kanohi te kanohi' would be more meaningful. A delegate was sent to me at school, to inform me in person, letting me know that approval had granted, in what they felt was a way that mattered more. This was the first, tangible lesson in the importance of being there, and being seen.

Even before that though, it was important that I was seen and heard on a regular basis. Asking the community networks for help was the first step in the process, securing their support and the suggestion that I visit the marae, accompanied by an introduction to allow this to happen was the next step. More important was that following the introduction, I continued to visit, joining in, forming relationships, allowing myself to be seen, to be known, without asking anything in return. By being there on a regular basis, I was letting myself be watched, allowing people to test my motivation, my integrity and commitment.

On a very physical level it is important to have a presence and that presence needs to be regular in order to demonstrate commitment. My working relationship at the Marae was

two-sided in that I had to wait to be invited in the first place, but then I had to be there and be seen, to prove my commitment before I was accorded the formal welcome.

Once I had become an established and recognised face and whanaungatanga had wrapped legitimacy and belonging around me, I found that I would be forgiven lapses in attendance that would never have been tolerated in another venue. When I was prevented from attending on my regular Wednesday morning by professional issues and by personal difficulties (my own parents' ill health) I worried that I may have lost that 'belonging' but found that it transcended the mundane.

> *I have to make myself **make** time to go to the Marae; I have to prioritise it above some of the things at school which threaten to overwhelm me. And then I have to front up and actually go - but I need not have worried. I am greeted with open arms, welcomed, told that I have been missed and given genuine sympathy for my troubles. I find to my surprise, that I am able to pick up pretty much where I left off and this leaves me wondering if such would be possible in the pākehā world in which I work.- I know that it would not (Diary entry).*

This was important because it indicated that Marae support for me extended not only to my work relationship with them, but, more importantly, to my personal relationships as well. I was beginning to lose the distinction between my professional and my personal self. This was uplifting and made me realise the strength that lies not only in the collective, but in that spirit of 'Turangawaewae' (a place to stand) which is embodied in a marae. If only we can capture a little of that for our schools – which is precisely what has been achieved in such units as Puutake, where the school marae is a place for all to belong – if only they all realised it.

The message is the same at the urban marae which I visit. It has been created for all peoples in a similar way and there is a recognisable motif for everyone in its beautiful wharenui. The important thing about that principle of "Being There, and Being Seen", is not only the demonstration of commitment by regularity of attendance, but also is an openness of mind and heart that is clear for people to see. The sharing of the personal and the professional self, and a human interest and care for the people that you meet, is noted and valued.

Look Listen Reflect

In the Māori world the people who have knowledge will not necessarily speak. They may appear to inhabit the edges, waiting, listening, looking and reflecting on what is being said

and what may be needed. If they think that there is nothing to be gained from contributing themselves, they will not do so. This is an important point that non-Māori educators need to understand when they are trying to access the knowledgeable Māori voice in their community. When Maryanne spoke about the need to not have a pre-set agenda, she was identifying a common mistake that Pākehā make when attempting to consult with the Māori community. It was also a need that Penetito was fully aware of when he began his work consulting with Māori to devise the Maori Education Strategy (2004):

> A plan that assumes prior knowledge of the outcomes, goals and views consultation as a confirmatory exercise focusing mainly on issues of implementation, foolishly believes its own propaganda (p. 184).....Māori audiences in particular are loath to be influenced by external parameters being placed on their perceptions of what needs to happen in any given situation. (p. 190)

This is what George (bi-lingual unit) was describing when he spoke of watching, listening and reflecting before deciding whether or not to take any action, and it is an underpinning factor in all of the guiding principles of culturally responsive and relationship-based research that Berryman et al. (2013) had described.

I went into my research with an open mind, I had no idea what I would find or how visiting the marae would assist me in finding out what would be best for our school. I also had no idea how I would be received. The fact that I attended with no clear plan or pre-set agenda meant that not only was I able to look and listen clearly, but the reservations and suspicion was broken down more easily than it might have been.

Some times when I visited, I simply joined in with the Tai chi and the Line dancing, or sat with people listening to presentations on 'Safety in the Home'. At times there were very few people there and I found myself wondering if I was merely foolish in my quest. I never knew what to expect from my visits but each time I returned to school I reflected on what I had seen or heard. Each time I found when I reflected, often with the help of my colleagues, that I had either learned something new, or had slightly shifted in the way that people were responding to me, and by implication, to the school that I was representing.

As time passed I began to understand that sometimes it is just about being there, receptive, and waiting for the need to show itself, for the opportunity to speak to become apparent. I began to trust my own judgement and to realise that often, the understanding that grew

only manifested itself when there was a specific need that called it forth. Sometimes that was a conversation with a teacher about what was happening in the classroom, or a discussion with a colleague, or friend, or family member. The reflection was on-going. I think that, as the Native American quoted by Willis Harman and cited in Meyer (2011), the wisest thing is indeed in being humble and in actively listening, to other people, to the things in nature and to oneself. I began to listen to myself and to other people in this way, as is evidenced by the following fragment of an email conversation with a Māori friend and colleague.

> *What I mean is, that I started out…a long while ago, by wanting to **know** more, to understand more. But I think that (feel) I have moved beyond …and now I want to **be**. I want to understand on a deeper feeling level, and I can recognise that when I am feeling stuff, then - I am really understanding. It is what George has always said about "just come down, just be here.." I think that the words will come as they come now. I hope so any way.*
> *At the very least, I am beginning to have some understanding of who and what I am, the fact that I can't really put a label on this is unimportant…it is **that** realisation I think that is really important.*
> *I cannot give you anything more precise, and I think that that is a key to some of what I am learning – that that does not matter. What is real is real, it is not the labels that you put on the reality that count, it is the reality itself. (Diary notes)*

In Chapter one of <u>What's Māori about Māori Education?</u> Wally Penetito (2004) discusses Māori identity, and specifically the shaping of his own, through education, work, research and circumstance. He points out how much his various experiences as a Māori educator and researcher and his own upbringing and social and private life have impacted on the way that he sees and reacts to things. He points out how relevant 'who you are' is to everything you do. On reading this, and reflecting at the same time on the stories that people were sharing with me throughout the time of this research, I began to think about the things that had shaped me, and the ways that my own positioning had been determined. Berryman also points out that "a culturally responsive research process begins by understanding one's own identity and the discourses within which one is positioned" (Berryman et al, p394, 2013). I am still working to understand my own identity and positioning, and this has made me much more aware of the struggle that this must be for people whose identities and sense of cultural relevance have been challenged in various ways.

When I read Mihipeka's story, and when I listened to the kuia at the marae telling me similar tales, of their own upbringing, I remembered Agnes, my Māori school friend, whangai (adoptive) niece of mixed marriage neighbours, who was batted back and forth between her Māori and Pākehā worlds and I began to understand something of what may have been happening to her.

> I have decided I am going to disown being a Māori. …My kuia always said that I can't be a rangatira if I don't speak my language, but I have decided I am not going to speak Māori any more. It is too difficult to be Māori……I have not yet decided what I will be (Edwards, 1990, p. 99).

Then later, Mihipeka articulates her problem. She has made the conscious decision to reject her cultural and ethnic identity. She has identified that in order to be successful, she must transform herself into a member of the dominant hegemonic group. She is not just leaving her 'Māoritanga' at the door when she enters the Pākehā world. She is turning her back on it entirely. She, like so many others, had become a victim of that creeping, incipient attraction and hegemony of the dominant discourse.

> So already I have started to be a Pākehā. My name is now Anne Davis, not Mihi Davis. The lady at the agency didn't ask me if I was a Māori, and I didn't say a word. Māori people do not have the same privileges as the Pākehā. So I have to hide my identity…… It is 1934, I am just starting my new life. (Edwards,1990, p. 125).

Penetito (2004) attributes this to the socialisation of Māori through education. Mihipeka was socialised when she was sent to school and punished for speaking Māori and for failing to understand the pākehā ways. She changes her identity because she has learned, from the earliest beginnings at school, that success is achievable as a Pākehā, but not as a Māori; that she will find approval in the dominant hegemony if she is assimilated into it, if she turns her back on a world that school, and experience, tell her is a deficient model. My school friend Agnes was displaying similar understandings.

Agnes was very popular and I used to be confused by her ability to be a something of a chameleon. She was whatever the people around her needed her to be - one person with the teachers, another with me, and something else again with other of our friends. I knew too that she was quite different whenever she returned from staying with her cousins up north where her life, as she recounted it to me, was a weird and wonderful adventure story.

I could not understand any of her various abilities to transmute, though I accepted her as she was, as I found her.

One of the kuia at the marae explained it this way to me:

> *You can't trust a Māori – they run with the herd… they've learned to say what they think you expect them to. They won't tell you the truth until they really trust you, they won't show themselves because it's not safe, not 'til they think they really know you, and that you mean what you say….. and that's not just with Pākehā – it's between Māori too - Whaea Barbara (Diary entry)*

It sounded harsh at the time, but later I realised that this comment was important on two counts: firstly, it was explaining that deep need for trust and understanding, and the inherent, ingrained suspicion that colonial repression, tribal conflict and social deprivation may have imbued the Māori people with over time. Secondly, the sharing of this was evidence of a development of trust in me, the researcher. Some of this was an outcome of my having moved slowly; waiting to be invited; looking, listening, and reflecting; of allowing the research process to adapt, evolve, by being responsive to the situation that I found myself in and to suggestions and advice from the participants; and to letting people see the authentic me – the real person, not just the researcher or teaching professional. My own personal experiences in education, as much as my professional role, had equipped me to do this research in this culturally responsive way.

During my own difficult High School years, at a huge South Auckland school, I had experienced all sorts of social and cultural dislocation problems of my own. Of course I could not identify these at the time – nor I am sure, could the Māori girls with whom I became friendly, and who were in a much worse plight.

My situation at school was difficult because I was a shy Pākehā country girl, adrift in a very urban school. I was placed in a top "professional" class on entry because I scored well on an IQ test. Shortly after settling in, I was moved to a lower level class because my 'rural' background had ostensibly prepared me differently from the other students. In my new class I was more isolated – the other students were much more socially aware than I, and I struggled to fit in. Eventually I discovered that by using my brains to subvert our rather dull lessons, I would at least have fun and score some kudos with some classmates. Eventually, school authorities tired of my games, and I was not permitted to graduate from Form four,

but made to repeat it. After six months of eating humble pie, I was allowed to graduate into form five, the school certificate class. These classes were rigidly streamed and although I was still allowed to be in the 'Professional' courses, I was put into all the bottom classes. Most of my new classmates were Māori and they struggled with the work. Our teachers seemed to have given up, and I spent a good deal of my time in those classes helping my new friends with their work, which as I realise now, was the best way for me to learn too. For the rest of that year, my safety in the playground was guaranteed. Favours were returned.

There was nothing "Māori" taught at all in that school; no cultural episodes such as I had enjoyed at Primary school, of any sort. Most of those Māori girls, with whom I became friendly, were relegated to the "General" courses, and lower streams of classes. The majority of them left school as soon as they turned 15, destined to work in menial positions if at all – many of them had become mothers before I entered university. Colonial policies aimed to equip young Māori for roles in servitude to the colonisers (Consedine, 2005 Smith, 1995) and through the 30s and 40s education policies were consciously aiming to assimilate Māori through 'adaptive training' (Simon, 1998). Even as late as the 1950s and 60s, such policies were still in effect (Harker 1990). These facts are identified by Penetito as part of a 'Social Control Thesis' (Table 3.1 p88) which is still being felt.

Berryman (2007, p. 44) describes as one of the five main principles of Māori pedagogy, the idea of "Learning through exposure" summarised thus;

> The role of the less experienced (learners) is active looking, listening, thinking and learning in preparation for the time when it will be their turn to begin to take on the role and responsibility. The strong socio-cultural contexts in which learning such as this occurs means that learning is seldom accompanied by explicit instruction or feedback. (Berryman, 2007, p. 44)

Naturally, one has to "be there and be seen" to allow this absorption of knowledge and understanding to take place.

When I went from a small rural school to a large urban one, then when I was removed from a class that I had settled into and placed into another at high school, I was socially and culturally dislocated and expressed that in misbehaviour. When I was later placed in those low academic streams, I knew what it felt to be ostracised and excluded. My erstwhile

friends no longer wanted to know me, and I felt the sting of the label that was attached to being in a group that was not expected to achieve. My new class mates however, did not exclude or judge me, they sought my advice and they valued my opinions. This may have been a foreshadowing of the way that a previously marginalized and discounted group feels when their opinions are genuinely asked for and their ideas and suggestions acted upon.

There were other reflections shimmering through this period of my learning. I was told stories by others who had had similar experiences and could recall upbringings similar to Mihipeka and to Agnes. The people recalling their childhoods as having been stripped of culture, were surprising young, kuia and kaumatua, yes, but not ancient. This was not the history of past generations they were talking about, as much as lived experience, well within their living memories.

Whaea Te Auae was one such. A lovely gracious lady, she took delight each week in making me feel welcome and emphasising that she appreciated and valued my work. Every time we met she would sit with me and stroke my hand, and bit by bit over time, she shared with me her story. Around this time I happened to be reading the Mihipeka Edmonds story, and the parallels were amazing, though there was less pain and bitterness in Te Auae, and she was emphatic that she had had a good life.

She grew up in the North a much younger child of a large family on a dairy farm, where she helped her father milk the cows by hand and went barefoot to school, standing in cowpats to warm her feet. Her parents were full Māori (Ngāpuhi) who spoke Te Reo at home and to all her older brothers and sisters. Like so many Māori children of that time, these older children were punished at school for speaking Te Reo, and so her parents stopped using it at home. They learned English from their older children and their employers and when Te Auae was born, though they gave her a Māori name, they only ever spoke English to her, in order that she would never learn Te Reo and would make no mistakes at school.

She grew up in touch with her marae and knowing her whakapapa, but in English. Although she went on the Marae with her family she never learned the traditional ways that her parents knew so well – they hid it from her, and her older siblings who had had more exposure, were spread far and wide. She never learned about harakeke, traditional medicine or other crafts.

When she was old enough, she was encouraged to socialise with Pākehā. She learned all the correct Pākehā ways to behave and looked after her appearance so as not to appear too Māori. She met and married a local farmer while quite young. He was Pākehā, and for many years she pretty well forgot her Māori identity. Only when her own children gave her grandchildren and started to search for their own identities did she begin to question all of this. She and her husband retired to Manurewa and when he died, she began to visit that marae where she was accorded the kindness and respect due to a kuia. She joined in with all activities that were appropriate to her age including the 'Korowai' senior kapa haka group, where she re-learned childhood waiata and felt that she had blossomed at last as a Māori.

Although Te Auae was not feeling resentful or bitter, as Miuhipeka Edwards seems to have felt at times, there were amazing parallels in their stories. I talked to others too, who shared similar tales of growing up in the North, not being allowed to speak the reo and strapped at school for doing so –even on occasion by teachers who themselves were Māori, who believed that the way to success was total immersion in the Pākehā world, and had been indoctrinated into viewing the Pa (traditional Māori village) as the way to all kinds of decline.

However, it was not only the older people who shared their feelings about such experiences of cultural alienation with me, but young people too, which is even more disconcerting because that means that it is still happening, though perhaps in not quite such overt ways.

One young woman told me of her family moving to the city, far from the family marae, to seek work, and turning their backs on their cultural roots as they did so. She had come to this urban marae, to learn Te Reo, so that she could act as a translator and coach her parents and older siblings in protocols they needed to understand when they did need to return to their homes. She told me of the difficulty and tension that this sometimes caused in her family relationships. I was told too of the marae open door policy toward families who needed help with holding Tangi, and how many city Māori who have lost touch with their whānau do not know what to do, or where to turn in times of bereavement, or other crisis.

Spiralling Discourses

I engaged in critical reflection both alone, and with the people with whom I talked. They shared in and contributed to my learning. I hope that some of our reciprocal learning has been as beneficial for them as it has been for me.

The problem with talking to people in the school context is that the people I need to reach seldom talk with anyone at school. When I express this concern at the Marae and to others with whom I consult, they reassure me. The word is out they say, people will know that there is someone at school who cares. Even if you have not spoken to them, they know and they will come.

> *Research Nurse – educating people about gout and testing: Individuals for genetic pre-disposition. She is at Marae each Wednesday – table set up with pamphlets, test kits etc. and talks to whoever will listen, tests the people and slowly spreads the word. It **IS** slow she says, but sure. Agrees with my decision to come to Marae to try to consult. Says that here I am preaching to the converted, these are the people who DO know the value of education and WOULD come to the school to talk about their children – but that they will tap shoulders, they will show me the way and it is the best place to start.* *(Diary Entry)*

Many of the old people I spoke to have children or grandchildren who have been very successful in the Pākehā education system. They told me proudly about their children's and grandchildren's achievements. They also told me that they had no hesitation in going to the school to talk about their children, that they always supported the school. I asked them why we have such a problem now, and they put it down to "young people today" or to a lack of parental caring. There was no shortage of deficit theorising being voiced among themselves about their people in this community. Nevertheless, they did support my work and they do have mokopuna, nieces and nephews that they talk to. They encouraged me and soon I found that they were referring their whānau to me, looking for answers to questions that are connected with education or with the lack of it. At the same time, many of them were now the caregivers for their mokopuna at secondary school. Their children may have been away working out of the community, or unable to cope with raising their own children for a raft of reasons. In the traditional Māori way, often the child is sent to stay with Koro and Nan, who may have been able to visit the school, talk to the teachers when they were young, but who often now are feeling tired, or left behind by the changes in the world.

Or perhaps Koro and Nan were among those who had a very bad childhood experience of school, just as Mihipeka, or some of those girls who were in my class did. Perhaps they are still uncomfortable dealing with educational authority figures, finding them distant, unfair or foreign.

> *Many of the care givers are Kuia and Kaumatua – they are even less able to talk to teachers. We never meet them. It needs to be different. Only 1 in 10 will go out of their way to speak to teachers. (Māori parent representative BOT)*

Here is a clear example of this discomfort: a grandparent I had not met before, recently came to visit me at school, but would only come to the school gate. His mokopuna (grandchildren) were causing him and his wife some difficulty but he did not feel able to enter the school, or ring anyone. Perhaps there is a message here about the school's lack of understanding of manaaki manuhiri, and of the role of a pōwhiri for such people who have been excluded for so long. Although there is a wonderful pōwhiri at the start of the year for all new students, hosted by the bi-lingual unit, there is no follow up to build on this later on, in the mainstream school. I went out to the car park to talk with him in his car – his territory, his safe place. He and his wife are both quite old, quite frail, and have already raised their families. They are both clearly unsure about how to proceed with the school, or with their troubled mokupuna. Equally clear is that they do care, they do wish educational success for all their family, and they do not understand what they need to do to secure this. Wider whanau support is available, but not on a daily basis – it is not wrapped closely around them as it would have been in a traditional Māori whānau environment. This is the kind of need that really responsive and collaborative consultation with Maori communities might be able to help to address. My response, of course, apart from doing all that I am able to support them in school, is to put them in touch with people at the marae.

5.3 What can we learn from my experience in carrying out this thesis? – What are the Implications?

A positive relationship can be built with the Māori community simply by non-Māori educators demonstrating honesty, open mindedness and commitment. The relationship develops out of being prepared to wait for an invitation and out of responding to the invitation with humility and respect. Bringing your authentic self to the engagement and

being prepared to share your personal life as well as your professional one helps to convince the people with whom one is attempting to engage, of the genuineness of your intentions. Expanding this mutual trust and respect into a relationship that is between the school and the community, will enable both work together to achieve more positive outcomes for Māori students. This is the challenge that remains ahead of us.

The school, as an institution, needs to focus on embedding, at a systemic level, a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations. Individual classroom teachers can begin the process of developing educationally robust relationships with the families of their students by concentrating their planning on culturally responsive pedagogy that values, respects and affirms students' prior experiences. Senior school leaders need to be visible and active in the community so that theirs are known and trusted faces. Consultation should be collaborative, frequent, should take on many forms, and take place in a range of venues. Goals and agendas should be co-constructed, and should at least allow for some flexible adaptation and for the expression of many voices. The educational interests of the child should always be positioned at the centre of proceedings, rather than residing at the margins.

Responsibility

When I began my investigation into how I should be trying to go about consulting the Māori community, one of the most powerful things that I, as a Pākehā, needed to understand was the concept of whanaungatanga and the responsibility that that carries. Part of that responsibility, of which I am now acutely aware, is to maintain the relationship. The work is not done, and even if it is, the relationship and the responsibility remain.

Māori communities have historically been let down by consultation processes, often because of the cultural divide which has not allowed for the need for the relationship, the connection to be maintained. Working collaboratively is not about doing anything once, it is about persistence.

> *I go back alone the following week, and the next. I seek and gain the principal's approval to make a commitment. The commitment is important and needed to be demonstrated, proved. I build the relationships through getting to know people and more importantly letting them know me, sharing my own experiences, demonstrating trust. I ask questions that allow them to tell me their stories* *(Diary entry)*

It was very powerful that the school Principal had endorsed my work, and had permitted me to organise my time so that I could commit to this weekly engagement. In my school role as Leader of Professional learning, I had the flexibility to do this, a luxury which is no longer available to me. It is important now, that I find ways to maintain the connection. Some of this is done through the teachers who are encouraged now to approach the Marae for cultural exchanges.

Working collaboratively also implies a two way relationship. There has to be give and take and it is important that the nature of the giving is not defined or regulated. Building reciprocity into the relationship will ensure that the relationship will last.

> *The relationship is on-going and has become reciprocal. Reciprocity is important. I arrange for others to visit, make introductions and ensure good koha. Our students visit and learn – we value the learning and the old people. Our Health Science students do presentations on Health that will help people and demonstrate their commitment to the community. Social Science students study sustainability issues and the marae is a case study. – They demonstrate that they value the work that is being done there. The marae sends people to work with us at Hui and is open to any group that we like to send to them (Diary entry).*

Acceptance

We have to accept that we have not yet got our relationships with Māori students and whānau right. Our established ways of building respectful and reciprocal relationships have been tried and found wanting. We have to accept that we have the responsibility for putting this right. As educators we need to lead the way. We need to teach ourselves, each other and our public, about our obligations as treaty partners and our accountability for the way that things are and are yet to be. We need to accept that we must make haste slowly, but surely, take small steps and be guided by the people we are trying to work with.

We have to accept that while we might not have everyone's ear right away, we should recognise that those who do listen will talk to others, and they to still others. The messages, good and bad, will spread. We must accept that we cannot continue to act on assumptions we make about about whānau. We cannot presume that, if students' families have not come to the school, they do not care. We must not assume that we know best.

Chapter 6: Conclusions

6.0 Introduction

This journey began as an investigation into appropriate ways that non-Māori might seek to collaborate with the whānau of Māori students in a particular educational setting. I was hoping to (metaphorically) build a bridge - a bridge that would be safe to cross from both sides. This bridge would connect the school and the community so that they could work together to support the academic achievements of all students, but specifically, those of Māori students in mainstream settings. The journey became much more than an investigation. It became one of self- discovery and of the growth of relational consciousness.

6.1 The question

Investigation of the research question first required an understanding of the reasons why this research was necessary. Research literature provided insights into the possible reasons for some of the positioning of the Māori people with whom collaboration was sought. Early Māori education was characterised by inter-generational and holistic ways of learning, teaching and knowing (Hemara 2000; Pattterson 1992). The effects of Europeanisation and socialisation on Māori education (Penetito, 2004) and the dominance for many years of hegemonic discourses in education have resulted in significant loss of identity and power for Māori learners and their whānau in mainstream contexts.

Culturally responsive research approaches such as those employed by Bishop and Berryman (2006) have enabled Māori student voices to be heard and pedagogical reforms, through Te Kotahitanga, have resulted. They also asked the whānau of those students that they spoke with, about their thoughts on education. These parents themselves identified a need to have a whole whānau input into the education of the child when they expressed the need to have kuia and kaumatua presence and guidance in the school (p. 137) and when they identified the failure of the system, rather than the failure of Māori "it's not the children failing, it is the system failing them" (Bishop & Berryman, 2006, p. 146).

Accessing the voices of kuia and kaumatua for this research necessitated proceeding in culturally responsive and respectful ways. This is where the real learning in this piece of research took place. The approach used was aligned with the 'Five Guiding Principles for Culturally Responsive Research' described by Berryman, Soo Hoo and Nevin (2013).

6.2 What can be Learned from all of this?

Professional learning

Classroom teachers are at the interface of school and community each and every day – working with the children whose development has been entrusted to them by whānau. The tamariki themselves are the direct links that teachers and families have in common. Robust professional learning programmes in the school should focus on developing teachers' cultural competency in the classroom (Te Kotahitanga achieves this, as exampled in Chapter 4) and confidence in building educationally powerful relationships with whānau. School leadership needs to actively promote this professional learning and model cultural responsiveness in all of the decision making and community interactions in which they are able to engage. A culturally responsive pedagogy of relations will promote the sorts of interactions which develop knowledge and understanding on both sides, and are centred on improving educational outcomes. Such positive and collaborative interactions will help to break down resistance and fear of engagement on a wider and systemic level. Professional development is needed to support this growth in all school staff at all levels.

Leadership

Collaborating with Māori communities involves a necessary commitment of time and energy, the progress may appear to Pākehā to be slow, and may at times involve working in ways that may seem to be irrelevant (as in line dancing with the elders in the Marae setting). But in order to build an effective, collaborative and responsive relationship, school leaders need to think laterally, be patient, adaptable and persistent. Consultation is most effective if it is undertaken in order to collaborate with Māori whānau, and to do that one must build a relationship. That relationship will only develop with time, commitment, persistence, and the sharing of the personal as well as the professional self.

If one Te Kotahitanga facilitator can build these kinds of relationships with the grandparents of our students, and those relationships impact positively on the way that some of the parents interact with the school because they know that they have a relationship, that whanaungatanga is established with that one person, then with a genuine and concerted effort, others in schools, and particularly leaders, can do the same. School leadership teams need to walk that same walk – they need to set foot on the bridge. While one person cannot build the relationship for others, one can act as a broker when whānau ask to be put in touch with someone who can help, they are placing their trust in the broker to ensure that they will be treated well; that is, with cultural respect. This is the fragile nub of the issue. We need to ensure that a shift in relational consciousness takes place across the school, so that everyone understands the importance of the ways that they connect to families.

Other research supports the need for school leaders to engage in dialogically responsive interactions with their school communities – particularly Māori - and to extend relational trust beyond the confines of their leadership groups. Training is indeed needed to enable those in leadership positions to see that this building of responsive dialogic connections is a necessity not a luxury, and that an investment of time, energy and genuine commitment will reap real dividends in the long term. Immediate beneficiaries will be the mainstream Māori students in our secondary classrooms. Intermediate benefits will accrue to the schools and the teachers and leaders themselves, whose jobs will be more rewarding. But the ultimate benefactors will be the whole next generation of New Zealanders, for whom the world will be a more open and equitable place.

6.3 Emerging themes

Three broad themes emerged as a result of this study. These were: The importance of **cultural respect and responsiveness**; the significance of **whanaungatanga**; and the development and importance of **cultural self- awareness.**

Cultural respect and responsiveness

Being Culturally respectful and responsive incorporates the nature of collaboration and relational consciousness. Before one can effectively collaborate, or develop and fully

understand relational consciousness, one must demonstrate respect and proceed in a culturally responsive way as outlined (Berryman, Soo Hoo & Nevin, 2013).

This includes the need to 'wait to be invited'; the importance of the 'known face'; of 'being there and being seen' in an authentic way, on both a professional and personal level; and the significance of whanaungatanga. All of these are all integral to proceeding in a culturally respectful and responsive way. The need for persistence and commitment is also related to the issue of respect. Commitment and persistence implies that the cause is important and believed in. It is also a Treaty consistent position in that it begins to help to redress past wrongs in education and in social research.

The nature of collaboration is important to understand from a Māori point of view. Consultation implies accessing the public voice, but with a prescribed agenda and in a situation of unequal power balance in that the consultant asks the questions – which of course drives the responses. In a collaborative situation the groups work together to determine the process of an inquiry as well as the outcomes: the power is shared. The questions of whose need, whose voices (Penetito, 2004) and what venues a consultative process serves are co-constructed with all parties if the real collaboration is desired. Leaders of schools, and teachers and researchers, who proceed in a collaborative and culturally responsive way, are demonstrating relational consciousness.

Whanaungatanga

As a pākehā, and an outsider, if I wished to consult with the whānau of our mainstream Māori whānau, I had to find a way to connect with them in their space. Before I could do this I needed to forge a relationship and allow whākawhanaungatanga to develop. Once achieved there is a need to maintain the relationships that have formed, and that is done by respecting and participating in manaakitanga and whanaungatanga.

What is important is not what I am, but who. People want to know the authentic self, not just the professional mask or persona. If I can share that with them, they will trust me and share themselves with me. Once that is achieved and the relationship is built on trust, it will persist over time, and across boundaries. The 'me' that the people got to know on the Tai Chi and Line dance floor, is the same person that they will recommend to friends and relatives as someone to seek out when communication is needed with the school.

I have found that by working to create a relationship, kanohi te kanohi; making connections through whakawhanaungatanga; operating in a responsive dialogic space; sharing myself as a person; by persisting, committing over a period of time; and by offering the best koha that I can – my own learning, that I have been able to build relationships of trust which have been transferred from the people with whom I have connected, to others who know them. It seems that the business of communicating with whānau, really is about knowing and moving amongst the people.

Cultural self -awareness

In order to be able to understand the positioning of the people with whom I sought to consult and collaborate, I needed to first of all understand my own. Engaging with the literature and with the stories of the people caused me to reflect on my own experiences and those of people I had known, realising that these were both important and relevant to my positioning today. I began to understand the impact that this had on the way that I connected to people, and thus by implication, to understand the ways that others connect as well. As I reflected, and as I listened and responded to the people I began to understand concepts and ideas that had been shared with me on a much deeper level than I had been able to before this work began. I am indebted to all of the people who have shared their insights with me. I have been made more fully aware on a personal level, as well as professionally, which has significantly impacted in a very positive way on my ability to assist the Māori students in our school.

The personal convictions that grew out of this research were all to do with whanaungatanga and relationships and the understanding that part of the koha that I brought with me was a sense of my own responsibility to see things through – to develop the relationships further so that a real link with the school was not only established, but maintained. Developing connections is one thing, but for them to be "educationally powerful" there needs to be a sense of on-going-responsibility, and an acknowledgement that the educational experiences of the students should be improved as an outcome of this connection. The relationship with the community and the discourses that go with it need to be what Berryman, Soo Hoo and Nevin (2013) refer to as spiralling and continuous. We need to understand that community

relationships are like a spider web. They reach out in all directions and the bonds, while often made of seemingly fragile connections, are surprisingly strong and elastic.

6.4 Whakatauki

What I discovered, was that the bridge does not need to be built. It is there already. One simply has to recognise it, cross over without looking down or back; but looking forward to embrace the new learning, the connections and the shared responsibility that comes, not from consulting the Māori community, but from real collaboration with it.

He manga ā wai koia, kia kore e whikitia
(It is a big river indeed that cannot be crossed)

7.0 References

Alton-Lee, A. (2003). *Quality teaching for diverse students in schooling: Best evidence synthesis.* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

BBC News (2008, February). Australia apology to Aborigines. Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/7241965.stm

BBC News (2012, November). Native Americans recall era of forced adoptions. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-20404764

Berryman, M. (2008). *Repositioning within Indigenous discourses of transformation and self-determination.* Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Thesis. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.

Berryman, M. (2011). The professional development process. In C.E. Sleeter (Ed.), *Professional Development for Culturally Responsive and Relationship-Based Pedagogy* (pp. 47-67). New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Berryman, M., SooHoo, S., & Nevin, A. (Eds.), (2013). *Culturally responsive methodologies*. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.

Berryman, M., Walker, R., Reweti, M., O'Brien, K., & McDonald, S. (2002). *Kia puta ai te reo: An essential foundation for literacy*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Association for Research in Education national conference, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

Biddulph, F., Biddulph, J., & Biddulph, C. (2003). *The complexity of community and family influences on children's achievement in New Zealand: Best evidence synthesis*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Bishop, R. (1996). Addressing issues of self-determination and legitimation in kura kaupapa Māori research. In B. Webber (compiler). *He Paepae Kōrero: Research Perspectives in Māori Education.* (pp.143-160). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative research stories: Whakawhanaungatanga.* Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Bishop, R. (1996). Evaluation of the kaupapa Māori aspect of Hei Āwhina Mātua. Unpublished report.

Bishop, R., & Berryman, M. (2006). *Culture speaks: Cultural relationships and classroom learning.* Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S., & Richardson, C. (2003). *Te Kotahitanga: The experiences of year 9 and 10 Maori students in mainstream classrooms.* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from www.minedu.govt.nz/goto/tekotahitanga

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2007). *Te Kotahitanga Phase 3 whanaungatanga: Establishing a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations in mainstream secondary school classrooms*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education.* Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Bishop, R., O'Sullivan, D., & Berryman, M. (2010). *Scaling up education reform: Addressing the politics of disparity*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of theory and practice.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Cardno, C. E. M. (1994). *Dealing with Dilemmas: A Critical and Collaborative Approach to Staff Appraisal in Two Schools*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Auckland University.

Consedine, R. & Consedine, J. (2005). *Healing our history: The challenge of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.
Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (second edition). Columbus, Ohio: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive interactionism*. Newbury Park: Sage.
Denzin, N., Smith, L. T., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.), (2008). *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Dewes, T. (1977). The case for oral arts. In M. King, (Ed.), *Te ao hurihuri the world moves on,* (pp. 46-63). New Zealand: Methuen Publications Ltd.
Dick, B. (2002). *Paper 47: Action Research as meta-research*. Paper prepared for the International Sociological Association Conference, Brisbane, Queensland, 7-13 July 2002.
Duncan-Andrade, J. (2009). Note to educators: Hope required when growing roses in concrete. *Harvard Educational Review, 2009:79*(2), pp. 1-13.
Duncan-Andrade, J. (2010). *What a Coach Can Teach a Teacher.* New York: Peter Lang.
Duncan-Andrade, J., & Morrell, E. (2008). *The art of critical pedagogy: Possibilities for moving from theory to practice in urban schools*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
Duncan-Andrade, J. (2012, February). *Note to educators: Hope required when growing roses in concrete*. Keynote address at Social Justice Education Symposium, Saturday 25 February 2012 at the Kia Aroha College, Otara, Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://www.working4youth.co.nz/view-event.php?id=301&
Durie, A. (1997). Te aka matua keeping a Māori identity. In P. Te Whāiti, M. McCarthy, & A. Durie, (Eds.), *Mai i Rangiātea Māori Wellbeing and Development.* (pp.142-162) New Zealand: Auckland University Press.
Durie, M. (1999). Te Pae Mahutonga: a Model for Maori Health Promotion**.** [Unpublished paper]. Palmerston North: Massey University.
Durie, M. (1999) Mental health and Maori development. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 33(1), 5-12.
Durie, M. (2006, October). Whānau Education and Māori Potential. Paper presented at the V Hui Taumata Mātauranga, Taupo, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://www.massey.ac.nz/massey/fms/Te%20Mata%20O%20Te%20Tau/Publications%20-%20Mason/HTML%20Charcode.pdf
Durie, M., & Kingi, T. K. (1999). **"**Hua Oranga": a Maori measure of mental health outcomes**.** Palmerston North: Massey University.
Engage Aotearoa. (2011, November). *A Day with Mason Durie*, 30 November 2011. Auckland University, Epsom campus, Music Auditorium, Gate 2 held by Professional Development Seminars. Retrieved from http://www.engagenz.co.nz/?p=934
Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* London: Penguin Books.
Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage (Critical Perspectives Series)*: Roman & Littlefield.
Gillies, A. (2013, April). Powhiri 'grotesque' – Danish politician. 3News – Politics. Retrieved from http://www.3news.co.nz/Powhiri-grotesque--Danish-politician/tabid/1607/articleID/293475/Default.aspx
Giroux, H. (1981). *Ideology, Culture and the Process of Schooling*, Lewes: Falmer Press.

Glynn, T., Berryman, M., & Atvars, K. (1995). *Pause, prompt, praise: Training and evaluation of tutoring procedures for Māori children reading in English*. Report to the Research section. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Glynn, T., & McNaughton, S. (1985). The Mangere home and school remedial reading procedures: Continuing research on their effectiveness. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 15*(2), 66–77.

Goddard, R. D. (2003). Relational Networks, Social Trust, and Norms: A Social Capital Perspective on Students' Chances of Academic Success. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. Spring 2003, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 59-74*.

Goren, P. (2009). *How policy travels: making sense of Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy, 2008-2012*. Fulbright New Zealand.

Harker, R. (1991). Schooling and cultural reproduction. In J. Codd, R. Harker, & R. Nash, (Eds.) *Political Issues in New Zealand Education* 2nd edition (pp. 25-42). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Hattie, J. (2009.). *Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement.* London: Routledge.

Hemara, W. (2000). *Maori pedagogies: A view from the literature.* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Hutchings, J., Barnes, A., Taupo, K., Bright, N., with Pihama, L., & Lee, J. (2012). *Kia Puāwaitia Ngā Tūmanako: Critical Issues for Whānau in Māori Education*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.

Joyce, C. I. (2012). *Relational Responsive Pedagogy: Teachers and Māori students Listening and Learning from each other*. Unpublished Masters Thesis. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.

Ka Hikitia, (2008). *Ka Hikitia – Managing for Success: The Māori Education Strategy 2008 – 2012.* Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Kāretu, T. S. (1977). Language and protocol on the marae. In M. King, (Ed.), *Te ao hurihuri: The world moves on.* (pp. 31-45). New Zealand: Methuen Publications Ltd.

King, Michael, (1978), "New Zealand Oral History: Some Cultural and Methodological Considerations" in *New Zealand Journal of History,* 12: pp 104-123.

King, M. (1978). Some Māori attitudes to documents In M. King, (Ed.), *Tihe mauri ora aspects of Maoritanga*. 9-18. New Zealand: Methuen Publications Ltd.

King, M. (1983). *Māori a photographic and social history*. Auckland: Heinemann.

King, M. (1997). *Ngā iwi o te motu, 100 years of Māori history*. Auckland: Reed.

King, M. (2003). *The Penguin History of New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Group.

Kivel, P. (2004). The Culture of Power. *Conflict management in the Higher Education Report, 5*(1), pp. 1-7.

Kress, G. (2004). Discourse analysis and Education: A multimodal social semiotic approach. In R. Rogers (Ed.). *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* (pp. 205-225). New York: Routledge.

Kruger, T. (1998). Mātauranga Māori. Notes from keynote address at the annual conference and AGM of Te Korowai Aroha, Palmerston North.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 47-68.

Macfarlane, A. (2004). *Kia hiwa ra! Listen to culture - Maori students' plea to educators*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council of Educational Research.

Marsden, M. (2003). *The woven universe selected writings of Rev. Māori Marsden.* Edited by T. C. Royal. Published by The estate of Rev. Māori Marsden. Masterton: Printcraft '81 Ltd.

Maaka, R., & Fleras, A. (2000). Engaging with indigeneity: Tino rangatiratanga in Aotearoa. In D. Ivison, P. Patton, & W. Sanders, (Eds.), *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples,* 89-109. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Macfarlane, A. (2004). *Kia hiwa ra! Listen to culture - Maori students' plea to educators*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council of Educational Research.

Macfarlane, A. (2004). *Kia hiwa ra! Listen to culture - Maori students' plea to educators*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council of Educational Research.

Macfarlane, A. H., Blampied, N. M., & Macfarlane, S. H. (2011). Blending the Clinical and the Cultural: A framework for conducting form psychological assessment in Bicultural settings. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 40*(2), pp. 5-15.

McKinley, E. (2000). Cultural diversity: Masking power with innocence. *Science Education*, 85 (1), 74-76 (Invited response for a special issue).

McNeight, C. (1998). *Wow. These sorts of things are similar to our culture. Becoming culturally inclusive in the senior secondary school curriculum*. Unpublished graduate research study. Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand.

Mears, C. L. (2007). What Happens Next? Research into the Aftermath of the Columbine Shootings. *Teachers College Record*. Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=14516

Mears, C. L. (2009). *Interviewing for Education and Social Science Research: The Gateway Approach*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Meyer, L. H., Penetito, W., Hynds, A., Savage, C., Hindle, R., & Sleeter, C. (2010). *Evaluation of Te Kotahitanga: 2004-2008*. Wellington New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

Meyer, M. A. (2011) *Holographic Epistemology. Native Common Sense.* Unpublished paper.

Meyer, M. A. (2012, February). *Aroha is our intelligence*. Keynote address at Social Justice Education Symposium, Saturday 25 February 2012 at the Kia Aroha College, Otara, Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://www.working4youth.co.nz/view-event.php?id=301&

Mezirow, J. (1981). A critical theory of adult learning and education. *Adult Education Quarterly, 32*(2), 3-24.

Milne, A. (2011, August). Policy Principles in White Spaces. Keynote address at the *New Zealand Principals' Federation (NZPF) 2011 Education Summit.* Principles to guide New Zealand public education system which will inform thinking for a vision of 21st century schooling. James Cook Hotel, Wellington, 27 August 2011. Retrieved from http://www.nzpf.ac.nz/sites/default/files/NZPF_Summit_Ann_Milne.pdf

Ministry of Education. (2010). Family and Community Engagement. *The New Zealand Curriculum Update, Issue 1, September 2010*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/News/NZC-update-issue-1-Family-and-community-engagement

Ministry of Education. (2011). *James Cook High School Education Review 05/05/2011*, pp. 1-10. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (n.d.). *Tataiako: Cultural Competencies for Teachers of Māori* Learners. Retrieved from http://www.minedu.govt.nz/theMinistry/EducationInitiatives/Tataiako.aspx

Mutch, C. (2005). *Doing educational research: A practitioner's guide to getting started*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research Press.

Nepe, T. (1991). *Te Toi Huarewa Tipuna. Kaupapa Māori: An Educational Intervention System*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, The University of Auckland.
Orbell, M. R. (1985). *Hawaiki: A new approach to Maori tradition*. Christchurch, New Zealand: University of Canterbury.
O'Sullivan, D. (2007). *Beyond biculturalism: The politics of an indigenous minority*. Wellington, New Zealand: Huia Press.
Patterson, J. (1992). *Exploring Māori Values.* Wellington, New Zealand: Dunmore Publishing.
Penetito, W. (2004). Theorising a 'Place-based Education': Ahakoa kai tahi, terā a roto te hāhae ke rā, keynote address presented at the New Zealand Association for Research in Education (NZARE) National Conference, November, Wellington, New Zealand.
Penetito, W. (2010). *What's Māori about Māori Education?* Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University Press.
Penetito, W. (2012, February). Manaaki = *mana-ā-kī – The power of the word*. Keynote address at Social Justice Education Symposium, Saturday 25 February 2012 at the Kia Aroha College, Otara, Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://www.working4youth.co.nz/view-event.php?id=301&
Piggot-Irvine, E. (2001). *Appraisal: Reducing Control, Enhancing Effectiveness*. PhD thesis, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
Piggot-Irvine, E. (2009). Evaluation of a special education professional development programme: Success case studies. E*valuation Journal of Australasia*, in press.
Piper, H. & Stronach, I. (Eds.), (2004). *Educational research: Difference and diversity. Cardiff papers in qualitative research*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishers.
Public Health Association of New Zealand. (2008). *Te Ture Whakaruruhau : Code of Ethical Principles for Public Health in Aotearoa New Zealand.* http://www.pha.org.nz/documents/120305code-doc.pdf
Robinson, V., Hohepa, M., & Lloyd, C. (2009). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and why: Best Evidence Synthesis iteration.* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
Rogers, R. (Ed.), (2004). *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. New York: Routledge.
Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
Salmond, A. (1983). The study of traditional Māori society: The state of the art. *Journal of the Polynesian,* 92, 309-52.
Scheurich, J. J., & Young, M. D. (1997). Coloring epistemologies: Are our research epistemologies racially biased? *Educational Researcher, 26*(4), 4-16.
Schwandt, T. A. (2004). Hermeneutics: a poetics of inquiry versus a methodology for research. In H. Piper & I. Stronach (Eds.). *Educational research: Difference and diversity. Cardiff papers in qualitative research*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishers.
Simon, J., (Ed.), Smith, L., Smith, G., McNaughton, S., Morris Matthews, K., Smith, W., Pīhama, L., Hēperi, I & Tuteao, V. (1998). *Ngā kura Māori: The native schools system 1867-1969*. University of Auckland: Auckland University Press.
Sleeter, C. E. (Ed.). (2011). *Professional development for culturally responsive and* relationship-based pedagogy (1st ed.). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
Smith, G. (1995). Whakaoho whānau: New formations of whānau as an innovative intervention into Māori cultural and educational crises. *He Pukenga Kōrero Koanga. Volume 1, Number 1,* (pp. 18-36).

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies research and indigenous peoples.* London & New York: Zed Books Ltd. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
Snook, I. (2003). *The ethical teacher*. Palmerston North, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.
Stafford, D. (1997). *Introducing Māori Culture.* Auckland, New Zealand: Reed Publishing.
New Zealand Teachers Council. (2010). *Registered Teacher Criteria Handbook, 2010*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Teachers Council.
Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). *Teacher professional learning and development: Best evidence synthesis iteration (BES).* Wellington: Ministry of Education.
Tully, J. (2000). The struggles of indigenous peoples for and of freedom. In D. Ivison, P. Patton, & W. Sanders, (Eds.), *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples,* (pp. 36-59) Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
Webber, M. (2008). *Walking the space between: Identity and Māori/Pākehā*. Wellington: NZCER Press.
Wink, J. (2011). *Critical pedagogy: Notes from the real world* (fourth edition). Boston: Pearson Education.