Libraries and Learning Services

University of Auckland Research Repository, ResearchSpace

Copyright Statement

General copyright and disclaimer

"It takes a village to raise a child":
Pastoral Care for Māori and Pasifika
secondary school students

Charmaine Anne Barber

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Education and Population Health,
The University of Auckland, 2016

ABSTRACT

There is a paucity of research on pastoral care in New Zealand schools, yet the extant literature endorses the value of pastoral care for secondary students. For Māori and Pasifika students, pastoral care may enable the blending of Māori/Pasifika models of health/wellbeing with socio-ecological models such as that of Bronfenbrenner (1979), in the school context. Improved student wellbeing could foster better school retention and participation. Pastoral care, therefore, holds potential to be the *nexus* of health and educational needs in the school setting for the increasingly diverse secondary student population.

The purpose of this study was to explore and interpret what pastoral care is in the New Zealand context, how it is understood, as well as how it is represented and co-ordinated both within and beyond the school environment. A case study design was used to research this phenomenon utilizing interviews, observations and document analysis. The study found that the commonalities, as well as the notable differences both inter- and intra- ethnically within Māori and Pasifika populations necessitate additional professional development in cultural responsiveness for all school staff, and other adults contributing to the school context. Culturally responsive pastoral care for students encompassing the *whole child*, and their families, looks likely to be the essence of a more nurturing school environment. In relation, Māori and Pasifika student voice indicated that they require improved processes in order to increase participation, engagement and retention at school. Students in lower decile schools will need increased funding in order to compensate for the layers of disadvantage that are predominantly anchored in historical inequities, but persist through the perpetuation of discriminatory structural inadequacies. The findings argue that these disparities need addressing with a fresh approach in order to benefit Māori and Pasifika students, but also New Zealand society at large.

DEDICATION

For Dad

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The opposite is beneficial; from things that differ
come the fairest attunement; all things are born through strife.
Heraclitus

Inclusion of Both Māori and Pasifika Peoples in One Study

This study upholds the heterogeneity of ethnic groups in New Zealand. The inclusion of (self-identified) Māori and Pasifika students in this research reflects a commonality of experience in terms of over-representation in negative educational statistics and wellbeing/experiences of school (Crengle, Robinson, Ameratunga, Clark, & Raphael, 2012; Ministry of Social Development [MSD], 2010; Smith, 2013). These ethnicities represent cultural heritages (Jones, 2001), which have been subjugated in New Zealand schools. In addition, McIntosh (2001) stated that "Māori identity is of political concern to more than just Māori, and it is intriguing that its implication for Pacific peoples has been so little investigated" (p. 141).

In relation, Bishop (2011) suggested that care, which is effective for Māori students in the addressing of disparities in education, is effective for other minority groups of students. This is important as, again, the increasing diversity of student populations is a major problem in education today, and one which is exacerbated by the relationship with a largely non-diverse population of school staff (Bishop, 2011). According to Menzies (2008), negative stereotypes of Māori and Pasifika students can significantly impact on their perspectives of themselves and that of their communities.

Moreover, Bronfenbrenner (1979) suggested that people's wellbeing and development cannot be studied apart from their history. Wellbeing, then, for students is inextricably bound with – at the very least – their school and home contexts in connection with both their associated histories and their contemporary realities. Marmot (2007) contended that "a combination of environments…can unequally expose different groups to factors that damage [wellbeing and] health" (p. 1157).

As Māori and Pasifika people are mostly under-represented in the positive social indicators in society (Smith, 2013; Bishop, 2011) action needs to be taken on

conditions within environments, but also in the wider social context as "behaviour and its social patterning…is largely determined by social factors" (Marmot, 2007, pp. 1158-1159). Marmot (2007) suggested that a social determinants of health approach acts on structural conditions in society in order to offer greater hope for equitable, and importantly, sustainable outcomes. Pastoral care in schools, and its association with student wellbeing could, therefore, be argued to have a role in fostering equitable health and education outcomes for Māori and Pasifika students. Marmot (2007) asserted that "unless action…addresses the structural drivers of inequity in behaviour, it will not tackle the contribution of these behaviours to health inequities…Health inequities result from unequal distribution of power, prestige, and resources among groups in society" (p. 1159).

The complexities of nurturing Māori and Pasifika students' wellbeing and equitable education outcomes, therefore, are unlikely to be adequately undertaken without the concurrent recognition and redress of cultural wounding. Cultural wounding is "the mechanism by which the historical cycle of trauma is revisited upon an individual or community" (Cook, Withy, Tarallo-Jensen, & Berry, 2005, p. 120). Trauma (particularly in international literature) is utilized as a term when describing personal and collective injuries suffered by colonised peoples (for Pasifika, the dawn raids have been an under-recognized trauma). In fact, intergenerational trauma has been suggested as a way to help understand school dropout rates (Menzies, 2008). Kirmayer, Brass, and Tait (2000) elaborated on the effects of the collective trauma:

> many forms of violence against…[Māori or Pasifika]… people are structural or implicit and so remain hidden in individual accounts…damaging events were not encoded as declarative knowledge but rather 'inscribed' on the body or else built into ongoing social relations, roles, practices, and institutions. (p. 613)

Education, however, has been affirmed as useful in the redress of colonising processes (Cook et al., 2005). The nature of the education has been acknowledged to be vital for marginalized peoples' wellbeing. According to Cook et al. (2005):

> [colonising] curricula can be posited as a direct form of cultural wounding…Education for purposes of healing is a pedagogical construct largely missing from the traditions of Western education. Contemporary

societies are more apt to separate the concerns of education and healing into discrete fields of discipline. (p. 126)

Dividing individual, or collective wellbeing into isolated silos (Tett, 2015) also runs counter to models of health such as Whare Tapa Whā (Durie, 1994) or Fonofale (Pulotu-Endemann, 2001) as well as the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education [MoE], 2007). An awareness of the health of the community, then, is likely to be a consideration in the nurturing of wellbeing for Māori and Pasifika students. The health/wellbeing of a community may be "linked to its sense of local control and cultural continuity" (Kirmayer et al., 2000, p. 614); but also to differences in meaning given to the term community (Kirmayer et al., 2000). These differences may be individual or collective; and both require care/pastoral care.

In relation, the repetitive categorization of Māori and Pasifika as the 'long brown tail of underachievement' (Aumua, 2013) perpetuates the historical subjugation of two very separate peoples; and more than two peoples, as Pasifika students come from different ethnic groups such as - to name just a few - Tongan, Niuean, Fijian, or Samoan (Anae, 1997). It is beyond the scope of this project to study each Pasifika ethnic group separately, or each Māori iwi, or urban group, individually. Yet the ethos of all of the different groups lie at the heart of this research. The term, Pasifika, although non-ideal, was chosen to represent the peoples from many Pacific Islands (Nakhid, 2003).

In the interests of social justice (Nakhid, 2006; Denzin, 2003; Kohl 1995; Henderson, Mapp, Johnson, & Davies, 2007), unity in diversity (Leahy, 2015) and cultural responsiveness the differences between Māori and Pasifika peoples in the oft-mentioned 'brown tail' (Aumua, 2013) require separate considerations in order to meet the obligations of equity in Article Three of the Treaty of Waitangi (Macfarlane, 2003). Pastoral care in schools, in future, will most likely benefit from a deeper understanding of Māori and Pasifika histories in New Zealand. The history stands before us.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY

Beanie – a knitted cap worn as a hat in summer or winter in New Zealand

Coconut – A derogatory term for a person of Pacific Island descent

Hidden Curriculum – the *unintended* curriculum which is based in values and norms of the dominant culture

Māori – The indigenous people of New Zealand

NCEA – The National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) is the national qualification scheme for secondary students in New Zealand

Pākehā – Non-Māori New Zealander descended from settlers

Palagi – Person of European descent

Pasifika – In alignment with Statistics New Zealand, this study utilizes the term Pasifika to refer to the seven largest Pacific Island ethnic groups in New Zealand: Samoan, Cook Island Māori, Tongan, Niuean, Fijian, Tokelau and Tuvalu

School deciles – The decile system is an educational funding model in New Zealand based on national census, school and zoning data. Decile ratings are socioeconomic indicators each representing 10 percent of the school population. Decile 1-3 schools draw higher proportions of students from low socioeconomic communities whereas decile 7-10 school populations have the lowest proportion of low socioeconomic students

Tangata whenua – People of the land. Original inhabitants of New Zealand

Te Reo – The Māori language, one of the official languages of New Zealand

Tikanga – Cultural principles, practices and custom

Wairua – Spirit

Whakapapa – Genealogy

Whakawhanaungatanga – The acts of establishing relationships, connecting

Whānau – Family, extended family

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

All who have meditated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced
that the fate of empires depends on the education of the youth.
Aristotle

I come from a multi-ethnic background which includes six ethnicities: Lebanese, German, Māori, Norwegian, Scottish and English. As I grew up in provincial New Zealand, however, the delineations imposed on people were Pākehā or Māori (the *other*). It was a situation of labelling people: either this or that. What became apparent as a child, was that Māori or Pākehā were code for poor or not poor, successful or not successful, in or out of social groups. These labels were assumptions from both Māori and Pākehā people whereby in or out of a social group was often decided by external markers that an individual carried with them, such as *too rich* equated with *not-Māori enough*, *skin too pale* equated with *not a real Māori*, enjoying reggae music was *not Pākehā enough*, learning the Māori language was equated with a waste of Pākehā time and *not Pākehā enough*. There was not an awareness of essentializing, so the discriminatory approaches became more of an overly simplistic, provincial vernacular which limited the breadth of either a Pākehā or a Māori person's experience of their neighbours in all of their abundance, and layers.

In the school setting, a micro version of provincial New Zealand in the 1970s and 80s played out. It was *more Pākehā* to ride a bike to school, *more Māori* to walk, *more Pākehā* to wear Treks school shoes, *more Māori* to wear Nomad shoes, *more Pākehā* to have sandwiches with lettuce in Molenberg bread, *more Māori* to eat pies from the school canteen, *more Pākehā* to put your hand up at the front of the class, and *more Māori* to sit down the back without putting your hand up.

As I listened to my father, over many years, talking about his experiences of growing up in a Māori family in the same provincial area in New Zealand (and attending school in the 1950s and 60s), I realized that his experiences had been similar to my own era, but more pronounced. The partitioning of him as a male of Māori descent in the early secondary school years led him along an entrenched

pathway (Maani & Kalb, 2007). His needs were not met and he opted out of school the day he turned fifteen, like many other Māori people of his generation.

I attended six schools myself and I witnessed the patterning of my father's school experiences too often. Sometimes I was on the positive end of a see-saw effect where a Māori or Pākehā teacher would give me (as an academically able, white-faced, well-off girl) privileges and accolades at the expense of a brown-faced Māori student (most often male) sitting beside me. This was despite him putting up his hand, and despite him requesting the role on offer. The process puts a student, such as myself, in an invidious position. Should I query a school staff member on their assumptions about me, about the Māori student beside me; or about their competency to engage in equitable behaviour as an adult of authority?

On many occasions I would see the *damage* before me of a crestfallen Māori (mostly male) student who had attempted to be chosen for a role of responsibility or for an opportunity to *star* in something apart from sport. I was frequently reminded of my father. Yet, it was too difficult to relinquish one of my privileged roles to another Māori student in front of a teacher or principal. I was left wondering about potential opportunities for school staff members to dismantle such embedded pathways of *safety* in terms of which students they chose as representatives and role models in the academic sphere? I also wondered how the unenlightened school staff might be enabled (as a starting point) to allow Māori students to imagine their own possibilities? Furthermore, I wondered whether the school staff could see that everyone stood to benefit if there were less young Māori glue sniffers around our school grounds when we played netball there in the weekends? I was very familiar with the smell of Ados glue, and I was twelve years old at the time.

Several decades later, living in Auckland, and married in to another ethnically diverse family with a Samoan heritage, many additional queries arose. I pondered questions about people from any Pacific Island (New Zealand-born or Island-born) having such different histories from provincial Māori, or provincial Pākehā; or Aucklanders of those ethnicities. I wondered why Pasifika people were so often categorized with Māori people when there are many, many experiences which are not

shared as ethnic groups? There are certainly commonalities, but it could be argued that the inter-group differences are more notable (Tupuola, 2004; Krebs, 1999).

When I trained as a teacher, the under-preparation of teachers to meet the increasingly diverse needs of students became obvious (Carpenter, 2014; Villegas & Lucas, 2002). The realities for Māori and Pasifika students echoed my father's, and my own, experiences. I felt empathy for bushy-tailed, newly trained teachers who confided in me a couple of years later (in my research capacity) that they were not managing to differentiate in their classes, and were struggling enough with basic lesson planning. I questioned how, if it really "takes a village to raise a child," the teachers will ever be able to meet the exorbitant demands on them? I wondered about the community of adults around teachers? How were people enabled to help each other in school contexts in our modern lifestyle, and whose outcomes would be affected most severely if there was not enough collaboration?

After undertaking a Masters in Public Health I was able to view wellbeing from different perspectives, and to recognize the interconnectivity of all areas of a person's, or a community's, livelihood (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Māori and Pasifika models of health (Durie, 1994; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001) featured in my growing understanding of student wellbeing, but so too did choice. I learnt that the imposition of other people's narratives, or other people's assumptions, on to our own individual wellbeing, was not sound practice. Limiting individuals because of historical patterns appeared myopic (Borell, 2005).

I, therefore, found myself gravitating towards a deeper understanding of how young people in secondary schools are enabled to have the freedom to grow, expand or explore their possibilities and potentialities. The fusing of my own educational pathways looked likely. It seemed that pastoral care could be a vehicle for growth in future, but I had no idea *what it was* in secondary schools in New Zealand. The importance of school staff and school students' voices in a review of pastoral care appeared logical. Conceptualization of a project that investigated such a complex area began with the intention to support young people in school, as well as their school staff, and their communities.

Before undertaking the research, it was imperative that the relevant literature was reviewed. This would entail delving in to the history and development of pastoral care, along with an examination of the New Zealand context. Māori and Pasifika young people being referred to as *the long brown tail of underachievement* (Aumua, 2013) in itself, warranted further reviewing of Māori and Pasifika realities both separately, and together.

Outline of Thesis Structure

This introductory chapter (chapter one) has provided the context from which the study was catalyzed. The literature review (chapter two) explores the complexities of pastoral care. For Māori and Pasifika people, extant research on pastoral care is extremely limited. Chapter Two, therefore, reviews relevant literature by interweaving the past with the present in a to and fro manner. The method (chapter three) gives an overview of the methodological framework for this research, including the Kaupapa Māori approach, data collection and the analysis process. Chapter Four presents the results of the individual interviews and focus groups along with the field note analysis and document analysis. The main themes and sub-themes of the study are also presented. Chapter Five provides a discussion of the research findings and an extension to our understanding of pastoral care. Finally, Chapter Six presents recommendations for the re-orientation of culturally responsive pastoral care in the New Zealand context in order to empower Māori and Pasifika students, and their families/communities.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

It is a wise man who said that there is no greater inequality than the
equal treatment of unequals.
Justice Felix Frankfurter, Dissenting, Dennis v. United States, 339 U.S. 184 (1949)

The complexities of pastoral care in secondary school necessitate cognizance, and understanding of diverse dimensions, and contexts, of wellbeing. These include the New Zealand context, the international context, concepts of care, and structural issues in education. The review of literature will, therefore, be presented in three sections. First, the historical context for Māori, for Pasifika, and for pastoral care more generally will be examined. Secondly, models of wellbeing, school retention, care and the curriculum, along with school deciles will be explored. Thirdly, more current understandings of pastoral care will be reviewed, along with associated concepts of care.

Section One: Historical Context

In New Zealand there is a dearth of contemporary literature on Māori and Pasifika pastoral care in schools. It is therefore alarming to discover that over forty years ago, the then Minister of Education Phil Amos, published a report which could arguably be interpreted as an overt endorsement for the formal implementation of pastoral care in to schools (Department of Education, 1973). Two esteemed Māori academics, Pita Sharples and Mira Szaszy were on the committee involved in co-ordinating the report. Both Māori and Pasifika young people were included as those who were to benefit from the proposed changes in the *nature of schools* as they became "places of sharing and caring" (Department of Education, 1973, p. 4). Pertinently, this sentiment was echoed on radio decades later by Judge Andrew Beecroft when he suggested that "ideally schools should act as hubs for social support services" (Beecroft, 2012). The Department of Education report (1973) went on to outline the modifications required:

> First, a whole shift of purpose so that schools see caring as one of their prime functions: caring about the values and cultures of minority groups; caring about the welfare of those having difficulties in adjusting, whether they are

less academically able, emotionally disturbed, or manifesting difficult to undesirable behavior patterns. Second, they should involve themselves much more in the community, both by offering their resources to the community and making fullest use of the talents of the community for themselves. (p. 6)

Interestingly, the Department of Education (1973) also recognized the inadequacies of teachers (and schools) to *go it alone* (Department of Education, 1973) in re-dressing the disparities in education for Māori (and later, Pasifika) young people when it stated: "[it] is a difficult thing we are asking of Pakeha teachers to see things through bi-cultural eyes. In fact it is probably impossible"(p. 9). Hence, this study sought to unravel *what pastoral care is*, or perhaps *what it is not* in secondary schools today in order that more effective professional development for school staff may enable the needs of Māori and Pasifika students to be met. According to Jackson and Davis (2000):

teachers do not know how to educate all children to achieve their full intellectual potential. Moreover, it is blatantly hypocritical to expect them to, given the weakness of most teacher preparatory programs and the lack of ongoing professional development opportunities. (p. 14)

In keeping with the Department of Education (1973) report, Jackson and Davis (2000) also supported the development of "a caring community of shared educational purpose" (p. 14). Young people themselves shared their feelings regarding caring communities in schools and the results of Youth'12 national health and wellbeing survey found that only 27.2% of students believed that teachers or other adults cared about them very much at school (Clark et al., 2013). Yet in response to this disappointing figure, the New Zealand Secondary Principal's Association (SPANZ) opined that it was not their job to care (Parsons, 2013). In relation to such an important issue, it is surprising that there is a paucity of research and professional literature generally on the topic. Moreover, the whole notion of pastoral care in New Zealand literature is inadequately critiqued and evaluated. Pastoral care is mostly mentioned – in passing – as *a given* in secondary schools, but there is an extensive gap in the literature in terms of *what it is* that authors are referring to as pastoral care. More specifically, there appears to be scant acknowledgement of how pastoral care is constructed and co-ordinated to meet Māori and Pasifika student need/s. For the

purposes of this research, after reviewing the literature an operational definition of pastoral care was developed to be: *an on-going student-centred process based in the community context to facilitate wellbeing for learning, and learning for wellbeing, in close connection with the family* (Renihan & Renihan, 1995; Bishop, 2011; Macfarlane, 2003). In light of this definition, it is important to be reminded of the different, and shared, historical contexts of Māori, and Pasifika peoples.

Māori

The colonisation of Māori people by the British since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 has resulted in alienation of land, resources, language and traditional Māori knowledge. Legislation dispossessed Māori further, and in turn, racism has perpetuated cultural dislocation (Wilson, 2014). Today the Treaty remains a living document. Health and wellbeing for Māori in the New Zealand context ought to see the Treaty of Waitangi as a pre-requisite for advancement (Durie, 1989) and an enabler in the school setting as it is an integrated part of the New Zealand Curriculum (MoE, 2007). Thus, the Crown has obligations to protect the rights of Māori and Pākehā to pursue wellbeing in all its dimensions – whether it is written in to documents or not.

Had the Treaty of Waitangi been fully honoured "we could have seen Māori being full participants in the emerging economy and society of the new nation" (Bishop, 2011, p. x). Rather, significant disparities in health and education are evident. Under Article Two of the Treaty, Māori have rights to determine appropriate pedagogy in education, whilst Article One should have ensured shared responsibility by the two Treaty partners for the development of policy in education (Macfarlane, 2003). Underpinning the above two Articles was the guarantee in Article Three of "equitable access to the educational resources of the state and the right to expect equity of educational outcomes for Māori students" (Macfarlane, 2003, p. 11).

In terms of Māori students' wellbeing, it could be argued that education has a pivotal role to play in reducing disparities as they have had a significant impact on Māori as a people (Bishop, 2011). In relation to Pasifika students, some of the disparities in wellbeing are similar, however, the process of subordination has been a

different experience in New Zealand as Māori are tangata whenua (Macfarlane, 2003; Makasiale, 2007a). For Pasifika people, Makasiale (2007a) went on to say:

> In Aotearoa/New Zealand, we are not 'the people of the land': that is the place of the Maori…The challenge for us is to weave something new and fresh out of the position of ambivalence and landlessness here. (p. 86)

It is acknowledged, however, that there is no homogeneity of Māori (or Pasifika) students. For Māori, hapū or iwi differentiation may hold varying amounts of importance or prioritization for whānau and individuals. Similarly, geographical locations of residence, or schools themselves (such as Māori colleges) may hold strong relevance in terms of variability of student ethnic identification. Durie (2006) encapsulated the above points:

> A focus on the Māori population uses norms and measures that are common to all Māori. They differ from hapū and iwi measures which are not applicable across the whole Māori population. Although Māori are far from homogenous and show a wide range of cultural, social and economic characteristics, there are nonetheless sufficient commonalities to warrant treatment as a distinctive population, at least for measuring social, economic and cultural parameters. While other measures will be necessary to identify hapū or iwi specific outcomes, the notion of a distinctive Māori population based on both descent and self identification, is sufficiently well grounded to justify conclusions about the population as a whole and the associated resources that are part of the collective Māori estate. (p. 14)

Pasifika

The fact that Pasifika people sit outside the Treaty obligations is irrelevant to the reality that Pasifika people have their own *tino rangatiratanga* in New Zealand (Leahy, 2015; Mara, 2014; Siope, 2011). Like, Māori, they ought to enjoy at least the same level of health/wellbeing, and education as the dominant population (Durie, 1994). For Pasifika students, it is acknowledged that young people's heritages may be linked to one, or several, different Pacific Islands. Anae (1997) suggested that a view of the *Pacific Way* or *Pacific Island unity or community* is indicative of a "lack of regard for the distinctiveness and diversity of each Pacific Nation" (p. 129).

Macpherson (1996) endorsed this view in regard to Pasifika people, and cautioned "in no case has…a united community, with a clearly defined social…[spiritual]… and political agenda emerged" (p. 141). In addition, New Zealand born Pasifika people are viewed differently from Island born Pasifika people (Anae, 1997; Tupuola, 2004).

The historical relationship of Pasifika people/students in secondary schools, in New Zealand, is associated with significant variations in wellbeing (Siataga, 2011). People from the Pacific came to New Zealand in large numbers between the 1950s and 1980s. This was in response to a number of factors such as a labour shortage in New Zealand (amidst a world climate of boom), and the related growth of the manufacturing and service sectors (Macpherson, Spoonley, & Anae, 2001; Tiatia, 1998). The available positions were unskilled and Pasifika people "were a source of recruitment for the cheap and convenient labour required for New Zealand's economic development" (Tiatia, 1998, p. 17).

Pasifika families also perceived there to be better educational opportunities, appealing wages, and the security of kin groups in New Zealand cities (Tiatia, 1998). The process of migration, however, has led to conflict within and between each Pasifika group. This may be due, in part, to historical tensions between nations, language barriers, different financial perspectives associated with churches, and tensions between those born in New Zealand and those born on another island in the Pacific (Tiatia, 1998; Macpherson et al., 2001). Tiatia (1998) expanded on the impact of cultural conflicts:

> Where the maintenance of traditional values is emphasized, the 'real' issues which exist in the wider society and are problematic for most of today's youth, are not being addressed by the church. The youth then may turn to other measures which temporarily relieve their problems such as drugs, alcohol and partying. (p. 142)

In consideration of how schools would ideally engage in pastoral care, (or participate in the provision of a caring environment) for Pasifika students, then, it would be prudent to consider Siataga's (2011) assertion that:

> Within the New Zealand Pacific literature, spirituality primarily refers to the socio-cultural and historical connections that Pacific peoples have to various

forms of Christianity and also to pre-Christian cosmological traditions. Within the Pacific cultural competency frameworks an understanding of 'spirituality' is considered a matter of both clinical and cultural competency. (p. 163)

Interestingly, Finau (1994) endorsed the many South Pacific Islands in their wish for the addition of spirituality to the World Health Organisation (WHO) definition. The rationale was to view health as a state of physical, mental, social *and spiritual* wellbeing, not just the absence of disease. In the school context this raises issues of cultural incompatibility. One study found a "mismatch between the academic institution and the cultural norms of …[Pasifika]… young people" (Anae, Anderson, Benseman, & Coxon, 2002, p. 121). In addition, the study found that 'culture' was often perceived as "Pacific songs and dances at cultural performances and not in the classroom" (Anae et al., 2002, p. 126). Conversely, other researchers noted a sentiment by Pasifika families that culture can be tended to at home, but that school is for achievement (Watson, Hughes, Lauder, Strathdee, & Simiyu, 1998).

Furthermore, according to some Pasifika young people, their parents had a lack of cognizance that *success* in the Palagi education system was often at the expense of their own Pasifika culture (Anae et al., 2002). For some Samoan students, in particular, there were suggestions that the obligations of fa'asamoa (Samoan way according to custom) could be a barrier to study, and fa'alavelave (occasions such as a wedding or funeral when family assistance should be given in the form of labour or goods) affected how much could be spent on young people's education (Anae et al., 2002). This is complex as Pasifika students' identities appear to be blended in many variations and combinations of tradition as well as contemporary interpretations of their context/s in New Zealand (Tupuola, 2004; Krebs, 1999; Mara, 2014; Siope, 2011).

In terms of supportive networks, however, there is a noticeable distinction in the literature between the impact and pervasiveness of the Church and Christianity on Pasifika students, and their families (Mara, 2014; Siope, 2011) compared with Māori students (and their families). Youth'12 health and wellbeing survey indicated that 61.2% of Pasifika students reported that spiritual beliefs are important to them, 59.7% attend a place of worship once a week or more often and 62.2% report that they feel

like they belong to their place of worship (Clark et al., 2013). Although the positive aspects of Christianity for Pasifika people/students, generally, are acknowledged (Lui, 2007; Taule'ale'ausumai, 1997), recent literature draws attention to the deficiencies of the Christian churches in New Zealand and the dilemmas they pose for young Pasifika people: New Zealand born and 'afakasi/half-caste in particular (Culbertson & Agee, 2007). In addition, despite pastoral care having linguistic overtones of Christianity, it has also been regarded as a pre-European and pre-Christian practice (Mitaera, 1997). Mitaera (1997) elaborated by stating that " pastoral care is one avenue allowing…communities to sustain…structures that maintain the integrity of their identity" (p. 117).

Without denying the relevance and *goodness* of pastoral care that has been based in Christianity, there is support for pastoral care to foster the identity of Pasifika young people through other organisations (Mitaera, 1997). Schools could well be a viable context for further development of pastoral care. The *label* of pastoral care may be retained but according to Mitaera (1997):

> while we can align with and accept the biblical metaphors of the 'Shepherd and His sheep' these are metaphors of care that in themselves can be either limiting or expansionist in our acknowledgement of the facts that [they] are relationships between people. (p. 130)

In the examination of relationships of Pasifika youth with adults in their lives, however, the literature points to limiting factors due to *the church* and Christianity (Lui, 2007; Culbertson & Agee, 2007). Some of the limitations for youth which are noted in the literature include: the *silencing* of young peoples' voices by church elders (Tiatia, 2007; Culbertson & Agee, 2007), the distorting of the traditional wisdom and spiritual beliefs of Pacific cultures (Lui, 2007; Culbertson & Agee, 2007), the upholding of traditions which no longer serve their original purpose (Culbertson & Agee, 2007), exploitation of youth – particularly female – within church-based hierarchies (Makasiale, 2007a; Taule'ale'ausumai, 1997), and a *fire and brimstone* approach by some religious practices which can have a negative effect on some young peoples' self-esteem (Tiatia, 2007).

A further confounding factor, suggested by Cotterell, Von Randow, McTaggart, Sua'ali'i-Sauni, Patrick, and Davis (2009), is that many Pasifika people, "despite their Christian beliefs, continue to subscribe to indigenous values, (if not to an indigenous religion)" (p. 62). When considering the secular nature of many New Zealand secondary schools, then, there is an inherent conflict between the nature of some schools and the "emphasis by Pacific cultures on the spiritual [including Christianity] and/or [the] supernatural" (Helu-Thaman, 2000).

The nature of pastoral care undertaken with Pasifika students in secondary schools is, therefore, an inherently fraught and entangled concept. Pastoral care is, nevertheless, a potentially important component of students' individual and collective/communal development. The history, therefore, will be outlined below.

History of Pastoral Care

In international literature, the definition of pastoral care in secondary schools is recognized as complex. Ribbins (1989) contended that there is not wide consensus on a specific definition of pastoral care, but he suggested that this " is a less serious problem than it seems" (p. 32). Variations in the definition of pastoral care, then, may allow pastoral care to be interpreted in relation to students' contexts (Calvert, 2009). *Pastoral* is related to *pastor,* and pastor's root word is *pascere,* which means to feed (Dooley, 1980). Thus the word pastoral is often used in the English language in reference "to the spiritual care or guidance of a flock" (Hughes, 1980, p.26).

Notions of a pastor guiding could evoke images of a paternalistic figure who *knows best* (Hughes, 1980). Or 'pastor' may give rise to images of a valued figure quite separate in approach and role from that of a teacher. Miller (1980) offered a historical context for this:

> In the past the family, the village, the guilds, religious societies, [tohunga, kuia, koroua, matai], the professions - lawyers, doctors, clergy or teachers – all contributed to guidance. They have all given their time, their authority, their advice, their opinions and their help, and this is a form of guidance which exists in every educational system and in most human relationships. (p. 121)

In the secondary school context, however, pastoral care did not feature in official publications on education before 1970 (Hughes, 1980). Reasons for the formalization are likely to include societal transitions of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, but Dooley (1980) also suggested that "teachers began to detect that pupils frequently lacked a sense of 'belonging'…[that] they had needs which demanded some fatherly (or motherly) attention" (p.17). Miller (1980) endorsed the concept of pastoral care being redolent of parenthood, but cautioned that "it assumes that adults, and in particular teachers, are instinctively imbued in the skills needed to encourage young people in their life task of growing up" (p.120).

This, then, raises questions regarding the role of education. According to Meuret (2001) "the education system is not an end in itself; its function is to introduce young people into the contemporary world" (p.94). If this is so, then due to the complexities of life, education is unlikely to be linear, particularly when considering the hidden curriculum and relationships within the school setting. In conjunction, early in the evolution of pastoral care, Marland (1974) suggested that size and diversity of schools contributed to the inception of pastoral care (possibly as a remedy to a historical *one size fits all* school approach). There was also a recognition that "discontinuities are realities of schooling", and pastoral care was touted as a responsive measure to assist students with such discontinuities (Marland, 1974, p. 10).

Underpinning Marland's (1974) statement was an ideal of fostering positive inter-connectivity between *worlds* both within a student's life, and between students. Inherent within positive student connections is the concept of wellbeing, both for the student population along with that of individual students. Corbishley and Evans (1980) suggested that "pastoral care may be ideally about community" (p. 214). In this way, there is an assertion that young people do not exist in a vacuum. Adding to this approach Johnson (1985) gave credit to the idea that the family itself is a pastoral structure which is not formalized.

A student and his or her family could therefore be conceptualized as a series of relationships, which are situated within the community of a school, as well as their community outside of the school (Siope, 2011). If pastoral care in a given school community allows the whole child to be nurtured, the care component of the term

pastoral care comes to the fore. According to Buckley (1980) the "notion of 'care' for a teacher is the creation of that relationship from which learning may follow. The teacher who 'cares' is the one who teaches effectively" (p. 183); and pastoral care seems to involve such caring along with a further, more encompassing approach towards multiple adults meeting the educational needs of the 'whole' person/student.

Boundaries and Borders

In order to meet the needs of the whole person, it is perhaps the crossing of *boundaries* and *borders* both by schools and agencies, which could facilitate an improvement in student wellbeing, school retention and academic achievement. Giroux (2005) conceptualized *borders* as zones to traverse in order to foster growth. He suggested that "thinking in terms of borders allows one to critically engage the struggle over those territories, spaces and contact zones where power operates to either expand or to shrink the distance and connectedness among individuals, groups and places" (p. 2).

Giroux's (2005) approach is useful for validating student choice and interpretation in "the co-mingling – sometimes clash – of multiple cultures, languages…histories [faiths] and identities" (p. 2). In this way, Giroux (2005) contended that our diverse communities and identities could have the potential to connect us more than separate us. Similarly, Augsburger (1986) conceptualized a person who could undertake *border crossings*:

> The intercultural person is not culture-free (a hypothetical and undesirable state). Rather, the person is culturally aware. Awareness of one's own culture can free one to disconnect identity from cultural externals and to live on the boundary, crossing over and coming back with increasing freedom. (p. 13)

In the exploration of pastoral care for Māori and Pasifika young people, then, this study views non-Western and Western *models* and *modes of being* with equal significance (Makasiale, 2007b): "not as polarities or binarisms…but in ways in which both are complicitous and resistant, victim and accomplice" (Giroux, 2005, p. 19). This research also upholds an approach of Giroux's (2005) towards pedagogy. Giroux (2005) contended that there is a:

need to create pedagogical conditions in which students become border crossers in order to understand otherness in its own terms, and to further create borderlands in which diverse cultural resources allow for the fashioning of new identities within existing configurations of power. (p. 20)

It is, therefore, pertinent that this study situates border crossings as a backdrop to the significant issue of *how* the organization of pastoral care may contribute to schools retaining their students, improve student wellbeing and allow pedagogy to play a central role in developing communities (Giroux, 2005; Lara, 1992; Rendon, 1992; Pomeroy, 1999).

Appropriateness of the Nature of Care

This research, then, seeks to fill a gap in the literature related to the appropriateness of the *nature* of care for Māori and Pasifika students in the provision of pastoral care in secondary schools. Both Bishop (2011) and Macfarlane (2003) have acknowledged the legitimacy of the role of pastoral care, but presently the most notable published research on pastoral care in the New Zealand literature is contained within brief paragraphs in the Hawk and Hill (1996) and Ministry of Health (MoH) (2009) reports on the Achievement in Multi-cultural High Schools (AIMHI). AIMHI's objectives were a) to improve access to health and social services for students, and b) to improve educational outcomes through meeting students' health and social needs (MoH, 2009). AIMHI engaged a multi-faceted approach which included horizontal form groups and whanau groups, skill development for students, professional development for teachers, tracking of student attendance, and strategies for dealing with student behaviour issues (MoH, 2009).

Teachers reportedly felt that the AIMHI initiative a) enabled students' health issues to be dealt with more effectively which had a positive impact on learning, b) relieved teachers of the stress of having to manage situations concerning student health issues which they were not well equipped to do, c) contributed to reduced truancy and students staying at school longer, and d) gave greater depth to the

school's ability to provide and support the health education syllabus (MoH, 2009; Denny, Balhorn, Lawrence, & Cosgriff, 2005).

In terms of pastoral care, the AIMHI schools indicated a large variation in the pastoral co-ordination. In one school, for example, "before the nurse could refer…[a] student to an outside agency, approval had to be sought from the person in charge of pastoral care" (MoH, 2009, p. 22). At another school, "a student support service provider…[had] involvement on the school's policy committee enabling consistent policy development and implementation within both the support service and the pastoral care service" (MoH, 2009, p. 33). Hawk and Hill (1996) found that some deans/whānau leaders tended to focus on teaching and learning whereas others focused on pastoral care; one approach was often to the detriment of the other. In addition, because school deans were deemed to provide *both* pastoral care and discipline, a close physical location to the student support service was noted in the Ministry report to have a negative effect on student engagement with the service (MoH, 2009).

Trust and Choice

In conjunction, themes of trust (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Goddard, Salloum & Berebitsky, 2009; Forsyth, 2008) and choice arose in the Hawk and Hill (1996) report. Hawk and Hill (1996) canvassed student opinion:

> we tend to go to a teacher we trust rather than a counsellor. It comes down to who you trust. [The Report went on to say that]…it appears that what is important is that each student has a formal opportunity to identify that person [or those people] for themselves. (p. 291)

Choice/agency (Smith, 2013; Cunningham, 2008), then, is identified as a valued component of pastoral care. This also assumes rights, although not only student rights, but also those of their families/communities and the school staff. Counsellors and teachers in the Hawk and Hill (1996) report highlighted this issue when they stated that "many [counsellors and teachers] are also nervous about crossing boundaries into family life because they don't feel qualified and because they don't have the right or the authority to do so" (p. 293).

This obviates a revisiting of the theme of *trust* spoken of in Hawk and Hill's (1996) report along with reciprocity of learning (Bishop, 2011). In order to develop trust between students, their families/communities, and school-based adults active in pastoral care, the literature again points to the fostering of quality relationships between students and teachers (Bishop, Berryman, Powell & Teddy, 2007; Davidson & Phelan, 1999). In relation, Hellwig (1989) contended that:

> schools taking Pastoral Care seriously will have to recognize that many teachers will require new skills and techniques for exercising a discipline that is not based on power and emotional blackmail, but on mutual respect, relevant curriculum, and satisfying learning experiences and effective relationships. (p.10)

This seems particularly relevant for Māori students, (and has a high likelihood for Pasifika students), as endorsed by Bishop et al. (2007): "changing teacher-student relationships from negative to positive, and changing interactions from passive to discursive, is necessary to allow young Māori people to bring their meaning and sense-making processes into their classroom interactions" (p. 129). In addition, trust and quality of relationships appear to hold relevance *beyond* the teacher (Thrupp, 2014). Valenzuela (1999) suggested that:

> administrators routinely disregard even the most basic needs of both students and staff. The feeling that 'no one cares' is pervasive - and corrosive. Real learning is difficult to sustain in an atmosphere rife with mistrust. Over even comparatively short periods of time, the divisions and misunderstandings that characterize daily life at the school exact high costs in academic, social, and motivational currency. (p. 5)

In the New Zealand context, there is a paucity of literature on the co-ordination of adults in relation to the process of care/pastoral care of secondary students. Regardless of whether some teachers still see caring as sitting outside of their professional responsibilities (Drake, 1998) their opinions may hold decreasing relevance today. This would be particularly so if teachers' roles were/are conceptualized as being obligated to an overriding ethos of care (Noddings, 2005a) embedded in the school's structural characteristics. Moreover, Croninger and Lee

(2001) suggested that whether "students gain access to…resources depends on the structural characteristics of their social networks" (p. 554). Improved, equitable school-related networks/connections appear necessary and highly relevant for Māori and Pasifika students; and, again, equity for Maori (and Pasifika) is an obligation in Article Three of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Section Two: Models of Wellbeing

A holistic approach towards student wellbeing is the lens through which the important notion of *connections* was explored. Connection is broadly "understood as the links that young people have with others, a fundamentally social and therefore environmental feature of life" (McCreanor & Watson, 2004, p. 40). Thus, pastoral care that actively fosters meaningful social connections appears to be important. Along with the previously mentioned expansion in social and ethnic diversity (Cunningham, 2011; Anae, 1997) there is "a decline in the effectiveness of the social institutions that young people rely on for support and guidance" (Croninger & Lee, 2001, p. 549). Noddings (2010) gave an overview of the context for such changes:

> In the past, when communication with diverse groups was relatively rare, parents could concentrate on the inculcation of the values espoused by their own community and the protection of their children from any bad influences within the community. Today we live and work regularly with people whose values differ from our own, and we may communicate instantly with people all over the world. (p. 390)

There is, therefore, a *disconnection* between many schools and some of their communities (Penetito, 2010; Kirmayer et al., 2000). Bishop (2011) suggested "culture is what holds a community together" (p. 68). Yet Macfarlane (2003) highlighted the pronounced fragmentation in cultural and community contexts from which Māori and other minority groups live their lives. Such cultural fragmentation may be detrimental to students' connectedness at school and their health/wellbeing. Macfarlane (2003) elaborated:

> Incomplete information, stereotypical presentations about different cultures, or lack of full participation of minority groups in the classroom detract from gaining an understanding or appreciation about cultures that characterize New

Zealand. Neglectful or careless treatment of this important topic has the potential to perpetuate Eurocentric notions. (p. 9)

The social context/s of school/s, then, hold particular relevance in terms of fostering a caring community. According to Resnick et al. (1997), the closer the context is to the young person, the more directly it influences his or her health-related attitudes and behaviour. Connections within and across contexts play an important role. A socio-ecological perspective such as this upholds the validity of exploring the nature of pastoral care, in relation to Māori and Pasifika students' experiences. Bishop (2011) suggested that "[a] newer educational ecological paradigm locates students' achievement within the quality of interactions they experience within their learning environments" (p. 55). Pastoral care, then, may have potential to be the nexus of health and education in schools. This would, of course, be linked with Māori and Pasifika models of wellbeing.

Whare Tapa Whā/Fonofale

One example is Whare Tapa Whā (a four-sided house), which was first presented as a health/wellbeing model in 1982 (Durie, 1994). It is, arguably, still relevant for young Māori people in secondary school today. Similarly, the Pasifika Fonofale model is likely to have relevance for some young Pasifika students. The models are anchored on a spiritual base (Durie, 1994). They also imply a capacity "to understand the links between the human situation and the environment" (Durie, 1994, p. 70); and although they appear as simple concepts, each component of the models contain the potential for layers of greater complexity. This is primarily due to the models being a holistic approach to people's/students' wellbeing.

Socio-ecological Model

Durie (1994) suggested that divisions between individual and family health are blurred; as are those between spiritual, mental, physical and emotional wellbeing. Whare Tapa Whā included taha wairua (spiritual), taha hinengaro (mental), taha tinana (physical), and taha whānau (extended family). This model was adopted by

Health and Physical Education as *Hauora* in the New Zealand Curriculum (MoE, 2007). For Pasifika, the Fonofale (Pulotu-Endemann, 2001) model included family, culture, spiritual, physical, mental, gender, sexuality, age and socioeconomic status.

Bronfenbrenner

In conjunction with the multifaceted, interwoven concept of health/wellbeing of Whare Tapa Whā and Fonofale**,** this study utilizes the ecological model of Urie Bronfenbrenner to explore the nature of pastoral care and its association with school retention. According to Bronfenbrenner (1979) "interactions between characteristics of people and their environments, past and present…[are important and]…if we want to change [school staff and student] behaviour, we have to change environments" (p.x). In addition, Macfarlane (2003) suggested that in "order to be consistent with…[an]… ecological paradigm, responsibility for developing… strategies that will benefit Maori students does not rest with Maori teachers and Maori consultants alone" (p. 213).

Bronfenbrenner (1979) situated the student/young person at the centre within a system or an ecological environment. The interactions of this environment are within an "arrangement of concentric structures, each contained within the next. These structures are referred to as the *micro-*, *meso-*, *exo-*, and *macrosystems*" (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 22). The microsystem is the most direct system in relation to the student/young person. It includes the setting in which the student lives, attends school and interacts with, for example, peers and neighbours. The mesosystem includes the relations between the microsystems and the connections between the contexts. This includes the "extent and nature of knowledge and attitudes existing in one setting about the other" (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, p. 25). An example could be Pasifika students and their church. The exosystem includes the experiences in a social setting in which the student/young person is not an active participant, but by which the student/young person is affected, for example, the funding or resourcing of school activities. The macrosystem includes attitudes and ideologies of the culture/s in which students/young people live, wider government policies, and how heterogeneity within

and between social groups influences ecological environments (Bronfenbrenner, 1979).

Bronfenbrenner (1979) emphasized the effectiveness of school being dependent on the interconnections, communications, participation and shared information between students' home and school contexts. In relation to students' participatory roles (and in alignment with Bishop, 2007), Bronfenbrenner (1979) also contended that roles "have a magiclike (sic) power to alter how a person is treated, how she acts, what she does, and thereby even what she thinks and feels. The principle applies not only to the…person but to the others in her world" (p. 6). Bronfenbrenner's (1979) assertion, then, raises the issue of agency (Smith, 2013) and reciprocity within communities (Cunningham, 2008; Penetito, 2005; Cushman, 2003). It also raises concerns about who determines Māori and Pasifika definitions (or arrangements), of communities in association with secondary schools (Milne, 2014; Giroux, 2005). Blum (1999) conceptualized a caring community as:

> more than a group of individuals caring for one another individually in the fullest sense. It must embody a sense of ethno-racial collectivity, and the virtues that can attend it (such as concern and loyalty for the group). The individualized caring needs supplementing by collectivity-related values. (p. 139)

McMurray (2007) concurred with Blum (1999) and similarly offered a socio-ecological perspective of a community as a system:

> of dynamic, interactive relationships between people and their physical, geographic, personal and social networks. Communities are ecological in that the relationships within the community not only connect people to the community, but give back to the community what it needs to sustain itself, and both sides benefit. (p.13)

In relation, Bronfenbrenner (1979) espoused that young people are not passive, but play a role in constructing their (school) context/s. Historical and contemporary experiences for Māori and Pasifika students in New Zealand, however, cannot be separated from the long-term colonising effects of the school environment (Durie, 1994). As a subset of this experience, wellbeing, which is purportedly

associated with pastoral care in secondary schools (Best, 1999), may in fact have been compromised for Māori and Pasifika students due to an environment of colonisation, assimilation, racism, cultural discontinuities, Native Schooling, and marginalization (Bishop, 2011; Penetito, 2010; Simon, Smith, & Cram, 2001). For some students, the process of pastoral care may, in fact, have amounted to pastoral damage (Hards, 2014). In a related way, according to Bronfenbrenner (1979) the macrosystem refers to how people are affected by the nature and extent of connections which exist between settings, and the consistencies of organization and behaviour, in their lives. The aforementioned disconnections and discrimination related to Māori and Pasifika students in school was explored in this research under the macrosystem heading. Questions regarding who decides what the definition of pastoral care is for Māori and Pasifika students were explored.

At face value, Bronfenbrenner's (1979) micro level may appear to be an obvious focus in the identification and exploration of influences on peoples'/students' wellbeing, but in fact, the meso and macro levels of the model contain important overt and covert influences on wellbeing relevant to this research. As previously stated, the macro level in particular holds significance for this study due to the effects of colonisation. The macro level is likely to expose the political nature of education and a history of contestation of values, laws, spirituality, and attitudes. Structural constraints and how they impact on student's behaviours and wellbeing are, therefore, validated in the model (Keddell, 2006; Golden & Earp, 2012).

The interconnectedness of Bronfenbrenner's (1979) model is in agreement with Cook, Withy, Tarallo-Jensen, and Berry (2005) as they argued that divisions "of an individual's life in to discrete, isolated compartments is in direct opposition to models of reality used by many environmentally centred, indigenous populations" (p. 126). In terms of the environmental component of wellbeing, Durie (1994) too, contended that without spiritual awareness (wairua) an individual has less opportunity for wellbeing. Wairua, according to Durie (1994) can be:

> evident in relationships with the environment. Land, lakes, mountains, reefs have a spiritual significance…and all are…commemorated in song, tribal history and formal oratory. A lack of access to tribal lands or territories is

regarded [badly] by tribal elders…since the natural environment is considered integral to identity and fundamental to a sense of well-being. (p. 70)

The Natural Environment

The effects, then, of a lack of access to the natural environment have most likely fragmented individual and collective identity. Cook et al. (2005) found that "high-context, aboriginal societies…drew upon their local environment for certain aspects of identity. Place names were often clues or markers that were about the ancestral antecedents of those living in the locality" (p. 124). In addition, changes in land tenure throughout the colonising process have had a detrimental impact on indigenous peoples' identity, "the echoes of which may still reverberate through the psyche of the modern…community" (Cook et al., 2005, p. 125).

Kirmayer et al. (2000) found such cultural discontinuity to be linked to depression, alcoholism, suicide and violence. The mediating mechanisms contributing to high levels of the above (particularly amongst young people) were "closely related to issues of individual identity and self-esteem" (p. 611). It was perhaps in consideration of these long-term discontinuities that Tapsell and Woods (2008) proposed the establishment of support networks to assist those young Māori people who wish to engage or re-engage with home marae and elders. It was also probable that these were the types of inherent cultural protections, which were expected by Māori when entering in to the founding agreement of the nation. In this way, it could be argued that culturally appropriate support and protection of young Māori and Pasifika people may assist schools in engaging, and retaining their students.

Hence, the care component of pastoral care in schools may encompass much variance including spiritual, social, physical, personal, medical or legal needs (Ribbins, 1989; Best, 1989); but the care may also include relationships which engage in powerful and effective communication with young people's homes, as well as responsiveness to the voice of parents/families (Marland, 1980). This responsiveness (sometimes termed competency or appropriateness) could be cultural (Gay, 2000). For students, their families and communities, cultural responsiveness from a school may

be a form of care related to need (Noddings, 2005b). According to Noddings (2005b) an expressed need is distinct from an inferred need: an "expressed need comes from the one expressing it…[whereas an]…inferred need comes from someone other than the one said to have it" (p. 148). Noddings (2005b) went on to say there is a "fear that sacrificing expressed needs to inferred needs may indeed have a depressing effect on intrinsic motivation, creativity, initiative, and the desire for continued learning" (p. 152).

School Retention

These points are relevant to the process of disengagement from secondary school by some students (and schools' diminishing opportunities to retain them), as Noddings (2005b) elaborated:

> [students] may cover over the need to belong with a show of indifference, their need to be relieved of fear by avoiding any task that might induce the fear of failure, their need to succeed in school by pretending that success is unimportant to them. These hidden needs are expressed in ways that require skillful and sensitive interpretation. (p. 151)

Caring teachers, then, within a pastoral care process in secondary schools could help "students to understand the process of socialization they are undergoing, the consequences of choices suggested by their expressed needs, and the sources to which they might turn for further knowledge" (Noddings, 2005b, pp. 154-155). In this way, pastoral care has the potential to positively contribute to improving schools' retention, and engagement, of students. School retention, or school holding power, is widely recognized in the literature as a positive feature for young people who attend the institutions (Rumberger & Thomas, 2000; Lee & Burkam, 2003; Rumberger, 1995). Whereas the literature also documents the negative change in life chances once a student has dropped out of school (Libbey, Ireland, & Resnick, 2002; Freudenberg & Ruglis, 2007). Libbey et al. (2002) stated that school connectedness showed the most powerful inverse association with emotional distress for boys; and the second strongest for girls after family connectedness. Similarly, Culpan and Bruce (2007) found care of students utilising a sustainable ecological approach held potential for fostering their connectedness, sense of belonging, identity and achievements.

Yet, there are pronounced disparities in school retention of Māori and Pasifika students. According to the Education Counts website (2016):

In 2014, Māori students had the lowest proportion of students remaining at school to age 17 (69.1%). This compares with a retention rate of 82.5% for Pasifika and 84.9% for European/Pākehā. [In addition] the proportion of the School Leaver Tail (less than 14 credits) [included] Māori 40%, Pasifika 12% and Pākehā 41% [and the percentages of] school leavers achieving NCEA Level 3 [were] Māori 27.2%, Pasifika 37.6% and Pākehā 53.8% (www.educationcounts.govt.nz).

These are concerning statistics, especially as, according to Blum, Beuhring and Rinehart (2000) school disengagement and failure "needs to be viewed as a health as well as an education crisis" (p. 37). In conjunction, the Statistics New Zealand website stated that the statistics are a "major concern to a nation focused on developing a knowledge economy" (www.nzstats.govt.nz). Schools, then, which do not retain their students contribute negatively to the "nation's human capital" (Lee & Burkam, 2003, p. 353), and propel the student dropouts to experience a loss of valuable information, a loss of developmental opportunities, a loss of personal assistance, less earning potential, higher unemployment, more criminal activity and more likelihood of lowered health status (Rumberger & Thomas, 2000; Campbell, 2003; Lee & Burkam, 2003; Rumberger, 1987, 1995).

In fact, it has been suggested that school dropouts/pushouts (Fine, Tuck, & Yang, 2014) may become "trapped in poverty and unemployment" (Campbell, 2003, p. 17), and in future this could be exacerbated by low-skilled jobs declining in a global, technology-based economy (Rumberger, 1995; Campbell, 2003). In addition, demographic changes (which may be multigenerational for Māori) such as increasing ethnic diversity, growing numbers of poor families, and more single parent households have the potential to increase the number of dropouts from schools unless there are effective changes in order to minimize student alienation (Campbell, 2003; Rumberger & Thomas, 2000; Rumberger, 1995).

The lack of equity in Māori and Pasifika student engagement and school retention draws attention to the process of student disengagement and dropping out of school; as dropping out is "not so much an 'event' as …a process of progressive disengagement" (Alexander, Entwisle, & Kabbani, 2001, p. 761). However, the ethnicity and social realities of students should not be excuses for schools to relinquish responsibility for lack of student engagement (Wehlage & Rutter, 1986; Pomeroy, 1999), especially as the various school level "structural and organizational features that may influence dropout behavior are likely to act in concert" (Lee & Burkam, 2003, p. 364). For Māori and Pasifika people the transformative colonising effects of the powerful dominant culture removed control and power over resources, languages and culture (Macfarlane, 2003; Bishop, 2011). The disparities in education are outcomes of an educational process whereby young people have been viewed as all the same (Bishop, 2011; Macfarlane, 2003). Non-Māori and non-Pasifika ways of conceptualizing the ways of the world have subordinated the centrality of Māori and Pasifika cultures (Bishop, 2011; Macfarlane, 2003; Bevan-Brown, 2009b).

Care and the Curriculum

The pastoral care in which students engage, with school staff will more than likely reflect what the student brings to the classroom. Prior learning is important. Thus if the learning within the curriculum - hidden (Thrupp, 2006a) and overt - does not have relevance to the student, then the nature of care may in fact become control (McQuaig, 2011; McLaughlin, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1995). This nexus is complicated as Duncan (1988) points out that in a positive way "one of the most effective forms of social control within a school is experienced through the curriculum" (p. 43).

The nature and type of learning experiences may determine a *good* or *not so good* curriculum. Historically, Marland (1979) suggested that "curriculum simply means a list of those activities which a school is trying to provide fairly deliberately for its pupils as some kind of learning experience" (p. 151). In relation to a good or not so good curriculum (at a similar time historically), Williamson (1980) stated that, "a good curriculum, well taught, may be an essential agent of personal development,

and if a good curriculum is not provided the pastoral organisation may be overloaded"
(p.180) by individualized problems. In the contemporary New Zealand context for
Māori and Pasifika students the curriculum will, therefore, require re-interpretation
and reorientation in order that Māori and Pasifika students have more agency within,
and a stronger connection to, the curriculum; thus, decreasing the individualized
disconnections/problems. Thrupp (2006a) provided an outline of some necessary
changes in order to create a good curriculum:

> The main thing within schools is to disrupt forms of curriculum (and pedagogy
> and assessment) which privilege the cultures of some social and ethnic groups
> over others…An example might be…a programme which provided an
> authentic history of…Samoan culture [that] was taught and assessed in a way
> which gave genuine weight to the language and culture of those students as it
> stands in New Zealand today, and where (crucially), the qualification gained
> was seen to be of equal standing to that gained in other kinds of courses. (p. 9)

The curriculum would, therefore, be engaged in culturally responsive pastoral
care. Whilst the individual forms a major component of pastoral care, the overriding
care of the collective group/s through an appropriate pastoral care approach is also a
vital component of the process; and if undertaken appropriately, has been suggested to
lessen the occasions needed for remedial pastoral care (Marland, 1974).

Whether the pastoral curriculum is taught separately from the academic
curriculum or whether the pastoral and the academic curriculum are blended is a
source of tension in the literature (Power, 1996). Marland (1974) has been a strong
proponent of the curriculum being blended. He asserted that:

> if the academic curriculum is not included [in the pastoral curriculum] any list
> of elements is incomplete. This is because all kinds of pastoral care in school
> work with, and depend on, the pupils' ideas, attitudes, skills, knowledge of
> facts, and knowledge of concepts. What the pupil actually knows, is capable
> of, and brings to a pastoral encounter are among the key factors which vary the
> effectiveness of the pastoral care that is offered. (p. 151)

The realities of pastoral care, however, have been noted to sometimes be those
which deal with conditioning, control, conformity, authority, routine administration,

order and discipline (Button, 1980; Dooley, 1980, Watts, & Fawcett, 1980). This is somewhat concerning as control is so intrinsically linked with colonisation, assimilation and contemporary oppression (Smith, 2012, 2013). Furthermore, it has been suggested that the growth of pastoral structures has more, potentially "to do with resolving the problems of teachers and administrators than those of the children for whom they supposedly cater" (Best, Jarvis & Ribbins, 1980, p. 252). In addition, pastoral care has been seen "as a 'boundary' issue for schools involving the school with various external agencies and entailing the crossing of the school boundary, in both directions by teachers, counsellors and agency professionals" (Johnson, 1985, p. 100). Giroux's (2005) notion of border crossings emerges as a way of understanding this complex and convoluted environment, suggesting that the distances between groups can shrink and the connections can be strengthened if care is taken.

In relation to a re-orientation of professional development for school staff, then, Bishop (2011) contended that the marginalization of students in schools ought to be re-theorised, and caring relationships need to fulfil a major role in the suggested discursive re-positioning. Further, Resnick, Harris and Blum (1993) found a focus on caring to be a protective factor for young people's wellbeing. The centrality of caring relationships between young people and adults included relationships within and outside of the family (Resnick et al., 1993; Bishop, 2011). Resnick et al. (1993) cautioned, though, that these relationships cannot be taken as a given in contemporary society, and that "there must be closer collaboration between the health and education sectors in order to promote both the wellbeing and educability of young people" (p. S7).

Māori and Pasifika Students in Contemporary New Zealand Society

For Māori and Pasifika secondary students, however, the connections need to be relevant and enabling in terms of how the students experience their ethnicity. The many ways in which Māori and Pasifika students may experience their ethnicity, though, are not static (Ramsden, 1993). Although ethnicity is anchored in historical, social, economic and political realities, it is also a deeply personal experience about which institutions such as schools ought not make broad assumptions (Borell, 2005; Krebs, 1999; Tupuola, 2004); nor settle in to stereotypes (Steele, 2010; Goff, Steele &

Davies, 2008; Katz, 2003; McKown & Weinstein, 2003). To be of Māori, Pasifika, or Māori and Pasifika ethnicities in contemporary New Zealand society is a complex phenomenon, but a reality amongst contemporary youth culture (Siataga, 2011).

Cultural reference points have shifted and although some Māori and Pasifika students access major traditional cultural markers such as language and places of worship/meeting, for other students cultural connectedness in these ways is either not sought, or not readily accessible (Siataga, 2011; Durie, 2006; Mara, 2014). Māori or Pasifika identity has been noted, sometimes, to be a more geographically localized sense of belonging according to the area/s in which a student lives (Borell, 2005). Or, other institutions may hold relevance for Māori and Pasifika students – together or separately - in terms of identity formation and a sense of belonging (Durie, 2006). According to Durie (2006) "the marae is not necessarily the key cornerstone of Māori society for all Māori. But other institutions can be identified as agents that contribute to the development of a secure cultural identity" (p. 7). In relation, for Pasifika, Siataga (2011) suggested that "gaining a sense of belonging is about much more than ethnic affiliation, particularly in a pluralistic multi-cultural social networking environment" (pp. 154-155).

The potential for secondary schools to evolve as more meaningful institutions in changing times, then, is highly credible. There is much scope for schools to care for the whole child/person particularly by providing options and choices for how students can develop, express and experience their identities. Ramsden (1993) asserted that these "choices…are a matter of mana…None of us is today what our ancestors were, and our descendents will not be like us…Our work…is…to continue our story" (p. 243).

In this way, care of students by secondary schools would be wise to be wary of defining students "by what they are seen as lacking, hence terms such as disconnected, distanced, detached, and dissociated" (Borell, 2005, p. 2). Such deficit-thinking creates "a scapegoat for the problem rather than providing a real substantive solution" (Campbell, 2003, p. 2). Borell (2005) went on to say that although "it may be the aspiration of some [students] to have greater cultural connection, what this means for different groups and individuals may have both congruence and divergence

with what are usually considered to be markers of cultural inclusion" (p.2). This may include, for example, students who do not wish to learn their traditional language, or attend other cultural immersion classes. In fact, Durie (2006) cautioned that if the use of the Māori language is confined to "narrow cultural sites that may act as…[a]… disincentive…to some people" (p. 10).

As aforementioned, community wellbeing and cohesion, however, for students, may nurture personal wellbeing (Durie, 2006). Ideally, pastoral care, therefore, could assist the reinforcement of a broad range of identities for Māori and Pasifika students in order to contribute "to a more embracing and inclusionary perspective of culture and identity" (Borell, 2005, p. 82). In turn, where pastoral care meets the needs of the whole person, young people may better engage in their schools, and schools may retain them for longer (Freudenberg & Ruglis, 2007).

School Deciles

Culturally responsive pastoral care, then, could have the potential to increase the retention of students particularly in lower decile schools. In relation, Marmot (2007) gave credibility to the exploration of "how fairly health… [and wellbeing are]… distributed across the social spectrum," and to the identification of the "causes of the causes" (p. 1153). Or to put it another way, Dale (2014) suggested that we need to "find ways of addressing the whys" (p. 12). Interestingly, Marmot (2007) also acknowledged the "interconnectedness of the causes of health [and wellbeing] inequity" (p. 1161). In this way school deciles may be associated with the distribution of life chances (Thrupp, 2006a). For New Zealand schools, meshblocks where students live are used to calculate deciles one to ten. Each meshblock is examined against five socio-economic indicators which are given equal weight in the calculations. These are based on household income, occupation, household crowding, educational qualifications and income support. The five indicators are then given weight by the number of students in each meshblock. The schools are ranked in relation to every other school and given a score. The five indicator scores for each school are added together which ranks the school in relation to all other schools in New Zealand. The schools are then divided in to the ten decile groups. Deciles 1-4 are

further divided in to three funding steps, for example, 1a, 1b and 1c (www.minedu.govt.nz).

Deciles are a *fragile* (Snook & O'Neill, 2014) denotation of levels of deprivation, but the complexities of Māori and Pasifika pastoral care gives credibility to the relevance of deciles in this study. In relation, Snook & O'Neill (2014) asserted that "there must be adequate health and pastoral care in, or attached to, the school" (p. 40). Although the current study would situate health *within* pastoral care for young people in secondary school, the assertion is, nevertheless, important for low decile communities as Māori and Pasifika students "are dominant in schools from the lowest two deciles" (Schulruf, Hattie & Tumen, 2008, p. 692). Again, deciles are complex as schools vary greatly within a decile in terms of achievement outcomes, but overall in 2014, 91.8% of students from deciles 9 and 10 remained at school until age 17 which is 17.9 percentage points higher than schools in deciles 1 and 2. In deciles 1 and 2 in 2014, 74.0% of students stayed at school until age 17 (www.educationcounts.govt.nz). This is concerning as the MoH (2008) stated that almost "half of all …[Pasifika]… secondary school students are attending schools classified as decile 1, 2 or 3, and comprise almost a quarter of all students in decile 1-3 schools" (p. 7). Māori and Pasifika student over-representation in the lower deciles is, also, noteworthy as Youth'07 national health and wellbeing survey found teachers perceived students to be 'less helpful, more disruptive, less sensitive, and to have lower achievement orientation in the low decile schools' (Denny, Robinson, Milfont & Grant, 2009).

Racism

The findings of Youth'07, therefore, raised questions regarding racism, perhaps classism, and the "role of ecological effects resulting from the concentration of ethnic minority groups in particular residential areas" (Karlsen & Nazroo, 2006, p. 21). Crengle et al. (2012) reported "results [which] suggested that students who reported 'yes' and 'unsure' with regards to ethnic discrimination may be an important determinant of health and wellbeing" (p. 52). In conjunction, according to the MoH (2008) educational achievement is a major factor in the socioeconomic positioning of people beyond school. Yet, without adequate relevant care in secondary school the "accumulation of disadvantage" (Karlsen & Nazroo, 2006, p. 21) for Māori and

Pasifika students in low decile schools could have a negative effect on school engagement, school retention and therefore "high rates of educational underachievement" (Shulruf et al., 2008, p. 697).

Ethnic identity may, therefore, be experienced in relation to socioeconomic identity by students, but also in relation to other identities such as gender, age and sexuality (Karlsen & Nazroo, 2006). Despite other diverse identities, however, a commonality of experience for Māori and Pasifika students across all school deciles is the likelihood of experiences of racism, overtly or covertly (Sheurich & Young, 1997). Being "a victim of racist stereotyping has been found to be one dimension along which people may define their ethnic identity" (Karlsen & Nazroo, 2006, p. 23). Karlsen and Nazroo (2006) went on to say that:

> Ethnic groups…are entirely historically and spatially located, defined from the outside as well as within…An ethnic 'minority', obviously, requires an ethnic 'majority,' even if that ethnic majority has sufficient power to ignore the ethnic dimension to its associations. (p. 22)

With this in mind, Māori and Pasifika disparities in school engagement, school retention and educational outcomes, raise questions regarding the existence of institutionalized racism. Jones (2000) contended that:

> Institutionalized racism manifests itself in material conditions and in access to power. With regard to material conditions, examples include differential access to quality education…and a clean environment. With regard to access to power, examples include differential access to information (including one's history), resources (including wealth and organizational infrastructure), and voice. (p. 1212)

Thus, institutionalized racism may need to be addressed in order to improve the outcomes for Māori and Pasifika students in lower decile schools. Jones (2000) further suggested that:

> the association between socioeconomic status and race…has its origins in discrete historical events but persists because of contemporary structural factors that perpetuate those historical injustices. In other words, it is because

of institutionalized racism that there is an association between socioeconomic status and race. (p. 1212)

Jones' (2000) assertion is important as Plank and Sykes (2003) found evidence of the type of difficulties lower decile schools may face. They espoused that:

> Not only did board members in schools serving low-income areas frequently lack technical skills, but they often lacked the sophistication that would allow them to challenge decisions by the principal…the sort of cultural capital that middle-income schools take for granted was largely missing. (p. 54)

The predominance of Māori and Pacific students in the lower school deciles, then, raises questions of equity as the same approach for all students is only equitable if all students *are* the same (Ladson-Billings, 1994). According to Borell, Gregory, McCreanor and Jensen (2009) the "normalizing of inequitable relations means privilege remains invisibly embedded in society's structures and institutions" (p. 44). They also suggested that historically "the framework predominantly used to view disparity sidelines those with advantage whilst turning the gaze on the disadvantaged" (Borell et al., 2009, p. 35). This research arose out of a concern for greater equity through relevant and culturally responsive care of Māori and Pasifika students' needs, and engagement in secondary schools. In terms of social order, behavioural issues, and discipline, the school as an ecological institution may better meet its students' needs when thorough consideration is given to caring overtly about full participation by Māori and Pasifika students, *as* Māori, and *as* Pasifika. Participation *of* a Māori or Pasifika person is different from participation *as* a Māori or Pasifika person' (Durie, 2006).

In support of this issue, Noddings (2005b) drew attention to the differing requirements, which some schools may need to consider as a responsibility to their students, to equitable outcomes, and as a component of a school, which cares for the whole child/person:

> Overwhelming needs cannot be met by the usual process of schooling. Children who are in pain, afraid, sick, or lost in worry cannot be expected to be interested in arithmetic or grammar. Many of us now believe that schools – particularly those in poor neighbourhoods – should be full-service institutions.

Medical and dental care, social services, childcare and parenting advice should be available on campus. People who are poor…without dependable transportation cannot afford to run all over town seeking such services. (p.153)

Thus, the social organization of schools may need to move beyond the type of institutions which Valenzuela (1999) perceived as being "organized formally and informally in ways that fracture students' cultural and ethnic identities, creating social, linguistic, and cultural divisions among the students and between the students and the staff" (p.5). Different school contexts will, therefore, be likely to require differing pastoral teams. These may include student services, school services, family services and/or community services (Martin, Tobin, & Sugai, 2002); and within these groups could be teachers, administrators, nurses, guidance counsellors, kaitiaki, teacher aides, doctors, careers advisors, community educators, Pasifika church leaders, mentoring programmes, social workers, homework centres, physiotherapists, kapa haka tutors, deans, whānau advisors, principals, psychologists, class tutors, sports coaches, choir leaders, or chaplains (Denny et al., 2014; Croninger & Lee, 2001; Anae et al., 2002).

In conclusion, the "pervasive impact of racism" (Resnick et al., 1993, p. 53), the tendency of social morbidities to co-occur, and the patterns of school drop out have suggested systemic shortcomings (Resnick et al., 1993; Bishop, 2011). These shortcomings are "patterns of dominance and subordination that exist in the wider society of New Zealand [and] also exist in our classrooms" (Bishop, 2011, p. 52). Hence, there is an urgency to re-position and re-theorise adults in order to reduce disparities in the social and wellbeing needs of young Māori and Pasifika people (Bishop, 2011; Resnick et al., 1993). Communities have a pivotal role to play in the fostering of wellbeing for young people. This is particularly so in the nurturing of a sense of belonging and connectedness in school (Resnick et al., 1993).

Section Three: Current Understandings of Pastoral Care

Although there was tension about whether the curriculum was to be included in pastoral care in literature from the 1970s and 1980s, overall there was more uniformity in the approach towards pastoral care. Since the mid-1990s the literature

has highlighted a growing diversity of schools and approaches towards pastoral care (Calvert, 2009). The extant literature, from the mid-1990s, appears to position Australia as a progressive and concise location in relation to the comprehensiveness of their documentation of school pastoral care. It is important to note, however, that not all Australian literature will apply directly to New Zealand. There is notable Australian literature that is precise in its focus on pastoral care, but there is also significant research on secondary school student well-being; which may be interpreted as a component of pastoral care (Hearn, Campbell-Pope, House, & Cross, 2006).

The aspects of student wellbeing documented are far-reaching and include, for example, the positive impact on school connectedness for students by the provision of a dedicated, discrete space for a pastoral co-ordinator, along with such diverse contributors to wellbeing as a lack of graffiti in the school (Waters, Cross, & Shaw, 2010). In addition, the social-emotional competence of students is seen to be enhanced by teaching adolescents productive coping responses such as optimistic thinking and problem solving, as well as teachers offering warmth, acceptance, inclusion and equity (Lewis & Frydenberg, 2002; Frydenberg, Lewis, Bugalski, Cotta, & McCarthy, 2004; Shochet, Dadds, Ham, & Montague, 2006). Successful leadership by the school principal is also noted to influence a range of student outcomes (Gurr, Drysdale, & Mulford, 2005).

Spiritual Component to Pastoral Care

Although not prevalent in the literature, a spiritual component to pastoral care in Australian schools is often viewed as a positive aspect if there is choice and a "respect for the religious freedom of…students" (Mason, Singleton, & Webber, 2007, p. 351). In relation, from a Catholic perspective, Grove (2004) suggested "Three R's of Pastoral Care, namely, relationships, respect and responsibility" (p. 34). Fisher (2007) also endorsed the development of the whole child including the spiritual, and argued that schools need to "step aside from their busyness…take stock of what is happening and find ways to nurture the relationships which enhance the SWB [spiritual well-being] of students (and staff)" (p. 165). This echoes literature from New Zealand which recognizes a spiritual component to student wellbeing (Durie, 1994; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001).

The complex realities of nurturing diverse student spiritual freedoms in secular school environments may, however, be under-acknowledged in the literature. This appears particularly so when the increasing ethnic diversity, and under-recognised indigenous history, of Australia is considered (Nakata, 2007; Rossi, Ryne, & Nelson, 2013). It is not clear how much of the Australian pastoral care literature is inclusive in relation to indigenous Aboriginal Australian students' lives and/or their spirituality. Inclusion, here, is not to suggest stringent parameters of ethnic identities but rather a backdrop of choice of identities for students, which could perhaps be termed a cultural interface (Nakata, 2007). According to the Aboriginal activist and lawyer, Noel Pearson (2011):

> Societies that sponsor 'cultural' diversity to the exclusion of other affiliations reinforce the problem of ethnicity or religion being seen as the single dominant affiliation. Cultures become identity blocs. (p. 84)

The Whole Person

Interestingly, Pearson (2011) develops these ideas further by challenging "the assumption that institutions of the state – public schools – are appropriate places for the cultivation of racial esteem" (p. 115). In a similar way to the suggestion of a cultural interface as a space to be contested by students (Nakata, 2007), the sentiments expressed by Pearson (2011) seem to hold relevance in terms of the care component of pastoral care; and in the consideration of how schools conceptualise the care of their students as whole people (de Jong & Kerr-Roubicek, 2007). In relation, two pieces of recent literature on pastoral care in Australian schools are perhaps indicative of such an approach towards pastoral care where the young person, as a whole person, is at the centre of the caring process. Hearn et al. (2006) firstly acknowledged the more prominent role school environments play in the wellbeing of school students today. Overtones of Whare Tapa Whā are apparent in the recognition of the social, moral, emotional, and physical wellbeing of students through the pastoral care process. In conjunction, through their review of current pastoral care literature Hearn et al. (2006) named the four most dominant components of pastoral care to be health and wellbeing, social capital, resilience and academic care. Key perceived weaknesses of pastoral care policy included the "fundamental complexity and burden of overload

in meeting…obligations, as well as the lack of professional education and guidance for teachers and parents, student staff relations, and how policy may be operationalized by schools at the local level" (p. ii).

de Jong and Kerr-Roubicek (2007) in alignment with Hearn et al. (2006) also recognized a contemporary change in direction by "reconceptualising pastoral care as being intrinsically integral to the life of a school rather than a complementary add on" (p. 2). Four components of young people's learning and behaviour are posited as influences on this reconceptualization. First, the emotional, social, physical, moral and spiritual aspects of adolescent development are increasingly seen as holistic, rather than as hierarchically layered in the multi-faceted interactions of individuals within their environment/s. Secondly, the influence of different ways to be intelligent such as Gardner's Multiple Intelligences (Gardner, 2006) have gained prominence. Thirdly, emotional and social competence assist the quality of the learning experience; and fourthly, the opportunity for student connectedness is vital because "schools as organisations are increasingly being acknowledged as highly influential environments impacting on the health and wellbeing and subsequently the learning of students" (de Jong & Kerr-Roubicek, 2007, p. 3).

Inherent Worth of Pastoral Care

The inherent worth of pastoral care in Australian schools is supported by at least five notable programmes which have been implemented throughout Australian States. The Gatehouse Project was instigated in Australian schools in 1995 where it sought to foster security, social connectedness and positivity (Hearn et al., 2006; Patton et al., 2000). The K-6 Framework implemented in New South Wales also sought "to move towards more student-centred rather than outcomes centred approaches" (Hearn et al., 2006, p. 29). Similarly, in Queensland, the New Basics programme began in 2000, highlighting a multi-dimensional approach to student learning and wellbeing (Hearn et al., 2006). Two further programmes have prominence in the literature, firstly, MindMatters, which promoted the mental health and wellbeing of all young people including the particular needs of minority students (Wyn, Cahill, Holdsworth, Rowling, & Carson, 2000; Hearn et al., 2006); secondly, The Community Change Project in the Independent sector sought to promote the

fusing of pastoral care and academic issues in order to nurture the wellbeing of young people. The project resulted in an Academic Care Charter to guide Independent schools in pastoral care (Hearn et al., 2006). It is, however, pertinent to note that Hearn et al. (2006) pinpoint Catholic Schools as having the most comprehensive pastoral care policy in Australia.

British Literature

Australian and New Zealand literature tends to acknowledge the seedbed of present day pastoral care to be in Britain, and the contemporary literature from Britain frequently appears to be similar to its antecedents. In comparison to Australian and New Zealand literature, indigenous people's needs are absent which questions the contemporary relevance of British literature to the South Pacific contexts of New Zealand, and Australia. One of the significant differences in the British literature involves the terminology which has been associated with pastoral care such as personal, social and health education (PSHE) and latterly, personal, social and health and citizenship (PSHEC) (Hearn et al., 2006). Hearn et al. (2006) highlighted a report produced by the government in Britain in 1997, entitled *Excellence in Schools*. It was purported to guide the improving health and wellbeing of people within school environments. Following this two years later the *Local Healthy Schools Programme* advocated a collective approach from the health and education sectors towards whole school approaches to improved health (Hearn et al., 2006).

Other British literature (Milner, 1983; Calvert & Henderson, 1998) canvasses debates which have sometimes been argued over a decade or two in relation to pastoral care. The most fervent of these involves "the extent to which the curriculum is primarily a means of transmitting knowledge, or a vehicle for addressing social and moral dimensions" (Megahy, 1998, p. 26). Davie (1996) is perhaps representative of the supporters of the education of the whole person/student, as he rejected "the dichotomy between children's learning on the one hand and their emotional and social development on the other" (p. xiv). He further reinforced these points by contending that people "interested in pastoral care are essentially people who see children as individuals, as wholes, rather than vessels to be filled with discrete bodies of knowledge" (p. xv); and this concurs with the current study.

Further debates prominent in the British literature include contentious issues such as who should provide pastoral care. Interestingly, this question is sometimes posed relating to specialist teachers versus tutor teachers (Megahy, 1998), which is far from the argument often present in New Zealand and Australia regarding pastoral care being touted as a whole school consideration (de Jong & Kerr-Roubicek, 2007; Cram, Phillips, Sauni, & Tuagalu, 2014). Megahy (1998) also drew attention as to whether caring should be separate from other school activities, and whether the divide between reactive pastoral care (which involves welfare and discipline) and proactive pastoral care can be reconciled (Megahy, 1998). Two other notable challenges were outlined in the literature, these included the challenge to manage rather than maintain pastoral care (Calvert & Henderson, 1998), and the challenge of "how to meet individual needs when the natural teaching mode is the group" (Milner, 1983, p. 38). Difficulties associated with pastoral care were also documented. Several of these were the difficulties of *in loco parentis* where pastoral care systems undertake parental roles without permission (Milner, 1983, p. 40), and the difficulty of how pastoral care can be accountable and demonstrate effectiveness if it sits outside of the school management system (Calvert & Henderson, 1998).

In addition, as an overlay to all of the above, the debates on pastoral care from both ends of the political spectrum were well summarized by Megahy (1998):

> the right…[see]…it as 'do-gooding' which stresses welfare at the expense of achievement, while certain left-wing critics remain convinced that pastoral care is primarily concerned with socializing deviants and maintaining a system of 'control.' In my view, there is some truth in both observations. (p. 50)

Canadian Literature

In Canada, the terms *guidance* or *guidance and counselling* have generally been used in place of pastoral care which is viewed as inherently British (Young, 1994). Hearn et al. (2006) noted Canada's Comprehensive School Health (CSH) framework which was intended to guide the health and wellbeing of school students. The CSH framework consisted of four main components: instruction, support

services, social support, and a healthy environment. Young (1994), however, elaborated on some of the realities of Canada's school pastoral care:

> there is…a tension between what is espoused as philosophy (which is developmental) and what is in fact implemented as practice (which is frequently remedial). This situation is not unlike the gap that exists in many realms between intentions and actions. (p. 43)

Young (1994) enlarged on other tensions in Canadian secondary schools such as: school systems dominated by specialist personnel being driven by human resources rather than the needs of users, a lack of evaluation of counsellors, specialist personnel sidelining teachers who wish to undertake additional caring roles, counsellors who conduct their own programmes without approval from the school Board of Trustees (BOTs), and the contemporary issue of counsellors possibly needing more training in mental health for young people. Students being rewarded rather than punished is also seen by Young (1994) as a key challenge within pastoral care from a whole-school perspective. He went on to say that the "implementation of pastoral care and similar programmes is a function of the school climate" (p. 51).

United States Literature

In the United States, pastoral care of the whole person appears to be encapsulated by The Search Institute. According to Hearn et al. (2006):

> the most prominent articles relating to pastoral care in schools have been those relating to resiliency emerging from The *Search Institute.* Their research has resulted in the identification of *40 Developmental Assets* that are essentially protective factors to enable youth to develop resiliency and competency into adulthood. Research has shown the more Developmental Assets an individual experiences (which involve both internal and external factors), the more likely an individual will be able to develop and strive in their life. (p. 65)

In addition, literature such as Darensbourg and Blake (2014) noted specific issues to consider in pastoral care for Black youth. Their research highlighted "the negative peer relationships maintained by Black youth moderate the relationship between positive parental involvement and school achievement – a finding that was

not significant for White populations" (p. 194). It has, therefore, been suggested that "strategies to increase academic attainment within Black adolescents should incorporate the cultivation of positive, academically supportive relationships between peers" (p. 204).

Diversity

The diversity of students' backgrounds in all of the countries mentioned above raise issues of how pastoral care ought to be undertaken in secondary schools today. In New Zealand, at least, students' diversity is growing and it could be argued that a fresh approach is needed. Renihan and Renihan (1995) spoke of the concept of responsiveness of a school as a social organization. Responsiveness was particularly in relation to drop-out rates of students which were seen as "evidence of the inadequacy of our schools to meet the changing needs of a diverse and complex student population" (p. 2). Renihan and Renihan (1995) focused their interest on what kept marginal students in school (rather than out), and raised awareness of the inadequacy of schools where the task culture subverted the social culture. Hence, an unbalanced emphasis on academic achievement/results/competition (the task culture) in schools can devalue students who are not *performing* well academically. The social culture values students, *sees* students and enables them to feel safe. A pivotal point for improving school environments was made:

> the culture of *pastoral care*, the vehicle for student empowerment, is pre-eminent. All other cultures of the school, the responsibilities of all major actors and the means by which they are empowered to contribute, are means to one end: the enhancement of their *pastoral* responsibility. (Renihan & Rehihan, 1995, p.

Intercultural Pastoral Care

In terms of how schools are responsible and inclusive of different ethnic groups, Lartey (2003) suggested an intercultural pastoral care. The growing ethnic diversity of Māori and Pasifika secondary students, and their families, in New Zealand necessitates an urgent addressing of disparities (Sleeter, 2011). In light of this, Lartey's (2003) approach holds relevance as mono-cultural, cross-cultural and

multi-cultural pastoral care were viewed as less inclusive of people's worlds than intercultural. Lartey (2003) contended that intercultural pastoral care was "premised upon the maxim that *every person is in some respects (a) like all others (b) like some others (c) like no others"* (p. 171).

Intercultural pastoral care is promoted as flexible, as being aware of need as well as promoting health, and as having an awareness of "the integrity of choice to accept, modify or reject aspects of …[one's]…heritage" (Lartey, 2003, p. 174). Lartey (2003) supported the exploration in pastoral care of how culture in the past and in the present exerts its influence on personal issues. He also asserted:

> Within multicultural environments, the influence of other cultures than ones' own will need to be investigated. No social group within a pluralistic society is unaffected by what happens to others. (Lartey, 2003, p. 173)

These factors all contribute to the vexatious, and longstanding, question in the literature of what could be a conclusive definition of pastoral care. The current term, pastoral care has been linked with the historical term *cura animarum* or the cure of souls (McNeill, as cited in Lartey, 2003). It seems, though, there is not one accepted definition, and given the contextual nature of pastoral care in schools it is probably unlikely that one will eventuate. Rather, definitions often convey similar sentiments. Examples of two of these will be given below. The first definition was seen as authoritative (Megahy, 1998; Hearn et al., 2006) and originates from a 1980s Department of Education British Report of Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI):

> Pastoral care is concerned with promoting pupil's personal and social development and fostering positive attitudes: through the quality of teaching and learning; through the nature of relationships amongst pupils, teachers and adults other than teachers; through arrangements for monitoring pupils' overall progress, academic, personal and social; through specific pastoral structures and support systems; and through extra curricular activities and the school ethos. Pastoral care, accordingly, should help a school achieve success. (cited in Hearn et al., 2006).

An example of a more contemporary definition, from Australia, reads as follows:

Pastoral care is an integrated approach to implementing an ethos of care within a school. Its ultimate goal is to build the capacity of the school community so that it can support each student to grow and develop and to engage with meaningful and successful learning. Pastoral care is integral to the curriculum and organizational life of the school that affects school culture, relationships within the school, the health and wellbeing of students and staff and the learning of students. (de Jong & Kerr-Roubicek, 2007, p. 5)

Again, regardless of precise definitions, the overarching endorsement of care within the school environment is apparent in writing from decades ago by Rudolf Moos (who was credited with applying the ecological approach of Bronfenbrenner to the educational context):

Conclusions about the influence of different environments vary, but all authors agree that the social-ecological setting in which students function can affect their attitudes and moods, their behavior and performance, and their self-concept and general sense of well-being. (Moos, 1979, p. 3)

Concepts of Care

The *caring* component of pastoral care is linked to a complex and highly contested concept. Literature on *care* is divisive, and often burdened by polarities: male/female, private/public, situational/universal (Sernak, 1998). Nel Noddings is perhaps the most oft-quoted academic on her concept of care being *relational* (Noddings, 2005a). This concept, and Noddings' work, however, is fiercely debated in the literature.

Feminists have, largely, fallen in to two opposing positions in the debate on caregiving. The more socialist-leaning feminists have argued that caregiving is oppressive, task focused, and contributes to women's disadvantage in society (Abel & Nelson, 1990). Caregiving from this viewpoint, highlighted the links between public and private spheres, as well as ridding caregiving of sentimentality (Abel & Nelson, 1990). As Abel and Nelson (1990) contended, though, this group of feminists also under-acknowledged a most important aspect of caregiving, that of human connectedness.

The second group of feminists believed that caregiving is humanizing and is not oppressive once it is delineated from personal service. Thus, caregivers of children or the infirm base their care (or concern for wellbeing) in reciprocity, and so expect to be cared for themselves when need arises. Personal service is not based in reciprocity but seeks to win approval and please (Abel & Nelson, 1990). Feminists on this side emphasized personal fulfillment from caregiving. In an educative environment, however, it could be argued that caregiving may not always be an appropriate basis for relationships (Abel & Nelson, 1990). In addition, Abel and Nelson (1990) suggested that caregiving could foster "exclusivity and privatism rather than a sense of collective responsibility; intense preoccupation with one or two individuals often eclipses concern for the broader community" (p. 7). Nel Noddings is particularly targeted in this light. Fisher and Tronto (1990) viewed Noddings' approach as:

> individualistic, focusing exclusively on one-to-one caring relationships. It
> takes into account neither the many situations in which the one cared for
> cannot reciprocate…nor the fact that caring is often difficult, unpleasant,
> collective work…Noddings completely ignores both power relations and the
> material conditions necessary for caring. (p. 37)

As an alternative, Tronto (1993) proposed thinking of caring as a *practice* in an effort to avoid over-idealizing it. Tronto (1993) also positioned care as gendered, classed and ethnically based. In conjunction care was upheld as a process in which there would more than likely involve conflict, lack of resources and divisions between those caring-about and taking-care of; and those care-giving and care-receiving (the latter two processes largely the domain of the less powerful) (Tronto, 1993).

Tronto (1993) promoted responsibility rather than obligation as a basis for care, in conjunction with notions of need and justice. Again, this is distinct from Noddings who posited caring as a private virtue (Tronto, 1993). In contrast, Tronto (1993) contended that there were no guarantees that care would be "free of parochialism, paternalism and privilege…[but that]…These potential moral problems…can…be resolved politically (pp. 153-154). She went on to say that an

"ethic of care remains incomplete without a political theory of care" (Tronto, 1993, p. 155).

Schutz (1998), Crigger (1997), and Hoaglund (1990) also elaborated on caring alone being too weak to be morally successful, (or engage adequate moral commitment) in order to resist oppression without a stronger guiding ethic. The need to resist oppression – and an ethic to guide it – resonates in the consideration of Māori and Pasifika young people's outcomes in secondary schools.

Noddings (1998) supported the concept of dialogue as a contributor to equality in the classroom. In a study by Webb, Wilson, Corbett, and Mordecal (1993) the participants were found to be talking past each other, and without dialogue, caring acts by one group in the school were not necessarily interpreted as caring by those who were supposedly cared for. In Noddings' (1998) words:

> A caring relation [rather than a virtue] is one in which the carer attends and responds appropriately to the needs of the cared-for…From this perspective, it is futile to insist that one cares, if the recipient of care denies that he or she has been cared for. (p. ix)

In a situation where the cared-for does not feel they have received care, questions might be raised about control. The tension between care and control in both the school and classroom setting is well acknowledged (McLaughlin, 1991; McQuaig, 2012). McLaughlin (1991) demonstrated that developing caring relations in a classroom assisted control. According to McLaughlin (1991):

> Ethical caring…requires that teachers exert some control over the environment, not allowing a few students to dominate or disrupt classroom interactions…Empowering students includes helping them set limits and…controlling group interactions to the extent that positive social interactions can occur. (p. 194)

If pastoral care is intended to meet the needs of multiple ethnic groups this nexus is more complicated. An appropriate positive, environment appears to be vital in relation to the process of power/care/and control, as outlined by Sernak (1998):

> Power can serve to engender care. As an amalgam of concepts, caring power

enables one to care enough to create the climate – the spaces – in which individuals and communities can use their innate…strength. (p. 157)

The links of such concepts of care with *the negotiated space* for different ethnic groups (Mila-Schaaf & Hudson, 2009) lends credence to the concept of culturally responsive pastoral care as an increasingly important component of New Zealand schools in the process of nurturing fully participating, diverse Māori and Pasifika citizens.

Summary

The critical analysis of the literature covered Māori and Pasifika contexts, the history of pastoral care, along with more current understandings of pastoral care. In addition, an overview of socio-ecological and cultural models of wellbeing was presented (interestingly, Durie's Whare Tapa Whā model was adopted by the New Zealand Curriculum) (MoE, 2007). Such models can provide some of the lenses through which an exploration and interpretation of pastoral care in the New Zealand context may be undertaken. This study will, therefore, assist gaps in the literature where there is little common understanding of what pastoral care is, how it is co-ordinated, or the roles it plays. The study was designed to discover the nature and processes of pastoral care particularly for Māori and Pasifika students.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day;
teach a man to fish
and you feed him for a lifetime.
Maimonides

This chapter describes the methodological framework, and the methods used, in undertaking a study on pastoral care for Māori and Pasifika students. In consideration of the diverse range of participants, along with the research questions to be answered, a mixture of methods and philosophies were used. Not all participants were either Māori or Pasifika, as there were many non-Māori and non-Pasifika school staff who agreed to be interviewed.

Rationale for the Research

New Zealand "has the second highest rate of relative educational inequality in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)" (Shulruf et al., 2008, p. 697). Although it appears there has been some improvement in the latest OECD figures (MoE, 2015a) it is not enough to dispense with the persistent kernel of inequity at the heart of Shulruf et al's (2008) statement. According to the OECD, New Zealand is still lower than the OECD median for upper secondary school retention (MoE, 2015a). Within this inequity (Ferguson, Gorinski, Wendt Samu, & Mara, 2008) Māori and Pasifika students are over-represented in: school leavers without qualifications, the lowest 20% of achievement outcomes in secondary schools, and the lower school deciles. Pastoral care is an under-recognised component of secondary schooling in the literature, yet the New Zealand government has stated that it has the potential to nurture students and enable them to stay at school, along with fostering their achievements as a whole person (MoH, 2009). Obtaining an understanding of what pastoral care is in secondary schools, including the processes it involves, and how it is embedded in, or excluded from, the school environment is timely given the increasingly diverse population growth in Māori and Pasifika communities. A greater understanding of pastoral care holds potential for the development of policy that could inform the advancement of pastoral care across a range of schools, as well as configuring advanced professional development for school staff in order to do so. In

this way, pastoral care has the potential to contribute positively to Māori and Pasifika student retention at school, along with increased connectedness, sense of belonging, sense of identity, and achievement outcomes. To date, however, there is a large gap in the literature on pastoral care for Māori and Pasifika students including whether the concept has contributed to improved outcomes; or whether in fact pastoral care has potentially contributed to adverse outcomes rather than fulfilling a caring role.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore and interpret what pastoral care was in the New Zealand context, how it was understood, as well as how it was represented and co-ordinated both within and beyond the school environment. Of particular interest was the role that pastoral care may have had in the engagement and retention of Māori and Pasifika students within differing school environments.

Research Questions

In order to fulfil the purpose of the study, three core research questions were used to guide the research:

1. What is the nature and purpose of pastoral care in Auckland secondary schools?

2. What is the association between pastoral care and school retention among Māori and Pasifika students?

3. What are the differences in the nature of pastoral care between schools with different decile ratings?

Research Methodology

The nature, differences and associations related to pastoral care for secondary students within their social contexts were the foci of the investigation. A case study design was chosen to research this phenomenon which included interviews,

observations and document analysis. In these ways, qualitative data is useful as the "influences of the local context are not stripped away but are taken into account…[and]…the possibility for understanding latent, underlying, or nonobvious issues is strong" (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014, p. 1). The study was also based within a Kaupapa Māori framework, or more specifically within my interpretation of a Kaupapa Māori approach in conjunction with the case study design. According to Cram (2002):

> a Kaupapa Māori approach does not exclude the use of a wide range of methods but rather signals the interrogation of methods in relation to cultural sensitivity, cross-cultural reliability, useful outcomes for Māori, and other such measures. As an analytical approach Kaupapa Māori is about thinking critically. (p. 13)

Te Kotahitanga exemplified an approach towards the formation of a relationships-based classroom founded on a Kaupapa Māori solution (Macfarlane, Glynn, Cavanagh, & Bateman, 2007; Bishop, 2007; Bishop, 2005). This study, however, contends that if pastoral care across and *beyond* (Snook & O'Neill, 2014; Bishop, 2011) the school is not culturally responsive, then what happens in the classroom is less compelling in terms of contributing to an individual's wellbeing in a sustainable way. In other words, a more collectivist/socially interdependent responsiveness is suggested (Noblit, 1993; Blum, 1999) for Māori and Pasifika students in close connection with their families (Sernak, 2004; Resnick et al., 1993). In the contemporary New Zealand setting this would be cognizant of students' different worlds (Jones, 1991; Siope, 2011; Hawk & Hill, 1996; Nakata, 2007; Marland, 1974) when considering the wellbeing of the whole person (Noddings, 2005a); and the fluidity of an individual's identity/s (Merriam, Johnson-Bailey, Lee, Kee, Ntseane, & Muhamad, 2001; Tupuola, 2004; Blum, 1999).

Hence, the nature of the pastoral care provided seems to be essential otherwise students may disengage from school and/or eventually be pushed out/drop out (Fine et al., 2014) of secondary school (Blum et al., 2000; Libbey et al., 2002). Pastoral care which is neither student-centred, nor family-centred, does not appear to provide adequate support or nurturing for Māori or Pasifika secondary students (Bevan-

Brown, 2009; Edwards, Gandini, & Forman, 2012). Bevan-Brown (2009) suggested that:

> People with the same cultural background differ from one another across the entire spectrum of human traits and characteristics including the degree to which they identify with and adhere to cultural beliefs, values and practices…consultation with parents…and students should be on-going. (p. 6)

Student (and family) need, today, appears to be compounded in low decile schools where parental and community resources are often lower (Plumb & Bilby, 2016; Thrupp, 2006a; Brooks-Gunn, 1995; Mara, 2014; Smith, 2013). Less resources may be related to lack of parental discretionary time due to factory-type employment, or less knowledge of, for example, management or accountancy processes in order to contribute to BOT positions (Mansill, 2014; Plank & Sykes, 2003; Thrupp, 2006a). According to Mansill (2014) lower socioeconomic "communities typically have fewer local people who possess the range of expertise required for successfully performing school governance roles" (p. 194).

Amidst the examination of pastoral care, therefore, in this study assumptions by school staff about how a student *lives* their ethnicity were considered; but differentiation, too, needed much consideration. As differentiation is lauded to be a key component of great teaching (and a potential component of great pastoral care), whether school staff were enabled to differentiate pastoral provisions in conjunction with specific family (and community) contexts (Bevan-Brown, 2009) was explored. According to Macfarlane et al. (2007) "an ambiance or atmosphere of care is central to creating a safe school…[and]…culturally-safe classrooms" (p.72).

Thus, a study of pastoral care for Māori and Pasifika students (as well as the school staff who support and engage with them) is informed here by the disciplines of population health and education. The amalgamation of these two disciplines is predicated on the drive to enhance young people's wellbeing. There is, then, an acknowledgement of the interplay between health affecting education and education affecting health (Blum et al., 2000).

In light of this, students are unlikely to be able to successfully compartmentalize their home-life and ethnicity/s in to a bundle which is kept separately from their experiences at school (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Cook et al., 2005). Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1986a, 1986b) endorsed the interconnections in young people's lives, and therefore, the links between their home and school contexts. In the current study, this again links (population) health and education, and aims to contribute to a better understanding of pastoral care. The socio-ecological approach towards young people's wellbeing taken by Bronfenbrenner (1979) may be helpful in order to equip students and staff for the many different worlds within which Māori and Pasifika people walk (Siope, 2011; Hawk & Hill, 1996; Nakata, 2007; Jones, 1991; Marland, 1974). These worlds increasingly require more conscious connectedness (Giroux, 2005; Johnson, 1985) within the various contexts in which Māori and Pasifika students participate.

Research that is cognizant of such contexts, but informed by the disciplines of (population) health and education lends itself to a fusion of relevant perspectives related to young peoples' wellbeing. When based within a Kaupapa Māori framework, the opportunities for fresh perspectives being useful for Māori and Pasifika students expand. Specifically from an education perspective this is important since, new ways of conceptualizing (Smith, 2013) and addressing the long brown tail of underachievement (Aumua, 2013) would be beneficial.

Kaupapa Māori Research

Today, defining Kaupapa Māori is a vexatious exercise. Definitions have evolved and changed over the years. Many current definitions are yet another way of colonising Māori knowledge. They are a reminder of the power of colonisation and othering (Moewaka-Barnes, 2000; Fine, 1994). I believe that Kaupapa Māori keeps the wairua in my research. It is not enough to just *be* Māori to do Kaupapa Māori research, there has to be the whakapapa and the wairua.

My interpretation of Kaupapa Māori research is, therefore, a personal one. Although, Kaupapa Māori research is not prescriptive there are nevertheless features which are seen to be inherent components of doing Kaupapa Māori research.

Amongst those relevant to this study are: a) Māori benefitting from the research (Jones, Crengle & McCreanor, 2006; Smith, 2012; Walker, Eketone & Gibbs, 2006), b) maintaining interpretive control over the research (Walker et al., 2006), c) cultural safety for the participants (Walker et al., 2006), d) emphasis on the Treaty of Waitangi (Jahnke & Taiapa, 2003), e) taking an integrated approach towards understanding indigenous people's self-determination (Jahnke & Taiapa, 2003), and f) whakawhanaungatanga "the process of identifying, maintaining or forming past, present, and future relationships" (Walker et al., 2006, p. 334).

This study, however, is also cross-cultural as the researcher is not of Pasifika descent. Spoonley (2003) contended that "cross-cultural research occurs in any situation where the ethnicity of the researcher and the researched is different" (p. 52). The research includes Pasifika secondary students along with Māori secondary students. Kaupapa Māori research has been acknowledged as suitable for Pasifika students as well (Walker et al., 2006). I do not, however, adhere strictly to the concept of positionality as either insider or outsider, but rather acknowledge the "slippage and fluidity" between insider and outsider status (Merriam et al., 2001, p. 405). In addition, although I am not Pasifika, I view my position as operating from *the space* between (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009; Bhabha, 1995; Cram et al., 2014; Tupuola, 2004): in Samoan literature, termed the *va* (Anae, 2010). The weaving within and between cultures with ease (Tupuola, 2004) is increasingly acknowledged as part of a greater understanding of people/s. Bhabha (1995) believed that:

> It is in this space that we will find those words which we can speak of Ourselves and Others. And by explaining this hybridity, this 'Third Space,' we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of ourselves. (p. 209)

In this way, according to Smith (2012) terms such as insider-outsider, the margin, (or in the current study the va), are powerful in research as they help to understand inequality and disadvantage. Researcher *fluidity* (Merriam et al., 2001) is also increasingly necessary due to the widening diversity of ethnic groups in contemporary New Zealand society. Spoonley (2003) suggested that "social and cultural worlds are different, and these differences deserve to be respected" (p. 61). In addition, Jahnke and Taiapa (2003) argued that:

It is becoming increasingly difficult to rely on traditional assumptions about Māori [or Pasifika] with many stereotypes being meaningless for many Māori [or Pasifka]. Relevance of so-called traditional values is not the same for all Māori [or Pasifika]. (p. 47)

Similarly, Macfarlane (2003) outlined realities for many students whether Māori, Pasifika, or Māori and Pasifika:

Some [young people] embrace…[traditional languages]…and …tikanga…while others who have been isolated from it, may be prone to experiencing some paranoia when confronted with it…Schools and families need to be aware of this reality and must play a role in shaping the behaviour of these students and in eliminating or reducing the frustrations and insecurities surrounding them. (p. 7)

Macfarlane (2003) went on to say that neither the responsibility nor the strategies, which will benefit Māori and Pasifika students rest with only Māori and Pasifika adults/school staff. In relation to the ways in which Māori and Pasifika researchers can benefit Māori and Pasifika secondary students, this methodology is cognizant of them not being limited to, or defined by tikanga. These realities were endorsed by Jahnke and Taiapa (2003):

It must be understood that not all Māori [or Pasifika] who undertake research are necessarily conversant with tikanga. It is fair to say that the effects of colonisation have ensured that those who are, are the exception rather than the rule (p. 49).

It is also from such a reality that I bring my interpretation (Walker et al., 2006) of a Kaupapa Māori approach to this research. I share an increasingly common experience as a New Zealander from a deeply fragmented, colonised family. My father is from a large Ngāti Kahungunu whānau, and his mother's people also bear the long term colonising effects of Christianity along with pronounced differences in socio-economic realities between family members (sometimes apparently linked to a seemingly simple historical parental decision such as which children went to Māori boarding schools). I have seen, and more poignantly felt, first-hand the divisions between family members due to their religious affiliations (predominantly Mormon),

and difficult inter-personal chasms due to the extensive diversity in socioeconomic status.

In our Ngāti Kahungunu family, at least, it is an overly simplistic viewpoint to position ethnicity – consistently – as the dominant signifier in terms of the educational and health outcomes of our whānau. It is, perhaps, arguable that ethnicity is the proxy for the far-reaching impacts of colonisation. The equation is extremely complex in terms of wellbeing, and I am aware of an ongoing process of oscillation, by family members, between ethnic, religious and professional/socioeconomic identities.

I have also experienced, first-hand, the realities of Māori staff within educational institutions who have inflicted harm due to entrenched viewpoints related to *what it is to be Māori*. I am wary, and weary, of such pigeon-holing. It appears that student choice in terms of how students experience their ethnicities, and what options their school provides in relation to caring about student choices is important (Hawk & Hill, 1996; Borell, 2005; Krebs, 1999; Tupuola, 2004). According to Ladson-Billings and Donnor (2008) the:

> Challenge to notions of ethnic purity moves us away from the futile chase for 'authenticity' and troubles the reification of ethnic and racial categories…Just because people look like us by no means implies that they have our best interests at heart. (p. 75)

In conjunction, the capacity of school environments (including their staff) to meet the pastoral care needs of individual self-identified Māori and Pasifika students has been examined in this research. Kincheloe and Steinberg (2008) asserted that schools are "complex matrices of interactions, codes and signifiers in which both the students and teachers are interlaced" (p. 139). In recognition of this, workforce development, capacity building and systemic change within schools and their communities have been considerations in this study (Jones et al., 2006; Bishop, 2011; Smith, 2012).

Kaupapa Māori, then, provides a framework within which the researcher can undertake culturally responsive research, and in conjunction, ensure that culture is seen as more than tikanga or customs (Bishop, 2006; Cooper, 2012). Denzin, Lincoln,

and Smith (2008) contended that the "performative is where the soul of the culture resides" (p. 14); and they elaborated on this point by stating that:

> Many…indigenous scholars are in the eighth moment, performing culture as they write it, understanding that the dividing line between performativity (doing) and performance (done) has disappeared…Interpretive research practices turn the world into a series of performances and representations, including case study documents. (pp. 4-5)

In other words, differing moments can catalyse new sensibilities and understandings as researchers gain an awareness of issues, which may not have been apparent, or overt, previously (Lincoln & Denzin, 2008). Lincoln and Denzin (2008) determined these moments to be performative forms of social science with "new participatory…values of interpretive research…that…[are]…democratic, reciprocal, and reciprocating rather than objective and objectifying" (p. 543). As further clarification, in an earlier work, Denzin (2003) explained how:

> A performative discourse simultaneously writes and criticizes performances. In showing how people enact cultural meanings in their daily lives, such a discourse focuses on how these meanings and performances shape experiences of injustice, prejudice, and stereotyping. (p. xi)

In summary, a Kaupapa Māori approach in the current study determined that "priorities…[were]…ranked differently, problems…[were]…defined differently, and people participate[d] on different terms" (Smith, 2012, p. 196).

Multiple Case Study Research

This research utilized a qualitative multiple case study design. Yin (1984) defined case study research as "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which multiple sources of evidence are used" (p. 23). As previously outlined, pastoral care has been an under-studied phenomenon in Auckland secondary schools. The case, then, in this study is pastoral care, but according to Stake (2006), in the process of attempting to understand organizational complexities it is "often useful to look carefully at persons and

operations at several locations" (p. v). Thus, the research stood to benefit from a multiple case study design in order to try to understand the "behavior[s], issues and contexts" (Stake, 1995, p. 78) associated with pastoral care for Māori and Pasifika students.

Context-sensitivity has, therefore, been a vital consideration in this case study research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Riessman (1993) asserted that there is no "view from no where" (p. 15) and in support of such a view this research has attempted to "work the borders, betwixt and between institutions and communities" (Smith, 2012, p. 199). As a case study researcher, an acknowledgement of multiple ways of seeing a situation, and the potential for people to talk past each other in various contexts was pre-eminent when considering the case in this study. Yin (2012) elaborated on the benefits of such a case study approach:

> The closeness [of case studies] aims to produce an invaluable and deep
> understanding – that is an insightful appreciation of the "case(s)" – hopefully
> resulting in new learning about real-world behavior and its meaning. (p. 4)

A depth of understanding has emerged from multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 2012) as well as a broad coverage of the studied phenomenon (Yin, 2009). In addition, the diverse historical and contemporary realities of many Māori and Pasifika people's experiences in secondary schools drew attention to the upholding of multiple perspectives by researchers such as myself in the construction of research projects such as this. According to Kincheloe and Steinberg (2008), a "multilogical epistemology and ontology promotes a spatial distancing from reality that allows an observer diverse frames of reference" (p. 139). In relation, as this research straddled two disciplines (health and education), the study was interested in the diversities and commonalities of Māori and Pasifika people, along with the borders which may need to be crossed. Kincheloe and Steinberg (2008) suggested that we can "gain new insights into the traditional concerns of…[an]…academic domain by looking outside the frameworks of one discipline" (p. 140). With a similar awareness of the limitations of categorization, Ladson-Billings and Donnor (2008) argued that "the boundaries between and among various racial, ethnic, and cultural groups are more permeable and more complex than the categories imply" (p. 80). In conjunction, the illumination of the pastoral care contexts in this study have involved considerations of

societal disparities, in particular the "interlocking relationships between race, gender, and class…[as they]…make oppression a complex sociological and psychological condition" (Smith, 2012, pp. 169-170).

The choice of a qualitative multiple-case study approach, then, upheld studying the varied nature of cases and their situations. According to Stake (2006) the "study of situations reveals *experiential knowledge*" (p. 12), and "experiential knowing is critical to the epistemology of individual people and agencies" (p. 88). Stake (2006) also contended that the "study of human activity loses too much if it reports primarily what is common among the several and universal across the many" (p. 88). A singular approach such as relying on individual interviews was not, therefore, seen to be appropriate for this research as the complexity of the phenomenon of pastoral care appeared to warrant a multi-faceted approach. Smith (2012) argued that a reliance on individual informants could result in information which "may be a long way from the full picture" (p. 176). In support of this notion, Yin (2009) suggested that researchers should attempt to convey how participants' social constructs influence their roles, rather than simply providing concise answers to questions.

According to Yin (2009), therefore, a case study with notable strength would be where the positioning of the evidence and experiences from each source was collected in such a manner that the data complemented, replicated, and/or converged with each other. In this way, by integrating information from, for example, interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and direct observations, a "strong evidentiary base" (Yin, 2009, p. 279) is created which would have the potential to "provide greater credibility for…[the]…case" (p. 279).

Yin (2009) expanded on these ideas by suggesting that "case studies should promote sound social science inquiry rather than raw polemic argument" (p. 266), and in order to understand "this grander scale…an appreciation of the concept of *embedded units of analysis*" is outlined. Yin (2009) went on to say:

> The concept applies when the data for a case study come from more than a
> single layer. For instance, a case study about an organization will certainly
> include data about an organizational layer…However, depending on the

research questions being studied, additional data may come from a second

layer – the organization's employees…The main unit is the single entity,

covering a single-case. The embedded units are more numerous and can

produce a large amount of…data. (p. 267)

Thus, the organization of pastoral care formed the phenomenon under analysis, and the staff, teachers and students engaged in pastoral care can be seen as different layers embedded in the phenomenon under analysis. The school, then, is seen as a further layer of analysis. By utilizing observations, document analysis, focus groups and interviews the current study had the potential to produce rich, multi-layered data. Overall, according to Yin (2009) "the evidence from multiple-case studies should produce a more compelling and robust case study" (p. 260).

Methods for Data Collection

A three-stage study including observations, document analysis and interviews/focus groups was undertaken in Auckland secondary schools. This design enabled the four components of qualitative data to be gathered separately, through the division of data collection into three successive stages.

Stage One: Direct Observations

Direct observations of moments of pastoral care were made in each of the four secondary schools. The observations incorporated a range of situations involving adults/school pastoral care staff and students. The researcher maintained a flexible approach to observing as much pastoral care as each school setting allowed without getting in the way or being intrusive. Yin (2009) suggested that making direct "observations is one of the most distinctive features in doing case studies" (p. 261). In relation, Creswell (2009) endorsed the natural setting of observations (rather than interviews in a designated place) to be a beneficial evidentiary base. The settings can enable relevant behaviours and environmental conditions (such as the nature of the physical surroundings) to be described and interpreted. Patton (2002) outlined several other advantages for direct observations in natural settings, a) the researcher can capture the interactions between staff and students in various contexts, b) the

researcher can be discovery oriented and inductive because there is less of a need to rely on prior conceptualizations, c) the researcher "has the opportunity to see things that may routinely escape awareness among the people in the setting" (p. 262), and d) the researcher can "learn things that people would be unwilling to talk about in an interview" (p. 263).

As the main function of direct observation is to present the observational evidence (Yin, 2009), the manner of reporting is seen to be important. A systematic technique for taking field notes outlined by Schatzman and Strauss (1973) was utilized in this study. Schatzman and Strauss (1973) referred to description, interpretation and methodological recording. Description involves recording the events that occur as verbatim as possible in a dry, neutral, factual tone (Yin, 2009). Interpretation refers to making a comment that is informed by the researcher's interactions in the school environment, or emerging from the context. Methodological comments refer to research notes that are incorporated into the data collection. For example, a question may arise that the researcher can ask a staff member in subsequent communication. As additional considerations, Patton (2002) cautioned against cluttering the descriptions with "irrelevant minutiae and trivia" (p. 262), while Mintzberg (1970) discussed Hawthorne effects or "unanticipated results due to the presence of [a] researcher" (p. 103). Yin (2003) also raised these effects by naming them reflexivity. That is, the event may proceed differently because it is being observed - this could be interpreted as a weakness of direct observations - but would hopefully be attenuated by the strengths of the evidence (Yin, 2003). Attempts, nevertheless, were made by the researcher to minimize this effect in each school.

Stage Two: Document Review

A document review, or document analysis, was also undertaken in each school. Available pastoral care policies, newsletters, school handbooks, student services information, Education Review Office (ERO) reports along with other relevant documents were reviewed on an on-going basis throughout the study. According to Yin (2003) "the most important use of documents is to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources…and to make inferences…as clues worthy of further investigation" (p. 87). Document reviews are also a stable and unobtrusive

means of gathering evidence (Yin, 2003), yet they may, for instance, highlight professional behavioural protocols, which could limit the effectiveness of pastoral care for Māori and Pasifika students/families.

Stage Three: Interviews and Focus Groups

In each school context, the initial approach pre-ceding interviews involved an invitation to pastoral care co-ordinators and/or principals to introduce myself, as well as the study; and to elucidate any queries. I practised my interviewing technique with colleagues and local teenagers, before entering schools. The subsequent co-ordination of interview/focus group sessions varied in each school setting. Broadly the interviewing schedule involved individual interviews with pastoral care staff and focus groups with students. Questioning guides were developed for the interviews and focus groups (Appendices A & B). All interviews were recorded and transcribed shortly after the interviews unless the participants requested an unrecorded session (this only happened once).

The individual staff interviews involved 6-14 staff members from each of the four schools involved in the study, with each interview lasting for up to an hour. The staff members in the 41 individual interviews were from many ethnicities (including Māori and Pasifika). Their positions within the four schools included teachers, deans, principals, chaplains, deputy principals, careers advisors, counsellors, special education needs co-ordinators (SENCO), and sports co-ordinators. Focus groups could have been chosen for school staff but confidentiality and social hierarchies can suppress some voices (Kitzinger, 1995). A selection of adults involved in pastoral care were chosen by myself and the schools in order to gain insights in to a range of perspectives (Dyson, 2006); and experiences of what pastoral care is in different schools along with how staff contribute to the fostering of Māori and Pasifika student retention. Individual, open-ended interviews were used as they are appropriate for case study research due to their potential to provide "greater breadth of data" (Fontana & Frey, 2003, p. 74). Open-ended interviews are also suitable for other reasons such as, interviewees can: a) answer on their own terms, b) be more conversant, c) be less affected by interviewer effects, and d) be more like informants than respondents (Bryman, 2008; Yin, 2003; Patton, 2002).

Semi-structured focus groups at each school involved up to 10 students. The respondents in the four focus groups were aged between 16 and 18 years. They were all self-identified Māori or Pasifika students. Two of the schools were single-sex, and two of the schools were co-educational. The focus groups were "loosely constructed discussion[s] with a group of people brought together for the purpose of the study, guided by the researcher and addressed as a group" (Sarantakos, 2005, p. 194). Focus groups fulfilled the purpose of facilitating a group discussion, as well as highlighting attitudes, feelings and expectations related to pastoral care (Sarantakos, 2005). Fontana and Frey (2003) drew attention to trust, rapport and presentation of the researcher in the interviewer role in focus groups. Trust was posited as "essential to the success of the interviews and, once gained…[could]…still be very fragile" (Fontana & Frey, 2003, p. 78). Similarly, if "the goal of unstructured interviewing is *understanding*, it is paramount that the researcher establish rapport with respondents" (Fontana & Frey, 2003, p. 78). Thus, the importance of whakawhanaungatanga was endorsed (Walker et al., 2006). As a further consideration, Fontana and Frey (2003) contended that the nature of the interviewer is important to the process as well when they stated that: "once the interviewer's presentational self is 'cast,' it leaves a profound impression on the respondents and has great influence over the success of the study" (p. 77).

Feedback to participants is also important. As part of member checking (Miles et al., 2014) teachers and school personnel were sent transcripts of their interviews in order to review the interviewer's accuracy once the preliminary analysis was completed. In this way interviewees could participate in analyzing their information.

Ethical Concerns

Application for permission to undertake this study was made, and ethical approval was granted by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee (Reference Number 2013/9951). Participant Information Sheets were prepared for the Principal and Board of Trustees (Appendix C), the school staff (Appendix D), the focus group participants (Appendix E), and Consent Forms were designed (Appendices F, G and H) as well.

Ethical concerns require thorough consideration when designing and anticipating the process of all social research. Social research is sensitive as it "involves collecting data from people, and about people" (Punch, 2005, p. 276). The key issues which are likely to require careful consideration (particularly in relation to the personal nature of qualitative data) are those of harm, consent, deception, privacy, and confidentiality of the data collected (Punch, 2005). Punch (2005) also cautioned that researchers ought to consider what each group will gain from participating. A component of reciprocity in this research will be dissemination of the results as early as possible.

The inclusion of Māori and Pasifika participants in this research is in conjunction with the researcher being of Ngāti Kahungunu descent and wishing to uphold the Treaty of Waitangi and its principles. The researcher is a trained teacher (and mother of three teenage children), who has also previously worked in a Māori research fellow position at a university. In addition, the researcher is married to a person of Samoan descent and has links to Pasifika communities through the extended family. The researcher has also worked collaboratively with pastoral teams in participating schools in order to ensure respect for all Māori and Pasifika school participants, along with school staff.

Participants

Although the number of participating schools was somewhat flexible, a desirable number of schools in the study was deemed to be four. Stake (2006) contended that the "benefits of multicase study will be limited if fewer than, say, 4 cases are chosen, or more than 10" (p. 22). Eight Auckland secondary schools across deciles were invited to participate in the research (with the anticipation that some would choose not to participate). Stake (2006) suggested several criteria for selecting cases to participate in a multiple case design. These included: a) relevance of the case, b) diversity of cases across contexts, and c) cases which provide good opportunities to learn about complexity. The criteria for selection of schools in this study also included: willingness of key school staff (particularly the principal) to participate, representation from across deciles, and adequate geographical representation.

Voluntary participation and anonymity across each of the three stages was guaranteed. The final four schools that were chosen met all of the above criteria. A purposive sample was, therefore, utilized in the current study (Patton, 2002).

Settings

Many secondary schools, co-educational and single sex, with varying roll sizes, from varying geographical parts of Auckland, with different decile ratings, were purposively chosen in the first instance (Patton, 2002). The schools were initially approached directly by the researcher, with the co-operation of links through social networks known to the researcher in the school communities. This was followed by letters of invitation to participate in the study, then the consent process, along with the setting up of dates and times at each school. Several schools were then omitted due to weaknesses in researcher networking related to the schools. Eight secondary schools were visited before the final four were invited and selected. The final four schools were chosen due to more diversity of Māori and Pasifika students both within, and between schools. A brief biography was provided verbally in the first meeting at each school, either with the principal or the staff member responsible for pastoral care.

During data collection I was in the schools for an extended period of time across three terms (twenty two weeks). I was out in each school multiple times, I wrote many field notes from observations, read documents from schools and wherever else I could locate them (for example, ERO reports online), as well as interviewing a large number of people. The interviews were not held at the university but in the school contexts. This was important in order to gain entrée in to the schools, establish trust and observe what was happening in the four environments. These were all important facets of credibility for this study, which is an important aspect of trustworthiness in qualitative research (Miles et al., 2014).

In all four schools I initially developed a rapport with either the principal, or a deputy principal, and – in three schools – the staff member who managed pastoral care. The interviewing process was able to begin once staff members informed me of available gaps in their timetables. I met with each adult sometimes in a boardroom, a staff room, a classroom, a common room, or their offices. School staff were able to

spend as much time on each of the questions in the interview as they wished. There was great variety in the lengths of different staff members' responses to each question.

The focus group participants were chosen by school staff members. In each school the students met with me in a boardroom, a tearoom, or a classroom. One group came to school early in order to meet me before school classes began, one group met with me at lunchtime, while the two other groups met with me during class time. The focus groups in each school enabled students to have *a voice* without adults from their school being in the room.

I ensured that the observations in each school were subtle, and mindful of the reality that what appeared before me at face value might mask other layers of complexity, in any situation. I had initially undertaken some informal interviews with school staff, teachers, and students. This allowed me to use follow-up questions, to chat with participants at schools, and to enhance my understanding of the happenings in each unique school context. The document analysis in each school was determined by what was available and what information school staff were willing to impart. I was also able to seek out several documents independently.

Schools were chosen from three different deciles in order to answer the research questions. Although deciles are a coarse measure of socioeconomic status, in this study they were utilized to denote differences for Māori and Pasifika students' pastoral care in relation to, but also in spite of, decile differences. In addition, the current study explored Māori and Pasifika pastoral care experiences within two schools of the same decile (Snook & O'Neill, 2014). The MoE allocates funds to schools based on the school decile rating:

> Deciles are a measure of the socio-economic position of a school's student community relative to other schools throughout the country. For example, decile 1 schools are the 10% of schools with the highest proportion of students from low socio-economic communities, whereas decile 10 schools are the 10% of schools with the lowest proportion of these students (www.minedu.govt.nz).

School Descriptions

Each school setting will be outlined below. The four secondary schools were given a pseudonym to protect their confidentiality. The schools were located in three distinctly different geographical areas in Auckland.

Fenton High School.

The first school was co-educational with a roll of approximately 2000 students. The composition of students was ethnically diverse. There were approximately 10% Māori and 10% Pasifika on the roll (Educational Review Office [ERO], 2013). The school's Māori strategic plan aimed to foster Māori enjoying educational success as Māori (ERO, 2013). Māori achieve more highly in the NCEA than Pasifika students at this school. The school was enthusiastic about developing its information and communication technologies (ICT), but physically the school environment was dated. This school had a higher decile rating.

Chilwell College.

The second school was also co-educational – in an entirely different location from the first school – with a roll over 2000 students. Māori students made up almost 25% of the roll, and Pasifika students almost 25% of the school roll. The school was documented to have high quality pastoral care systems (ERO, 2014). Māori and Pasifika achievement was given specific attention, but there was an overt desire for achievement to be lifted higher. There were average academic outcomes, with Pasifika students achieving higher than Māori students overall. The school had a lower decile rating, and many classrooms were in need of re-furbishment.

Lambert High School.

The third school was a single sex school with a roll much smaller than the first two schools. The roll composition included approximately 80% Pasifika students, and 20% Māori students. In terms of achievement, Pasifika students were achieving well, whereas Māori students were not experiencing high levels of achievement outcomes (ERO, 2013). This school had a low decile rating (which was lower than Chilwell College), and the whole school needed re-furbishment.

Rawhiti College.

The fourth school had a roll under 1000 students. The ethnic composition of the school roll was a mix of approximately 25% Māori students and approximately 75% of Pasifika students. Digital technologies were a focus of the school. It had the same low decile rating as Lambert High School, but the school environment was contemporary and well maintained.

Qualitative Data Analysis

The interpretation of data in this study was situated within a desire to create space for diverse Māori and Pasifika student, and staff, *voice* (Cook-Sather, 2014). Māori and Pasifika *student voice* (what was important for Māori and Pasifika students) was, therefore, at the forefront of the interpretation. A desire to raise awareness of pastoral care in a way that was responsive to Māori and Pasifika secondary students' aspirations was one of the Kaupapa Māori lenses that was utilized in this analysis. In addition, the thirteen Māori and Pasifika school staff participant voices (what was important for Māori and Pasifika staff) were also prominent in the interpretation. My personal experiences (particularly of racism) enabled me to interpret the data with sensitivity, respect and an understanding of the systemic factors which impact on Māori and Pasifika experiences in school contexts.

An inductive thematic analysis approach has, therefore, been utilized in this study. According to Braun and Clarke (2006) thematic analysis "is a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organizes and describes your data set in (rich) detail" (p. 79). In relation, Thomas (2006) stated that the primary purpose of the inductive approach was one in which the research findings were allowed to "emerge from the frequent, dominant or significant themes inherent in raw data" (p. 238), whereas Braun and Clarke (2006) reflected more accurately the approach of this research which situated the researcher in an active role. That is, Braun and Clarke (2006) suggested that an "account of themes 'emerging' or being 'discovered' is a passive account of the process of analysis, and it denies the *active* role the researcher always plays in identifying patterns/themes" (p. 80).

Coding was the beginning of analyzing the information collected in this qualitative research (Tolich & Davidson, 1999). Braun and Clarke (2006) outlined six phases of thematic analysis which guided the research: 1) familiarize yourself with your data, 2) generate initial codes, 3) search for themes, 4) review themes, 5) define and name themes, and 6) produce the report. Initially, then, the data in this study was read repeatedly. Once the breadth and depth of the content was familiar, "patterns of meaning and issues of potential interest" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 86) were coded in a systematic way. Codes were then collated into potential themes by gathering text/data that illustrated meaning, associations, perspectives or relevance to each potential theme (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Thomas, 2006); this was followed by generating candidate themes and sub-themes. The themes and sub-themes were analyzed in an ongoing manner in order to enable refinement of the details of each theme (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The on-going analysis continued until the final write-up. Braun & Clarke (2006) also stated that analysis is a "recursive process, where movement is back and forth as needed throughout the phases" (p. 86) and that "[w]riting is an integral *part* of analysis" (p. 86). Writing began during the first stage of this research. The researcher's advisors acted as 'peer debriefers' throughout the research process to contest interpretations of the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The peer debriefing process provided feedback in order to enhance credibility and ensure validity (www.debriefing.com/peer-debriefing). In these ways, the interpretation, exploration, and analysis of the data along with the theoretical position of the researcher provided a grounding to the data analysis process.

This research, then, has been predicated on an acknowledgement of involvement with the research, which entails bias. Although objectivity may be a noble intent, or at least a regulatory ideal (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004), the writer is aware of being part of communities, of holding values, of conducting inquiry from a standpoint correlating with those values, and interpreting data in a way which can never be free of life experiences and a particular worldview (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). Being female, and of multiple ethnicities (including Māori) are several of the lenses through which I interpreted this study. In relation, Lincoln and Guba (1985) contended that "*at a minimum* we should be prepared to admit that values do play a significant part in inquiry [as this] is infinitely to be preferred to continuing in the self-delusion that methodology can and does protect one from their

unwelcome incursions" (p. 186). Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Miles et al. (2014) also argued that trustworthiness is a vital consideration in qualitative research in as much as researchers need to ask themselves whether the findings of their inquiries are "worth paying attention to" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 290). To enhance credibility, as aforementioned, member checks were carried out with all interviewed participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). That is, using the process of member checking, transcriptions of interviews were returned to all adult participants to check consistency and provide an opportunity to modify or clarify any aspect of the interview (Miles et al., 2014). In this way, the informants had a chance to consider whether their words on the taped recording matched what they intended to say or convey (Shenton, 2004). The researcher is then able to "confirm the accuracy of the conclusions drawn" (Zach, 2006, p. 7).

In conjunction with participants and their contexts, the lens of the researcher is utilized in judging or determining what constitutes a theme (or sub-theme) in the analysis of research. A theme may illuminate superficial or deep, simple or complex, experiences of participants both as individuals and/or as part of one or more collective groups. The themes provide a guide to answering the research questions and hold meaning in relation to the data set; that is, all the data selected from the data corpus that are being used for a particular analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Themes within data can be identified in either an inductive or deductive way. This research has been mainly inductive, but certainly has had broad cognizance of the strong deductive influences, in particular the influence from the critical analysis of the literature. Morse (2003) suggested that the inductive drive is "primarily used for developing description and for deriving meaning and interpretation of the phenomena" (p. 199), whereas the deductive drive is towards testing or validating theory often in consultation with the literature (Hunter & Brewer, 2003). In this way, a summary framework was produced which reflected the research objectives (deductive) and the themes highlighted from the literature (deductive), as well as the themes and sub-themes which were drawn from the raw data (inductive) (Miles et al., 2014; Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Further credibility has been established in this study by "turning to individuals external to the project" (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p. 128). This is often referred to as an audit trail where other experts examine the "product of the inquiry, and determine

the trustworthiness of the findings" (p. 128). Anonymous raw data (transcripts and field notes) were reviewed to assess themes and inferences in relation to those noted by the key researcher. One Māori and one Pasifika expert, along with several post-graduate students, reviewed a number of transcripts and interpretations. I met with them after their reviews. They talked me through the similarities and differences they had drawn from the data in comparison to my own analysis of evidence. Their recommendations were carefully considered in the final write up (Miles et al., 2014). In addition, throughout the research process my supervisors reviewed a number of transcripts and interpretations, and revised some interpretations of the evidence presented.

Limitations and Key Assumptions

This research is only concerned with Māori and Pasifika pastoral care and to what extent it affects student retention and wellbeing at secondary school. Although this is linked to achievement outcomes, the study is not examining achievement outcomes *per se*. It is acknowledged that Māori and Pasifika experiences are shaped by other ethnic groups of students in their given school context, but the study was not concerned with other ethnic groups; or with educative institutions outside of the mainstream. The research does not represent all Māori and Pasifika students' experiences in all secondary schools, and the scope was too small to include specific pastoral care for disabled students. The study is limited by the small sample size of four schools, although the research was strengthened by a large number of school observations over an extended period of time, as well as multiple interviews. The following assumptions were derived from the literature that was integral to the research:

• that pastoral care has the potential to enable Māori and Pasifika students to thrive
• that pastoral care is vital in education due to the need to care for the whole person/student in their particular context

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Be who you are and say what you feel because
those who mind don't matter
and those who matter don't mind.
Dr. Seuss

In this chapter, the results of the individual interviews and focus groups are presented. These incorporate themes and sub-themes that became evident from analysis of the data. Accompanying italicized quotations from interviewees are provided. Participants are represented by a pseudonym, to protect their anonymity. Student respondents also have decile signifiers high or low alongside their pseudonym. Adult respondents do not have any details to denote their role in the school (or its decile rating), in order to reduce the chance of identifiable information. Field note analysis of observations and information from the document analysis are presented after the interview and focus group data.

Even though the essence of Māori and Pasifika students' perspectives expressed through their needs and experiences form the backbone of all of the data, the results in this chapter are separated in to two sections. The reason for two sections is that interviewees predominantly bracketed pastoral care into those issues about which they named ethnic groups, and those which they did not. Therefore, even though the data in the first section still pertains to Māori and Pasifika, it is the second section that refers to data which specifically named Māori, *or* Pasifika people, along with data that referred to Māori *and* Pasifika people together as one group.

The importance of presenting the data in two sections is primarily due to the growing complexities of Māori and Pasifika ethnic groups in New Zealand. Although it might be easier for school staff to compartmentalize students into neat ethnic categories, the realities are that Māori and Pasifika students may have, for example, one parent who is perhaps Chinese, or Dutch. This may result in a young person who 'looks' Chinese, or another who has light skin like their Dutch parent. In addition, a student's surname may be a Chinese, or Dutch name. Whatever the combination of ethnicities, the young person may choose to identify with their Māori or Pasifika parent's ethnic group. Due to ethnic stereotyping of, for instance, Chinese or Dutch

people, the young person may, therefore, be excluded from appropriate pastoral care. Conversely, if a student prioritizes their identification with their Chinese, or Dutch ethnic group, they may be offended to be categorized into a stereotypically defined Māori or Pasifika ethnic group at school. These dynamics may also be apparent for children who are adopted into families with surnames (or stereotypical physical features), which do not indicate a student's ethnic identification; but more particularly their ethnic identification preference. This is, of course, never fixed. In addition, by presenting the data in the two sections, both naming and not-naming ethnic groups, similarities in implicit school staff discrimination towards young people may become apparent; and in this study more distinctly illuminated when we view the whole person through a socio-ecological lens.

Data from the staff interviews and student focus groups have been presented together partly as the case in this study is pastoral care, and partly because the *dance* of pastoral care does not separate school staff from students (Denzin, 2003). In fact, it was surprising how many of the themes were unanimous between Māori and Pasifika staff, and Māori and Pasifika students. It is, also, the interplay between students and staff which forms the nucleus for so much more within the school setting, the community, and beyond.

The respondents in the four focus groups were aged between 16 and 18 years. They were all self-identified Māori or Pasifika students. Two of the schools were single-sex, and two of the schools were co-educational. The staff members in the 41 individual interviews were from many ethnicities (including Māori and Pasifika). Their positions within the four schools included teachers, deans, principals, chaplains, deputy principals, careers advisors, counsellors, SENCO, technology staff and sports co-ordinators.

Interviews and Focus Groups

Section One: Data That Did Not Specifically Refer to Ethnicity
      The nature of pastoral care.

Safety.

In consideration of the nature of school pastoral care, safety was mentioned more often than anything else by interviewees. Some respondents spoke of safety holistically by way of including physical, mental, spiritual and emotional safety within the school environment.

> *If…spirituality is out…then it causes an imbalance in all those other things.*
>
> <div align="right">(Ema)</div>

Several participants – school staff and students – referred to safety at school being important due to the lack of stability which young people find outside of school. One respondent suggested that the community did not feel safe, so school was an important refuge.

> *For some kids this is their safe haven…we've got kids you know…like the amount of students that get 100% attendance for five years.*
>
> <div align="right">(Rana)</div>

In addition, emotional safety for students in times of need can be sought from school rather than outside of school.

> *[For some students]…when their parents have passed away and they've come to school even though they've got a tangi at home because this is their safe haven and going to the Deans is what they wanted to do and you know it is like far out.*
>
> (Rana)

A further extension of the requirements of safety for students included school staff recognizing when it was not safe to notify parents or family members of a young person's negative behaviour at school. Recognition of the realities of the student's family dynamics in the home did entail staff members mitigating against the young person being violently assaulted at home due to parental/family disapproval of the student's conduct at school.

You decide when to withhold…information from the family…to protect the
student…I don't want to be the reason that a kid goes home and gets a hiding.

<div align="right">(Lara)</div>

Trust.

In this way student safety was closely related to trust. Respondents often
mentioned that it can take a while to build trust between school staff and families.
Similarly, it can take time to build trust between individual staff members and
students; but it can be dismantled far more quickly if adequate care is not taken to
maintain the trust that has been built.

Once the trust is there the word quickly spreads around…once you are
trusted…you are trusted by the whole school and if you ever let somebody
down...the other side of the coin is that nobody will trust you.

<div align="right">(Matthew)</div>

Trust and Safety were partnered by several respondents, who referred to safety
in the classroom and safety on the sports field, as being important in terms of students
being able to try new things and take risks with their learning. In conjunction, one
interviewee noted that some schools are too big and therefore unsafe for both staff and
students. There was a belief that doors being left open in the school could foster an
atmosphere of safety and trust, as a starting point.

In relation – behind closed doors – the effects on student safety of social
media was seen as a growing concern for school staff aswell as students (Ford, 2008;
Li, Cross, & Smith, 2012; Dyson, Hendriks, & Grant, 2007). One respondent
suggested that it was worthwhile to remind families that most social media time for
young people is outside of school time, and therefore the onus was not entirely on
schools to provide internet safety. Similarly it was recommended that families raise
the awareness of the potential repercussions for students by venting their frustrations
about school staff on Facebook.

I often have the Year 10 girls in my office with cyber bullying…it's nasty…I deal with a lot of that…[we]…need to find ways of making school relevant for…[the bullies].

      (Susan)

In this way peer influence can be positive or negative in terms of student safety. The notion of brotherhood or sisterhood can be very strong for secondary students.

I want to stay at school for the brotherhood.

      (Riki. Student. Low Decile)

Safety, therefore, related to a sense of belonging was seen to be important for school retention. Anxieties were mentioned by several participants related to students wanting to retain the safety of their social connections when they leave school at the end of Year 13.

A lot of our…[students]…when they get to tertiary they struggle a bit because 'where is all my support gone,' you know.

      (Mark)

Environment.

The physical environment of the school was notable in terms of how learning was enhanced or hindered for school staff and the students. School staff referred to the value of a well configured, well resourced environment, often.

It would be good if we could have…a setup…[where]…you keep your junior classes together and things like that.

      (Stan)

Accessibility and privacy were linked to more beneficial pastoral care. Students were sometimes sensitive about being seen going to a building which housed counsellors, nurses and other visiting health professionals. It was important for the building to be easy to access, welcoming, and positioned out of view of the main classroom blocks.

I love the fact that the [student support] building is…accessible for our parents, our families…[and] the kids.

(Odette)

Comfortable spaces were viewed by several participants as components which assisted students to belong within their school, but also to help teachers and deans.

[I would like] a more comfortable learning environment. So, better classrooms…and smaller class numbers would be two things that I think would really make a difference.

(Philip)

Carpeted floors and common rooms were cited as useful for students to gather together and sit on the floor. For students, the physical environment and the resources within in were referred to many times in terms of the associated lack of opportunities.

Active students are all bunched up with other students trying to do quiet stuff.

(Kara. Student. Low Decile)

Some student misgivings revolved around wanting a bigger field, less concrete, a bigger less restricted music department, more practical experiences at school, more field trips, and more work experience. Most students wanted to go to Polyfest (a Polynesian cultural festival) every year, rather than every second year. One adult respondent lamented:

We are lacking in so many physical resources.

(Mary)

Relationships that contributed to school participation and retention.

Families.

The historical context of how education has been experienced/approached by a family was deemed by one participant to be a huge factor in relation to how a family

interacts with their child/ren's school. One respondent contended that it should not be an us and them (schools and families) approach. Rather, it was suggested that the impact and influence of families being with students for up to 18 hours a day needed to be acknowledged.

> *[Students] are only here for six hours of the day.*
>
> (Tia)

Another interviewee believed that some families approached schools with unrealistic expectations, almost like *come on school, turn them in to something*. This attitude was sometimes further endorsed at school interview time.

> *We've had parent-teacher interviews where we ring up home and there's been parents turn around and say oh yeah no I'm not really interested.*
>
> (Philip)

Yet several respondents believed that it was extremely important for parents to understand NCEA for their children's benefit. Despite this, one respondent mentioned that parents had – at times – been rude to a dean on the phone. Most deans did not tolerate verbal abuse. Another respondent recognized a difference in how Pākehā parents conducted themselves.

> *The biggest thing I've…noticed is with Pākehā kids their parents are…going to back their own kid irrelevant of what the actual situation is and they perhaps don't want to hear the full story of an incidence (sic) before blame is laid or expectations are made.*
>
> (Lara)

There were also situations where families were desperate for their child to do paid work because the family needed the money. Some deans tried to allow students to do paid work within the school day but still achieve NCEA at Chilwell College.

Teachers.

All respondents – students and staff members – endorsed the vitally important role that teachers play in pastoral care. Most of the sentiments also respected the boundaries between teachers and students.

> *We don't know teachers personally. There's still a boundary between students and teachers. There is still respect.*
>> (Ruby. Student. Low Decile)

Boundaries were also apparent for some interviewees in terms of teaching and caring. Some teachers viewed their role as one where they were at school purely to teach, while others included carer in the description of their role. Several respondents blended the above concepts in to an approach where it was suggested that teachers needed to do both (teach and care) in order to know their students.

> *Teachers…have got to actually talk to their kids and find out who it is that they're teaching.*
>> (Joe)

Where teachers did not adequately know their students, several respondents cited a lack of flexibility and adaptability on the part of the teachers.

> *[Some of the teachers in the more practically based subjects] won't make any allowances for our kids that can't do the book work. They can do the practical stuff.*
> (Joe)

Lack of knowledge of a student was also referred to by one highly experienced staff member as a detrimental factor towards caring, because the teacher was less able to know what a student's triggers were.

> *[Some] poor teachers don't know that that they're pulling a trigger [with a particular student].*
>> (George)

In addition, another participant endorsed the intransigent mindset of some teachers.

Teachers…get fixed in one place and this is what they know and that's it.

(Peggy)

Conversely, some respondents believed that good teachers show their fallibility.

[As a teacher] I will talk a lot about me as a mum and my family just so they can see that I'm not an alien...I have issues with my kids.

(Phyllis)

Sometimes I don't have a filter but I just want kids to see that teachers are real; we are real people.

(Iris)

The human side of teachers extended to the ease with which students engaged in class. Some interviewees gave the impression that experiences of teachers at their present school may have been in comparison to teachers at a previous school. This was in relation to an inferred point that discomfort with teachers might result in less engagement.

We are comfortable with our teachers so it's easier to learn.

(Mia. Student. Low Decile)

Another student reinforced the comfort with their teachers, and inadvertently endorsed caring as being relevant to teaching and learning. Interestingly, the student had also linked supporting and caring together.

All of the teachers are pretty supportive. It feels like they care about the students.

(Pip. Student. Low Decile)

Many respondents also spoke of caring aspects related to their jobs which they believed removed some of the barriers to learning for students. These included: academic counselling rather than parent-teacher interviews, homework centres after school, tailoring student's programmes in the senior years, building resilience in students, reducing class size, reducing noise levels, keeping students in class rather than doing too many activities, progressing top students further, and ensuring teachers refer students on to other professionals when necessary instead of coping alone.

Every single thing you do in teaching is relational.

(Susan)

Homeroom teacher.

The Homeroom teacher (or Tutor Group teacher, or Form Room teacher) was a notable figure in pastoral care in this study. A homeroom is either a vertical (mixed secondary school year groups), or horizontal (same secondary year groups) class, where students have continuity of a homeroom teacher/tutor teacher/form teacher. The specialist subjects and teachers branch off from this centralized homeroom base for the students.

We say that the tutor teacher is as the significant adult in the school for each student.

(Nicky)

The overriding belief was that it was best for students to meet with the homeroom teacher at least four times a week. Homeroom teachers tended to have more time with the students than deans, and this was expanded when students had the same homeroom teacher for the five years of secondary school.

Students see their tutor teacher every single day and the tutor teachers deal with a lot of the day to day issues.

(Edith)

One respondent stated that students would sometimes move to another homeroom teacher if they don't feel cared for. Overall smaller homerooms were seen

to be beneficial and the homeroom teacher was viewed as a good news messenger or neutral messenger for families compared to the dean.

The tutor teacher's starting to see that bigger picture with a student.

(Flora)

House system.

Similarly with the school house system, several interviewees suggested that the house structure needed to work for each student. The school house system intended to provide a sense of belonging as students are allocated a house when they start at a school. Sometimes this will be the same house as their older sibling/s, parents, or grandparents were in. The house system in schools generally promotes leadership opportunities, mentoring roles, and team spirit (utilized as a unifying component particularly in bigger schools).

You're…giving those kids a chance to actually grow because there is someone caring about them.

(Alexander)

One respondent mentioned that if students did not get on with a dean in a house, there would be another significant adult (sometimes a co-dean, or a deputy dean) for them to turn to in the same house.

Discipline.

The restorative approach to discipline was often mentioned by respondents. There was a prevalent belief that the restorative approach could enable students to have awareness of the impact they had on a teacher, and a teacher could gain some insight in to what drove a particular student's behaviour. One senior staff member, however, suggested that the restorative approach is not what it seems.

It is a great way of getting to know the people but the problem is that teachers don't want to know…it is just a get out of jail free card for the teacher and it's not used consistently [across the school].

(Joe)

Conversely, two participants contended that the restorative approach lets parents know that everyone is in a partnership, rather than the ensuing negativity being held solely by parents if they feel they are fully responsible for their children's issues.

> *We know that often when the news goes home that the child is misbehaving that they'll get the bash.*
>
> (George)

When the bigger picture was focused on (which included possible outcomes), there was a movement away from oversimplified blame on the student's undesirable action.

> *School-based sanctions don't necessarily improve the relationships with the kids and the parents, and engage learning. It comes down to talking with the families [and asking them:] 'what do you think we can do'?*
>
> (Leonard)

School policies, though, linked to issues such as major physical fights could result in students being instantaneously stood down in some schools. One respondent believed that doing a stand down made a statement, but it did not necessarily fix anything. In relation, school retention going up could create statistical problems for schools because their stand down numbers could go up. Stand-downs for drugs could be alleviated by drug testing within schools according to one teacher.

> *We offered drug testing…we give them eight weeks to get clean and it gives the…[student]…a weapon against…friends even though it's not legally true…[the student] can say…I can't have a smoke because I might get kicked out of school, they're going to test me.*
>
> (Robert)

One respondent suggested that more contextual behavioural management strategy advice could be given to adults in positions of authority.

If you've got a PE teacher struggling then they refer to a…dean and the…dean is a maths teacher then the classroom behaviour management strategies for the maths teacher will be significantly different to what a PE teacher needs teaching on the field or the courts.

(Joe)

Several other respondents believed that when school staff knew a student and interpreted the disciplinary code for a student's benefit then discipline would be easier.

[If] …you're sending a kid out to somewhere else to be dealt with, you're not developing a relationship. The other person... is developing the relationship.

(George)

In conjunction, a dean suggested school staff encourage the behaviours we want to see. This involved effective differentiation for learners in each class.

Most [non-ideal] behaviour in class is because the kids are bored either because they can't do it or it's too easy.

(Leonard)

Deans.

Participants mostly believed that deans contributed to pastoral care for young people to a large degree. The role of a dean was frequently portrayed as marvellous work; but very often it was also overwhelming.

The deans are overworked and…if you were to ask teachers they would probably say that often they don't feel supported…[as] …a dean you are just fighting fires all the time…and often what teachers believe is a priority is not necessarily.

(Odette)

The feeling of being overworked included: the pressure of having to teach three periods as day as well as deaning, the difficulties of matching some dean's philosophies with others, the pressure of phonecalls to parents, or other dean work after hours, and the requirement of excellent intra-school collaboration as effective deaning cannot be done in isolation.

> *Pastoral care is not something that we can do at school, leave it at school, go home, forget about it. It's constantly there all the time.*
>
> (Edith)

In addition, the pressure on deans to know their students was evident. Knowing their students incorporated a range of factors, but initially deans were simply expected to know students' names. Acknowledging a student also came down to the dean's management in relation to how the dean approached a student.

> *If you have a kid in your house and you don't know their name, that's just like relationship damage.*
>
> (Alexander)

Conversely, if a dean hasn't shared something of themselves to students, there can be a chasm which restricts students in their relating.

> *If the child knows you, they can be honest with you. Kids are quite defensive if they don't know who they are dealing with.*
>
> (Alexander)

An additional barrier for deans was time. Several respondents referred to a lack of time in order to investigate a particular student's situation. There were either too many competing demands, or the process of tending to a student's needs was continuously broken up by other requests. One dean was disappointed that each student could not be reached at least once each term.

I would really love [as a dean] to have an opportunity to sit down with every single one of my students once a term just to have a catch up…just have a five minute chat, but [we] just don't have time.

(Ra)

The provision of time seemed important for those students who were shy, or who took several years to warm-up to a dean. Trust was sometimes slow to build and could include a dean purposefully visiting classes on a regular basis, saying hello to students around the school, letting students pop-in to dean's offices to talk about positive or negative things, and congratulating anything noteworthy at assembly, or in class.

Deaning is experiential – you have to do it – and every situation can be slightly different yet there's not one size fits all.

(Susan)

The variety of deaning approaches required in order to attempt to meet students' needs, were referred to by most deans. Some of the aspects which deans felt were necessary to juggle included: keeping an eye on students as a form of support, prioritizing issues which came to the deans' offices so that the first student issue to arrive was not necessarily the first issue to be dealt with, and attending to many home-based family issues which came to the deans' attention.

[Students] come in and make a disclosure which we can't listen to…abuse…[deans] can't process that because we're not subject to the same rules as counsellors are.

(George)

Several interviewees believed that seeking and offering support to students involved dealing with barriers. The deans acknowledged that they had more of an overview of students than teachers; which could include delicate and confidential information. Deans suggested that it was still in a teacher's best interests to check the student pastoral records for any information that was available on a student in order to remove some of the tension between a dean's approach and that of a teacher.

One of the things that I have had to deal with is the fact that some of the decisions that I make don't sit well with other teachers because…there is a lot of information that I'm privy to [as a dean] that…teachers are not.

(Ema)

Many respondents referred to the broad role of support which deans offered students. Two interviewees believed that deaning was a bit punitive in its approach for some staff members. There was a sentiment that the image of a dean needed to change from somebody only involved with naughty kids (remedial work) to somebody who cares about students and helps them overcome barriers to learning (proactive pastoral care). Several respondents mentioned cusp students who were not necessarily going to achieve unless they had intervention, but the complex realities of supporting students were sometimes compounded by factors such as the student's family situation. Some families said they would attend meetings about their child, but they did not turn up. Other families would come to a meeting with a dean but the tension in the meeting did not improve until the family realized that the meeting was about their child's wellbeing, rather than a narrow punitive focus.

You can just see people thaw out.
(Susan)

One respondent reflected on the difficulties of phoning a student's home. An example of the start of the conversation was:

Dean: "How are you today?" Parent: "Well I was fine until you rung up."
(Leonard)

The response from one interviewee to such situations was resolute.

I think if we could save everybody we would, but I have learned…[as]…a dean that you just can't.
(Phyllis)

Similar thoughts were acknowledged by other deans:

A lot of parents you become very close to. They're not friends exactly but they know they can rely on you.

(Susan)

Working with a student…when it gets to a point where I'm exhausting my abilities to influence change then the deputy principal will step in…when it becomes a disproportionate use of your time with one student, yes, we have got that back-up.

(Nicky)

Counsellors.

The role of counsellors in pastoral care appeared to be one of great variation in terms of how counsellors perceived themselves, and how other school staff perceived them. On one hand counsellors spoke of teachers needing to trust counsellors when counsellors are unable to tell teachers all the details of what is going on for a student. On the other hand concern was expressed that there needed to be a reduction in conflict between counsellors and senior management due to the damage which counsellors can do in a school; and the trust or acceptance which is eroded between counsellors and other staff as a result.

Counsellors…need to be seeing someone, it's too much they carry round and they need to be well if they are going to function in this job…If you are not well you can make some big blunders.

(Fred)

One respondent believed that counsellors were told daily by various students, "I can't get on with this teacher," so the counsellor provided students with a toolbox in order to help students cope at school. Yet teachers mentioned that there were good and bad counsellors.

Some kids don't want to access…[the counsellors]…because they don't enjoy them…it's a mixed opinion on them.

(Lara)

Counsellors referred to the difficulties in deciphering which students actually had an issue and which students were simply making excuses for themselves. There was also evident pressure on counsellor resources in relation to demands on their time, and being over-booked.

To make my role easier I would have a…receptionist…filter out the kids who are…trying to avoid going to class…dealing with the human traffic…so I could just focus on…the kid in my office.
(Max)

One counsellor suggested that there are always 10% of students who have issues beyond a teacher's abilities. For these young people, a participant believed that it can be useful to find out what some of a student's underlying issues are (even when it took a long time). The difficulties were compounded when students acted as gatekeepers to information because they did not want their parents to know certain facts. If, however, the information concerned the safety of a particular student, or other students, then particular people might have to be told; sometimes a parent would not be told information if they were the perpetrator of abuse.

[Lots of staff] live in the community…and we try to prioritise partnerships with parents… [Sometimes] it's tricky with the counsellors because there's a confidentiality component.
(Fred)

Counsellors tended to work with individual students rather than families. One respondent noted, however, that for some students, once their parents had been contacted the student might be more receptive to counselling; otherwise the student might not be as willing. In conjunction, several interviewees believed that some young people did not want to engage with a counsellor (or social worker) who shared the same ethnicity as themselves.

I would never go to counsellors.
(Ana. Student. High Decile)

From a school staff perspective counselling roles appeared to be centred around assisting students to adapt to the school, and working out how the school could adapt to the student.

We need an ethos of we are all in this and provide community support for kids.

(Fred)

Furthermore, one participant saw school as a community of care with counsellors providing particular specialist knowledge to the community.

It's really an important skill to know how far to go before you hand it on…first up all teachers should be…caring but they've got to understand not to go too far and get in to trouble [with student's problems].

(Fred)

Sometimes, though, the divisions of care appeared to be blurred when caring for students.

[Out of class services for students need to] advocate for that one kid or those two kids that a teacher really can't [advocate for]. Teachers are in a class of thirty.

(Fred)

Careers Advisors.

Careers Advisors referred to an ability to be able to see the big picture for a student. When a student is struggling at school, it was suggested that careers advisors could step in, assist with where the journey was going, and motivate the student.

We have a point of difference…[because]…we see the picture [for the student] the whole time.

(Flora)

When students wanted to leave school to pursue other options, several interviewees believed that careers advisors could assist a student.

> *[If students want to drop out of school, it's] 'well, what are you dropping out to'? We'll go [and] get careers involved.*
> (Susan)

The Gateway programme develops relationships with employers, but one interviewee cautioned that only suitable students were placed with employers as the school did not want to damage the relationship with the employers. Where students wanted to assess a job before they committed to study/training, a staff member supported the value of work experience.

> *[We need] more time to take students outside of class so that they can experience stuff. So if they want to be a lawyer they can actually go and experience what it is to be a lawyer for a day…just one day in five years…but it is really hard to plan that kind of stuff.*
> (Ra)

One respondent believed that there was not enough careers advice, but also that the type of careers advisors with whom students were engaging could have a negative effect on student choices/outcomes. Another respondent suggested that even though career advisory work is easier than teaching (because there is not a discipline component), it would still be preferable to have less administration to do, and more time with the students.

Sport.

Sport, as an extracurricular activity, was seen by many respondents as a multi-dimensional, positive factor in young people's lives. One senior staff member, however, drew attention to a lack of participation by some young people.

A lot of the kids don't want to or they appear afraid of trying or giving 100% in case they fail [across the school curriculum] ...I guess it relates back to sport as well within the school.

(Philip)

Conversely, another respondent noted the protective aspect of sport.

In a week I'd probably get three or four stand-down notices come through...that's 30 or 40 a term...maybe two [of those students] a year are involved in a sports team.

(Peggy)

Even though one staff member believed that sporty kids are not druggies or taggers, there was still tension around sport in schools. Some tension was located around allocating time/s for sport.

Most of the teachers here don't believe there is room for sport in education.

(Sandra)

Whilst other tensions were pinpointed by students in terms of opportunities and recognition in sport. The lack of acknowledgement of Under 15 rugby teams, Second XV rugby teams, and netball teams was endorsed by an adult interviewee.

The good average person who might play in the third netball team or even the second netball team and be a great student and be well liked, chances are senior management won't even know they are in it.

(Peggy)

In relation to the lack of opportunity one student respondent recognized that sport was not necessarily open for all willing participants.

There are heaps of sports but you have to be really good at it.

(William. Student. High Decile)

In addition, racism was apparent in inter-school sport. Student respondents were forceful in their articulation of experiences of racism in sport, and overt when conveying how frequent verbal criticism was levelled at them.

When we play rugby they are racist…if there are some white rugby players we give them heaps.
(Tana. Student. Low Decile)

Participation in sport from the beginning of secondary school was seen to be vital by one respondent. Several staff members also believed sport could be a protective factor for young people, along with positive physical health outcomes.

If I can't capture...[students] into sport probably within the first six months [of secondary school] then I will lose them.
(Sandra)

It was also acknowledged that young people pull out of sport because their parents might be working, or cannot offer transport, or are not interested. One senior staff member believed that if local church ministers could link with school sport, then participation rates would increase significantly.

Our numbers would go like this [points upwards]
(Peggy)

Another perceived way to increase sport participation was for schools to employ sports co-ordinators. As an adjunct, the positive effects of bonding with, and getting to know parents/families through sport aswell as increasing school pride, was endorsed by several respondents. In a related way, physical education (PE) was touted as a component of school in which senior students potentially gained leadership roles by running junior classes or organizing lunchtime tournaments.

Make PE compulsory for every year you are at high school... make PE
compulsory in every school in the country…do what the South Island
does…have no classes on a Wednesday afternoon.

<div align="center">(Peggy)</div>

There was a caution, though, around boundaries related to coaches when relationships were formed because external sports coaches sometimes came in to school to support a student who was in trouble.

If you've got 16/17 year old students going around to coaches' houses to have
drinks they are under 18…there's legalities around it.

<div align="center">(Philip)</div>

Decile and links beyond school.

Respondents in the interviews and focus groups tended to have reasonably strong opinions about school decile ratings and the relevance of them to pastoral care within their own school. Overall the interviewees believed decile was more of an issue for low decile schools, as many people perceived a low decile to be negative. The negativity extended to factors such as less access to technology in lower decile schools (Jesson, Annan, McNaughton, & Snedden, 2014), and communication problems with parents/families.

[In decile 1, the students] are either hungry, not fully clothed, haven't had
much sleep, don't have all the resources, don't even have internet or
computers at home… whereas you've got kids who are in decile 10 who have
all that, that is just part and parcel.

<div align="center">(Tia)</div>

Communication.
Communication was a major concern for many respondents. The problems with communication outweighed the positive aspects. Two streams of communication were clearly apparent: communication with families, and communication between school staff. Communication with families often failed due to a myriad of factors.

You often find that students of the highest need have the most difficult parents to get in touch with probably just because [that's] the way they are coping with the need.
(Antoinette)

Digital networks such as parent portals, Facebook, email and twitter feeds were seen to be useful for communication with parents. When none of these options were utilized by families (whether by financial limitations or choice), school staff found basic communication such as attendance issues to be more difficult.

[A] big thing is attendance. If our kids can be here for 95% of the time then they are going to achieve.
(Lara)

School staff often spoke of attendance taking too much time and requiring more resources than were available.

We spend a lot of time…trying to get these kids to school who don't really want to come.
(Stan)

Several respondents acknowledged that some school communication systems break down most days which meant that about half of the daily notices failed. Deans were noted to be particularly affected by inadequate communication lines within the school environment. Deans communicating with other deans was seen to be an important facet of their role, but so too was wider communication with the school and community.

[Deans can't do their] job in isolation…[they] have to engage with the teachers…have to engage with the families…have to engage with all the support networks.
(Susan)

Many deans spoke of the paperwork being enormous in their roles, and that they would benefit from some administrative assistance. Ineffectual communication systems appeared to be exacerbating some deans' workloads.

Dealing with the 'deaning' stuff…the admin tends to get pushed to the back…and we end up…doing it at home.

(Edith)

Language barriers.

English as a second language was a further difficulty for several school staff members when they attempted to contact some students' families. One respondent noted that leaving a message in English on the family's answerphone elicited no response. Conversely, when a dean who spoke the same language as a family contacted them, the family was open to communication with the school. Respondents readily acknowledged that literacy needed to be more supported for Pasifika students in school (Gorinski & Fraser, 2006). Translators in Pasifika languages were seen to help young people in school, families in parent-teacher interviews, and families in general school interactions.

Parents are better off teaching their kids how to speak their mother tongue…let us teach them English…Better to have strength in one language that we can communicate with you in, than two that you can't.

(Dave)

Respondents often mentioned the difficulties of contacting parents/families in low deciles when there is no landline, a series of wrong or disconnected numbers, no cell-phone top-up of payment, cellphone numbers which have changed multiple times, or language barriers on answer phones. Language barriers were seen to have a negative impact in circumstances where a teacher leaves a message in English, but if English is not the family's first language then a family member was less likely to respond to the teacher/staff member. School staff members were often concerned that a school student was not receiving the care they required due to factors which became more pronounced the lower the school decile was.

Because our families didn't go all the way through school we can see the struggle and what happened to them so we want it to be different.

(Lani. Student. Low Decile)

Most of us struggle financially so we want to get some qualifications and get a job.

(Ava. Student. Low Decile)

One respondent believed it was difficult to get good staff in to Decile 1 schools, and that once staff are there, that it is harder for them to move back up in to higher decile teaching positions.

Teachers from schools who are decile 9 [and] 10 moan about first world problems [they] need to harden up and come and do a year with us [in a low decile] and then stop…moaning and complaining.

(Tia)

Similarly, school attendance issues were seen to be more pronounced in the lower decile schools. Several participants believed that lower decile parents were more likely to give-up on endorsing school attendance for their children once a child was 16, 17 or 18 (as it is not compulsory to remain at school). This issue was compounded in families where parents did shiftwork.

We want to improve things for our families financially.

(Aniva. Student. Low Decile)

Some respondents believed that lower decile schools required more funding and more help with social services and health services. Parents/families in low decile schools often apply much later than was seen to be ideal for funding such as Higher Learning Needs (HLN) and The Ongoing and Reviewable Resourcing Schemes (ORRS). These families were seen to be disadvantaged in terms of pastoral care because young people in low decile schools were not receiving the help they were entitled to, in many instances. One respondent believed this may be exacerbated by

Pasifika families sometimes concealing their disabled, and dyslexic children. In addition, low decile schools needed more visiting doctors.

> *[Decile] it sucks and…I mean it sucks.*
>
> (Tia)

A further aspect of disadvantage for low decile schools related to counselling. Counsellors working in low decile schools were seen to have their time actually counselling students impacted on by the amount of referrals required to Child, Youth and Family Services (CYFS) and mental health services. In comparison, higher decile schools were perceived to do less referrals to outside services.

In this study, the higher decile school respondents spoke less about decile. For several of the interviewees, the school's decile rating had absolutely no bearing on their roles. The higher decile staff referred to decile in relation to achievement rather than incorporating health needs of the students (Snook & O'Neill, 2014). Many respondents believed that in higher decile schools, higher achievement was the norm. The high decile schools were perceived to be able to drop the teacher/student ratio because they did not need to pay as many support services. Instead of paying a teacher salary to a full-time counsellor, for instance, a high decile school was more likely to employ an additional teacher.

> *Decile…it is a code for something.*
>
> (Mary)

Uniforms.

Uniforms were noted by several participants as a barrier to young people fully participating in school.

> *Don't let uniform issues deprive a student of an education.*
>
> (Philip)

For families who could not afford uniforms, some staff members had devised ways to provide uniforms discretely to students. The staff members either found ways

for the school to fund a uniform or for the school to sell second hand uniforms for a price as low as $5 to students who required them. Several students felt very strongly about their uniform being distasteful, or their uniform changing too often. At Lambert High School and Chilwell College observations of students discussing uniforms in their peer groups endorsed the focus group findings; especially those Samoan students who wanted to wear a lavalava (a piece of cloth worn as a loincloth or skirt).

Stop changing the uniform. It is too expensive.

(Nava. Student. Low Decile)

Funding.

Funding in education was recognized as a significant contributory factor towards the comprehensive consideration of students' needs, by many participants. Of particular note was ORRS funding and HLN. ORRS funding is available from when a student starts school, until they have finished Year 13; and for assisting students in to the workforce. The funding is very difficult to get, but once a student is allocated the funds, then their specific funding is attached to the student regardless of whether they change schools.

If kids can dress themselves and get to school they are not going to get ORRS funding.

(Antoinette)

Other students can sit in the category below ORRS, which is HLN. Again, it can be difficult for school staff to get these funds allocated to a student, and SENCO was also seen to be putting inadequate funding in to schools.

[We have a student with] cerebral palsy…[who]…is scoring too high on the cognitive. So…[the student]…gets no [Higher Learning Needs] support.

(Antoinette)

There are lots of students who can't cope with mainstream but there is nowhere to put them.

(Antoinette)

97

Similar frustrated sentiments from several other respondents included perceived inadequacies in areas such as: underfunding social workers, diluting funding for successful programmes in schools, paying support staff too little, and expecting schools to reallocate funds in order to sustain programmes once the government withdraws its support after 2-3 years.

> *Funding has been decreased…and we've had to rely on the goodwill of teachers to carry on and maintain those programmes.*
>
> (Ema)

Another area of funding concern for two interviewees was related to Resource Teacher Learning and Behaviour (RTLBs). Usually RTLBs come from a primary teaching background which means they can teach up to Year 10. Funding, therefore, for RTLBs stops at the end of Year 10; although sometimes applications can be put in for funding beyond Year 10. RTLBs, however, have been referred to as a very loose service and there was sometimes tension around them being in a classroom.

> *The RTLB is not there theoretically…to work with the kid, they are there to work with the teacher. So teachers don't like that.*
>
> (Joe)

It is also becoming less likely that RTLBs are situated in a particular school, so tensions with teachers, aswell as other school staff, have become more pronounced.

> *We had to have itinerant RTLBs…we have between eight and ten RTLBs coming in to the school each week to work with one kid…they only take referrals…twice a term…you often have to wait.*
>
> (Fred)

A further area of funding issues were related to Alternative Education (AE). It is known that some Year 12 and 13 students have not been gaining any credits and they have been asked to move on from school.

[Kids who have found school difficult] turn 16…and it will just get to the point where [they have] 21 days absent and [they'll] be out on [their] own.

(Joe)

Transitioning students from school to another institution.

When a student wanted to leave school, several respondents believed that there was quite a bit of skepticism about some of the courses they might transition to.

All these courses are merely bums on seats making people money with no real outcome for the kids.

(Dave)

One staff member suggested that lack of confidence could keep students in school even though it might be more beneficial for the student to move on to another institution.

We don't just go 'okay goodbye' but we try to put the steps in place and make sure that everything is supported and that [it] is an easy transition, it's not a scary thing.

(Ra)

Alternative education.

One respondent saw AE as a dumping ground. Many aspects of AE were cited as inadequate, such as: the funding streams being totally different to mainstream, the physical environments of some AE facilities being inappropriate, the employment of qualified teachers being greatly needed (Clark et al., 2010a, 2010b; Higgins & Nairn, 2014), mainstream students stigmatizing AE students when they were situated within mainstream school grounds, and the transitioning from AE back to mainstream (or vice versa) being ineffectively managed.

There needs to be…a folder that we give to the AE provider saying look this is where the kid is [at] …so they clearly know what they are getting.

(Joe)

Trade academies.

Trade Academies can assist students in minimizing the big transition between school and the workplace. Several points were made regarding the potential benefits of trade academies: student attendance was likely to go up because academies have been teaching the responsibility of turning up to a job, the first experience of being in a quasi-workplace was within a safe environment, and students who have not achieved much in an academic classroom can relate real life processes to subject learning such as concrete volume calculations to maths.

> *You've got to hold…[the students']…interest each day.*
>
> > (Timothy)

One respondent, however, lamented that attracting good staff in to a trade academy can be difficult because it is hard to pay them adequately.

Other agencies.

The interactions of school staff with outside agencies often appeared to be a fraught situation. Truancy management arose as an area of concern for several interviewees. One participant believed that it would be better to give resources to the school to deliver its own truancy service.

> *Truancy officers…[are] traditionally not great…but I think there's so many kids for them to deal with they probably struggle 'cause they're across a lot of schools.*
>
> (Stan)

An organization funded by the government with the intention of referring students to attendance officers (once students drop to about 60% attendance) was mentioned negatively by one interviewee. The organization was not seen to be fulfilling their role sufficiently.

> *Cynically, they're a group of people…that really hit the government gravy train.*
>
> (Cameron)

Several respondents despaired that social services were increasingly being situated outside of the school so that they were available on demand. The participants believed it was an approach that appeared to value efficiency, so that adults were not sitting around in a school waiting for students to come to them. It was not necessarily seen as a good care model.

This school works with lots of police. The kids who are fifteen and a half find that nothing happens because everyone is shrugging their shoulders saying they're about to turn sixteen. It's a challenge.

(Cameron)

Tensions were also apparent when schools attempted to work with other agencies. An overriding view was that outside agencies were often problematic and very slow. One interviewee contended that who phones CYFS could make a difference in terms of whether a student received adequate care, or not.

We refer people to CYFS and that's not particularly helpful generally.

(Cameron)

Timing was also suggested by one interviewee as potentially having an impact on outcomes with CYFS. Sometimes it was seen to be better for families to seek CYFS help earlier rather than later. Even though several participants believed that schools needed to reach out for specialist advice when there was high student need, the realities of doing so were often stressful for school staff. One respondent mentioned the burden on school counsellors when Counsel for the Child came in to the school, as the student was often distressed when they were sent back to class. School counsellors were often already overburdened and found it difficult to support the student. This was compounded by outside agencies arriving at a school at any time of the school day and getting students out of class. The situation could be further exacerbated by outside agencies coming in to a school to meet a student when the referral had been made outside of school. Some schools tried to enforce the idea that referrals taken outside of school were preferably taken to agencies outside of school time.

Unfortunately a lot of agencies see themselves as the experts:'give us the kid and we'll give them back to you when they are fixed.'

(Fred)

Summary of Data That Did Not Refer to Ethnicity Directly

The nature of pastoral care was closely linked to adult respondents, predominantly, intending to position the whole child (Noddings, 2005a, 2005b) at the centre of their work in schools. The intentions of all staff interviewed were admirable, yet the approaches to pastoral care illustrated a continuum of those staff members who perceived pastoral care to be somewhat more strongly related to discipline (remedial), and those who believed pastoral care was about putting as many positive factors in place (as possible), for each student (Hearn et al., 2006). The *success* of pastoral care in the four schools was indisputably related to relationships which were formed between any given staff member, and a student. The emphasis on knowing each student was commonly referred to, although the difficulties of doing so in the present system, were also highlighted.

Student respondents were extremely opinionated about which staff members they liked, and which staff they would trust. There was a vast amount of confidence in particular staff members in each school, and some were referred to with fondness. There was also, however, despondency in relation to the small number of connections which other students had formed with staff members; some accounts were of students attending secondary school for five years with scarcely an adult who *knew* them. Favoured relationships were given a lot of emphasis by students, especially if these links were with only one or two adults at school. The dilemma this posed was that if a favourite staff member left the school, or was away often, or too busy, students felt in limbo/disconnected. Similarly, families were recognized as gravitating towards certain staff members, and mostly developing trust slowly. Sometimes this put significant (possibly unsustainable) pressure on a staff member. The situation was compounded if the staff member themselves did not feel adequately supported, or recognized, or prepared. The school's physical environment was, also, noted as either a positive, or negative feature of pastoral care depending on its age, maintenance,

space and atmosphere. Facilities and resources (Thrupp, 2014) in the school were seen to either enhance or hinder the process of pastoral care (and positive collectivity).

Decile differences between low and higher decile schools were profound for students, and staff. Communication with young people's families was an overt need for staff in each school in terms of tending to students' requirements. In low decile schools, however, family resources (financial, time or language) were significant barriers to meeting students' needs through effective school-to-home linkages (Santamaria, Webber, McKinley, & Madjar, 2014; Snook & O'Neill, 2014; Thrupp, 2014; Perez, 2009). Additional factors which staff believed impacted on this connection were family members' own experiences of school (Thrupp, 2006a; Schulruf et al., 2008; Milne, 2014).

The funding of low decile schools, along with governmental funds for students' special requirements (Bevan-Brown, 2006) within the schools, were acknowledged to be inadequate and replete with barriers. Low decile students, despite many staff doing remarkable work, were unable to offer students as many experiences at school as those in a higher decile (O'Connor, 2014). Although some notable NCEA results were being achieved in low decile schools, looking through a socio-ecological lens, many aspects of young peoples' wellbeing were not given adequate opportunity to flourish (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Snook & O'Neill, 2014). Limited access to different types of sports, or access to a wide range of options in the performing arts/music meant that financially disadvantaged students were further disadvantaged. This was also apparent in limited subject choices (O'Connor, 2014; Snook & O'Neill, 2014; Karlson & Nazroo, 2006; Thrupp, 2006a), inadequate timetabling (Oakes, 2005), and limited extension work (Bevan-Brown, 2009a, 2009b). Consequently, low decile communities were receiving "more structured and item-focused teaching which…[limited]…access to higher-order aspects of curricula" (Jesson et al., 2014, p. 253).

Low decile schools found it harder to attract excellent staff (Thrupp, 2014). This was partly seen as low decile schools being an unfavourable career option for some teachers, but staff also spoke of the weightier workload in order to compensate for low-socioeconomic difficulties (Thrupp, 2014). Often this resulted in staff giving

food to families (outside of school), as well as their children at school (Wynd, 2014). Uniform difficulties were a prevalent factor for which schools were utilising time and school resources in order to limit the shame for students of not having a uniform. Lack of computers, or access to the internet at home were further factors which separated low decile students from their higher decile counterparts. Small amounts of computer usage at school did not appear to be addressing this disadvantage (Mara, 2014), "thereby extending educational disparity through a digital divide" (Jesson et al., 2014, p. 253).

Schools were re-directing funding from, for example, social workers or counsellors to other areas of the school which further disadvantaged students who had previously benefitted from the services. Other agencies who linked with schools appeared to lack a suitable structure through which they could sensitively navigate the complexities of staff and student timetables, and need. Student health needs were included in the areas which were deficient in terms of the lack of a visiting general practitioner, lack of eye checks, ear checks, or psychologists (Mara, 2014; Snook & O'Neill, 2014). School staff frequently referred to being over-worked, over-burdened, and at times overwhelmed (Thrupp, 2014; ERO, 2015). Sports coaches and performance group staff were often welcome additions to the significant adults to whom students could turn to for support, guidance, or a sense of connectedness. Underpinning all of the above, for Māori and Pasifika students, were experiences of their ethnicities. The next section will explore these nuances.

Section Two: Referring Specifically to Māori and Pasifika

All of the above themes are intertwined with the daily complexities of Māori and Pasifika students interacting with each other; as well as with Māori, Pasifika, non-Māori and non-Pasifika school staff. The four school contexts in this study revealed an array of school staff responses towards caring for Māori and Pasifika students, along with varied responses from the students in relation to their interactions with school staff. At one end of the continuum were feelings of competency for school staff, whilst at the other end were feelings of frustration, professional isolation and, at times, being out of one's depth (Thrupp, 2014).

Adult respondents highlighted many commonalities and many divergent approaches to Māori and Pasifika students. Some participants kept Māori and Pasifika students together in their responses, whereas other participants separated Māori and Pasifika students in to two ethnic categories. For those who spoke of Māori and Pasifika together, the divergencies in terms of pastoral approaches towards students of particular ethnicities tended to be either a melting pot approach, or quite separate approaches towards each ethnic group of students. Many staff, however, were still *seeing* these students collectively as the long the brown tail of underachievement (Aumua, 2013).

I am aware…[of]… Māori and Pasifika but at the end of the day I just see kids sitting in front of me and just treat them the same.

(Phyllis)

I think there is no such thing as people who say oh but I treat my students all the same. It's rubbish. There is no way that you would treat a Māori student the same as a Pacific Island student.

(Tia)

The approaches towards school retention were also distinct in relation to perceptions of why Māori and Pasifika remained at, or moved on from school.

[Pasifika students stay on till Year 13 because of] parent expectations, and Pasifika parents are quite strict.

(Tania)

We don't have a whole lot [of Māori students] so with the few that are staying...I don't know what is keeping them here.

(Rana)

For the respondents who linked Māori and Pasifika *together*, perceptions were held, (either positively or negatively), regarding why Māori and Pasifika students would remain throughout the secondary school years.

Maori and Pasifika students stay on till the end of Year 13 because they're achieving and they know they can achieve.

(Mary)

[Most Māori and Pasifika students don't stay at school until the end of Year 13] because of poverty [and] there's no value for education in their home and the jobs they are going to get they can get when they are 16.

(Fred)

Similarly, staff members positioned Māori and Pasifika self-determination and will to succeed from varying standpoints.

Our Māori and Pacific families do want to be part of the problem solving and just be informed once we can get a hold of them.

(Lara)

For too long we've deficit theorized…about Māori and Pacific Islanders and they write themselves off.

(Odette)

In conjunction, initiatives and incentives for Māori and Pasifika students were sometimes perceived by individual staff members to be negative.

Pacific Island students shouldn't be priority learners when they are a migrant population like lots of others. Māori should be priority learners because they are tangata whenua.

(Cameron)

As much as I support everything, kids are kids at the end of the day and I would love…every kid to have what…[the Māori kids are]…getting.

(Phyllis)

An additional feature of some participants' responses was the reference to students identifying with more than one ethnic group and the complex dynamics this sometimes created.

[Students who are of mixed ethnicity] it's hard for the kids because sometimes it gets confusing…and [they] will get mock[ed] because [of] the…surname [not matching their physical appearance].

(Tania)

Being aware of the background and how the family functions is important…for a lot of mixed [ethnicity] kids now.

(Tania)

Respondents readily pinpointed components of their school which were instigated to assist Māori and Pasifika students, but there was not necessarily widespread belief in their efficacy. Culture at school appeared to be a divisive factor with Pasifika families showing more enthusiasm to school staff for 'tending' to their culture (themselves) at home, whereas it was not apparent that Māori families proposed such a distinction to staff in this study.

Culture nights [are] fantastic and celebration nights, but they don't directly translate into increased NCEA results.

(Cameron)

There's a person whose job it is to oversee Māori and Pacific achievement.

(Max)

Whilst most staff acknowledged that knowing a student is important for teachers and other school staff in terms of understanding a student, there were also staff who preferred to override these differences. Some school staff believed that they were simply teaching a room of students. Knowledge of students' backgrounds and their present realities appeared to be overlooked so that all students were 'treated' the same, now, and presumably in the future.

*I think…[the school] …could be a bit more understanding to the realities of
our [Pasifika] kids' situations.*

(Noah)

[Staff are] not looking at the person, they are not getting to know the person.

(Joe)

[Māori] don't like having the flashlight or the torch on them kind of thing.

(Phyllis)

*[Staff] should have the same expectations [for] their students regardless of
what ethnicity they come from.*

(Ra)

*It's not just dealing with them now at school as students, it's about looking
beyond this.*

(Edith)

For Māori and Pasifika teachers, there was evidence of being overwhelmed,
overburdened, and unfortunately, sometimes approaching burn out early in their
careers.

*It's a bit 'shame' to ask for help sometimes, you know, the school is looking at
you like you are the Māori teacher so you should know what you are doing.
But sometimes you are like actually well I need a bit of help and yes sometimes
you don't know who to ask.*

(Ra)

*Then I take all that stuff home and then I have to do a lot of weekend work and
I'm not moaning or complaining but that's the reality of it. I have to ring
parents at night because I can't get them during the day. Sometimes I have to
have parent conferences in the weekend because they are on shift work.*

(Tia)

All consuming, yeah. And it's just this year that I've realized that I need to have a balance otherwise it'll just take over…and you'll burn out and you'd lose that spark or that passion… for these things.

(Awa)

Regardless of those school staff who ascribed to the one big melting pot approach to students there was much evidence from many respondents related to racism and racist tendencies. Home visits were less simple than a caring staff member arriving at a student's home. One Pākehā respondent mentioned how, despite being a very senior staff member, it was still unwise to visit a Māori student's home without an accompanying Māori staff member. This, too, was applicable for Pasifika home visits.

[As Pasifika, Māori families at home visits] see you…and go 'oh another Coconut.'

(Noah)

Pākehā Senior Management was viewed as racist by one interviewee who had witnessed higher decile schools being involved in pastoral care for Māori students which was simply box ticking for the principal. Authentic consideration of the socio-ecological needs for Māori students were believed to have been omitted.

They think that because Māori are high achieving at that [high decile] school that they are okay…they feel disenfranchised and they feel no sense of belonging there.

(Tia)

Racism was a prevalent concern for student respondents in relation to teacher (and other staff) attitudes.

It happens in every class, the teachers choosing white kids.

(Albert. Student. Low Decile)

Some teachers just give you 'the look.' Like you are dumb.

(Lepu. Student. Low Decile)

My English teacher told me and two other Tongan boys that we wouldn't pass.

(Conrad. Student. Low Decile)

We need some nicer teachers, not racist ones, for Maths and English, so that we can do NCEA.
(Tama. Student. Low Decile)

Māori and Pasifika students also believed that racism was the reason that they received a lack of teacher attention.

I have my hand up for ages, and then one white girl put her hand up quickly and the teacher picked her immediately. It happens every day.

(Albert. Student. Low Decile)

Teachers should give all students attention.

(Tama. Student. Low Decile)

In addition, Māori and Pasifika student participants felt a lack of respect from some of their teachers. Mostly this appeared to be non-Māori and non-Pasifika teachers. For example, some Pasifika participants were disturbed by their particular school's decision to split Pasifika rugby boys in to their different Pasifika ethnic groups on the school field. Respondents suggested that the decision had caused friction between the various Pasifika groups and created a pecking order of Pasifika ethnicities. There was also evidence, in this research, of assumptive practices by Māori teachers. Students (and other staff) indicated biased - unconscious or conscious - practices where Māori teachers expected that their uniform approach towards pastoral care for Māori students was acceptable for *all* Māori students.

We have this lady that is in charge of Māori kids…If you call them out in the class 'Mrs so and so wants to see you,' they don't want to go.

(Phyllis)

They are all Palagis[referring to Pākehā teachers] who bully us.

<div align="right">(Lepu. Student. Low Decile)</div>

Teachers are racist.

<div align="right">(Tama. Student. Low Decile)</div>

The teacher gets my beanie out of my bag.

<div align="right">(Sam. Student. Low Decile)</div>

Some student respondents believed that peer racism was as prevalent as teacher racism.

White boys should stop mocking us.

<div align="right">(Joseph. Student. Low Decile)</div>

Palagis tease us to get a reaction, and then we Islanders get in trouble.

<div align="right">(Conrad. Student. Low Decile)</div>

They call us blacks.

<div align="right">(Sam. Student. Low Decile)</div>

Furthermore, some male Pasifika participants suggested that their school was fragmenting Pasifika brotherhood. Brotherhood was stronger in some schools than others and was referred to more often by Pasifika males than Māori males particularly as an anchor point in their lives. A sense of belonging was highly apparent when interviewees spoke of their brotherhood. Sisterhood was not referred to in any of the schools.

Pacific Islanders should all be treated the same and should all get on.

<div align="right">(Lepu. Student. Low Decile)</div>

They split us rugby boys up on the field in to Pacific Island groups. It's not good for the brotherhood.

<div align="right">(Albert. Student. Low Decile)</div>

Tuvaluans are up the top of the Samoan, Tongan, Niuean and Fijians.

<div align="right">(Conrad. Student. Low Decile)</div>

Tuvaluans get smart to other Pacific Island groups.

<div align="right">(Sam. Student. Low Decile)</div>

Ethnically based perceptions of discrimination also extended to opportunities at school.

Māori have a bilingual unit. They do whatever they want. We need a Pacific Island class like the Māori unit.

<div align="right">(Wayne. Student. Low Decile)</div>

Some students see Māori and Pacific Island students having things handed to them and don't like it. Our school gets something out of Māori and Pacific Island students achieving. It's really actually pretty racist. They're not doing it because they care about us, but they're getting stuff out of it. So we just take it.

<div align="right">(Jessica. Student. High Decile)</div>

[We need] more time for careers advice. Too many middle aged white women who have become bored with teaching are careers advisors and don't necessarily have Māori and Pacific Island students' best interests at heart.

<div align="right">(Ra)</div>

Summary of Data That Referred Specifically to Māori and Pasifika

The majority of non-Māori and non-Pasifika staff viewed Māori and Pasifika students together. Staff who were exceptions to this approach often made extra effort to be involved with either Māori *or* Pasifika groups in the participating schools. Sometimes they were staff who came from a distinctly different ethnic group themselves, and had developed an understanding of the needs of either Māori or Pasifika people in their contexts.

Other staff believed their approach towards pastoral care was engendering equality by *treating* students *all the same*. There was a lack of understanding that, in fact, their philosophy was discriminatory (Atwater, 2008). Such staff were unaware that in order to achieve equity in a democracy there must be different treatment of people in order to achieve similar outcomes (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Their bias indicated a lack of knowledge of Māori or Pasifika histories in New Zealand, and the lack of a supportive structure to address ethnically-based staff incompetencies (Atwater, 2008). These staff effects were across deciles. Low decile staff appeared more aware of ethnic disparities in education, but some of them had a sense of resignation to the socio-economic circumstances and the layers of disadvantage in their students' lives (Karlsen & Nazroo, 2006; Snook & O'Neill, 2014). This staff approach, often, suggested the conceptualization of the students' circumstances as the Māori and Pasifika norm.

Māori or Pasifika staff members across deciles approached pastoral care with students differently in the current study. Participants referred to the responsibility and weight they felt towards either their Māori or Pasifika students, *as well as* their families. Accounts by staff members at Chilwell College, Lambert High School, and Rawhiti College, who spent extensive amounts of time visiting families in their homes in order to get to know them (and welcome the families in to their schools), raised questions of sustainability in a system where some of the visiting work was undertaken by staff in school holiday time. Lack of support, loss of morale (Snook & O'Neill, 2014), and references to burnout, were far more readily spoken of by Māori and Pasifika school staff, than other ethnic groups, in this study.

Concurrently, the evidence collected in the current study represented a lack of professional development for all teachers involved with Māori and Pasifika students as reported in other research (Snook & O'Neill, 2014; Cram, 1999). The interviews suggested that it was unlikely that many school staff had been adequately prepared for the complexities of Māori and Pasifika pastoral care needs. A further layer to this was the shame that some Māori teachers felt when they were aware that they were incompetent in Māori language, cultural practices, or community networking. This resulted in the Māori staff feeling unable to let senior management know that they were unable to fulfil cultural expectations imposed on them (oversimplistically) by

virtue of their Māori ethnicity. Furthermore, advice sought from these Māori staff members on all matters Māori, by other school staff, reinforced feelings of inadequacy (Borell, 2005; Macfarlane, 2003).

Simply being Māori did not make any school staff member an instant expert on all matters Māori. For non-Māori staff members, difficulties were also apparent, as individual efforts towards greater cultural responsiveness sometimes required Māori expertise, advice and guidance. In the present system, it has become evident that supportive culturally responsive structures for school staff are persistently inadequate.

Student participant responses were an intricate origami of struggle, resistance, hope, despondency, and - if ever there was a reflection of an unsound structural system - anger. The anger was more pronounced in co-educational schools. In these contexts, it appeared that gender differences exacerbated the already unsavoury situation for Māori and Pasifika males, when females were overtly favoured by teachers. This is not to downplay evident female anger, but some female Māori and Pasifika participants seemed to be quite adept at deciphering how to navigate racism with slightly more self-promotional intuition. The observations indicated that females aimed to please teachers more openly.

Nevertheless, observations and interview data in the current study indicate that experiences of racism on a daily basis were ubiquitous in each school context. The school environments were seed beds for racism between Māori and Pasifika students, between different Pasifika ethnic groups, between Pasifika and Indian students; as well as the more widely recognised racism between Māori and Pākehā, or Pasifika and Pākehā. Finally, racism appeared to be overshadowing some staff members' belief in the relevance of Māori and Pasifika students staying at school. Such an approach appeared to result in staff passivity towards the engagement of students in pastoral care, which held the potential to nurture them.

Observations: Field Notes Analysis

Field notes from each school in this study endorsed the interview and focus group data. The observations, however, contributed valuable additional data by an

experiential approach which incorporated "experience, perception, cognition and behaviour" (Kolb, 1984, p. 21). This is distinct from theories that deny subjectivity, or researcher consciousness (especially in recording the unremarkable) (Kolb, 1984; Stake, 2006; Greene, 2007). Rather, the presentation of data, below, has involved a "working of thought processes" (Schatzman & Strauss, 1973, p. 109) as a component of the iterative nature of this study. The observations allowed for deep reflection as a researcher and indicated many (sometimes fleeting) instances of wonderful staff engaged in pastoral care with students in a caring manner. This was mostly illustrated by mutual respect (Yukich, 2014; Grande, 2008) between staff members and students. Adult participants referred to caring about their students, willing to listen to what had been affecting them negatively at home, and what was happening in friendship groups. Some staff were visibly emotional when recounting students' needs, and how they (as staff members) had managed to find ways to help. This was often a combination of two staff members supporting each other, such as a Māori staff member supporting a Pasifika staff member with a Māori student, or a Pasifika staff member assisting a Māori staff member with a Pasifika student. All of the participants in this study recounted how their pastoral care work would not have been possible without the assistance of their colleague/s. At Lambert High School, the field notes had multiple examples of female and male staff members assisting each other (in their single sex school), whenever they believed it was appropriate for a particular gender to be assisting a student with the resolution of their personal issues.

Counsellors, and student health centres were inundated with students. Student need was mostly greater than the capacity of the staff. Counsellors were aware that they were not managing to spend time with adequate numbers of students. Students and staff were aware of which counsellors were preferable, and in one instance there was a unified negative account from several staff members regarding the ineffectual/damaging nature of a recently departed school counsellor.

The strongest illustrations of ineffective or damaging pastoral care, however, were in the lack of staff understanding (or refusing to gain a full understanding), of some Māori or Pasifika students' home circumstances; and day-to-day struggles (Milne, 2014). One example of a teacher's punitive response to a student who punched a hole in the classroom wall indicated that the teacher did not know the

student, or the student's triggers. The inappropriate pastoral care/staff attitude (and perhaps lack of structural support for the teacher as well), led the student down a pathway of interventions which compounded the student's feelings of anger, worthlessness, and disengagement. It took considerable time, for another staff member, along with delicate understanding of the student's parent (seconded in to the school), in order to calm the anger for the child and parent. In the process the child was marred by additional *labels* (Anae, 1997) by staff, and further ostracism by students. Infact, the background to the event was an horrendous situation for the child and parent in their home environment. As the interviews and focus groups indicated in this study, the resourcing (socially, financially or structurally) was stretched in this instance. Yet this was only one student's needs, and the observations in schools had indicated many similar situations for other students.

The field notes revealed time after time where this level of one-to-one pastoral care was not able to be an adequate part of the school environment even though many staff were aware of the great need (Jones, 2000). The literature, however, suggested that if the structure of the pastoral care system is oriented appropriately for the students, then there are less likely to be so many requirements for one-on-one pastoral care in total (Duncan, 1988; Marland, 1974; Williamson, 1980).

In each school context, the field notes illustrated incidences of families being inadequately engaged in to the school context. At Chilwell College, these incidences were more overt. Families and their young people were (probably unintentionally by the school), visibly uncomfortable in how they were received at the school's front desk. Although the area around the desk appeared informal and non-confronting, the approach of administrative staff indicated a lack of effective professional development in relation to Māori and Pasifika families (Carpenter, 2014). As an opening interaction to their child's school context, the staff approach to families appeared to be condescending, and fixed in one mode.

In addition, observations at one of the two larger schools, compared to a school with under half of its roll, revealed notable differences in the number of staff knowing student's names. In the smaller school, students were more likely to be referred to *by* name; this included by the principal and the deputy principals (Higgins,

& Nairn, 2014). Field notes on the smaller school recorded interactions which suggested that students felt safer in their school environment, than those in the larger environment. A strong sense of belonging was evident in words such as pride in our school being spoken, often. This was in direct contrast to one of the two the larger schools where a senior staff member candidly mentioned that the school had a problem with pride. The lack of pride was overt in terms of how students interacted with staff and the physical environment of the school in a disrespectful way, and how the sentiments in the focus group reflected the staff member's assertion.

Observations of unsafe or insensitive pastoral care were also evident in the nature of the process for students to interact with police, at Chilwell College. The police officer waited in the main entrance (to one side of the administration desk), for the students to, individually, come out of class. There was no privacy for the students as they were in full view of the administrative staff, and any visitor arriving at the school. The lack of consideration for the student constructed a combative and punitive environment with an authority figure in a uniform. The students' information was spoken about in loud voices between a deputy principal and the police officer before the students arrived. The process appeared to be in sharp contrast to culturally responsive, student or family-centred pastoral care, which had been referred to by other staff members in the school as a desirable approach. There was no evidence of knowing the student, and caring about their context/s.

In conjunction, the current study found through observations at Fenton High School and Chilwell College, that the school principals were not obvious or had a limited presence around the school. At Lambert High School and Rawhiti College, there was a stark contrast with the principal being extremely obvious about the school. This raised questions about the inclusive structure of pastoral care, and whether, in fact (despite some school information indicating an emphasis on pastoral care), that the responsibility was handed over to other staff members. Available information on pastoral care in each of the four schools, along with other documents will be analysed in the next section.

Document Analysis

Individual school pastoral care documentation was extremely varied. Chilwell College admitted that they did not have a pastoral care policy, Fenton High School referred broadly to a pastoral care network, while the two other schools, Lambert High School and Rawhiti College, had a more developed pastoral care approach. Only Rawhiti College, however, was comprehensive in its documentation of a specific pastoral care plan. Again, although the importance and relevance of pastoral care was reinforced so often in the school staff interviews, the actual process of pastoral care in three of the schools appeared more haphazard.

Rawhiti College had highly developed pastoral care documentation that was outstanding when compared with the three other schools in this study. While the other schools tended to be re-framing pastoral care under a term (which appears to omit so much): student services, the Rawhiti College documentation was explicit in its holistic pastoral care approach. One salient example, from this school, was the inclusion of the principal, a specific pastoral deputy principal, deans, form teachers, nurses, counsellors, social workers, careers advisors, allied health professionals, families, and peer support leaders. Staff support was also built into the system (Thrupp, 2014). Even though the school's documentation did not include the curriculum, or other adults involved/engaged in the school (particularly administrators and extra-curricular adults), the pastoral care information was comprehensive in relation to Fenton High School and Chilwell College. They had scant documentation on school-wide pastoral care.

Rawhiti College did not overtly place the student/family at the centre (Higgins & Nairn, 2014) of pastoral care in documentation, but the interviews gave the impression that the school environment was the most family-centred out of the four participating schools. Unfortunately, the other three schools had very little information available in order to assess whether their pastoral care strategies were, infact, reasonably similar to Rawhiti College, but simply not as well documented. In addition, although Fenton High School had a specific policy for Māori achievement, none of the schools articulated in any documentation, pastoral care approaches specifically for Māori students, or for Pasifika students, or their families.

The ERO reports for each of the four schools in this study were also evaluated. For each school, the most recent report was accessed which meant all of the reports fell between the years 2013-2015. Disappointingly, just two of the reports mentioned pastoral care, yet only in passing. There was no review of what pastoral care *is* (in each school context), no assessment of pastoral care for Māori or Pasifika students, and no recommendations for improved pastoral care. Only two reports mentioned families at all, again in passing.

The ERO reports, therefore, separated pastoral care from the curriculum, careers advisors, special needs, peer mentoring, spirituality, and agencies/people beyond the school. This is in contrast to literature which suggested that pastoral care ought not be separated from other aspects of school life (de Jong & Kerr-Roubicek, 2007). Field notes, too, suggested that more pastoral care integration is required in order that Māori and Pasifika students, along with their families, are *enabled* to become more engaged in their school environment.

In contradiction to the findings in the aforementioned school-specific ERO reports, in a non-school specific ERO report, *Wellbeing for Young People's Success at Secondary School* (2015), there are multiple references to good care systems being recognized as important in order that students' learning was not compromised. The report also, however, recognized the negative aspects of an insufficiently co-ordinated system within schools by stating that "most schools did not connect the academic opportunities with the sporting and cultural opportunities and the care and guidance system. It was often left to each student to make sense of the connections and clashes" (ERO, 2015, p. 19).

Disarmingly, in alignment with this study, the report (ERO, 2015), also drew attention to some school staff being overwhelmed with workloads:

> In some schools the guidance counsellors and nurses were overworked…some Māori teachers carried a disproportionate burden where they were responsible for the care of all Māori students. In these schools the health and support services were less visible or more difficult to access. (p. 28)

This indicated an inadequate structural system across many schools for both school staff, and students (Thrupp, 2014). The co-ordination of outside agencies, or external adult school assistants were not mentioned in the ERO (2015) report; but the current study highlighted an inadequate structural system for external agencies/other adults coming in to the school context, as well as for those adults within it (Gott, 2003). In relation, although the report (ERO, 2015) did not refer to co-curricular/extra-curricular activities as beneficial to students forming relationships with teachers, the report did suggest that "a wider range of co-curricular activities…will promote wellbeing for more students" (p. 21).

A further report entitled *Raising Achievement in Secondary Schools* (ERO, 2014) recognized that "there are gains to be made in schools strengthening their pastoral care processes" (p. 2), in order to "keep students engaged" (p. 13). An interesting extension to this assertion, in the report, was the emphasis on school staff "knowing the student" (ERO, 2014, p. 17). The current study endorses such an approach, as did the New Zealand Post Primary Teachers' Association (PPTA). The PPTA (2015) contended that teachers need to know students, differentiate learning, and spend one-on-one time with each student.

Relating the above to ethnic specific information in documents, the MoE released a report in 2015 entitled *New Zealand Schools. A report on the compulsory schools sector in New Zealand.* For Pasifika people, *The Pasifika Education Plan 2013-2017* (PEP), which is referred to in the MoE (2015) report, outlined the intended strategies to improve Pasifika education over a five year period. Although the MoE (2015) report does not refer to pastoral care for Pasifika secondary school students, the suggestions within the report could be interpreted as components of culturally responsive pastoral care; especially when the interview, focus group and observational data from the current study are considered. The MoE (2015) report advised that "a multi-pronged approach…to change the system, build capability and accelerate achievement" (p.16) was necessary. In addition, it contended that families need to be at the centre of the education system, along with culturally responsive pedagogies which are oriented towards being student-centred (MoE, 2015).

Similarly, for Māori people, the MoE (2014) report, *Ka Hikitia. The Māori Education Strategy*, emphasized "education professionals who have strong self-efficacy…[and]…believe in their own ability to create change and are confident of their teaching abilities" (p. 38). It asserted that "Māori students frequently end up in education settings that may not support their success" (MoE, 2014, p. 38). Therefore, partnerships with parents, whānau, hapū, iwi, other Māori organisations, communities and businesses were suggested. This was seen to be vital in order to promote members of these communities as advocates for Māori students by becoming BOT members in schools (Mansill, 2014). Thus, "connections…both inside and outside of school" (MoE, 2014, p. 41) were strongly affirmed.

Interestingly, both of the aforementioned MoE (2014, 2015) reports lend credence to the results of the current study. The strategies for both Pasifika and Māori students (and their families) could be conceptualized as endorsement of an across the school and beyond the school (Snook & O'Neill, 2014) response towards increasing Māori and Pasifika participation and engagement at school, *as* Māori and *as* Pasifika.

Combination of Interview, Observational and Document Analysis Data

At Fenton High School, the observations did not necessarily support the extremely positive perspectives that several of the interviewees gave of their school's pastoral care. In fact, the glowing appraisal of some staff members, particularly counsellors and careers advisors, were inconsistent with focus group participants' accounts, as well as the observations. There was no available documentary evidence regarding counsellors and careers advisors being appraised by students and their families.

Chilwell College applied overt scrutiny to their pastoral care. The staff interviewed offered a more rigorous outline of the glaring inadequacies of their pastoral care. This was consistent with many of the observations. A number of staff appeared to be floundering due to a very large school roll, funding drops for valued programmes in their school, and insufficient physical resources. The lack of school unity and pride was evident at Fenton High School and Chilwell College. Yet, despite all of the above, there was no pastoral care policy.

The document analysis in this study found more accuracy in relation to Rawhiti College. The documents were quite closely aligned with the observations and the interviews. Nurturance was a key component of their pastoral care, but almost to the point of cloistering the young people. The student participants were less likely to speak-out about their school, but towards the end of the focus group some of their more candid comments matched some of my less favourable observations.

Lambert High School appeared to be in a stage of transition in terms of aligning their pastoral care approach with the social realities of many of their students' families. Observations indicated a warm environment, but not necessarily one that was energized to fully endorse student participation. The document analysis revealed areas of concern in relation to equitable outcomes for different ethnic groups. These concerns were also evident in the focus groups, interviews and observations.

Rawhiti College, Lambert High School, and Chilwell College indicated ethnic differences between Māori and Pasifika students that were not apparent in the document analysis, the observations, or the staff interviews. It was only in the student focus groups that Pasifika students constantly referred to *the struggle*. For some participants this related only to *the struggle* at home, whereas for other students *the struggle* referred to school as well as home. Both genders were forthright in the expression of difficulties in their lives. For Māori student participants, there was more resistance (and at times *cheek*), but also more antagonism towards aspects of their school and the staff within it. Both Māori and Pasifika participants knew *the look*: a condescending discriminatory expression that some school staff imposed on students. Neither *the struggle*, the resistance, *the look*, nor the discrimination were apparent in any documentation.

Māori and Pasifika staff participants, however, revealed differences in the perspectives they had for Māori students, compared with Pasifika students, in terms of coping with the school environment and socioeconomic difficulties. Several staff members across two different schools believed Pasifika students had a head-start in education in New Zealand. They suggested that this was due to many Māori people having had a long history of dislocation from mainstream education in New Zealand,

whereas respondents believed that Pasifika students did not carry so much intergenerational alienation.

Nevertheless, a senior staff member at Chilwell College revealed further detail to this equation by asserting that although they have increased the numbers of Pasifika students staying till the end of Year 13 at their school, they do not believe that Pasifika students gain as much in the senior secondary school years, by all measures, compared with other ethnic groups (except Māori) who stay until the end of Year 13. Overall, Māori and Pasifika staff responses (when compared to staff interviewees from other ethnic groups) spoke with more detail and specificity regarding pastoral care for their students. Each Māori or Pasifika interviewee seemed to focus on their own ethnic group of students, but certainly had opinions and aspirations for the statistically related group of students. This meant that a Māori staff member at Fenton High School prioritized the Māori students, but Pasifika students were a close second. The opposite was evident at Rawhiti College where a Pasifika staff member prioritized Pasifika students, but was conscientious about Māori students' wellbeing.

One piece of disconfirming evidence (Miles et al., 2014) came from a Māori staff member in a low decile school who believed that decile did not hold any weight, that all students should be treated the same, and that their school was well resourced (which was in contradiction to the student focus group). Intriguingly, the interviewee's opinions were in direct contrast to another Māori staff member's responses, in the same school. To conclude this results chapter, then, the key themes and sub-themes from the findings are tabulated below.

Table 1.1: Māori and Pasifika Experiences of Pastoral Care

Key Themes	Sub-themes
Colonising Effects	Racism/unconscious bias
	Ethnicity as a strength
Resistance by Māori and Pasifika youth	Safety
	Trust
Subordination of Māori and Pasifika realities	Nurturing the whole person
	Invisibility
Professional development and workforce capacity	Māori and Pasifika staff over-burdened
	Unrealistic expectations of Māori and Pasifika staff

Summary

The consideration of the interviews, focus groups, observations and document analyses indicated that the nature, purpose and associations of pastoral care for school staff and students varied greatly in this study. The value given to, and the school processes of, pastoral care were widely referenced by adult interviewees. The extent, however, to which pastoral care was appropriate and engaging for students (along with their families), requires more interrogation. The themes and sub-themes are embedded within the findings. These will be discussed in the next chapter in order to answer the research questions.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

There is no creature whose inward being is so strong that
It is not greatly determined by what lies outside of it.
                                                    George Eliot

This chapter provides a discussion of the research findings and their contribution to the literature. The discussion also presents an extension to the understanding of pastoral care for Māori and Pasifika students in the New Zealand context, particularly in relation to the research questions.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore and interpret what pastoral care is in the New Zealand context, how it is understood, as well as how it is enacted and co-ordinated both within and beyond the school environment. Of particular interest is the role that pastoral care may have in the engagement and retention of Māori and Pasifika students within differing school environments. In order to fulfil the purpose of the study, three core research questions were used to guide the research: What is the nature and purpose of pastoral care in Auckland secondary schools? What is the association between pastoral care and school retention among Māori and Pasifika students? What are the differences in the nature of pastoral care between schools with different decile ratings?

Key Findings of the Study

Six key findings were identified in this study. The first significant finding is that the nature of pastoral care is extremely difficult to define, overall, as it is highly context-specific. There is a paucity of literature on pastoral care, and very little agreement on a definition of it. This study supported and expanded our knowledge and understanding of pastoral care. Participants at the four secondary schools endorsed pastoral care, and even though they all used their own definition of pastoral care, the essence of each adult's conceptualization of it was similar.

The second finding is that the purpose of pastoral care is to increase student participation in school. Discriminatory practices and institutional racism were widespread and common. The nurturing of students is a complex interplay of historical, social, emotional, and environmental factors.

A third finding relates to the intrinsic association between pastoral care and school retention for Māori and Pasifika students. It became apparent from this study that if Māori and Pasifika students were not safe to engage in school *as* Māori and Pasifika, due to racism, then the student underwent a process of disengagement. Culturally responsive pastoral care which was inclusive of family appeared to be an antidote.

A fourth finding identifies tensions between various roles within the school: between counsellors, teachers and careers advisors. Counsellors and careers advisors were perceived to be divisive figures in the present study as some students supported them, but other students refused to engage with them. Staff participants in these groups often felt overwhelmed with the volume and magnitude of the work required to provide culturally responsive care.

A fifth finding concerns the inequitable provision of pastoral care between school deciles. The nature of pastoral care for lower decile schools is particularly complex and resource intensive. In order for pastoral care to be more equitable in lower deciles, increased funding and additional expertise are required.

A sixth finding is that Māori and Pasifika students desire more fluidity in culturally responsive pastoral care than some school staff realized. This suggests that assumptions regarding student, or family need, ought not be static, or stereotyped. Students require inclusive, holistic environments and increased choice/agency.

These findings will be discussed in the following sections. The components of pastoral care in the current study were many. Although it is beyond the scope of this study to go in to great depth for each component, the discussion presents the most relevant aspects of each component of pastoral care, related to each finding. The section headings encompass the research questions, whereas the sub-headings relate

to the study's findings (presented in relation to the most relevant research question section).

The Nature of Pastoral Care

A key finding from the study was that the definition of pastoral care does not have wide consensus in the New Zealand context. This, however, is an enabler rather than a hindrance in terms of the opportunity to interpret pastoral care for Māori and/or Pasifika students in each context (Ribbins, 1989).

The historical links of the term pastoral care being associated with the spiritual care of a flock (Hughes, 1980), or the cure of the souls (Lartey, 2003) appear to have been dispensed with, at first glance. A more thorough examination in the current study, however, revealed that in the New Zealand context, the holistic care of students in secondary schools was underpinned by oscillating combinations of the spiritual, the physical, the mental and the emotional aspects for many young people (Durie, 1994; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001; Sernak, 2004). Such comprehensive pastoral care was referred to in the literature as caring for the whole person (Hellwig, 1989; Noddings, 2005a; Marland, 1974; Duncan, 1988).

Although the term pastoral care was noted by many participants in this study to be outdated (and "too Christian" for some participants in secular schools), the ethos of the caring and supporting nature was acknowledged by all adult participants. In the literature, it has been suggested that the term pastoral care be replaced by a term which seems more contemporary (Calvert, 2009). Even though this was sometimes endorsed by participants in the current study, others found a replacement term difficult to conceive, and many participants were content to just settle for pastoral care.

In addition, a highly contested aspect of the nature of pastoral care in the literature was whether pastoral care was predominantly involved in the care or control of students (Duncan, 1988; Marland, 1974; Williamson, 1980; Megahy, 1998; Young, 1994). This tension was further exacerbated by the care/curriculum split (Marland, 1974; Bolton, 1980; Dooley, 1980). That is, whether pastoral care runs through the

curriculum, or whether, in fact, pastoral care is a separate division of a school (Watts & Fawcett, 1980; Bolton, 1980; Marland, 1974).

In the current study, the majority of participants believed that pastoral care was intended to care for the whole child and in this way included the curriculum. The positive view, which some participants aspired to, was that if social control was taken care of within a *good* curriculum, then less individualized pastoral care would be necessary in a school (Thrupp, 2006a; Duncan, 1988; Marland, 1974; Williamson, 1980). This begs the question, what is a good curriculum? and, therefore, what is *good* pastoral care? In the New Zealand context, for Māori and Pasifika students, a good curriculum would surely be one where there is a culturally relevant pedagogy, and cultural competency or responsiveness (Delpit, 2012; Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Noddings, 2005b). Connell (1992) took this a step further and suggested "curricular justice" (p. 7). Whatever the semantics, however, there is no one way, or one size fits all within pastoral care which *includes* the curriculum.

In this study, most school staff had good intentions in terms of the provision of pastoral care for their students, and many school staff were diligent in their efforts. In relation to the literature (Delpit, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1995), however, there were deficiencies in relation to the differentiation of care for students especially in the nature of the staff and school responsiveness to the students' home culture, and the culture/s of their other world/s (Jones, 1991; Marland, 1974; Hawk & Hill, 1996).

Context.

Thus, the current study upholds the approach of Resnick et al. (1997), which suggested that the closer a context (Brooks & Gunn, 1995; Thrupp, 2006b) is to a student, the more likely they will be to have a sense of wellbeing. Context-sensitivity involves understanding students' lives and worlds in order to enable them to learn, and to choose learning pathways which students can relate to, rather than having prescriptive pathways which are the same for every student (Nieto & Bode, 2012; Fergus, Noguera, & Martin, 2014; Delpit, 2012; Steele, 2010). According to Ladson-Billings (2008), context-sensitivity reminds teachers of the greater social purpose of their work. In this study, there were also significant variations in school staff

128

approaches towards pastoral care either being an integral part of all staff roles, or relegated to certain staff members (Spratt, Shucksmith, Philip, & Watson, 2006; Kidger et al., 2010). It appears likely that, within a school, all staff members needed to be involved in a process of culturally responsive pastoral care as the challenges confronting Māori and Pasifika students "extend well beyond the boundaries of the schools" (Fergus et al., 2014, p. 9).

Environments.

Therefore, in order to improve educational opportunities the connectivity of environments (or linkages across contexts) appear to need re-orienting (Resnick et al., 1997; Kirmayer et al., 2000). The many different worlds which Māori and Pasifika students (and their families) navigate have been acknowledged for their complexities (Tupuola, 2004; Hawk & Hill, 1996; Jones, 1991; Marland, 1974; Krebs, 1999). School staff in the current study, however, often lamented the difficulties of *getting* Māori or Pasifika families into school for meetings or events. It is concerning, when looking through Bronfenbrenner's (1979) lens, at the extent to which family member's own historical experiences of school might negatively influence the idea of re-entering the school environment for their child/ren (Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Durie, 2006; Milne, 2014). The current study, then, adds to the literature by recognizing the widespread requirement of pastoral care to provide a safe environment for families, and most pertinently, for their young people (Nieto & Bode, 2012).

Safety.

The nature of pastoral care for some students and school staff held no concerns regarding being safe at school. For many other participants, however, school was not safe in several predominant ways (Giroux, 2005; Nieto & Bode, 2012). From the perspective of socio-ecological and cultural models such as Bronfenbrenner (1979), Whare Tapa Whā (Durie, 1994) or Fonofale (Pulotu-Endemann, 2001), the interdependency of factors that affected individuals (and arguably their families) became apparent during interviewing. The most prevalent factor about which students felt unsafe was their ethnicity (Bishop, O'Sullivan, & Berryman, 2010). Experiences

of racism, and the lack of culturally responsive environments were contributing to young people feeling disconnected from their schools (Macfarlane et al., 2007). This is concerning as, today, positive environmental links are seen to promote positive educative, social and health outcomes (McCreanor & Watson, 2004).

Macfarlane et al. (2007) suggested that safety was the freedom to be who and what we are, individually and collectively, in school environments. In the literature it is suggested that people need to feel safe in order to engage in an environment in such a way that they feel a sense of belonging. When people are not safe to be themselves, shame can result. If people feel too much shame within a system, they disengage in order to protect themselves, and they stop caring (Brown, 2012). Many students in the current study demonstrated that they did not feel free to be who they were *as* Māori or *as* Pasifika (Durie, 2006). Despite attending schools where pastoral care was said to be provided, some participants noted a major lack of a culture of care (Macfarlane et al., 2007), or more specifically, the lack of a culturally-safe school.

Previous literature has commented that a culturally safe, or a culturally responsive, school is one where students from all cultures feel safe (Macfarlane et al., 2007). Ideally, the nature of cultural provisions should be decided in conjunction with students (along with their parents and families). Respondents were not always necessarily aware of what was missing, but for both students and teachers the schools' approaches were – often unintentionally – too individualistic to fulfil the suggestions of either Bronfenbrenner (1979), Durie (1994), Pulotu-Endemann (2001), Macfarlane et al. (2007) or Bishop's (2007) models.

In this way, the schools' emphases in the current study perpetuated the dichotomizing of Māori and Pasifika young people (as well as several Māori and Pasifika staff members), and potentially positioned them as either resilient or non-resilient, successful or non-successful *despite* a less than ideal (pastoral care) environment (McCreanor & Watson, 2004). As John Hattie reminded us (cited in McCreanor & Watson, 2004), for the bottom twenty percent of students, New Zealand is not a safe place psychologically to be a school student. The bottom twenty percent is largely composed of Māori and Pasifika students which suggests a more systemic (Snook & O'Neill, 2014) overhaul of the pastoral care system is required; that is, a

true culture (or environment), of care is required in secondary schools (Macfarlane et al., 2007).

Trust.

In addition, the present study illustrated that, for Māori and Pasifika students, pastoral care needed to extend to the students' families (Thrupp, 2014). Distrust of staff members who were not of their family's ethnicity (nor held a strong connection to the family) were common features for school staff attempting to link with a family for the first time. At Chilwell College, building initial trust with a family often involved Māori staff members visiting Māori homes and Pasifika staff members visiting Pasifika families. The trust (Carpenter, 2014; Yukich, 2014) could be built, but it took time, and where a staff member within the school setting was from a different ethnic group, initial meetings - as with home visits - were more positively fostered by the involvement of another staff member from the same ethnic group (particularly if they spoke the home language). Bryk and Schneider (2002) believed that distrust between school staff and parents disallowed a genuine dialogue especially when ethnicities or socioeconomic circumstances were different between the two. Without meaningful dialogue it appears that purposeful pastoral care would be lacking.

In the current study, however, evidence of genuine dialogue between school staff and families of the same ethnicities (particularly through home visits) for Māori or Pasifika students was straining for resources (time and finances). The staff members at Chilwell College, Lambert High School, and Rawhiti College who were managing to uphold a caring dialogue were not necessarily sure that the process was sustainable without further assistance. This needed to either entail the employment of other staff similar to themselves, or a large injection of financial resources in order to create more time by enabling such staff to relinquish other responsibilities.

The inadequacies of this aspect of pastoral care for students' and their families is concerning as trust is a substantive property within the organization of school communities (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Goddard, Salloum, & Berebitsky, 2009; Forsyth, 2008). If trust is not built and tended to on an ongoing basis schools may

well find that parents are operating in opposition to school staff (Bryk & Schneider, 2002).

An additional aspect of trust which exemplary school staff members were aware of was the individual recognition – from the very beginning of the school year – of each Māori or Pasifika student. The nature of this particular aspect of pastoral care might be subtle or overt, but was always related to the historical experiences of invisibility (Smith, 2012; Higgins & Nairn, 2014; Delpit, 2012; Cunningham, 2008) which Māori and Pasifika students often felt in mainstream schools. School staff who recognized this historical reality were motivated to acknowledge each student at every opportunity, such as through a window with a quick nod, pronouncing their names correctly, saying hello by name around the school grounds, and asking a brief "how are you going?" now and then. Delpit (2012) endorsed being able to *see* school students, in a supportive way, particularly as Māori and Pasifika students' frequent invisibility in classrooms was exacerbated by hypervisibility when they gathered in groups outside of the classroom.

As an extension of staff seeing a student, the recognition of a Māori or Pasifika student as a *person* was paramount, as students needed to be able to develop their potential, rather than just be representatives of their ethnic group or a feature of a school's ethnic diversity (Delpit, 2012; Smith, 2013; Root, 2004). In this study, the findings suggest that students were surprisingly intuitive about when they were receiving recognition or resources because of school diversity box-ticking. That is, because of the ethnic group/s they belonged to, rather than for particular personal attributes (Higgins & Nairn, 2014).

The Purpose of Pastoral Care

A second key finding of the current study provides new insights in to the prevalence of discriminatory practices in schools. Much of the ethnic discrimination appeared unintentional, or was so entrenched in the school culture that the norm was to present Eurocentric information and practices as superior to others (Duncan, 1988).

For many Māori and Pasifika students, such discontinuities (Penetito, 2010; Marland, 1974) thwarted their attempts to participate *as* Māori or *as* Pasifika (Durie, 2006) in their school context. The inadequacies of the pastoral care provided meant that school environments were inequitable. Māori and Pasifika students were not gaining sufficient access to resources due to structural characteristics of schools (Anyon, 2009; Croninger & Lee, 2001). Thus, racism was invisibly embedded in school environments (Borell et al., 2009).

Racism.

In this study, the illustration of racism by some school staff, and the sufferance of racism by students (and occasionally Māori and Pasifika staff) appeared to be a significant impediment to sound comprehensive pastoral care. The personally mediated racism, both intentional and unintentional, manifested itself as a lack of respect and devaluation by school staff towards students or other staff (Jones, 2000). It was evident that this was coupled with internalized racism, where students (and perhaps some staff) had *taken on* negative messages about their abilities or intrinsic worth (Schmidt, 2005; Jones, 2000; Karlsen & Nazroo, 2006; Milne, 2014). The most pressing worry was that repetitive racist attitudes looked to be creating the cumulative effect of disengagement by some students one day at a time through a sense of resignation and hopelessness (Jones, 2000; Milne, 2014). Student participants referred to ongoing assumptive actions by some school staff which illustrated that they believed non-Māori or non-Pasifika students would be more likely to answer their questions, or would be more likely to contribute to the class in a predictable fashion. This amounted to the antithesis of a culture of care (Macfarlane et al., 2004).

Some teachers and other school staff were, therefore, positioning Māori and Pasifika at the bottom of an ethnic pecking order and creating a culture of debilitation for many young people within these ethnic groups. Young Māori and Pasifika lives were being altered negatively by a lack of culturally responsive pastoral care. As Ladson-Billings (2008) contended, school staff have a responsibility to their students' futures, but those futures will also affect the rest of us. It appears short-sighted to ill-equip teachers or other staff for their role as care-takers of our future especially as the

population is becoming *decidedly browner* (Leahy, 2015; Smith, 2013; French, Seidman, Allen, & Aber, 2006; Sleeter, 2011; Delpit, 2012).

There is a racist attitude inherent to the approach of Māori and Pasifika students being thrust only into the domain of Māori and Pasifika staff. This study endorsed the literature, in that, the influence of each other's culture on our own culture determines some of the ecological effects on ourselves and on our families (Lartey, 2003). In this way, the current study indicated that there is a moral responsibility for all staff in (and outside of) schools to contribute to each cog in the wheel, in order to enhance the opportunities for underachieving students to engage and learn (Delpit, 2012). As Dame Anne Salmond once said in conversation with Chris Laidlaw, this is to do with the fair distribution of life chances (Laidlaw, 2011).

In relation, the innovative programme in schools, Te Kotahitanga, could be argued to offer far more pastoral care for Māori students than students who we not involved in it. Te Kotahitanga aims to improve Māori students' outcomes by supporting teachers in developing a culturally responsive environment, including changing school structures to assist teachers (Bishop, Berryman, & Wearmouth, 2014). Yet respondents who worked with Te Kotahitanga in this study certainly felt the 'weight' of responsibility for their Māori students; and the despair for the numbers of Māori students who were still (despite Te Kothaitanga) leaving school early with no qualifications or clear pathway into other educational institutions. This suggests institutional racism was able to override the sound work of Te Kotahitanga in the New Zealand education system (Schmidt, 2005). At Chilwell College, a Māori staff member engaged in Te Kotahitanga struggled to conceptualize, or articulate reasons, for the numbers of Māori students leaving school before Year 13 even though they had been involved in Te Kotahitanga in the staff member's class.

One of the many problems with institutionalized racism is that it is hard for people at the chalk face to pinpoint. The racism is structural in that it is inequitably embedded, or codified, in the "organs of government" (Leahy, 2015, p. 265), in the institutions of law, and in customs (Anyon, 2009; Jones, 2000). Furthermore, Jones (2000) noted, evidence of institutionalized racism can be found when there is inaction despite great need.

Inequitable educational outcomes, then, for Māori and Pasifika people indicate a long history of institutionalized racism as there has been differential access to the power which could have sufficiently altered the system, and therefore, the pastoral care, which may have contributed to school environments being more culturally responsive (Jones, 2000; Leahy, 2015). In fact, Fergus et al. (2014) believed that the greatest challenge their students of colour faced was institutionalized racism. They contended that the racist structures of the system kept their students back, inadequately funded their schools, contributed to violence in the communities, and then trapped people due to a lack of opportunities (Anyon, 2009). Institutional racism is the most fundamental form of racism and must be addressed in order to create significant positive change (Schmidt, 2005; Jones, 2000). Personally mediated racism was also apparent in this study between Māori and Pasifika students, but according to Jones (2000) once institutionalized racism is addressed, the other forms of racism are more likely to subside.

In the current study, although the indications of institutionalized racism were recognized by informed adult respondents, for young Māori and Pasifika students in schools the racism was implicit (Schmidt, 2005). The ways in which young people navigated the fumes of institutionalized racism predominantly presented as an inherent distrust. Several Pasifika students at Chilwell College spoke of not wanting to put their hands up in class anymore, as the teachers always deferred to white students. There was close scrutiny of school staff, by students, and strong opinions were quickly formed about who cared for the students, and who did not. Several staff members were aware that some of the suspicious approaches by students reflected those of their parents so that the intergenerational effects of distrust of schools, and many staff within them, were perpetuated. It also came to the researcher's notice that some of the effects had in fact become multi-generational (Smith, 2013; Leahy, 2015). For example, at Chilwell College some family surnames were associated with familial distrust and resistance towards the school. The third generation of these families were noted by school staff as soon as the students' names appeared on the roll at the beginning of secondary school.

Pastoral care, therefore, being (at the very least) a two way process between schools and families, could unintentionally become a process of pastoral obstruction or pastoral resistance (Higgins & Nairn, 2014) by the students if they deduced that teachers or other school staff did not genuinely care about them (Fergus et al., 2014). School staff recognized that Māori and Pasifika students who came from large extended families were particularly perceptive regarding who genuinely cared for them at school. Student behavioural and discipline issues were deemed to be less dominant when teachers and other staff had shown they truly cared for students, and consequently provided a safe and secure environment (Haberman, 2015; Dixson, 2003; Ware, 2006). In fact at Chilwell College, the principal had hired a Māori teacher to work full-time in order to increase student personal and social responsibility. This appeared to be an ongoing issue at the school.

The Association of Pastoral Care and School Retention

A third, and extremely important, finding in the current study is that pastoral care is intrinsically associated with school retention (Cram et al., 2014; Hearn et al., 2006). The degree of responsiveness of a school, as a social organization, determines school drop-out rates (Milne, 2014; Renihan & Renihan, 1995). If schools are not retaining their students, then there is evidence of not meeting students' diverse needs (Milne, 2014; Rumberger & Thomas, 2000; Renihan & Renihan, 1995). Within this inequity, the quality of relationships are unlikely to be sufficient (Higgins & Nairn, 2014; Bishop, Berryman, Powell, & Teddy, 2007; Davidson & Phelan, 1999).

Relationships.

Despite the insidious negative influence of institutional (or structural) characteristics (Thrupp, 2005) on processes in schools, and therefore on the *process* of pastoral care (Hellwig, 1989), the centrality of relationships in pastoral care are absolutely fundamental (Cornelius-White, 2007; Best, 2014; de Jong & Kerr-Roubicek, 2007). Respondents in the current study were predominantly overt about the relational nature of teaching and caring in secondary schools. There was concern from many participants that there was not enough time (Bevan-Brown, 2003; Trimble, 2002) to form the connections or relationships with students that would be beneficial

to the students' sense of belonging at school, as has been clearly found in the literature (Cornelius-White, 2007). In particular, the structure of deans' roles due to the combination of teaching and deaning were seen by a significant number of respondents as detrimental towards the meaningful care of students. School deans, however, were one of the most overt examples of the *artificial* split between discipline and pastoral care. In fact whether deans are deaning or teaching they are still spokes in the wheel of pastoral care. Where deans are splitting pastoral care and discipline, they are engaged in reactive pastoral care. Care of Māori and Pasifika collective groups of students, *determined by the students,* will lessen the occasions of such remedial pastoral care.

Some participants were keen to emphasize the importance of student choice in that they may not get on with a particular dean, and may be best to link with a deputy dean, or another school staff member. Student choice was also prevalent in relation to the ethnicity of staff. Māori or Pasifika students did not necessarily always want to consult adults of their own ethnicity. Some students preferred the anonymity of consulting an adult from a different ethnicity to themselves, while other students would only consult an adult of their own ethnicity if they liked them as a person.

Students were aware of assumptions made about them as Māori or Pasifika students. Some Māori or Pasifika staff assumed that they knew what was best for individual Māori or Pasifika students, or that as adults they were entitled to make assumptions about how students would want to 'live' their ethnicity (Borell, 2005; Krebs, 1999; Tupuola, 2004). This included lack of recognition that children from the same family might also choose to identify differently (Root, 2004). In fact, in the current study, there were Māori and Pasifika students who either did not want to be actively engaged in what they saw to be *top-up* culturally based activities at school, or they wanted the autonomy to make individual choices about which languages they would learn, and which, if any, performance groups they joined. Unfortunately, however, indications of structural problems were apparent when some student participants stated that if staff turnovers were too high for performance groups then it was less likely that students would join in.

Beyond the classroom, in this study, performing arts-related relationships with school staff and other adults were referred to less than sports-related relationships with adults. Respondents found relationships in sports to be extremely important, and the boundaries in the relationships with sports coaches were, at times, slightly contentious. In the current study, adult participants expressed relief at the caring nature of many sports coaches who *looked out* for their students to the extent that if students had difficult issues at school, some coaches would come in to school to help sort out student's problems (Spratt et al., 2006). This was expressed as a win-win situation because coaches were able to retain the students they wanted in their teams, whilst students received the pastoral care that enabled them to minimize potentially troublesome (usually academic) issues at school; and also, at times, to actually stay at school.

There was a caution, however, regarding coaches in relation to holding after-match parties at their own homes. Staff were wary of coaches crossing boundaries and allowing underage students to drink alcohol. There was, though, strong opinion that relationships with sports teams were protective for students and, therefore, reduced the likelihood that students would receive detentions or stand downs (Cook et al., 2005; Bronfenbrenner, 1986a).

Several respondents also referred to the value of being in the outdoors/being in nature in order to build relationships (Brown, 2009; Tapsell & Woods, 2008; Vascellaro, 2011; Kirmayer et al., 2000). The respondents unanimously recognized the difference in some students once they were in the bush, or at the seaside, in terms of how much more positively they related to adults and to fellow students. The credibility of the work of Fergus et al. (2014) was reinforced as participants in the current study inadvertently acknowledged the inadequacies of an impoverished (narrowly academically focused) curriculum. The nature of the pastoral care in the outdoors could arguably, also, attend to young people's spirituality (Tapsell & Woods, 2008; Sernak, 2004).

Both Durie (1994) and Pulotu-Endemann (2001) included spirituality in their holistic models of health. The outdoors may be one example of where the spiritual component of wellbeing (as part of pastoral care) could be developed. In the current

study, faith-based Christian schools provided a firm basis for the development of spirituality, but spirituality was also referred to in secular schools particularly by Māori and Pasifika staff. According to Durie (1994) and Pulotu-Endemann (2001) all aspects of a person need to be tended to in order to enable wellbeing/health. It could be argued, that spirituality for Māori and Pasifika students ought to be a component, but also a choice, within pastoral care in schools (Plank & Sykes, 2003, MoE, 2007).

Pasifika students referred to the church more readily than Māori students in the current study. This is consistent with the findings of Youth'07 (Denny et al., 2009) and Cram et al. (2014) as they suggested that in future Māori can build Treaty-based relationships with tribal authorities, whereas Pasifika have the church as a core institutional support which could partner with other institutions.

Professional development.

In order to aid the fundamental (Best, 2014) role of relationships in pastoral care and, therefore, school retention, professional development arose as a major consideration in the current study (Delpit, 2012; Carpenter, 2014; Snook & O'Neill, 2014; Mara, 2014; Villegas & Lucas, 2002; Mills, 2008; Cram, 1999). This is in alignment with the findings from the Best Evidence Synthesis (Timperley, Wilson, Barrar & Fung, 2007). Delpit (2012) also charted a process of teachers who had not experienced adequate professional development (or initial training). Inadequate training and/or professional development resulted in situations where newly trained white teachers had been primed up (sometimes by ill-equipped teacher educators and professors) to believe that they could *save* non-white children, (Ladson-Billings, 2008). The new teachers were mostly unsuccessful as they did not *know* the students, the families or the communities. The teachers were prone to burning out due to the "weight of salvation" which they carried (Delpit, 2012, p. xviii). In a variation on Delpit's (2012) exposé, in the current study Māori and Pasifika teachers, and other staff, often found themselves culturally and professionally isolated. Even being of the same ethnic group as some of the students rendered a similar 'weight' for some of the school staff (Kidger et al., 2010). The school staff themselves, therefore, were also part of the whole system (Snook & O'Neill, 2014), and like students, staff are not autonomous. Staff are linked to communities, and in conjunction with students'

communities, all of the environments mesh to create life histories within wider society (Kirp, 2011; Borell, 2005; Macfarlane, 2003).

In this study, the successful meshing of student and staff environments, or communities appeared to require a heightened pastoral care related response. School staff either edged towards a sense of helplessness in terms of what else they could do to improve educational outcomes for Māori and Pasifika students, or they were proud of what they had implemented but lacked adequate (or suitable) workforce capacity to assist, in schools (Bevan-Brown, 2009; Walker et al., 2006; Carpenter, 2014).

In the current study, the pastoral care of Māori and Pasifika staff members was insufficient. Several staff members discussed disparities in their schools in terms of the loading on Māori or Pasifika teachers to be *everything* for their ethnic group. There appeared to be a lack of support (Thrupp, 2014) and care of these particular staff members, along with too many expectations (Kidger et al., 2010). The outcome of the burden of these cultural expectations was close to burnout (Bevan-Brown, 2009; Kidger et al., 2010) for several of staff members. It was alarming that one of them was a fledgling teacher. The current study is, therefore, consistent with the ERO report (2015) cited in the document analysis as it suggested Māori teachers are often overburdened. Again, this positions a culture of care (Macfarlane et al., 2007) as a necessary focus for pastoral care. The responsibility for Māori and Pasifika wellbeing ought not fall only on Māori and Pasifika school staff (Ladson-Billings, 2008), just as the responsibility for any other ethnic groups of students does not fall only on adults from their ethnic group. All of society stands to benefit from better educated and more connected young people (Ladson-Billings, 2008).

Thus, professional development in culturally responsive pastoral care, for teachers (and all adults working in secondary schools) appears to be inadequate. Teachers seem to be under-prepared (Snook & O'Neill, 2014) for teaching diverse Māori and Pasifika young people, and particularly those in lower deciles (Tatebe, 2014; Ladson-Billings, 2008; Haberman, 2003; Root, 2004). Ladson-Billings (2008) contended that teachers will not be able to rely on teacher education to tell them how to be culturally responsive teachers. Instead, a commitment to democracy as a pivotal component of their pedagogy was suggested. Ladson-Billings (2008) went on to say

that being is more important than doing as a culturally responsive teacher. The implications of 'being' an informed school staff member who is committed to democracy would possibly contribute to pastoral care for students and other staff members. This study, therefore, broadens the notion of Bronfenbrenner's socio-ecological theory by highlighting the more opaque (hard to recognize) 'connections.' These are mostly negative structural issues which need to be addressed through better policy, and appropriate strategic planning.

School Counsellors and Careers Advisors

In relation, a further finding in this study concerned tensions associated with two non-teaching roles. The first of these to comment on tensions were counsellors. Itinerated adults (based in agencies outside of the school) often created tensions with counsellors, as itinerants appeared to be service-centred rather than student-centred (or family-centred). The itinerant adults' approach, therefore, seemed to value efficiency rather than a good care model for the students. There was also a complicated nexus referred to by school counsellors where, in the current study, counsellors believed that teachers ought to be more caring towards their students, but also that teachers ought not *cross the line* in to counselling their students. In support of, and extension to, the literature which documented counsellors sidelining teachers, counsellors conducting their own programmes without permission, and counsellors requiring professional development, this study found senior management and counsellors also had particular tensions (Young, 1994). Additionally, the privacy of information, territoriality, along with gatekeeping by students, teachers, and counsellors appeared to create further tensions in school environments (Young, 1994; Cooper, Hough & Loynd, 2005; Calvert, 2009; Kidger et al., 2010; Gott, 2003). In a similar way, careers advisors straddled two ends of a continuum, being highly valued by some school staff but evoking a degree of despondence by others. Career advisory work was generally seen as a positive component of pastoral care, but for Māori and Pasifika students it was evident in the current study that a more culturally responsive advisory focus would be appropriate (Sernak, 2004).

The Nature of Pastoral Care in Different School Deciles

A fourth significant finding related to the inadequate pastoral care in low decile schools. Although school staff were evidently engaged in a positive process of pastoral care with their students, the institutionalized racism in the lack of provision for low decile students, despite great need (Jones, 2000) determined, in part, to what extent motivated staff members' efforts met these needs.

Funding.

Genuine governmental compensation for the lack of family, or community, resources feeding in to low decile schools was not apparent. Low decile communities gained less from fund raising efforts (than higher decile schools), as well as receiving less school donations from families (Thrupp, 2006a, 2007; Plumb & Bilby, 2016). The current study adds to the literature on the struggle of low decile schools to provide, in particular, the so-called extras in education (O'Connor, 2014; Snook & O'Neill, 2014; Nieto & Bode, 2012; Griffin & Allen, 2006). While low decile (schools with the highest proportion of students from low socio-economic communities) school staff manage to find funding (with extraordinary effort), to channel into necessities such as uniforms and food, the funds for promoting students' greater educational growth appeared more difficult to find (Rashbrooke, 2014; Snook & O'Neill, 2014; Wynd, 2014; Fergus et al., 2014; Plank & Sykes, 2003).

Staff were quite aware of programmes, in schools which were funded in a way that would not be sustainable, or would be unlikely to offer quality educational assistance (Smith, 2013). It appeared that the promise of governmental programmes too often let staff and students down (Snook & O'Neill, 2014; Smith, 2013). Several programmes, mentioned by participants, were funded for three years and schools were expected to finance the programmes themselves after three years. Often staff noticed a difference in student outcomes (across all measures) once the funding was withdrawn and the programme was either watered down or ceased (Bishop et al., 2010). According to Smith (2013) and Kirp (2011) we would be best to undertake

stewardship for the next generation and develop effective systems rather than be drawn in to yet another programme.

In lower decile schools, staff often recognized certain programmes as good or not good. Yet even when good programmes were seen to have high potential gain for students, a school would not necessarily implement the programme because of the expense (Bishop et al., 2010). The nature of pastoral care, then, was one of prioritization or rationing of funds. Kirp (2011) believed that programmes needed to be available to middle class as well as poor young people, otherwise the programme would most likely be starved of funds. This assertion appears to be worth considering in the New Zealand context.

Students in low decile schools, also relayed the lack of music, lack of field trips, lack of work experience, lack of fully equipped science laboratories in order to do experiments (Snook & O'Neill, 2014; Lareau, 1989), lack of European or Asian languages, lack of subject choice overall (O'Connor, 2014; Oakes, 2005), lack of sports options, lack of performance groups (Nieto & Bode, 2012), and lack of wider opportunities (lisahunter, Rossi, Tinning, Flanagan, & Macdonald, 2011). Haberman (2015) termed such tight control over lower socioeconomic students' learning (and development) as The Pedagogy of Poverty. It is a pedagogy wherein learners can 'succeed' without being fully engaged. In the current study, there was evidence that if students adhered to the school processes which had been targeted to lift their academic achievement above that of the stereotype of their ethnic group then they had 'succeeded' and the school would be congratulated. Yet, looking through a 'whole person' pastoral care lens, students were engaged in a somewhat impoverished curriculum (O'Connor, 2014; Fergus et al., 2014; Smith, 2013); and the care had stepped closer to control (McQuaig, 2012; Sernak, 1998; McLaughlin, 1991; Oakes, 2005; Kohl, 1988). In the current study, for example, at Lambert High School some students had been convinced to remain at school for Year 12, but once the students agreed to stay, the school refused to alter the timetable so that the students could take the subjects they were interested in. In fact, in this study, many students appeared to be longing for greater breadth and depth of learning. The requested components of music, sport, performing arts, and the arts in general, are referred to in the literature as necessary for young people's development (O'Connor, 2014; Snook & O'Neill,

2014), for the recognition of their growth rather than their deficiencies, and to instill some fun in to their learning (Smitherman, 2007; Thrupp, 2005; Fergus et al., 2014; Delpit, 2012).

Communication.

Thus, the extent of cultural responsiveness in pastoral care appears to require students being able to draw on a wide range of adult expertise and many connections. In this study, co-ordination and communication (which seem to be so integral to comprehensive pastoral care connections) were an ongoing frustration for many respondents (Hellwig, 1989; Gorinski & Fraser, 2006; Trimble, 2002).

In low decile schools, the lack of reliable phone numbers or telephones, or internet connections, consumed an inordinate amount of school staff time (Gorinski & Fraser, 2006; Trimble, 2002). Sometimes it was presumed that families also preferred not to speak to school staff which raised questions regarding families feeling alienated from their child/ren's school. Staff members noted other families felt 'singled out' rather than feeling as though they were simply part of a team caring for their child (Gorinski & Fraser, 2006). A staff member at Lambert High School did not manage to elicit any responses from a Māori mother and father in a school office until it was stated that they (several staff members and the parents) were all going to work together to help their child.

In conjunction, in this study it was acknowledged that school communication systems were not particularly reliable, and co-ordination was often under-developed between staff. Communication inadequacies appeared to be exacerbated when discipline issues were being tended to in a school. There seemed to be tensions between teachers and other staff members in terms of the extent to which a teacher attempted to understand a student's history, their present circumstances, and the contemporary *stereotype threat* (Steele, 2010; Goff et al., 2008; Katz, 2003; McKown & Weinstein, 2003) of being a Māori or Pasifika school student. Several respondents expressed disdain at teacher decisions to punish a student, when it was believed that some additional understanding, empathy and time may have prevented a student from the cascade of interventions which eventually rendered them with *a label* (Anae,

1997) and further school disengagement. School staff generally believed that by working with families (whether through the restorative approach, or not), outcomes for the student and the school could be more beneficial (Perez, 2009; Leahy, 2015).

Language barriers (Gorinski & Fraser, 2006) heightened all of the aforementioned communication issues in the current study. School phone messages left on home phones in English when parents spoke a different language, or school staff attempting to conduct a meeting in English when it was not the home language, were both barriers to effective pastoral care. At Chilwell College and Lambert High School there were multiple episodes of students also not receiving governmental funding for their special learning requirements because of communication difficulties. In addition, literacy for lower decile secondary school students was a notable barrier to classroom learning (Nieto & Bode, 2012). When considering equitable opportunities to learn, it was clear that schools needed to put additional resources in to effective English speaking and writing lessons at the beginning of secondary school; or create multilingual learning environments (Tuafuti & McCaffery, 2005). Proactively, Chilwell College had utilized some Pasifika translators to assist students and their families. Without addressing the above communication and literacy issues, students had less opportunity to engage in classroom learning (Nieto & Bode, 2012) and pastoral care was, therefore, less comprehensive and inclusive.

Beyond the school.

Additional care for school students from outside of the school environment often appeared to compound existing co-ordination of care difficulties from within the school (Higgins & Nairn, 2014). Respondents referred to RTLBs, AE, Children Young People and their Families (CYPFs), and Counsel for the Child as groups of people who, despite providing some helpful services, often corrupted the flow of care within a school. This is concerning as, in the current study, pastoral care extends beyond the boundaries of the school environment (Calvert, 2009). More specifically, as with pastoral care within the school, pastoral care from beyond the school appears to require a well co-ordinated, strengths-based, family-centred, culturally responsive approach (Noblit, 1993). Thus, Bronfenbrenner's (1979) *macro* and *micro* levels of wellbeing, are endorsed.

Māori and Pasifika Students' Fluid Identities

A sixth, and final, finding was related to Māori and Pasifika students' desire for flexibility in terms of their sense of belonging and identification with various Māori and/or Pasifika groups. In the literature, Borell (2005) contended that an inclusionary perspective of culture strengthens the wide range of identities which Māori and Pasifika students have in contemporary society. Many Māori and Pasifika young people in this study, shared similarities such as: experiences of racism, neighbourhood particularities (Borell, 2005; Brooks-Gunn, 1995; Wilson, 1997), and negative experiences of school despite different school environments (Mara, 2014).

A damaging issue for male school students was referred to by several participants. Some school staff – perhaps unwittingly – displayed a lack of awareness of the impact of school decisions on boys' brotherhood (Wyatt, 2009). Male student respondents were staunch defenders of their brotherhood. At Lambert High School, the brotherhood was so strong that some students had the school's motto tattooed on their chest. At Chilwell College and Lambert High School, brotherhood was signalled to be a reason to stay at school, an anchor point in their lives, and a source of malcontent when it was tampered with. For example, some Pasifika participants were disturbed by the particular school's decision to split Pasifika rugby boys in to their different Pasifika ethnic groups on the school field. Respondents suggested that the decision had caused friction between the various Pasifika groups and created a pecking order of Pasifika ethnicities. It could be argued that the lack of culturally appropriate/responsive pastoral care had led to an unsatisfactory situation for the school students. Although Pasifika often prefer to be acknowledged for their individual ethnicities (Siataga, 2011; Anae, 1997), in the current study the respondents provided an example of the need to communicate with students more thoroughly in order to meet their specific needs in particular contexts (Lartey, 2003). Interestingly, a further example of student humiliation in this study (with vociferous exclamations) was related to inappropriate types, or frequent changes in, uniform. Students from Chilwell College and Lambert High School both referred to their family's difficulties in replacing an old uniform design with a new one when there was inadequate money for food at home. Chilwell College students felt that their

school had not listened to their *shame* in wearing a uniform that many of the students disliked.

Agency.

In order to be equipped to disrupt entrenched cultural patterns Fergus et al. (2014) suggested promoting agency for students, as well as collective agency (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008; Cunningham, 2008; Penetito, 2005; Cushman, 2003), for the school, teachers (Bishop et al., 2010) and the community (Perez, 2009) to foster positive change. According to Grace (1994):

> structural and cultural determinism has to be resisted, and the constant dialectical interplay of structure and agency must be brought back in to the analysis. In other words, while there may have to be pessimism (arising from facing the facts) there should also be optimism (arising from the potential of agency). (p. 55)

The importance of agency was apparent in the current study as a number of students recounted how some of their friends had *given up* and left school early (Smyth & Banks, 2012; Penetito, 2005). In their narratives, some of the respondents appeared to be *holding up* against the alienating challenges of being at school, but there was an inferred clock ticking (or a timeframe) within which they too might decide it was time to *give up* (Smith, 2013). There was evidence among some students of an ongoing *toss-up* of whether it was more unsafe to leave school, or more unsafe to remain in a toxic school environment (Fine et al., 2014). Some students admitted that staying at school was only due to one particular staff member of their own ethnicity. Thus, the students' agency had the potential to reduce their feelings of powerlessness (Grace, 1994) in an unstable situation where, perhaps, only one staff member was engaged in pastoral care which engendered the students' trust.

Student agency was also inherently linked to their family's agency. In order to foster the agency of Māori and Pasifika families, schools need to give control to families (and their communities). Families require information within frameworks that they can relate to so that they can make choices with their child. Thus, the school environment needs to be kept close to the student environment so that culture and

school are connected. What the student *brings* to school is important. There needs to be an acknowledgement by all adults working in education of the social interdependence that is necessary to facilitate wellbeing in Māori and Pasifika secondary school students. This includes closer collaboration between the education and health sectors. Māori and Pasifika young people and their families need to be involved in the consultation, planning, implementation and appraisal of *what is important to them* in the school context.

Summary

Fine et al. (2014) documented the lack of wellbeing that may be present when (pastoral) care is inadequate in the school environment. Yet, as Dale (2014) contended, "the issue is structural and political before it is technical and processual" (p. 11). This is a pivotal point as it looks likely that the structural changes which need to occur in order that school staff (and relevant adults from beyond the school environment), can better fulfil their roles within a culturally responsive approach to pastoral care, are overdue for Māori and Pasifika students. This chapter has reinforced the contention that socio-ecological and cultural models of care hold much relevance when considering comprehensive approaches towards promoting school retention, and addressing cumulative student disengagement (Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Durie, 1994; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001; Pomeroy, 1999). The implications of these findings are discussed in the final chapter.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS

Tell me, I forget
Show me, I remember
Involve me, I understand.
                    Chinese Proverb

Strengths and Limitations

In consideration of the importance of the current study, several strengths and several limitations were recognized. The first strength is its valuable contribution to such research, based in four schools, in the New Zealand context. Whereas other research has taken a cursory look, or positioned pastoral care as an assumed component of the fabric of a school, this research takes a fresh and in-depth approach by exploring what pastoral care might, in fact, *be* in New Zealand secondary schools.

A second strength is evident in the multiple case study design used. Multiple case studies in this area of research are quite rare, but the complicated phenomenon received better representation by delving more deeply, and more thoroughly, in to the case (pastoral care). In order to do so, commonly conceived notions of pastoral care were either somewhat supported, or discarded, by the richly layered individual, and collective participant accounts of pastoral care in secondary schools. The detailed, multi-faceted illustration has presented a stark, and at times confronting view of pastoral care today, rather than the brief, superficial glance which other research has occasionally afforded it.

Thirdly, a strength of the study is its inclusion of Māori and Pasifika students' views of the phenomenon under investigation in a way in which young peoples' experiences/voices have been interwoven and portrayed in connection with the school staff who interact with them. This presentation is consistent with the socio-ecological (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) approach towards wellbeing which initially gave impetus to the research. The socio-ecological approach is aligned with several cultural Māori and Pasifika models (Durie, 1994; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001; MoE, 2007) of wellbeing which propose that all aspects of a person need to be taken care of in the process of

lived wellbeing, and therefore require closer collaboration between the education and health sectors.

Lastly, there is a strength in the inclusion of Māori and Pasifika students, together, in the current study. The commonalities and differences for Māori and Pasifika peoples in New Zealand's Pacific context gave credibility to the essence of the study (Tupuola, 2004). This related to moving towards achieving equity under the Treaty of Waitangi, along with fostering the wellbeing of Māori and Pasifika students separately as ethnic groups, but also in a process of ongoing evolving relationships with each other (Leahy, 2015; Smith, 2013; Cram et al., 2014). It is important to recognize that neither Māori, nor Pasifika people speak with one voice. Even though Māori and Pasifika are often grouped clumsily together in negative statistics, there are infact many more layers related to wellbeing that connect to the students' contexts; and which exist beneath the statistics.

In the consideration of limitations of this study, firstly, the scope was necessarily capped due to the complicated nature of the phenomenon. The study explored the nature and purpose of pastoral care at a relatively small amount of schools. Even though the schools were purposively chosen (Patton, 2002), there was not sufficient scope from which to glean further conclusions from a wider range of diverse schools. Limitations were also apparent due to the abundance of participant information, which meant that prioritization needed to be given to parts of respondents' narratives. This resulted in facets such as the implications for mixed-ethnicity Māori and Pasifika students being briefly mentioned rather than interrogated. It is hoped that such topics will become detailed studies for other future research in New Zealand schools.

A further limitation in the study is the lack of participants from other areas of school life. Pastoral care warrants further investigation in to the contribution, involvement and interplay between other adults within, and beyond, schools. These people may include grandparents, physiotherapists, caretakers, iwi liaison people, church ministers, public health nurses, kapa haka tutors, dentists/dental nurses, and most particularly, administrators. An additional concern was that the study was only conducted in Auckland. The study of pastoral care in other areas of New Zealand may

bring about distinctly different results when the demographics of Auckland are considered.

In addition, the parameters of this study only extended to a passing consideration of the probable effects of the role of the interviewer. There was a risk that a non-Pasifika interviewer would elicit different responses to questions than a Pasifika interviewer; but it is acknowledged that some Pasifika people feel more anonymity speaking to a non-Pasifika person. In conjunction, the detailed description in the Methods section (chapter three), of how the researcher trained and practiced being an interviewer assisted the process before collecting any data in schools. Although there is value in being both an insider and an outsider in this study, it would add to the breadth of the research to have Pasifika interviewers; along with male interviewers from both Māori and Pasifika ethnicities. Different responses may be given if an interviewer is of the same gender as participants.

Recommendations

With the results of this study in mind, recommendations are suggested below for school staff, families, students, and other staff involved in education. As the study arose out of a concern for equitable student wellbeing there is emphasis on possibilities for moving towards greater wellbeing by increased participation and engagement - for all - in culturally responsive school environments. Institutionalized racism needs addressing at all levels of education. Personally mediated and internalized racism also need addressing, but as institutionalized racism is often invisibly embedded in educational structures, it is hoped that by reducing institutionalized racism, the other forms of racism will decline as well (Jones, 2000).

School Staff

All school staff are urged to gain an awareness of the importance of the study's findings in terms of the day-to-day effects of interactions with secondary students. The study alerts each staff member – not just teachers – to acknowledge the significance of a culturally responsive pastoral care approach that is inclusive of Māori and Pasifika students.

The complexities of supportive adult-to-student relationships in the study suggested that professional development with a basis in cultural responsiveness, is vital. The required level of expertise from tutors delivering professional development would be extensive. The tutors would, therefore, need to be highly regarded people by Māori and Pasifika communities before they were appointed. Māori and Pasifika history in New Zealand would be an important starting point for professional development. Separate considerations would be necessary for Māori students, as well as the various Pasifika ethnicities in New Zealand schools. School staff would be better equipped to dismiss negative stereotypes of Māori and Pasifika students with such additional ongoing training.

In conjunction, this study draws attention to the perspectives of Māori and Pasifika student ethnicities. Findings from the study suggest that static, prescriptive notions of individual Māori or Pasifika student ethnic identities are too limiting. Students indicated that they preferred to decide how their ethnicity/s would be lived. Assumptions by school staff appeared to be neither helpful, nor appropriate, and did not amount to safe pastoral care. The study suggested that the development of pastoral care in which staff respected student choice/agency would be beneficial.

Families

The current study also highlighted how (or whether) families are incorporated in to school life; but, more particularly, pastoral care. Although it is acknowledged that families are not passive, this study suggested that Māori and Pasifika families would be likely to benefit from culturally responsive invitations to be partners, rather than sideliners, in their child/ren's education (Leahy, 2015). Genuine culturally responsive pastoral care may allow families (particularly adults) to heal from the widely documented alienation which many Māori and Pasifika people felt in school contexts in the past (Milne, 2013).

The empowerment of families by a high quality process of culturally responsive pastoral care could deactivate some of the frustration and resistance which was apparent from student participants in this study. Supporting parents so that they

may fulfil governance roles at their children's schools, improving school communication strategies, along with addressing language barriers also appeared to be necessary for families to more comfortably interact with, and trust, their children's schools.

Students

In order to increase Māori and Pasifika engagement in secondary school, the current study noted that deficiencies of the school curriculum need addressing. This study found that pastoral care runs through the curriculum. In relation (as the curriculum is not neutral), a more culturally responsive interpretation of the New Zealand Curriculum (MoE, 2007) in all subjects (including Health and PE) appears to be necessary in order to encourage greater student engagement and, in turn, higher levels of Māori and Pasifika school retention.

A more culturally responsive curriculum may also assist student behaviour and discipline. In the current study, there was rhetoric against schools being punitive. In reality, however, some staff members were quite apathetic in relation to student discipline and (perhaps lacking adequate pastoral support themselves), reverted to knee-jerk punitive responses. It was evident that such responses lacked a full understanding of the student's background.

In low decile schools, this study found that funding was inadequate. In order to offer an enriching and engaging curriculum, additional funds are required due to the substantial amount which low decile schools use to provide basic necessities for their students. An impoverished curriculum was found to potentially achieve positive academic results, but in consideration of socio-ecological/holistic models of wellbeing, the whole person/student needs to be nurtured. School staff, therefore, need to be enabled to allow Māori and Pasifika students to imagine their own possibilities. Comprehensive pastoral care policies that attend to all aspects of a student may be a beneficial addition to the development of pastoral care in secondary schools. In this study, the specificities of each school context also appeared to be dominant within desirable, culturally responsive pastoral care approaches. The importance of narrowing the chasm between home and school contexts, for Māori and

Pasifika students, was a compelling factor in the current study (appropriate action in this area also applied to adults beyond the school who were involved in the care of students). This needs to be an on-going process that is modified when necessary to meet the needs of the students.

Furthermore, pastoral care for Māori and Pasifika students in higher decile schools would involve varied components in order to enable students to engage in their environments as Māori, or as Pasfika (the choice to do so, should be open to students in all deciles). Schools, in all deciles, must also be responsive to those students who do not wish to be singled out for their ethnicity. This may relate to ethnically-based group meetings (often at the start of the year), which some schools co-ordinate in order to offer ethnic-specific pastoral care, (due to ethnic categories which families have ticked on enrolement forms). In this study, students wished to have choice regarding ethnic specific school events.

Recommendations for Further Research

Given the implications of the current study, it is recommended that future research includes additional investigation in to pastoral care for multiple ethnic groups of people in New Zealand. The growing diversity of the country, in populations such as Chinese and South African students (Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment [MBIE], 2015), suggests that ethnic groups apart from Māori and Pasifika could benefit from an exploration in to what specific requirements their people might need in various school contexts. A further area where research is encouraged is in to the intersection of, for example, Māori and Chinese students in various contexts. The intersection of different Pasifika ethnicities would be worthwhile research, as would an exploration of South African secondary students in New Zealand school settings, in terms of the nature of pastoral care which would be most appropriate.

In light of New Zealand's increasing differences in ethnicities, research in to other sectors' approaches towards diversity may help to inform concepts (Smith, 2013) of cultural responsiveness in education and health. Named 'cultural intelligence' in, for example, business, (Livermore, 2010; Early & Ang, 2003), law

and government, it is understood as "the capability to relate and work effectively across cultures" (www.superdiversity.org).

Another important area for future research is the interplay between ethnicity and disabled students in Māori and Pasifika communities. The nuances of disabled students' experiences in school contexts could provide useful information for school pastoral care policies, and for government funding (Thrupp, 2006a).

A further area of research, related to the work of Bevan-Brown (2009b) which may helpfully inform school staff is consideration of pastoral care for gifted and talented Pasifika students, and their families. Similarly, research in to pastoral care for Māori and Pasifka lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex (LGBTQi) students is a gravely under-recognised need in our communities (Lucassen et al., 2014). All of the aforementioned areas of research would also be advised from a basis of viewing young peoples' ethnicity as fluid (and personal), in terms of how, and when, it is grown as a strength.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study's significance is situated within the illustration it gives of the complexities of pastoral care in four New Zealand secondary schools. Far from being a historically British, and largely Christian based concept, it has the potential to be a culturally responsive vehicle for the empowerment of Māori and Pasifika students (whatever the nature of their spirituality), in the contemporary New Zealand school setting.

The current study found that the *manuals* of how to *drive* such a vehicle (to develop and foster culturally responsive pastoral care) are located within communities. Until communities are genuinely welcomed in to schools, and families as well as their children are engaged rather than simply present, the driving forward of nurturing pastoral care will be obstructed. In conjunction, a comprehensive professional development process will be required in order for school staff to acquire adequate competency for the many and varied interactions with Māori and Pasifika families which will become normative.

This study has also shown that adjustments, due to historical disparities, for Māori and Pasifika students need to work in concert with the equitable, and just, funding of pastoral care processes in schools. In this way, sustainable culturally responsive pastoral care has the potential to become the enabler for fuller Māori and Pasifika student participation in schools, along with a stronger sense of belonging.

In so doing, pastoral care, or whatever else we might care to call it, is perhaps above all pervaded by *an attitude* towards nurturing relationships from which all in New Zealand society stand to benefit. Particularly salient areas of beneficial change would be through the less likely incarceration of young Māori and Pasifika people, and through a greater depth of developed talent for Māori and Pasifika students in order to contribute to the New Zealand context; but also as proud citizens representing us all in global contexts.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONING GUIDE

School Staff Individual Interviews

i.   How would you define pastoral care in this school?

ii.   What are the relationships like between school staff and students' families when caring for students?

iii.   What do you see as the most important factors in order for Māori and Pasifika students to achieve and do well in this school? If there could be some improvements in your school, what would they be?

iv.   To what adults, apart from teachers, do you believe students link with, in this school?

v.   What outside agencies work with and/or visit this school? How do you find these relationships?

vi.   If you could wave a magic wand in your role, what would it be that you would ask for individually?

vii.   If you could wave a magic wand in your role, what would it be that you would ask for, for the school?

viii.   Why do students stay until the end of Year 13 in this school?

ix.   How do you perceive resourcing between schools of different deciles?

x.   In what ways does this school assist students to move in to other educational institutions instead of completing Years 12 and 13?

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONING GUIDE

Student Focus Group Interviews

i.   What factors [What are some reasons that] would make you want to stay at school until the end of Year 13?

ii.   What factors would [What are some of the things that would] make you want to leave school before the end of Year 13?

iii.   What [sorts of things] make you feel happy and comfortable at school?

iv.   What are some of the things that could make you feel unhappy at school?

v.   How could your school contribute to making you feel more happy when you are here?

vi.   Thinking of your favourite staff members at school: what are the factors [things] you like most about them?

vii.   How are you cared for at your school? [how do you feel looked-after by your school?]

viii.   If you had a magic wand, what would be one thing you would most like to change at your school?

ix.   How is your ethnic group looked after/cared for at your school?

x.   What areas of school would you like more choice in? [or would like that you don't have already?]

THE UNIVERSITY
OF AUCKLAND
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Te Kura Akoranga o Tāmaki Makaurau
Incorporating the Auckland College of Education

Participant Information Sheet: Principal/Board of Trustees

Researcher: Charmaine Barber

Project title: *The nature of pastoral care for secondary students*

Date:

Dear Principal and Board of Trustees members,

My name is Charmaine Barber and I am a PhD student at the University of Auckland Faculties of Education and Health Sciences. I am about to undertake a research project and I seek your permission to ask your staff, and Year 12-13 students to participate in this research project. The aim of the study is to explore and interpret pastoral care along with its potential association with school retention, particularly for Māori and Pasifika students.

The study has two components: focus groups and individual interviews. I wish to obtain your permission to:

   a) Conduct a focus group interview. The focus group will be conducted with up to10 teacher-selected students for 30-60 minutes. The focus group interview will be conducted on school grounds in a time that causes least interruption to the school day.
   b) Conduct individual interviews with school staff. Confidential 30-minute interviews will be undertaken with 10-15 key staff members involved in pastoral care. All of the interviews will enquire into the nature of pastoral care in the school setting..

The interviews and focus group interviews will be digitally recorded and transcribed. Unobtrusive observations and a document review will also be components of the study during the researcher's time in your school, with your consent. I also request your permission to ask the Year 12-13 Māori and Pasifika students to give consent to take part in the study.

Staff and student participation is completely voluntary and participation or non-participation will not be revealed to anyone except the researcher. Non-participation will not affect the students in terms of their relationship with the school or their grades, and school staff participation or non-participation will in no way affect any staff member's employment. The staff, students, or their families, may withdraw their permission at any time with no negative consequences. Students will not be encouraged to name teachers, or other school staff, they comment on. If, however,

they inadvertently name an individual teacher, the teacher's confidentiality will be guaranteed as the researcher will only use pseudonyms where a name is required in a transcript, or report. The information interview participants provide may also be withdrawn up to the date of data analysis in October, 2015. Only the researcher, transcriber, data entry person(s) and academic supervisors will have access to the information contained in the interviews, observations, documents and consent forms, which will be stored in a locked cupboard in Associate Professor Ben Dyson's office at the University of Auckland for a period of six years. They will then be destroyed by shredding the paper, and erasing the digital audio files.

The data gathered at your school and content from the subsequent doctoral thesis may be published for a wider academic audience, but the identity of your school and the students involved will not be revealed at any point.

Individual interview data will be analysed by the researcher and a hard copy of the transcription and analysis will be made available to participants so that they have the opportunity to read and revise their interview transcripts. The transcriber will be required to sign and abide by a confidentiality agreement. Your school will be given a copy of the final report and the researcher will present the study findings to staff, parents or Board of Trustees at the school's request.

If you have any questions about this research or would like to discuss any concerns prior to providing consent, please feel free to contact me on 09 623 8899, or my doctoral supervisor or Head of School.

Associate Professor Ben Dyson
09 623 8899 (extn. 48337)
Faculty of Education
Rm N525
The University of Auckland
74 Epsom Avenue
Epsom
Auckland 1023
b.dyson@auckland.ac.nz

Professor Judy Parr
09 623 8899 (extn. 88998)
Faculty of Education
Rm N501
The University of Auckland
74 Epsom Avenue
Epsom
Auckland 1023
jm.parr@auckland.ac.nz

For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Research Office, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142. Telephone 09 373-7599 extn. 87830/83761. Email: humanethics@auckland.ac.nz

If your school is happy to participate in this study please sign the attached consent form and return in the self addressed envelope.

Kind Regards,

Charmaine Barber.

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE on the 31 OCTOBER for a period of three years. Reference number 2013/9951.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF AUCKLAND
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Te Kura Akoranga o Tāmaki Makaurau
Incorporating the Auckland College of Education

Participant Information Sheet: School Staff

(Individual Staff Interview)

Researcher: **Charmaine Barber**

Project title: *The nature of pastoral care for secondary students.*

Date:

Dear Staff Member,

My name is Charmaine Barber and I am a PhD student at the University of Auckland Faculties of Education and Health Sciences. I would like to invite you to participate in a research project exploring the nature of pastoral care for Māori and Pasifika students in secondary schools. To better understand this topic it is important to talk to some school staff about their experiences of pastoral care. The study requires that a number of staff, across four schools, complete a 30-60 minute one-on-one interview with the researcher, answering questions about his/her role in pastoral care. There are approximately 40 staff in all being interviewed, 6-15 from each school. Your school has identified you as a suitable participant due to your role in pastoral care.

If you agree to participate, your interview will be undertaken at school, in a time that will cause the least disruption to you. Your participation is completely voluntary and the information you provide will not be revealed to anyone except the researcher. Your name will not be used in any written report. I would like to audiotape the interview but you may ask that the audio recorder be turned off at any stage during the interview. You may withdraw your participation and any information you have provided up until the time of data analysis in October, 2015 with no negative consequences. Only the researcher, transcriber, data entry person(s) and academic supervisors will have access to the information contained in the interviews, which will be stored in Associate Professor Ben Dyson's office at the University of Auckland for a period of six years, after which they will be destroyed by erasing digital audio files and shredding paper. The transcriber will be asked to sign an agreement requiring that the confidentiality of all information be preserved.

If you have any questions about this research or would like to discuss any concerns prior to providing consent, please feel feel free to contact me on 09 623 8899, or my doctoral supervisor or Head of School.

Associate Professor Ben Dyson
09 623 8899 (extn. 48337)
Faculty of Education
Rm N525
The University of Auckland
74 Epsom Avenue
Epsom
Auckland 1023
b.dyson@auckland.ac.nz

Professor Judy Parr
09 623 8899 (extn. 88998)
Faculty of Education
Rm N 501
The University of Auckland
74 Epsom Avenue
Epsom
Auckland 1023
jm.parr@auckland.ac.nz

For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Research Office, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142. Telephone 09 373-7599 extn. 87830/83761. Email: humanethics@auckland.ac.nz

If you are happy to participate in this study please sign the enclosed consent form and return it in the self-addressed envelope provided.

Kind Regards,

Charmaine Barber.

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE on the 31 OCTOBER for a period of three years. Reference number 2013/9951.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF AUCKLAND
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Te Kura Akoranga o Tāmaki Makaurau
Incorporating the Auckland College of Education

Participant Information Sheet: Students

(Student Focus Group Interview)

Researcher: Charmaine Barber

Project title: *The nature of pastoral care for secondary students.*

Date:

Dear Year 12 or 13 student,

My name is Charmaine Barber and I am a PhD student at the University of Auckland. You are invited to take part in a project which is exploring the care and support that Māori and Pasifika students receive in secondary schools. To better understand this topic it is important to talk to some Year 12 or 13 Māori and Pasifika students about their experiences at school. The study requires that a number of students participate in a focus group interview with the researcher, answering questions about his/her care and support at school. There are approximately 10 students participating in the focus group interview together at one time for up to an hour. Your school has identified you as a student who has shown interest in the focus group interview.

Initially the researcher will meet with the Principal of your school to discuss the study. This will be followed by an oral presentation to your teachers and other school staff, as well as an oral presentation to students at your school. The researcher will be able to answer questions about the research and you will be given the opportunity to volunteer to participate. This invitation will also be extended to staff at your school.

If you agree to participate, the focus group will be undertaken at school, in a time that will cause the least disruption to students and your teachers. Your participation or non-participation is not linked to any assessment or course requirements and will not affect your school grades in any way. Your participation is completely voluntary and the information you provide will not be revealed to anyone except the researcher and other students in the focus group. Due to a number of individuals being together in a focus group, your confidentiality cannot be guaranteed but your name will not be used in any written report. The focus group will be audio-taped. You may withdraw your participation at any stage with no negative consequences but the information you have given up to that point will need to stay in the study. Only the researcher, transcriber, data entry person(s) and academic supervisors will have access to the information contained in the focus groups. This information will be stored in Associate Professor Ben Dyson's office at the University of Auckland for a period of six years. After that

time they will be destroyed by erasing digital audio files, and shredding paper. To ensure confidentiality the transcriber of all digital files will be asked to sign an agreement requiring that the confidentiality of all information from the focus groups be preserved.

If you have any questions about this research or would like to discuss any concerns prior to providing consent, please feel feel free to contact me on 09 6238899, or my doctoral supervisor or Head of School.

Associate Professor Ben Dyson
09 623 8899 (extn. 48337)
b.dyson@auckland.ac.nz

Professor Judy Parr
09 623 8899 (extn. 88998)
jm.parr@auckland.ac.nz

For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Research Office, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142. Telephone 09 373-7599 extn. 87830/83761. Email: humanethics@auckland.ac.nz

If you are happy to participate in this study please sign the enclosed consent form and return it in the self-addressed envelope provided, or simply return it to your school office.

Kind Regards,

Charmaine Barber.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF AUCKLAND
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Te Kura Akoranga o Tāmaki Makaurau
Incorporating the Auckland College of Education

Consent Form: Principal/Board of Trustees

(This form will be held for a period of six years)

Researcher: Charmaine Barber

Project title: *The nature of pastoral care for secondary students*

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, have understood the nature of the research and why our school has been selected. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

• I understand that our participation in this study is completely voluntary.

• I give assurance that participation or non-participation in this study will in no way affect any school staff member's employment.

• I agree that non-participation will not affect the student's relationship with the school or their grades.

• I understand that the school and all research participants may withdraw their information up until the date of data analysis, December, 2014.

• I understand that only the researcher, transcriber and academic supervisors will have access to the information contained in the questionnaires, interviews, documents, observations and consent forms.

• I understand that the transcriber will be required to sign a confidentiality form.

• I understand that data gathered may be used to contribute to the academic literature but all names will have a pseudonym in order to ensure confidentiality. Findings may also be used for publication and conference presentations.

• I am aware that the school will be given a copy of the final report which participants and non-participants are welcome to read.

• I understand that all data and consent forms will be stored separately in a locked filing cabinet in Associate Professor Ben Dyson's office at the University of

Auckland for a period of six years, after which they will be destroyed by erasing audio files and shredding paper.

On behalf of the Board of Trustees, I agree to our school taking part in this research.

Name…………………………. Signature………………………………..

Date…………………………... Name of School…………………………

THE UNIVERSITY
OF AUCKLAND
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Te Kura Akoranga o Tāmaki Makaurau
Incorporating the Auckland College of Education

Consent Form: School Staff (Interview)

(This form will be stored for a period of six years)

Researcher: Charmaine Barber

Project title: *The nature of pastoral care for secondary students*

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, have understood the nature of the research and why I have been selected. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

• I understand that the interview will take approximately 30 minutes.

• I consent to being interviewed for the study with the understanding that my participation is entirely voluntary and I can withdraw at any time with no negative consequences.

• I understand that participation or non-participation in this study will in no way affect my employment as a school staff member.

• I understand that I can withdraw any information I have provided up to the date of data analysis in December, 2014.

• I agree to the interview being audio-recorded and then transcribed, but I am aware that I can have the audio recorder turned off at any time.

• I understand that my identity will be kept strictly confidential.

• I understand that data gathered may be used to contribute to the academic literature but all names will have a pseudonym in order to ensure confidentiality. Findings may also be used for publication and conference presentations.

• I understand that only the researcher, transcriber and academic supervisors will have access to the information contained in the questionnaires, interviews, documents, observations and consent forms.

• I understand that all data and consent forms will be stored separately in the Associate Professor Ben Dyson's office at the University of Auckland for a period of

six years, after which time the digital audio files will be erased and the paper shredded.

I agree to taking part in this research project.

Name………………………………………..

School……………………………………

Signature……………………………………

Date…………………………………….........

THE UNIVERSITY
OF AUCKLAND
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
Te Kura Akoranga o Tāmaki Makaurau
Incorporating the Auckland College of Education

Consent Form: Students (Focus Group Interview)

(This form will be held for a period of six years)

Researcher: Charmaine Barber

Project title: *The nature of pastoral care for secondary students*

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, have understood the nature of the research and why I have been selected. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

• I understand that the focus group interview will take approximately an hour.

• I consent to participating in the focus group interview with the understanding that my participation is entirely voluntary and I can withdraw at any time with no negative consequences, however, due to the confidentiality of the other participants, my information up to the point of withdrawal will stay in the study.

• I agree to the focus group being audio-recorded and then transcribed.

• I understand that there are a number of students in a focus group so it is not guaranteed that my identity is confidential.

• I agree to not disclose anything which is discussed in the focus group.

• I understand that only the researcher, transcriber and academic supervisors will have access to the information contained in the focus group questionnaires, interviews, documents, observations and consent forms.

• I understand that all data and consent forms will be stored separately in Associate Professor Ben Dyson's office at the University of Auckland for a period of six years, after which time the audio files will be erased and the paper shredded.

Although your name is required on this consent form your identity will remain anonymous.

I agree to participate in this research project   Yes ……   No ……

I agree to being audio-recorded   Yes ……   No ……

Name…………………………………….

Date……………………………………...

REFERENCES

Abel, E., & Nelson, M. (1990). (Eds.). *Circles of Care. Work and Identity in Women's Lives*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Alexander, K., Entwisle, D., & Kabbani, N. (2001). The Dropout Process in Life Course Perspective: Early Risk Factors at Home and School. *Teachers College Record*, *103*(5), 760-823.

Anae, M. (1997). Towards a NZ-born Samoan identity: some reflections on "labels". *Pacific Health Dialog*, *4*(2), 128-137.

Anae, M., Anderson, H., Benseman, J., & Coxon, E. (2002). *Pacific Peoples and Tertiary Education: Issues of Participation*. Final Report. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Anyon, J. (1997). *Ghetto Schooling: A Political Economy of Urban Educational Reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Anyon, J. (2009). Theory And Educational Research. Toward Critical Social Explanation. New York: Routledge.

Atwater, S. (2008). Waking Up to Difference: Teachers, Color-Blindness, and the Effects on Students of Color. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *35*(3), 246-253.

Augsburger, D. (1986). *Pastoral Counseling Across Cultures*. Pennsylvania: Westminster Press.

Aumua, T. (2013). Mind the gap. *Spasifik*, *57*, 36-37.

Beecroft, A. (Guest). (2012, July 16). *Morning Report*. Wellington, New Zealand: Radio New Zealand.

Best, R., Jarvis, C., & Ribbins, P. (Eds.). (1980). *Perspectives on Pastoral Care*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Best, R. (1989). Pastoral Care: Some Reflections and a Re-statement. *Pastoral Care in Education*, *7*(4), 7-14.

Best, R. (1999). The impact on pastoral care of structural, organisational and statutory changes in schooling: some empirical evidence and a discussion. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, *27*(1), 55-70.

Best, R. (2014). Forty years of Pastoral Care: an appraisal of Michael Marland's seminal book and its significance for pastoral care in schools. *Pastoral Care in Education*, *32*(3), 173-185.

Bevan-Brown, J. (2003). *The Cultural Self Review. Providing culturally effective inclusive education for Māori learners*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Bevan-Brown, J. (2006). Beyond policy and good intentions. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *10*(2-3), 221-234.

Bevan-Brown, J. (2009a). *Māori learners with special needs. Culturally appropriate, effective provisions*. Germany: Lambert Academic.

Bevan-Brown, J. (2009b). Identifying and Providing for Gifted and Talented Māori Students. *APEX, 15*(4), 6-20.

Bhabha, H. (1995). Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths, & H. Tiffin, *The Post Colonial Studies Reader* (pp. 206-209). New York: Routledge.

Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing ourselves from neocolonial domination in research: A Kaupapa Māori approach to creating knowledge. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. 3rd ed. (pp. 109-138). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Bishop, R. (2011). *Freeing Ourselves*. The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

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

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Powell, A., & Teddy, L. (2007). *Te Kōtahitanga. Improving the Educational Achivement of Māori Students in Mainstream Education. Phase 2: Towards A Whole School Approach*. Final Report. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., & Wearmouth, J. (2014). *Te Kōtahitanga: towards effective education reform for indigenous and other minoritised students*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Bishop, R., O'Sullivan, D., & Berryman, M. (2010). *Scaling up Education Reform: Addressing the Politics of Disparity*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Blum, L. (1999). Ethnicity, Identity, and Community. In M. Katz, N. Noddings & K. Strike (Eds.), *Justice and Caring. The Search for Common Ground in Education* (pp. 127-145). New York: Teachers College Press.

Blum, R., Beuhring, T., & Rinehart, P. (2000). *Protecting Teens: Beyond Race, Income and Family Structure*. Evaluative Report. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Borell, B. (2005). *Living in the City Ain't So Bad: Cultural Diversity of South Auckland Rangatahi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Massey University, New Zealand.

Borell, B., Gregory, A., McCreanor, T., & Jensen, V. (2009). "It's Hard at the Top but It's a Whole Lot Easier than Being at the Bottom:" The Role of Privilege in Understanding Disparities in Aotearoa/New Zealand". *Race/Ethnicity*: *Multidisciplinary Global Perspectives*, *3*(1), 29-50.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*, 77-101.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986a). *Alienation and the Four Worlds of Childhood. Phi Delta Kappan*, *67*(6), 430-436.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986a). Ecology of the Family as a Context for Human Development: Research Perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, *22*(6), 723-742.

Brooks-Gunn, J. (1995). Children in Familes in Communities: Risk and Intervention in the Bronfenbrenner Tradition. In P. Moen, G. Elder (Jr), & K. Lűscher, *Examining Lives in Context. Perspectives on the Ecology of Human Development* (pp. 467-519). Washington: American Psychological Association.

Brown, B. (2012). *Daring Greatly*. New York: Penguin.

Brown, M. (2009). Reconceptualising outdoor adventure education: Activity in search of an appropriate theory. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, *13*(2), 3-13.

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

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford.

Buckley, J. (1980). The Care of Learning: some implications for school organization. In R. Best, C. Jarvis & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Perspectives on Pastoral Care* (pp. 182-195). London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Button, L. (1980). The Skills of Group Tutoring. In R. Best, C. Jarvis & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Perspectives on Pastoral Care* (pp. 70-80). London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Calvert, M. (2009). From 'pastoral care' to 'care': meanings and practices. *Pastoral Care in Education*, *27*(4), 267-277.

Calvert, M. & Henderson, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Managing Pastoral Care*. London: Cassell.

Campbell, L. (2003). As strong as the weakest link: urban high school dropout. *High School Journal*, *87*(2), 16-25.

Carpenter, V. (2014). Pedagogies of hope: Dialogical professional development. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 123-144). Auckland: Dunmore.

Clark, T., Smith, J., Raphael, D., Jackson, C., Denny, S., Fleming, T., …Crengle, C. (2010a). Kicked out of school and suffering. The health needs of alternative education youth in New Zealand. *Youth Studies Australia*, *29*(4), 10-17.

Clark, T., Smith, J., Raphael, D., Jackson, C., Fleming, T., Denny, S., …Robinson, E. (2010b). *Youth'09: The health and wellbeing of young people in Alternative Education. A report on the needs of Alternative Education students in Auckland and Northland*. Auckland: University of Auckland.

Clark, T., Fleming, T., Bullen, P., Crengle, S., Denny, S., Dyson, B., …Lewycka, S. (2013). Health and well-being of secondary school students in New Zealand: Trends between 2001, 2007 and 2012. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, *49*(11), 925-934.

Connell, R. (1992). *Citizenship, Social Justice & Curriculum*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Sociology of Education. Westhill, U.K.

Cook, B., Withy, K., Tarallo-Jensen, L., & Berry, S. (2005). Changes in *Kānaka Maoli* Men's Roles and Health: Healing the Warrior Self. *International Journal of Men's Health, 4*(2), 115-130.

Cook-Sather, A. (2014). The trajectory of student voice in educational research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *49*(2), 131-148.

Cooper, E. (2012). *Mokopuna rising: intervention in whānau violence*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Cooper, M., Hough, M., & Loynd, C. (2005). Scottish secondary school teachers' attitudes towards, and conceptualisations of, counselling. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 33*(2), 199-211.

Corbishley, P., & Evans, J. (1980). Teachers and Pastoral Care: an empirical comment. In R. Best, C. Jarvis & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Perspectives on Pastoral Care* (pp. 201-224). London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-Centred Teacher-Student Relationships Are Effective: A Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 113-143.

Cotterell, G., Von Randow, M., McTaggart, S., Sua'ali'i-Sauni, T., Patrick, D., & Davis, P. (2009). *Pacific families now and in the future: changing Pacific household composition and wellbeing 1981-2006*. Wellington: Families Commission.

Cram, F. (1999). *Workload issues for Māori secondary school teachers: an overview*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Cram, F. (2002). *Maori and Science: Three Case Studies*. Final Report. Prepared for The Royal Society of New Zealand. Auckland: Auckland Uniservices Limited.

Cram, F., Phillips, H., Sauni, P., & Tuagalu, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Māori and Pasifika Higher Education Horizons. Diversity in Higher Education*. Bingley, U.K: Emerald Group.

Crengle, S., Robinson, E., Ameratunga, S., Clark, T., & Raphael, D. (2012). Ethnic discrimination prevalence and associations with health outcomes: data from a nationally representative cross-sectional survey of secondary students in New Zealand. *BMC Public Health, 12*, 45-55.

Creswell, J., & Miller, D. (2000). Determining Validity in Qualitative Inquiry. *Theory Into Practice, 39*(3), 124-129.

Crigger, N. (1997). The Trouble With Caring: A Review of Eight Arguments Against an Ethic of Care. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 13*(4), 217-221.

Croninger, R. & Lee, V. (2001). Social Capital and Dropping Out of High School: Benefits to At-Risk Students of Teachers' Support and Guidance. *Teachers College Record, 103*(4), 548-582.

Culbertson, P., & Agee, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Penina Uliuli: Contemporary Challenges in Mental Health for Pacific Peoples*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Culpan, I., & Bruce, J. (2007). New Zealand Physical Education and Critical Pedagogy: Refocusing the Curriculum. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science*, *5*, 1-11.

Cunningham, C. (2008). Diversity and Equity for Māori. In K. Dew & A. Matheson (Eds.), *Understanding Health Inequalities in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Dunedin: Otago University Press.

Cunningham, C. (2011). Adolescent development for Maori. In P. Gluckman, *Improving the Transition. Reducing Social and Psychological Morbidity During Adolescence* (pp. 145-152). Office of the Prime Minister's Science Advisory Committee. Auckland: Crown Copyright.

Cushman, K. (2003). *Fires in the Bathroom*. New York: The New Press.

Dale, R. (2014). Foreword. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 9-12). Auckland: Dunmore.

Darensbourg, A., & Blake, J. (2014). Examining the Academic Achievement of Black Adolescents: Importance of Peer and Parental Influences. *Journal of Black Psychology, 40*(2), 191-212.

Davidson, A., & Phelan, P. (1999). Students' Multiple Worlds. An Anthropological Approach to Understanding Students' Engagement with School. In T. Urdan (Ed.), *The Role of Context* (pp. 233-273). Stamford, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Davie, R. (1996). Preface. In K. David & T. Charlton (Eds.), *Pastoral Care Matters in primary and middle schools* (pp. xii-xv). London: Routledge.

de Jong, T., & Kerr-Roubicek, H. (2007). Towards a Whole School Approach to Pastoral Care: A Proposed Framework of Principles and Practices. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, *17*(1), 1-12.

Delpit, L. (2012). "*Multiplication is for White People*." New York: New Press.

Denny, S., Balhorn, A., Lawrence, A., & Cosgriff, J. (2005). Student access to primary health care and preventive health screening at a school-based health centre in South Auckland. *NZMJ, 118*(1218), 1-16.

Denny, S., Robinson, E., Milfont, T., & Grant, S. (2009). *Youth '07: The Social Climate of Secondary Schools in New Zealand*. Auckland: The University of Auckland.

Denny, S., Grant, S., Galbreath, R., Clark, T., Fleming, T., Bullen, P., …Teevale, T. (2014). *Health Services in New Zealand Secondary Schools and the Associated Health Outcomes for Students*. Auckland, New Zealand: University of Auckland.

Denzin, N. (2003). *Performance Ethnography. Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Culture*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (Eds.) (2005). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2008). *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. California: Sage.

Denzin, N., Lincoln, Y., & Smith, L. T. (2008). *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*. California: Sage.

Department of Education. (1973). *Parent-School Communication: report of the Committee on Communication Between Schools and Parents*. Wellington: Department of Education.

Dixson, A. (2003). "Let's Do This!" Black Women Teachers' Politics and Pedagogy. *Urban Education, 38*(2), 217-235.

Dooley, S. (1980). The Relationship between the Concepts of 'Pastoral Care' and 'Authority'. In R. Best, C. Jarvis & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Perspectives on Pastoral Care* (pp. 16-24). London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Drake, B. (1998). Pastoral care: the challenge for international schools. In M. Hayden & J. Thompson, *International Education. Principles and Practice* (pp. 146-170). London: Kogan Page.

Duncan, C. (1988). *Pastoral Care: An Antiracist/Multicultural Perspective*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Basil Blackwell.

Durie, M. (1989). The Treaty of Waitangi and health care. *New Zealand Medical Journal, 102*: 283-5.

Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora. Maori Health Development*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (2006). *Measuring Maori Wellbeing*. New Zealand Treasury Guest Lecture Series. Wellington.

Dwyer, S., & Buckle, J. (2009). The Space Between: On Being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(1), 54-63.

Dyson, B. (2006). Students' perspectives in physical education. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald, & M. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *The Handbook of Physical Education* (pp. 326-346). London: Sage.

Dyson, L., Hendriks, M., & Grant, S. (2007). *Information Technology and Indigenous People*. U.S.A: Information Science Publishing.

Earley, P., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural Intelligence. Individual Interactions Across Cultures*. California: Stanford University Press.

Education Review Office (2013, 2104, 2015) School Review Reports. www.ero.govt.nz

Education Review Office. (2015). *Wellbeing for Young People's Success At Secondary School*. Crown Copyright: Welllington

Education Review Office. (2014). *Raising Achievement in Secondary Schools*. Crown Copyright: Wellington.

Edwards, C., Gandini, L., & Forman, G. (2012). *The Hundred Languages of Children*. 3rd ed. California: Praeger.

Fergus, E., Noguera, P., & Martin, M. (2014). *Schooling for Resilience. Improving the Life Trajectory of Black and Latino Boys*. Cambridge, Masschusetts: Harvard Education Press.

Ferguson, P., Gorinski, R., Wendt Samu, T., & Mara, D. (2008). *Literature review on the experiences of Pasifika learners in the classroom*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Finau, S. (1994). Traditional health practices in a modern Pacific: a dilemma or blessing? *New Zealand Medical Journal*, *107*, 14-17.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the Hyphens. Reinventing Self and Other in Qualitative Research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 70 - 82). New York: Sage.

Fine, M., Tuck, E., & Yang, W. (2014). An Intimate Memoir of Resistance Theory. In E. Tuck & K. Wayne Yang (Eds.), *Youth Resistance Research and Theories of Change* (pp. 46-58). New York: Routledge.

Fisher, J. (2007). It's time to wake up and stem the decline in spiritual well-being in Victorian schools. *International Journal of Children's Spirituality*, *12*(2), 165-177.

Fisher, B., & Tronto, J. (1990). Towards a Feminist Theory of Caring. In E. Abel & M. Nelson (Eds.), *Circles of Care. Work and Identity in Women's Lives* (pp. 35-62). New York: State University of New York Press.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. (2003). The Interview. From Structured Questions to Negotiated Text. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* (pp. 61-106). California: Sage.

Ford, D. (2008). Cyberbullying in schools. *Professional Educator*, *7*(4), 38-41.

Forsyth, P. (2008). The Empirical Conseqences of School Trust. In W. Hoy & M. DiPaola, *Improving Schools. Studies in Leadership and Culture* (pp. 1-28). U.S.A: Information Age Publishing.

French, S., Seidman, E., Allen, L., & Aber, L. (2006). The Development of Ethnic Identity During Adolescence, *Developmental Psychology*, *42*(1), 1-10.

Freudenberg, N., & Ruglis, J. (2007). Reframing School Dropout as a Public Health Issue. *Preventing Chronic Disease. Public Health Research, Practice, and Policy*, *4*(4), 1-11.

Frydenberg, E., Lewis, R., Bugalski, K., Cotta, A., McCarthy, C., Luscombe-Smith, N., & Poole, C. (2004). *Prevention is Better than Cure: Coping skills training for adolescents at school. 20*(*2*), 117-134.

Gardner, H. (2006). *Multiple intelligences: new horizons*. New York: Basic Books.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally Responsive Teaching. Theory, Research & Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Giroux, H. (2005). *Border Crossings. Cultural Workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge.

Goddard, R., Salloum, S., & Berebitsky, D. (2009). Trust as a Mediator of the Relationships Between Poverty, Racial Composition, and Academic Achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *45*(2), 292-311.

Goff, P., Steele, C., & Davies, P. (2008). The Space Between Us: Stereotype Threat and Distance in Interracial Contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*(1), 91-107.

Golden, S., & Earp, J. (2012). Social Ecological Approaches to Individuals and Their Contexts: Twenty Years of *Health Education & Behavior* Health Promotion Interventions. *Health Education & Behavior*, *39*(3), 364-372.

Gorinski, R., & Fraser, C. (2006). *Literature Review on the Effective Engagement of Pasifika Parents and Communities in Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.

Gott, J. (2003). The School: The Front Line of Mental Health Development? *Pastoral Care in Education*, *21(*4), 5-13.

Grace, G. (1994). Urban Education and the Culture of Contentment: The Politics, Culture, and Economics of Inner-City Schooling. In N. Stromquist (Ed.). *Education in Urban Areas. Cross-National Dimensions* (pp. 45-59). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Grande, S. (2008). Red Pedagogy. The Un-Methodology. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln, & L.T. Smith, *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* (pp. 233-254). California: Sage.

Griffin, K., & Allen, W. (2006). Mo' Money, Mo' Problems? High-Achieving Black High School Students' Experiences with Resources, Racial Climate, and Resilience. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *75*(3), 478-494.

Greene, J. (2007). *Mixed Methods in Social Inquiry*. California: Jossey-Bass.

Grove, M. (2004). The Three R's of Pastoral Care: Relationships, Respect and Responsibility. *Pastoral Care*, *22*(2), 34-38.

Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2005). Successful principal leadership: Australian case studies. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *43*(6), 539-551.

Haberman, M. (2003). Can Teacher Education Close the Achievement Gap? In D. McInerney & S. Van Etten, *Sociocultural Influences and Teacher Education Programmes* (pp. 1-14). U.S.A: Information Age Publishing.

Haberman, M. (2015). The Pedagogy of Poverty Versus Good Teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *73*(4), 290-294.

Hards, M. (2014). Deliberate acts of engagement. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 230-237). Auckland: Dunmore.

Hawk, K., & Hill, J. (1996). *Towards making achieving cool. Achievement in Multi Cultural High Schools* (AIMHI). Institute for Professional Development and Educational Research: Massey University, Albany Campus.

Hearn, L., Campbell-Pope, R., House, J. & Cross, D. (2006). *Pastoral Care in Education*. Child Health Promotion Unit. Perth: Edith Cowan University.

Hellwig, E. (1989). Pastoral Care for the 1990's – and Beyond: A Visitor's Viewpoint. *Pastoral Care*, *7*(1), 6-13.

Helu-Thaman, K. (2000). *Towards Culturally Democratic Teacher Education*. Module One. Pacific Cultures in the Teacher Education Curriculum. Suva, Fiji: Institute of Education, University of South Pacific.

Henderson, A., Mapp, K., Johnson, V., & Davies, D. (Eds.). (2007). *Beyond the Bake Sale*. New York: The New Press.

Higgins, J., & Nairn, K. (2014). "Out of sight, out of mind?" Education provision for learners disengaged from school. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland: Dunmore.

Hoaglund, S. (1990). Some Concerns About Nel Noddings' *Caring*. *Hypatia*, *5*(1), 109-114.

Hughes, P. (1980). Pastoral Care – the historical context. In R. Best, C. Jarvis & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Perspectives on Pastoral Care* (pp. 25-31). London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Hunter, A., & Brewer, J. (2003). Multimethod research in Sociology. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research* (pp. 577-594). California: Sage.

Jackson, A., & Davis, G. (2000). *Turning Points 2000. Educating Adolescents in the 21st Century*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jahnke, H., & Taiapa, J. (2003). Māori research. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social Science Research in New Zealand. Many Paths to Understand* (pp. 39-50). Auckland: Pearson Education.

Jesson, R., Annan, J., McNaughton, S., & Snedden, P. (2014). Manaiakalani: Tackling the educational challenge of poverty through innovation and collaboration. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 253-259). Auckland: Dunmore.

Johnson, D. (1985). Pastoral care and welfare networks. In P. Lang & M. Marland (Eds.), *New Directions in Pastoral Care* (pp. 100-113). Oxford, United Kingdom: Basil Blackwell.

Johnson, R., & Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004). Mixed Methods Research: A Research Paradigm Whose Time Has Come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14-26.

Jones, A. (1991). *At school I've got a chance: culture/privilege: Pacific Islands and pakeha girls at school*. Palmerston North: Dunmore.

Jones, C. (2000). Levels of racism: A theoretical framework and a gardener's tale. *American Journal of Public Health*, *90*(8), 1212-1216.

Jones, C. (2001). "Race," Racism, and the Practice of Epidemiology. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *15*(4), 299-304.

Jones, R., Crengle, S., & McCreanor, T. (2006). How tikanga guides and protects the research process: insights from the Hauora Tāne project. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, *29*, 60-77.

Karlsen, S., & Nazroo, J. (2006). Defining and measuring ethnicity and 'race.' In J. Nazroo (Ed.), *Health and social research in multiethnic societies* (pp. 20-38). New York: Routledge.

Katz, P. (2003). Racists or Tolerant Multiculturalists? How Do They Begin?: Awards for Distinguished Senior Career Contributions to the Public Interest. *American Psychologist*, *58*(11), 897-909.

Keddell, E. (2006). Pavlova and pineapple pie: selected identity influences on Samoan-Pakeha people in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, *1*(1), 45-63.

Kidger, J., Gunnell, D., Biddle, L., Campbell, R., & Donovan, J. (2010). Part and parcel of teaching? Secondary school staff's views on supporting student emotional health and well-being. *British Educational Research Journal*, *36*(6), 919-935.

Kincheloe, J., & Steinberg, S. (2008). Indigenous Knowledges in Education. Complexities, Dangers, and Profound Benefits. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln & L. Smith, *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* (pp. 135-156). California: Sage.

Kirmayer, L., Brass, G., & Tait, C. (2000). The Mental Health of Aboriginal Peoples: Transformations of Identity and Community. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *45*(7), 607-616.

Kirp, D. (2011). *City Kids*. New York: Perseus.

Kitzinger J. (1995). Qualitative research. Introducing focus groups. *British Medical Journal*, *31*(7000), 299-302.

Kohl, H. (1988). *36 Children*. U.K: Open University Press.

Kohl, H. (1995). *Should We Burn Babar?* New York: The New Press.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential Learning. Experience As the Source of Learning and Development*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Krebs, N. (1999). *Edgewalkers. Defusing Cultural Boundaries on the New Global Frontier*. New Horizon: New Jersey.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The Dreamkeepers. Successful Teachers of African American Children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, *32*(3), 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2008). "Yes, But How Do We Do It?" Practicing Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. In W. Ayers, G. Ladson-Billings, G. Michie, & P. Noguera (Eds.), *City Kids, City Schools* (pp. 162-177). New York: New Press.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Donnor, J. (2008). Waiting for the call. The Moral Activist Role of Critical Race Theory Scholarship. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln & L.T. Smith, *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* (pp. 61-83). California: Sage.

Laidlaw, C. (Presenter) & Salmond, A. (Guest). (2011, November 27). *Influential Kiwis talk about their influences*. Wellington, New Zealand: Radio New Zealand.

Lara, J. (1992). Reflections: Bridging Cultures. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *80*, 65-70.

Lareau, A. (1989). *Home Advantage: Social Class and Intervention in Elementary Education*. U.K: The Falmer Press.

Lartey, E. (2003). *In Living Color. An Intercultural Approach to Pastoral Care and Counselling*. 2nd ed. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Leahy, H. (2015). *Crossing the Floor. The Story of Tariana Turia*. Welllington: Huia.

Lee, V., & Burkam, D. (2003). Dropping Out of High School: The Role of School Organization and Structure. *American Educational Research Journal*, *40*(2), 353-393.

Lewis, R., & Frydenberg, E. (2002). Concomitants of failure to cope: What we should teach adolescents about coping. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *72*, 419-431.

Li, Q., Cross, D., & Smith, P. (2012). *Cyberbullying in the Global Playground*. U.K: Blackwell Publishing.

Libbey, H., Ireland, M., & Resnick, M. (2002). Social connectedness; is protection cumulative? *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *30*(2), 102.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. California: Sage.

lisahunter., Rossi, T., Tinning, R., Flanagan, E., & Macdonald, D. (2011). Professional learning places and spaces: the staffroom as a site of beginning teacher induction and transition. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *39*(1), 33-46.

Livermore, D. (2010). *Leading with Cultural Intelligence: The New Secret to Success*. New York: American Management Association.

Lucassen, M., Clark, T., Moselen, E., Robinson, E., Fleming, T., Bullen, P., …Teevale, T. (2014). *Youth'12 The Health and Wellbeing of Secondary School Students in New Zealand: Results for Young People Attracted to the Same Sex or Both Sexes*. Auckland: University of Auckland.

Lui, D. (2007). Spiritual Inquiry. A Samoan Perspective on Spirituality's Impact on Mental Health. In P. Culbertson & M. Agee (Eds.), *Penina Uliuli: Contemporary Challenges in Mental Health for Pacific Peoples* (pp. 66-76). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Maani, S., & Kalb, G. (2007). Academic performance, childhood economic resources, and the choice to leave school at age 16. *Economics of Education Review*, *26*, 361-374.

Macfarlane, A. (2003). *Culturally Inclusive Pedagogy for Maori students experiencing learning and behavior difficulties*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Waikato, New Zealand.

Macfarlane, A., Glynn, T., Cavanagh, T., & Bateman, S. (2007). Creating Culturally-Safe Schools for Māori Students. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, *36,* 65-76.

Macpherson, C. (1996). Pacific Islands Identity and Community. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Nga Patai. Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 124-143). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Macpherson, C., Spoonley, P., & Anae, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Tangata O Te Moana Nui The Evolving Identities of Pacific Peoples in Aotearoa/ New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Makasiale, C. (2007a). Making Culture "God" Is Driving Our People Crazy! In P. Culbertson, & M. Agee (Eds.), *Penina Uliuli: Contemporary Challenges in*

Mental Health for Pacific Peoples (pp. 77-86). Honolulu: University of
Hawaii Press.

Makasiale, C. (2007b). The Use of Symbol and Metaphor in Pasifika Counseling. In
P. Culbertson, & M. Agee (Eds.), *Penina Uliuli: Contemporary Challenges in
Mental Health for Pacific Peoples* (pp. 109-121). Honolulu: University of
Hawaii Press.

Mansill, J. (2014). Boards of trustees and parents in low-decile schools:
Communication. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand
Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 194-199).
Auckland: Dunmore.

Mara, D. (2014). Pacific students: Positioned as failures, targets and consumers. In V.
Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and
Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 102-122). Auckland: Dunmore.

Marland, M. (1974). *Pastoral Care*. London, United Kingdom: Heinemann
Educational Books.

Marland, M. (1980). The Pastoral Curriculum. In R. Best, C. Jarvis & P. Ribbins
(Eds.), *Perspectives on Pastoral Care* (pp. 151-170). London: Heinemann
Educational Books.

Marmot, M. (2007). Achieving health equity: from root causes to fair outcomes. *The
Lancet*, *370* (9593), 1153-1163.

Martin, E., Tobin, T., & Sugai, G. (2002). Current information on dropout prevention:
Ideas from practitioners and the literature. *Preventing School Failure*, *47*(1),
10-18.

Mason, M., Singleton, A., Webber, R. (2007). *The Spirit of Generation Y. Young
People's Spirituality in a Changing Australia*. Victoria, Australia: John
Garratt.

McCreanor, T., & Watson, P. (2004). Resiliency, Connectivity and Environments:
Their Roles in Theorising Approaches to Promoting the Well-Being of Young
People. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, *6*(1), 39-42.

McIntosh, T. (2001). Hibiscus in the Flax Bush: The Maori-Pacific Island Interface.
In C. Macpherson, P. Spoonley, & M. Anae (Eds.), *Tangata O Te Moana Nui
The Evolving Identities of Pacific Peoples in Aotearoa/ New Zealand* (pp. 141-
154). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

McKown, C., & Weinstein, R. (2003). The Development and Consequences of Stereotype Consciousness in Middle Childhood. *Child Development*, *74*(2), 498-515.

McLaughlin, H. (1991). Reconciling Care and Control: Authority in Classroom Relationships. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *42*(3), 182-195.

McMurray, A. (2007). *Community Health and Wellness. A socio-ecological approach*. New South Wales, Australia: Elsevier.

McQuaig, L. (2011). Dangerous Carers: Pastoral power and the caring teacher of contemporary Australian schooling. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *44*(8), 862-877.

Megahy, T. (1998). Managing the curriculum: pastoral provision as a vehicle for raising student achievement. In M. Calvert & J. Henderson, *Managing Pastoral Care* (pp. 26-52). London: Cassell.

Menzies, P. (2008). Developing an Aboriginal Healing Model for Intergenerational Trauma. *International Journal of Health Promotion & Education*, *46*(2), 41-48.

Merriam, S., Johnson-Bailey, J., Lee, M., Kee, Y., Ntseane, G., & Muhamad, M. (2001). Power and positionality: negotiating insider/outsider status within and across cultures. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *20*(5), 405-416.

Meuret, D. (2001). School Equity as a Matter of Justice. In W. Hutmacher, D. Cochrane, & N. Bottani (Eds.), *In Pursuit of Equity in Education. Using international indicators to compare equity policies* (pp. 93-111). The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Mila-Schaaf, K., & Hudson, M. (2009). The interface between cultural understandings: Negotiating new spaces for Pacific mental health. *Pacific Health Dialog*, *15*(1), 113-119.

Miles, M., Huberman, A., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Research*. California: Sage.

Miller, P. (1980). Guidance and Counselling: changing patterns of care in schools. In R. Best, C. Jarvis & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Perspectives on Pastoral Care* (pp. 120-130). London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Mills, C. (2008). "I don't have much of an ethnic background" Exploring Changes in Dispositions towards Diversity in Preservice Teachers. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, *4*(3), 49-58.

Milne, A. (2013). *Colouring in the white spaces: reclaiming cultural identity in whitestream schools*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Waikato, New Zealand.

Milne, A. (2014). Colouring in the white spaces. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 223-229). Auckland: Dunmore.

Milner, J. (1983). Pastoral Care: Myth and Reality. *British Journal of Guidance and Counsellling, 11*(1), 35-45.

Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment. (2015). Migration Trends and Outlooks 2014/15. Retrieved from www.mbie.govt.nz

Ministry of Education. (2007). New Zealand Curriculum. Retrieved from www.minedu.govt.nz

Ministry of Education. (2012). Retrieved from www.minedu.govt.nz

Ministry of Education. (2014). *Ka Hikitia. Accelerating Success*. Retrieved from www.minedu.govt.nz

Ministry of Education. (2015a). *How does New Zealand's education system compare? OECD's Education at a Glance 2015*. Retrieved from www.minedu.govt.nz

Ministry of Education. (2015b). *New Zealand Schools. A report on the compulsory schools sector in New Zealand*. Retrieved from www.minedu.govt.nz

Ministry of Health. (2008). *Pacific Youth Health: A paper for the Pacific Health and Disability Action Plan Review*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.

Ministry of Health (2009). *Evaluation of Healthy Schools Community School Initiative in AIMHI Schools*. Wellington: Ministry of Health.

Ministry of Social Development. (2010). *The Social Report*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.

Mintzberg, H. (1970). Structured observation as a method to study managerial work. *Journal of Management Studies, 7*(1), 87-104.

Mitaera, J. (1997). Pastoral Care and the "Real World Context" of Cook Islanders in Aotearoa New Zealand. In P. Culbertson, *Counselling Issues and South Pacific Communities* (pp. 117-131). Auckland: Accent Publications.

Moewaka Barnes, H. (2000). Kaupapa maori: explaining the ordinary. *Pacific Health Dialog, 7*(1), 13-16.

Moos, R. (1979). *Evaluating Educational Environments*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morse, J. (2003). Principles of Mixed Methods and Multimethod Research Design. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Research* (pp. 189-208). California: Sage.

Nakata, M. (2007). *Disciplining the Savages. Savaging the Disciplines*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Nakhid, C. (2003). "Intercultural" Perceptions, Academic Achievement, and the Identifying Process of Pacific Islands Students in New Zealand Schools. *The Journal of Negro Education, 72*(3), 297-317.

Nakhid, C. (2006). Ethics and the obstruction of social justice for Maori and Pasifika (Pacific Islands) students in tertiary institutions in Aotearoa (New Zealand). *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *9*(3), 295-305.

Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2012). Affirming Diversity. *The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education*. 6th ed. Massachusetts: Pearson.

Noblit, G. (1992). Power and Caring. *American Educational Research Journal*, *30*(1), 23-28.

Noddings, N. (1998). Foreword. In K. Sernak. *School Leadership – Balancing Power with Caring* (pp. i-x). New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2005a). *The Challenge to Care in Schools. An Alternative Approach to Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2005b). Identifying and responding to needs in education. *Cambridge Journal in Education*, *35*(2), 147-159.

Noddings, N. (2010). Moral Education in an Age of Globalization. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *42*(4), 390-396.

Oakes, J. (2005). *Keep Track. How Schools Structure Inequality*. 2nd ed. U.S.A: Yale.

O'Connor, P. (2014). A suicide of the soul: Neoliberalism, the arts and democracy. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 260-264). Auckland: Dunmore.

Parsons, T. (Guest). (2013, December 19). *Te Manu Korihi News*. Wellington, New Zealand: Radio New Zealand.

Patton, G., Glover, S., Bond, L., Butler, H., Godfrey, C., Di Pietro, G., & Bowes, G. (2000). The Gatehouse Project: a systematic approach to mental health promotion in secondary schools. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, *34*, 586-593.

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. California: Sage.

Pearson, N. (2011). *Radical Hope. Education and Equality in Australia*. Victoria, Australia: Black Inc.

Penetito, W. (2010). What's Maori about Maori Education? : the struggle for a meaningful context. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Perez, M. (2009). Low-income Latin Parents, School Choice, and Pierre Bourdieu. In J. Anyon, *Theory and Educational Research. Toward Critical Social Explanation* (pp. 135-148). New York: Routledge.

Plank, D., & Sykes, G. (Eds.). (2003). *Choosing Choice. School Choice in International Perspective*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Plumb, S., & Bilby, L. (2016). Parents paid $161million for children's 'free education. *New Zealand Herald*, 20 January, 2016.

Pomeroy, E. (1999). The Teacher-Student Relationship in Secondary School: insights from excluded students. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *20*(4), 465-482.

Post Primary Teacher's Association (2015). Retrieved from www.ppta.org.nz

Power, S. (1996). *The Pastoral and the Academic. Conflict and Contradiction in the Curriculum*. London: Cassell.

Pulotu-Endemann, F. (2001). Fonofale Model of Health. Retrieved from www.hauora.co.nz

Ramsden, I. (1993). Borders and Frontiers. In A. Calder (Ed.), *The Writing of New Zealand. Inventions and Idenities* (pp. 236-244). Auckland: Reed Books.

Rashbrooke, M. (2014). *The Inequality Debate. An Introduction*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

Rendon, L. (1992). From the Barrio to the Academy: Revelations of a Mexican American "Scholarship Girl". *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *80*, 55-64.

Renihan, F., & Renihan, P. (1995). Responsive High Schools: Structuring Success for the At-Risk Student. *The High School Journal*, *79*(1), 1-13.

Resnick, M., Harris, L., & Blum, R. (1993). The impact of caring and connectedness on adolescent health and well-being. *Journal of Paediatric Child Health*, *29*, Supplement 1, S3-S9.

Resnick, M., Bearman, P., Blum, R., Bauman, K., Harris, K., Jones, J., …Udry, R. (1997). Protecting Adolescents From Harm. Findings From the National

Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health. *Journal of American Medical Association, 278*(10), 823-832.

Ribbins, P. (1989). Pastoral Care: in Praise of Diversity? *Pastoral Care in Education, 7*(4), 28-36.

Riessman, C. (1993). *Narrative Analysis*. Qualitative Research Methods Series 30. A Sage University Paper.

Root, M. (2004). Multiracial Families and Children. Implications for Edcuational Research and Practice. In J. Banks & C. McGee Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (pp. 110-124). 2nd ed. California: Jossey-Bass.

Rossi, A., Rynne, S., & Nelson, A. (2013). Doing Whitefella Research in Blackfella Communities in Australia: Decolonizing Method in Sports Related Research. *Quest, 65*, 116-131.

Rumberger, R. (1987). High School Dropouts: A Review of Issues and Evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 57*(2), 101-121.

Rumberger, R. (1995). Dropping Out of Middle School: A Multilevel Analysis of Students and Schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 583-625.

Rumberger, R., & Thomas, S. (2000). The Distribution of Dropout and Turnover Rates Among Urban and Suburban High Schools. *Sociology of Education, 73*, 39-67.

Santamaria, A., Webber, M., McKinley, E., & Madjar, I. (2014). The Starpath Project: Promoting student success in secondary schools serving low-SES communities. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.). *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 238-245). Auckland: Dunmore.

Sarantakos, S. (2005). *Social Research*. 3rd ed. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A. (1973). *Field Research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Scheurich, J., & Young, M. (1997). Coloring Epistemologies: Are Our Research Epsitemologies Racially Biased? *Educational Researcher, 26*(4), 4-16.

Schmidt, S. (2005). More Than Men in White Sheets: Seven Concepts Critical to the Teaching of Racsim as Systemic Inequality. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 38*, 110-122.

Schutz, A. (1998). Caring in Schools is not Enough: Community, Narrative, and the Limits of Alterity. *Educational Theory*, *48*(3), 373-393.

Sernak, K. (1998). *School Leadership – Balancing Power with Caring*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sernak, K. (2004). Slaves No More: The Caring Power of African-American Female Leaders, *A Journal for the Scholar-Practitioner Leader*, *2*(3), 71-97.

Shenton, A. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, *22*, 63-75.

Shochet, I., Dadds, M., Ham, D., & Montague, R. (2006). School Connectedness Is an Underemphasized Parameter in Adolescent Mental Health: Results of a Community Prediction Study. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *35*(2), 170-179.

Shulruf, B., Hattie, J., & Tumen, S. (2008). The predictability of enrolment and first-year university results from secondary school performance: the New Zealand National Certificate of Educational Achievement. *Studies in Higher Education*, *33*(6), 685-698.

Siataga, P. (2011). Pasifika child and youth well-being: roots and wings. In P. Gluckman, *Improving the Transition. Reducing Social and Psychological Morbidity During Adolescence* (pp. 153-167). Office of the Prime Minister's Science Advisory Committee. Auckland: Crown Copyright.

Simon, J., Smith, L.T., & Cram, F. (Eds.). (2001). *A Civilising Mission?: perceptions and representations of the Native Schools system*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Siope, A. (2011). The schooling experiences of Pasifika students. *Research Information for Teachers*. New Zealand Council for Educational Research, *3*, 10-16.

Sleeter, C. (2011). The Quest for Social Justice in the Education of Minoritized Students. In. C. Sleeter (Ed.), *Professional Development for Culturally Responsive and Relationship-Based Pedagogy* (pp. 1-21). New York: Peter Lang.

Smith, L.T. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples*. 2nd ed. U.K: Zed Books.

Smith, L.T. (2013). The Future is Now. In M. Rashbrooke (Ed.), *Inequality. A New Zealand Crisis* (pp. 228-235). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

Smitherman, G. (2007). Afterword. In H. Samy Alim & J. Baugh (Eds.), *Talkin Black Talk* (pp. 153-155). New York: Teachers College Press.

Smyth, E., & Banks, J. (2012). 'There was never really any question of anything else': young people's agency, institutional habitus and the transition to higher education'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *33*(2), 263-281.

Snook, I., & O'Neill, J. (2014). Poverty and inequality of educational achievement. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 19-43). Auckland: Dunmore.

Spoonley, P. (2003). The challenge of cross-cultural research. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social Science Research in New Zealand. Many Paths to Understand* (pp. 51-61). Auckland: Pearson Education.

Spratt, J., Shucksmith, J., Philip, K., & Watson, C. (2006). 'Part of Who we are as a School Should Include Responsibility for Well-Being': Links between the School Environment, Mental Health and Behaviour. *Pastoral Care in Education*, *24*(3), 14-21.

Stake, R. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. California: Sage.

Stake, R. (2006). *Multiple Case Study Analysis*. New York: Guildford Press.

Stanfield, J. & Dennis, R. (Eds.). (1993). *Race and Ethnicity in Research Methods*. California: Sage.

Statistics New Zealand (2011). School leavers. Retrieved from www.nzstats.govt.nz

Steele, C. (2010). *Whistling Vivaldi And Other Clues to How Stereotypes Affect Us*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Tapsell, P., & Woods, C. (2008). *Potikitanga*: indigenous entrepreneurship in a Maori context. *Journal of Enterprising Communities*, *2*(3), 192-203.

Tatebe, J. (2014). *The politics of discomfort: unsettling conversations about preservice teachers' engagement with socioeconomic disadvantage*. (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Auckland, New Zealand.

Taule'ale'ausumai, F. (1997). The Word Made Flesh: A Samoan Theology of Pastoral Care. In P. Culbertson, *Counselling Issues and South Pacific Communities* (pp. 161-187). Auckland: Accent Publications.

Tett, G. (2015). *The Silo Effect. Why Putting Everything in its Place Isn't Such a Bright Idea*. London: Little Brown.

Thomas, D. (2006). A General Inductive Approach for Analyzing Qualitative Evaluation Data. *American Journal of Evaluation*, *27*(2), 237-246.

Thrupp, M. (2005). *School Improvement. An Unofficial Approach*. London: Continuum.

Thrupp, M. (2006a, July). *Improving the schooling chances of New Zealand's poorest children: policy and community challenges*. Presentation to the AGM of the Poverty Action Group, St Columba Centre, Vermont St, Ponsonby, Auckland.

Thrupp, M. (2006b). Taking School Contexts More Seriously: The Social Justice Challenge. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *54*(3), 308-328.

Thrupp, M. (2007). Education's 'Inconvenient Truth': Persistent Middle Class Advantage. *Waikato Journal of Education*, *13*.

Thrupp, M. (2014). Deficit thinking and the politics of blame. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 88-101). Auckland: Dunmore.

Tiatia, J. (1998). *Caught between cultures: a New Zealand-born Pacific Island perspective*. Auckland: Christian Research Association.

Tiatia, J. (2007). New Zealand-born Samoan Young People, Suicidal Behaviours and the Positive Impact of Spirituality. In P. Culbertson & M. Agee (Eds.), *Penina Uliuli: Contemporary Challenges in Mental Health for Pacific Peoples* (pp. 94-104). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). *Teacher Professional Learning and Development. Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration [BES]*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Tolich, M., & Davidson, C. (1999). *Starting Fieldwork. An introduction to qualitative research*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Trimble, S. (2002, March). Common Elements of High Performing, High Poverty Middle Schools. *Middle School Journal*.

Tronto, J. (1993). *Moral Boundaries. A Political Argument for and Ethic of Care*. New York: Routledge.

Tuafuti, P., & McCaffery, J. (2005). Family and community empowerment through bilingual education. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *8*(5), 480-503.

Tupuola, A. (2004). Pasifika Edgewalkers: complicating the achieved identity status in youth research. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *25*(1), 87-100.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive Schooling; U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Vascellaro, S. (2011). *Out of the Classroom and into the World*. New York: The New Press.

Villegas, A., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing Culturally Responsive Teachers. Rethinking the Curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(1), 20-32.

Walker, S., Eketone, A., & Gibbs, A. (2006). An exploration of kaupapa Maori research, its principles, processes and applications. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *9*(4), 331-344.

Ware, F. (2006). Warm Demander Pedagogy. Culturally Responsive Teaching That Supports a Culture of Achievement for African Amercian Students. *Urban Education, 41*(4), 427-456.

Waters, S., Cross, D., & Shaw, T. (2010). Does the nature of schools matter? An exploration of selected school ecology factors on adolescent perceptions of school connectedness. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *80*, 381-402.

Watson, S., Hughes, D., Lauder, H., Strathdee, R., & Simiyu, I. (1998). Ethnicity and School Choice. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, *7*, 95-110.

Watts, A., & Fawcett, B. (1980). Pastoral Care and Careers Education. In R. Best, C. Jarvis & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Perspectives on Pastoral Care* (pp. 106-119). London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Webb, J., Wilson, B., Corbett, D., & Mordecal, R. (1993). Understanding caring in context: Negotiating borders and barriers. *Urban Review*, *25*(1), 25-45.

Wehlage, G., & Rutter, R. (1986). Dropping Out: How Much Do Schools Contribute to the Problem? *Teachers College Record*, *87*(3), 374-392.

Williamson, D. (1980). Pastoral Care or Pastoralization? In R. Best, C. Jarvis & P. Ribbins (Eds.), *Perspectives on Pastoral Care* (pp. 171-181). London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Wilson, D. (2014). Māori Research. In V. Wright-St. Clair, D. Reid, S. Shaw & J. Ramsbotham, *Evidence-based Health Practice* (pp. 65-76). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, J. (1997). Foreword. In J. Anyon, *Ghetto Schooling: A Political Economy of Urban Educational Reform* (pp. ix-x). New York: Teachers College Press.

Wyatt, S. (2009).The Brotherhood: Empowering Adolescent African-American Males Toward Excellence. *Professional School Counselling*, *12*(6), 463-470.

Wyn, J., Cahill, H., Holdsworth, R., Rowling, L., & Carson, S. (2000). MindMatters, a whole-school approach promoting mental health and wellbeing. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, *34*, 594-601.

Wynd, D. (2014). Food in schools: Reflections on the new social space. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 67-87). Auckland: Dunmore.

Yin, R. (1984). *Case Study research: design and methods*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Yin, R. (2003). *Case Study Research Design and Methods*. Applied Social Research Methods Series Vol. 5. 3rd ed. California: Sage.

Yin, R. (2009). How to Do Better Case Studies. In L. Bickman & D. Rog (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods* (pp. 254-282). Los Angeles: Sage.

Yin, R. (2012). *Applications of Case Study Research*. California: Sage.

Young, R. (1994). A Systems Perspective on Whole-School Guidance/Pastoral Care Programmes. In P. Lang, R. Best, & A. Lichtenberg. *Caring for Children: International Perspectives on Pastoral Care* (pp. 42-54). London: Cassell.

Yukich, R. (2014). Relational trust and Pākehā principals working with Māori cultural difference. In V. Carpenter & S. Osborne (Eds.), *Twelve Thousand Hours. Education and Poverty in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 205-209). Auckland: Dunmore.

Zach, L. (2006). Using a Multiple-Case Studies Design to Investigate the Information-Seeking Behavior of Arts Administrators. *Library Trends*, *55*(1), pp. 4-21.