Culturally Responsive, Sustaining and Safe

Youth Mentoring Practice

in Aotearoa New Zealand

A Va Relational Approach

Yvonne Maggie Ualesi

Abstract

Previous research suggests that youth mentoring shows a range of benefits that address the social, emotional and academic needs of young people; however, some evaluations reveal only modest effects both locally (in Aotearoa New Zealand) and abroad. Scholars have argued for a strengths-based lens of adolescent development through positive youth development theory, focussed on plasticity with emphasis on youths' assets. However, much of the research excludes Indigenous knowledge systems and theories that centre holistic approaches of Indigenous wellbeing. Despite the growing interest and subsequent scholarship in youth mentoring effectiveness as a strategy of positive youth development, there is a paucity of evidence to understand how youth mentoring programmes might be effective for Indigenous and minoritised youth who are often targeted populations utilising culturally responsive approaches to research.

This thesis takes a culturally nuanced strengths-based lens underpinned by Indigenous frames of reference, drawing on both Pasifika/Pacific [1]and Kaupapa Māori research theories through a va relational approach to explore key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice. The youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand used as a vehicle to explore the phenomenon was originally developed at a large State University in the US, and was culturally adapted and implemented at a large urban university in Aotearoa New Zealand. This qualitative study employed a multimethod approach combining two methods underpinned by culturally responsive methodologies to explore an in-depth view of the participants' lived experiences informing the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice. Three studies were conducted: talanoa/kōrero 1:1 interviews (face to face and by phone) and talanoa/kōrero focus groups were utilised in the first study; a participant observational study was conducted in the second study; and talanoa/kōrero focus groups and phone were again used in the third study.

The thematic analysis revealed similarities and contradictions between the current research and literature highlighting key ingredients for youth mentoring practice that is responsive, sustaining and safe for diverse and minoritised youth. The findings provide evidence that

---

[1] In this thesis the terms Pasifika and Pacific are used interchangeably, however does not imply homogeneity. The term Pasifika refers to peoples with genealogical links to Pacific nations of Samoa, Tonga, Cook Islands, Niue, Tokelau, Tuvalu and other smaller Pacific nations residing in Aotearoa New Zealand.

indeed "one size does not fit all". Further, that youth mentoring programmes that prioritise Indigenous holistic theories and methodological approaches, gain insight into the role of race, ethnicity and culture in positive youth development. Implications for youth development theory, research and practice that seeks to serve "at-risk" youth effectively, particularly minoritised ethnicities in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand, are discussed.

The knowledge generated from the research contributes a framework with 7 key ingredients to understand how programmers can respond to the needs of underserved youth through the voices of youth, their whānau/'aiga/caregivers and their communities themselves. A discussion of advancing knowledge in culturally responsive methodologies in youth mentoring to inform cultural translation work needed for youth mentoring programmes imported from overseas is offered through a va relational approach, invoking and weaving both Pasifika and Kaupapa Māori theories.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I give thanks to God. The genesis of this thesis grew out of prayer. The kind of prayer that comes from the mouth of my grandmother who as part of her daily ritual, rose before sunrise reciting, chanting, at times wailing scripture over the affairs of her household. Those same prayers were chanted from my mother in the dusty pews of the Ōtara Catholic Church where the sun spilt through stained-glass windows, no doubt to pray me through a tumultuous period of adolescence. Like many other Pacific families in the diaspora my parents were of an era of the migrant's dreams for their children. I acknowledge my ancestors and 'aiga in the villages of Samoa – Mulivai Safata, Pu'apu'a, Savalalo, Lotopa. In Tokelau, Fakaofo, and in Fiji, Ovalau Bureta. Importantly, I acknowledge our extended 'aiga, kāiga, vuvale, whānau (family) our kaihana, whanaunga (cousins/relatives), tāngata whenua (people of the land), the original Indigenous inhabitants of this land Aotearoa New Zealand.

I am eternally grateful to my dearest Mum – Maria Rasela. I also acknowledge my late father Andy Pereira. My heartfelt gratitude goes particularly to my mother who raised me and my three eldest siblings in the heart of Ōtara. Affectionately known as Mum Pereira, you are my first mentor and nurturer. Your story of resilience and courage runs deep through my veins to enable the completion of this project. I lo'u tina, I hope I am yours and my grandparents Ivona & Ugapo Laulu, Maria Rosie Ovalau Bureta (nee Pereira) & Lilo Lofipo Ovalau Bureta and their parent's manifestation of educational success. Your blood runs deep through my veins Great Grandma Puaavivi, Great Great Grandpa Tofa and Antonio (Atone) Pereira Vitorino de Barros. Malo le tapua'i!

To my eldest sister Rosie and brothers Lionel and Andy, this is for our 'aiga and the next generation (Numera 6:24–26). As the first and only graduate of our family, and certainly not the last, I am reminded that our educational journey never ends. You will always be my eldest siblings, my tuakana who taught me to be resilient, who told me to "run it straight" and "go hard or go home." As the teina, I know you will always have my back.

I acknowledge my loving Uncle Manu'aito'alasi Kelekolio Laulu Tovia, your wisdom and continued love is felt deeply. To my late Uncle Ugapo Ugalo Teofilo and Aunty Nia and more recently Uncle Ugapo Moetoto Eliseo Te'e Tovia at rest with our Creator during my PhD and all my Aunts and Uncles who are resting, this is also for you.

Allen, Whetuu Nathan, Dr Barbara O'Loughlin, Abigail McClutchie, Ashlea Gillon, Dr Zhiying Liao, Esther Yao, Sandra Yellowhorse, Emmaline Pickering, Dr Emma Cunningham and Alapua Poasa. Thank you Dr David Fa'avae, Dr Hinekura Smith, Dr Frances Hancock, Dr Rose Yukich, Lincoln Dam, Jade Flavell my TPW whānau/'aiga. To my City Campus 'aiga Dr Sereana Naepi, Dr Patrick Thomsen, Associate Professor Terryann Clark (TC) for your cheerleading. My Faith City Church, Project Wy (Youth Mentoring) 'aiga, you know who you are. You are all my village. Viia le Atua! Praise God!

To the 44 participants, more affectionately known to me as my co-researchers, specifically Kaumātua (Beautiful Whaea and Kōkā – alofa atu), rangatahi/youth and their 'aiga/whānau, youth experts in the field and alternative education tutors, who gave their hearts and lifelong friendship – I am indebted to your wisdom and trust to do this mahi. I am reminded of my place to tautua – to serve by presenting this collective body of work. I hope to honour your voices and time. As I ponder the multiple worldviews we all have as part of a "collective" from diverse backgrounds to make meaning and understanding, I am reminded of the journey to get to this point. Three streams of thought that come to mind when I think of my va (relational space) with you all; a scriptural reference, whakataukī, and alagaupu, Samoan proverb.

Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. It does not dishonour others, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs. Love does not delight in evil but rejoices with the truth. It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres. - 1 Corinthians 13:4–8

Ehara taku toa i te toa takitahi, engari kē he toa takitini

My success should not be bestowed onto me alone, it was not individual success but the success of the collective.

I am not an individual; I am an integral part of the cosmos. I share divinity with my ancestors, the land, the seas and the skies. I am not an individual, because I share a *tofi* (inheritance) with my family, my village and my nation. I belong to my family and my family belongs to me. I belong to my village and my village belongs to me. I belong to my nation and my nation belongs to me. This is the essence of my sense of belonging. - Afioga Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Efi

Dedication

For Mum – My Number One Mentor.

To my incredibly patient and loving husband Lawrence Peti Ualesi

You sacrificed so much to push me along

Your love and perseverance is like no other.

Alofa atu

For Rasela-Rose, Lawrence, Gloryah-Grace and Joshua

You hail from a strong lineage, gafa, whakapapa of navigators and servant-leaders.

Never forget who you are. Never fold. Cherish one another. Fa'amalosi.

"O le ala i le pule ole tautua – The pathway to leadership is through service"

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Glossary

Māori terms

Aotearoa	New Zealand
āhuatanga	way, aspect, likeness, characteristic, property, feature, function
aroha	love, compassion, affection
hapū	kinship group, clan, tribe
hauora	wellness, wellbeing
hinengaro	mind, thought, intellect, consciousness
hui	meetings, gatherings
ihumanea	innovation
iwi	tribal kin group
kai	food
kaihana	cousin
Kaikaranga	caller
Kaikōrero	Speaker, narrator
Kanohi-ki-te-kanohi	face to face
kaupapa	agenda, an ideology, theory, methodology, epistemology
Kaupapa Māori	Māori approach, Māori principles, Māori agenda
karakia	prayer
Kaumātua	adult, elder, elderly person of status within the whānau.
Kōkā	Mother, aunty
kōrero	speak, talk, discuss; discussion
kura	school, education, learning gathering
maia	confidence, brave, bold
māhaki	humility
mana	power, spiritual power, authority, control, power in all things from Atua
manaaki	to support, nurture, protect, show generosity, respect and care
manaakitanga	hospitality, kindness, generosity, support
manawanui	resilience
manuhiri	visitor
Māori	Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand
marae	courtyard - the open area in front of the wharenui, where formal greetings and discussions take place
maunga	mountain
moana	ocean, sea
pepeha	tribal acknowledgements
Pākehā	New Zealand European
Pasifika	peoples of the Pacific Ocean
pōwhiri	welcome and calling
rangatahi	younger generation, youth
rangatiratanga	chieftainship, cultural sovereignty
tāngata whenua	the people of the land, Indigenous Māori
te ao Māori	Māori worldview
tautoko	support, advocate for
teina	younger sibling/s, less-experienced relation/s
tahi	one
tapu	taboo, sacred, set apart

Te Moana-Nui-A-Kiwa	the Pacific Ocean
te reo Māori	Māori language
tikanga	practice, plan, protocol, systems of values, customs and practices
tinana	body
tino rangatiratanga	sovereignty, self-determination, autonomy
toru	three
tuakana	older sibling/s, more experienced relation/s
turangawaewae	a place to stand
rua	two
wairua	spirit, soul
waka	seafaring vessel
wairua	spirit, soul
Whaea	Mother, aunt, aunty
whakataukī	proverb
whakapapa	genealogy
whānau	familial group, family, extended family
whanaunga	relation, relative, kin
whanaungatanga	relationships, kinships, familial connections, friendships, reciprocal connections
whakawhanaungatanga	building relationships, relating with others

Pacific terms

Va	space between, relational space, social space
vaka moana	ocean-going canoe
Talanoa	Tongan research methodology
talanoa	sharing stories, creating dialogue in an inclusive, receptive space
teu le va	maintaining the relational space
va'a	seafaring vessel
vaka	seafaring vessel
wā	Time
'aiga	family
alagaupu	Samoan proverbs, wise sayings or expressions about life
alofa	love, compassion
alofa atu	I love you
fa'aaloalo	respect
fa'aSamoa	The Samoa way of life
faifeau	church minister
fale lalaga	weaving house
feagaiga	brother sister covenant
gafa	genealogy
kainga	family (Tonga)
kopu tāngata	family (Cook Islands)
lotu	prayer
magafoa	family (Niue)
malaga	journey
mālō	well done
maufaufau	mind
Pasifika	People living in New Zealand who have migrated from the Pacific Islands
Tautua	To serve, service

teu le va	nurture, care and maintaining the relational space
tofi	inherit, inheritance
tuagane	brother of a girl
tu'ungava'e	a place to stand
Va	Relational and/or social space
va'a	seafaring vessel
va fealofani	brotherly and sisterly love that people should show one another
va fealoaloa'i	the respectful space
va tapuia	space made sacred
va tapua'i	worshipful space
vaka	seafaring vessel
veitapui	relational space

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Overview

Recent decades have seen a groundswell of interest in the field of youth mentoring as a strategy of positive youth development. The positive youth development philosophy reflects a strengths and promotion-oriented move away from a focus on prevention where youth problems have been seen as problems to be fixed (Liang et al., 2013). Blaskeslee and Keller (2012) have asserted that the growth in popularity of youth mentoring programmes has been a strategy for intervening with youth-at-risk. At a local level, in response to the growing interest of the youth mentoring field internationally, Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon et al.'s (2011) systematic review examined the effectiveness of youth mentoring programmes in the local context of Aotearoa New Zealand. The authors recommended programmers incorporate principles of good practice in the context of international research to increase effectiveness and promote the idea that every young person has potential when in nurturing environments. Building on the earlier work of Farruggia and Bullen (2010), Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon et al., (2011) posited the need for mentoring research and evaluation to build upon practice within a positive youth development framework.

Despite the plethora of research literature on positive youth development internationally that has emphasised the internal and external assets youth have to mitigate deficits (Tolan et al., 2016), much of the evidence base is largely underpinned by positive youth development theories that are Eurocentric and individualistic. Much of the scholarship of positive youth development excludes Indigenous theories and models vital to Indigenous holistic approaches of wellbeing and adolescent development, with the exception of local scholars such as Ware and Walsh-Tapiata (2010), Simmonds et al., (2014) and Wexler (2009) whose contributions have privileged mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge systems) and Kaupapa Māori theory. Whilst this has enabled some insight and understanding into the values and constructs important for the positive development of Māori rangatahi (youth) a notable gap in both the positive youth development and youth mentoring research landscape is a robust evidence base underpinned by both Pasifika and Māori constructs relevant to holistic health and wellbeing models.

The positive youth development landscape, developed largely by international scholars, has sought the elusive critical ingredients for effective youth mentoring; however, the theoretical assumptions underpinning evidence-based theories are often framed by non-Indigenous

epistemological and ontological positions and frameworks. Li and Julian (2012) proposed developmental relationships as the key active ingredient whereas Schwartz et al. (2013) suggested natural mentors as critical ingredients. More recent studies have argued for adult–youth relationships and empathy as key critical ingredients in the success of youth mentoring programmes (Spencer, 2012). Similarly, Lester et al. (2019) suggested combined dimensions of experiential empathy and posited relational excitement, referred to as mutuality, as the elusive key ingredient to effective intervention programmes.

Although international studies have sought "critical or elusive" ingredients across the youth mentoring discourse in youth development and youth mentoring programmes, they are largely underpinned by Eurocentric interventionist prevention approaches. Despite international studies having suggested a range of active or critical ingredients in effective youth mentoring programme interventions, there is a notable gap from a localised lens that considers the role of culture, race and ethnicity. In addition, little empirical evidence exists from an interpretivist or critical framework that considers the role of race, ethnicity and culture on youth mentoring approaches (Weiston-Serdan, 2017). Furthermore, there is a lack of culturally grounded and relevant research of youth mentoring programmes that employ culturally appropriate research methodologies, both internationally (Sánchez et al., 2014) and also in Aotearoa New Zealand (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al., 2011).

Research Rationale

Most of the structured activities within youth mentoring programmes are underpinned by positive youth development theories that are defined in terms of universal developmental needs (Simpkins et al., 2017). However, there is a dearth of research about how effective youth mentoring programmes work for diverse groups of youth, both locally (Farruggia, Bullen, Davidson, et al., 2011) and internationally (Sánchez et al., 2014), utilising culturally responsive approaches that centre the voices of Indigenous and minoritised youth and their communities, that is, the very youth often targeted. Despite research in Aotearoa by Keelan (2001; 2014) and Ware and Walsh-Tapiata (2010) who have contributed important knowledge in positive youth development from a uniquely Māori lens that drew on relevant Māori constructs and values, the results did not include Pasifika or diverse mixed youth. To contribute to the knowledge gap, the current thesis explored the voices of diverse Māori rangatahi, and Pasifika youth including their whānau/'aiga/family and communities. Additionally, the current research contributes to understanding the importance of holistic approaches in youth mentoring,

particularly Indigenous relational theories that emphasise identity development within collectivist cultures drawing on Pasifika and Māori constructs of wellbeing.

Although there has been a convergence of literature from diverse areas such as ecological development psychology (Bronfenbrenner, 2005), positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2014) and socioemotional development (Durlak et al., 2011) there is a lack of research that considers the knowledge systems of diverse and minoritised ethnic groups in youth mentoring programmes. Furthermore, such groups in the literature landscape are often framed in deficit terms such as "at-risk," "marginalised" and more recently as "vulnerable," which contradicts the intention behind positive youth development which is a strengths-based position. Prioritising the protection of vulnerable young people who continue to suffer health and educational disparities has become a national and worldwide concern.

This has become much more challenging at global, national and community levels as governments, through agencies, work towards appropriate solutions. Locally, performance measures of child wellbeing in Aotearoa New Zealand have historically been among the worst in the OECD, prompting the enactment of the Children's Act 2014 (Grant, 2016). The Children's Act 2014 advocates for a collective and co-ordinated effort of multiple agencies to protect vulnerable children. A collective approach among government agencies reflects the notion that supporting all young people to develop socially is everyone's responsibility. Youth mentoring is posited as one way to support vulnerable youth in Aotearoa New Zealand to develop successfully through adolescence.

Given the uptake of interest in youth mentoring programmes, particularly those from overseas that may target underserved population groups, it is vital to understand the growing demographic and heterogeneity of young people in Aotearoa New Zealand and the challenges youth face who have been marginalised or alienated. This is particularly salient for youth who face continued challenges through marginalisation and alienation in mainstream education between 13–15 years of age and enter alternative education (Schoone, 2017). As the general youth population increases, research supporting how to best serve youth in mentoring programmes will become increasingly important as the country's youth population grows and diversify.

Aotearoa New Zealand is made up of people who identify as Pākehā/NZ-European (70.2%) (hereby referred to as Pākehā) followed by Indigenous Māori (16.5%), Asian (15.1%), Pacific people (8.1%) and Middle Eastern/Latin American/African (MLEAA; 1.5%) (Stats NZ, 2018).

Importantly, youth, defined by Stats NZ (2016) as the age cohort between 15–24 years, make up approximately 14% of the total population. Geographically, most Pacific people (92.9%) live in the North Island (Stats NZ, 2014) and two thirds (65.9%) of this group live in the Auckland region, followed by 12.2% in the Wellington region. Both the Māori and Pacific populations are youthful and increasing, reflecting higher growth rates on average. Just under half (46.1%) of the total Māori and Pacific population is under 20 years old compared to 27.4% of the total population (Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2016). The Māori and Pacific youth populations (aged 15-24 years) are predicted to experience the highest rate of growth (14%) by 2023 in comparison to other ethnic groups (Stats NZ & Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs, 2011).

Youth populations in Aotearoa are increasingly diverse with many young people identifying with multiple ethnicities over time. For example, the proportion of secondary school students who identified with more than one ethnic group increased from 29% in 2001 to over 42% in 2012 (Clark et al., 2013). This illustrates the fluid and intercultural mix of ethnicities among many youth and supports the idea that identity is both dynamic and fluid (McIntosh, 2005; Mila-Schaaf, 2011; Tupuola, 2004; Webber, 2008). Diverse youth are still reported as manifesting higher morbidity and mortality rates (Edwards et al., 2007), thus current and future research must consider the importance of the multi-layered nature of youth identities and diversity across a growing youthful population (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010; Webber, 2012). More work is needed to ensure youth mentoring programmes underpinned by positive youth development philosophies whose origins are Eurocentric take into consideration the diverse cultural needs of multi-ethnic vulnerable youth (Larson & Ngo, 2016; Williams & Deutsch, 2016).

The nature of "vulnerability" is compounded by previous studies that characterise the Pacific and Māori youth demographic as disproportionately represented by low economic status, in addition to poorer health and education outcomes (Bishop et al., 2009; Borell et al., 2009; Clark et al., 2013; Houkamau & Sibley, 2011). Research studies have also highlighted both Māori and Pacific peoples as living in the most deprived areas and having poorer health and greater unmet need for primary care than other ethnic groups (Minister of Health, 2016). Further, in terms of education, across the general population one in eight people under 25 years of age are not earning or learning (Stats NZ, 2018). Māori and Pacific youth continue to be reported as having more deleterious education outcomes than non-Māori, with higher rates of not being in employment, education or training (NEET).

A recent study showed that in 2018 nearly 18% of Māori and Pacific youth were NEET, nearly twice the recorded rate for non-Māori and Pacific youth (Apatov, 2019); expulsion,[2] for Māori, is reported as more than four times that of Pākehā youth; and Māori and Pacific youth are disproportionately represented in alternative education (Education Counts, 2013). Alternative education is an education model in Aotearoa that caters for students between 13–15 years of age who have been alienated from mainstream school. To be eligible for alternative education students must meet at least one of the following criteria as defined by the Ministry of Education (2019):

1. Out of a registered school for two terms or more
2. Excluded and enrolment is refused by local schools (including a history of stand-downs or suspension in the past 2 years)
3. Has dropped out of …Te Kura [Correspondence School] after enrolment in either category 1 or 2.
4. Absent for at least half of the last 20 school weeks for reasons other than illness and the absence has meant they are unable to maintain a mainstream programme.
5. Has multiple suspensions and risks further suspension.
6. At any one time 20% of students do not have to fit one of the first five categories above but in the professional opinion of the school alternative education is the best option for the student (p.4)

As a result of ongoing marginalisation and colonisation, reports continue to highlight Māori and Pacific youth as overrepresented in youth justice and offences (Ioane et al., 2014). Given the deficit nature of reports related to Māori and Pacific youth, there is a groundswell of interest in developing and implementing youth mentoring programmes that might respond to the needs of diverse youth. The rationale of this thesis was borne out of an invitation by the Programme Directors of a youth mentoring programme based at a university in Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand to conduct research as part of a larger programme of research. Their desire was to enhance programme delivery through attending to culturally safe practice that surfaced as a result of this research. The aim of this thesis was to utilise the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand as a vehicle to explore the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice.

---

[2] Expulsion in NZ refers to formal removal from school if 16 years or older

Significance of the Topic

Although mentoring has grown in popularity in Aotearoa New Zealand, there are very few programmes that serve the needs of young people who have been alienated from mainstream education and placed in alternative education (Bullen, Deane, Wilder et al., 2020). Māori make up 50%, and Pacific youth make up 29%, of the total students accessing alternative education in comparison to 18% of Pākehā, 1% Asian, and 2% Other youth (Clark, Smith, Raphael, Jackson, Denny, et al., 2010). Notably, compared with their mainstream counterparts, young people in alternative education are significantly more likely to experience profound emotional challenges and participate in antisocial/risky behaviours (Noel et al., 2013). Given these concerning statistics there is a sense of urgency about better understanding the youth mentoring strategies that most effectively meet the needs of Māori and Pacific youth.

Given the diverse youthful population, high NEET rates, and overrepresentation in criminal youth justice and violent offences rates, Māori and Pacific youth are often the target of youth mentoring programmes. With this in mind, the current study sought to explore how Māori and Pacific youth might be supported effectively through youth mentoring programmes that are culturally responsive, sustaining of youth linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and culturally safe. There is a paucity of research evidence about effective mentoring from a culturally responsive perspective that seeks to better understand the needs of vulnerable youth who are Indigenous or ethnic minorities, both internationally (Fredricks & Simpkins, 2012; Larson & Ngo, 2016; Salzman, 2000; Sánchez & Colón, 2005; Sánchez et al., 2014; Williams & Deutsch, 2016) and nationally (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al., 2011; Noonan et al., 2012).

In a systematic review of youth mentoring research in Aotearoa New Zealand, Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al. (2011) concluded that there were very few programmes that took into account the cultural backgrounds of Māori and Pacific youth. They also asserted that most programmes working with Māori youth were not culturally appropriate. Their review highlighted important cultural considerations within youth mentoring programmes, arguing that youth mentoring programmes should (a) include whānau/family involvement (both immediate and extended) (b) integrate tikanga (cultural protocols) so that cultural identity and ancestry is explicit and (c) prioritise collective wellbeing as opposed to an individual wellbeing. Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al. (2011) also emphasised the need for culturally appropriate research methodologies that are underpinned by Indigenous customs to increase participation, reliability and validity of data (Allen et al., 2012; Jahnke & Taipa, 1999).

Researcher Positionality – Researcher as Navigator

A culturally responsive methodological approach fits with the researcher's epistemological positioning. The multimethods approach chosen for this study (see Chapter 3 – Methodology) were well suited to my researcher positionality as a Pacific researcher of Samoan, Tokelauan, Fijian and Portuguese ancestry. Like many Pasifika colleagues in the New Zealand diaspora, navigation and voyaging is in our bloodlines. Our ancestors in their malaga (journey) to Aotearoa traversed the expanse of Oceania across Te Moana-Nui-a-Kiwa (the Pacific Ocean) by reading the stars and constellations, marking winds and mapping currents. It is with the strength of my ancestors that I wear many hats and inhabit many spaces.

Currently I am a senior lecturer in initial teacher education at an educational institution in South Auckland. I am also a trained primary school teacher with 10 years' experience, a volunteer youth mentor, and board member on a youth mentoring trust with experience working across 10 primary and full-primary schools in South and West Auckland. I also sit on Pasifika and Māori advisory boards to further support students achieve who they are as Pasifika and Māori learning in predominantly Western spaces. I am a local to South Auckland. I attended Decile 1 South Auckland schools and now work in the largest Polynesian city in the world that includes many Māori-Pacific offspring with diverse intergenerational identities. It is with this rich lens that I position myself to explore and contribute our collective worldviews and epistemologies to the youth mentoring research landscape: to tautua – to serve.

The current research was located as part of a larger youth mentoring research project and involved the cultural translation of a youth mentoring programme targeting Pasifika/Pacific and Indigenous Māori youth. The researcher was both an "insider outsider" in the research project (L. T. Smith, 1999) – someone who connected to the project because of her Pacific heritage (with Pacific participants) – but also someone who was unfamiliar in the specific youth mentoring context because of her university researcher role. As a non-Māori researcher, I was mindful of my responsibility to acknowledge and ensure principles of Indigenous research (Wilson, 2001) and Kaupapa Māori theory were visible (Kovach, 2009; LT Smith, 2012) and operationalised in my interactions with research participants and the wider community (Berryman et al., 2013).

As a researcher of Pasifika descent in Aotearoa New Zealand I have made research decisions to ensure that the Pacific values, concepts and theories that are presented, and which guided this project, contribute to positive youth development and youth mentoring. Specifically, the

discussion of Samoan concepts of va, and feagaiga are drawn from my own diasporic and academic interpretations. My analysis is informed by other scholars of va (see Chapter 2 – Literature Review and Theories) with an acknowledgement and understanding that there are differences in understanding va in Samoa and in the diaspora. Through my New Zealand-born lens I investigated the phenomena of what makes youth mentoring programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand culturally responsive, sustaining and safe. I conducted three studies and offer a contribution of new knowledge regarding the role of race, ethnicity and culture in youth mentoring programmes from a localised lens drawing on indigenous knowledge systems. I have foregrounded Indigenous voices and epistemologies.

This research explored the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice. The project was conducted in a youth mentoring context where an existing international programme was culturally adapted for the Aotearoa context. The research was designed with the following broad question and subquestions:

What are the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice in Aotearoa New Zealand?

   i.   What are the conditions present that determine culturally safe practice in youth mentoring?
  ii.   What are the actions taken by mentors that support culturally safe practice in youth mentoring?
 iii.   What features or indicators of the youth mentoring programme are representative and beneficial for rangatahi or youth of Aotearoa?

A Youth Mentoring Programme in Aotearoa New Zealand – The Va'a, Waka, Vehicle
The youth mentoring programme central to this thesis is based on a therapeutic mentoring programme originally developed in the US by a State University to serve young people and their community. This thesis utilised the cultural translation of the New Zealand version of the youth mentoring programme, based at a major Auckland university, as a vehicle to explore key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice. Both the Aotearoa New Zealand and US programme operate as part of service-learning courses at university institutions. The youth mentoring programme in New Zealand is based on the original US therapeutic mentoring model with an aim to respond to calls from Youth Justice to create solutions to reduce youth offending rates specifically targeting youth at risk. The multilevel mentoring community has therapists who are in training provide therapy "in the

moment" and facilitate youth connecting with other resources they may need. Over 12 weeks, through the provision of structured and intentional pro-social activities, youth are paired with mentors within a group; in the case of the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand these are known as whānau groups. Central to the programme model is the mechanism of quality mentor–mentee relationships. Through the youth mentoring dyad, and whānau group members immersed in pro-social activities with access to therapy in the moment, with aims that specific outcomes would be realised, for example improved mental health, self-concept, existing and new relationships, behaviour and aspirations and future goals.

In the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand, youth are recruited from two alternative education service providers from a region in New Zealand. A key point of difference is the partnership between the youth programme and Alternative Education whereas the US programme takes referrals of at-risk students. There is a greater emphasis between the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand and alternative education working collaboratively and reciprocally to respond to the unique needs of students in alternative education. Alternative education service providers cater for students aged between 13–15 years of age who have been alienated or disengaged from mainstream schooling in New Zealand (Schoone, 2017). Students who turn 16 years of age while in alternative education have historically been able stay in alternative education until the end of the school year; however, since 2017 they have an opportunity to stay longer if alternative education is deemed the pathway most likely for a successful transition back into school or for further education, training or employment (Ministry of Education, 2019). Students in alternative education have usually been through a process of multiple suspensions and/or been excluded as a result of gross misconduct or continued truancy. According to Clark et al., (2010), they are the most vulnerable and undertake riskier life choices than their peers in mainstream education.

One of the two programme directors at the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand was inspired by the US model. Spurred on by government interest to bring the programme to Aotearoa, the programme director engaged in a consultation process to first determine if there were any service gaps for particular groups of young people. This consultation confirmed that there were very few positive youth development opportunities for young people in alternative education in a large region of Auckland. In response to this need, the programme director alongside her colleague at the university setting, the second programme director, developed close partnerships with alternative education providers over a large region of Auckland for the

first iteration of the programme delivered in 2017, the time of which this research was conducted. Thus, central to the current research are these two alternative education service providers (AESP1 & AESP2).

Prior to the start of the programme, student practitioners (coaches, mentors and counsellors) engage in 2 full-days of training. The 12-week youth mentoring programme is a highly structured 4-hour programme that is delivered on the university campus. Prior to the youth arriving, students participate in 1-hour flipped classroom lecture (as part of their service learning) where mentoring practice-relevant academic literature is presented and discussed. The alternative education youth are transported to campus by their tutors. Each 4-hour session begins with a karakia (prayer) to welcome the youth and their tutors. This is followed by a half-hour time slot where whānau groups (inclusive of mentors and mentees) choose routes to walk in the university grounds for Walk 'n Talk. This activity is designed so that the whānau group can catch up informally about their week whilst visiting a different location of the university.

The third activity involves whānau groups engaging in activities that support transition success. In this hour, mentors collaborate with their mentees in discussing their goals and aspirations for future success. They discuss and record ways to achieve their set goals over the course of the programme, and mentors prepare and provide resources for mentees to support their plans and goals for success. The fourth activity includes a shared meal with all members of the programme; the fifth activity includes a variety of pro-social activities. The youth choose from a range of activities that cover art, dance, cultural activities, cooking, sports, games, and social justice-oriented activities. Each week, the youth participate in two pro-social activities of their choice. A key objective of the pro-social component of the programme is that mentees have autonomy to determine which activities they want to engage in with their mentors, and the activities are structured to support the development of pro-social skills.

The youth and their mentors then return to the classrooms where they wind down, check in, reflect and talk about how their day has gone. This includes discussions about what went well, what was challenging, and more general discussion directed by the mentees' interests. This activity concludes with a closing karakia (prayer). Once the youth and their tutors are farewelled, the student practitioners attend a post mentoring briefing. During this debrief, students are encouraged to reflect on their practice and then have an opportunity to share about the day's experiences, including the highs and lows. Importantly, this component enables the programmers to scaffold and support mentors and mentor coaches in learning that takes place

over the day and to reflect on their practice in relation to the realties they have experienced with their mentee.

The day-long programme is designed to maximise learning for all participants in the programme in addition to providing opportunities for mentees to access health services such as counselling on a voluntary basis The programme content is also designed to amplify learning opportunities for the mentors, mentor coaches, and programme directors. The current research was designed to provide understanding for programmers of what might work well to culturally respond to the needs of traditionally underserved youth.

Organisational Outline of the Thesis – The Malaga/Voyage Mapped

This section presents the map of the research malaga (journey or voyage) culminating in the seven chapters of this thesis. Chapter 2 – Literature Review and Theories, is focussed on a critical review of the positive youth development literature and the move from prevention science to an ecological assets framework. It also reviews the conceptualisation of the youth mentoring landscape as a strategy of positive youth development. Following that is a review of positive youth development and youth mentoring in Aotearoa New Zealand. The importance of whānau, 'aiga or family contexts is discussed in relation to the development of strong cultural youth identities. Rhodes's (2005) youth mentoring model is also discussed. The salience of Indigenous wellbeing constructs of health and wellbeing relevant for Pasifika youth and Māori rangatahi development are analysed including a focus on critical mentoring with a focus on equity approaches, the va (relational space) as an organising construct to theorise Pasifika/Pacific and Māori identity development, and Indigenous concepts of human development relevant to the wellbeing of youth in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Chapter 3 is focussed on the methodology and presents a rationale for a culturally responsive multimethod approach and a decolonial and indigenising research lens. The chapter presents Moana Theory and discusses relational ethics underpinning a va relational approach. A brief discussion of the researcher's epistemological position congruent to the va relational approach is offered followed by an overview of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand's governance and programme structure. The latter part of Chapter 3 provides an overview of participants, procedure, analysis and ethical issues relevant across the three studies.

Chapters 4, 5 and 6 each contain Studies 1 to 3 respectively. Each study was conducted to explore culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice in youth mentoring. Chapters 4, 5

and 6 include a brief introduction, research context and method followed by the results, and finally a brief discussion. Chapter 7 provides an overall discussion that integrates the findings outlined in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 and examines their contribution to the wider field of culturally responsive, culturally sustaining and culturally safe practice. Chapter 7 includes a discussion about the ways knowledge of critical mentoring through critical cultural mentoring and advancing methodological approaches can be advanced. The limitations of the current research are discussed and suggestions for future research around race, culture and ethnicity are presented. The dissertation concludes with reflections on the navigational research malaga. The next chapter, Chapter 2, reviews the literature and theories relevant to culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice.

Chapter 2 – Literature Review and Theories

Chapter Overview

This chapter presents a critical review of positive youth development theories that have informed local approaches to positive youth development and the move from prevention science to an ecological assets framework. The next section reviews the youth mentoring literature base and provides a description of the youth mentoring landscape in Aotearoa and a discussion of the mechanisms to achieve effective youth mentoring outcomes. Following is a brief discussion of the need for reconceptualising youth mentoring to include and affirm Indigenous wellbeing constructs of health and wellbeing relevant for Pasifika/Pacific youth and Māori rangatahi development. The next section describes the importance of whānau, 'aiga and family as an Indigenous ecosystem of youth development relevant to youth mentoring.

Following is a review of equity approaches that inform the conceptualisation of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice in the youth mentoring landscape and a review of recent contributions of critical mentoring in relation to postcolonial theory. Building on ideas of critical mentoring and the need to focus on culturally relevant approaches and theories in youth mentoring, an overview of relationality and the va (relational space) is discussed. Next a discussion of a va relational approach provides a segue to theorise Pasifika/Pacific and Māori identity development and related Indigenous concepts of human development relevant to wellbeing for adolescents in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Positive Youth Development Abroad

International literature of positive youth development shows a shift towards the strengths-based approach of positive youth development in contrast to early deficit-oriented theories of adolescent development (Liang et al., 2013). Positive youth development emerged from the work of Eccles and Templeton (2002), Benson et al. (2006), Lerner et al. (2005) and, more recently, Brooks-Gunn and Roth (2014) with emphasis on building capacity and the existing strengths that vulnerable youth bring into positive youth development programmes. One of the positive youth development aims was to nurture a variety of positive outcomes for adolescents and assist youth to negotiate and navigate their way through adolescence in a healthy way (Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003). Conceived within the developmental systems frameworks, Tolan et al. (2016) argued that the positive youth development framework is differentiated from intervention prevention frameworks by the centrality of agency to understand adolescent development. In a similar vein, recently Tolan et al. (2016) asserted that positive youth

development views youth as having agency or the power to thrive by tapping into strengths and aligning these with resources and opportunities. This approach views the most vulnerable youth as having reserves of resilience, abilities to change behaviour, abilities to develop new skills, as well as being able to nurture different and new interests and build trusting relationships (Lerner, 2004). A key tenet to positive youth development is to target universal youth resiliencies that are unique to their personal strengths and community contexts (Liang et al., 2013).

Although the positive youth development framework rejects conceptions of youth as flawed (Liang et al., 2013), intervention programmes are still being developed that frame youth in deficit ways, either as at-risk or vulnerable, in need of interventions to fix them. Notably, Farruggia and Bullen (2010) posited positive youth development as a strengths-based approach that draws on Bronfenbrenner's (2005) bioecological model, acknowledging the role of context in children's development, making the assumption that every child has potential and/or inherent strengths. However, the construction and theoretical underpinnings of those "strengths" are understood from positive youth development constructs that were developed within the US context.

Internationally, positive youth development constructs are most prevalent in two notable models in the thriving literature, such as the 5 Cs model of positive youth development (Lerner et al., 2005) and the developmental assets model (Search Institute, 2018). Thriving is usually aligned to the 5 Cs of competence, confidence, connection, character and caring (Lerner et al., 2000). An extra C – contribution – may occur once all prior Cs are present, thus making it the six Cs (Lerner, 2004). As mentioned above, another well-established model, the assets model, developed by the Search Institute, developed 40 important external and internal assets. External assets such as support, where young people receive family support, positive family communication, support from other adults' relationships, a caring neighbourhood, caring school climate and parent involvement in schooling, are vital. External assets include youth feeling valued and valuable through feeling safe and respected. Assets related to empowerment include the community valuing youth, youth being seen as resources, youth being of service to others, and youth feeling safe. Further external assets include boundaries and expectations where young people have family, school, and neighbourhood boundaries; positive adult role models; positive peer influences; and high expectations. Finally, external assets include a constructive use of time where young people have opportunities outside the school context and environment to learn and hone new skills and interests with others. Youth need creative

activities, youth programmes and religious communities where they spend time constructively in activities, including activities at home.

The Search Institute also developed internal assets such as a commitment to learning; where young people need to feel a long-lasting sense of importance of their abilities, such as achievement motivation, school engagement, homework, bonding to school, and reading for pleasure. Internal assets include positive values where young people develop a string of guiding values and principles for healthy life choices through caring, equality and social justice, integrity, honesty, responsibility, and exercising restraint. Further internal assets include social competencies where young people develop social skills and make challenging decisions to improve coping. These can be developed through planning and decision making, interpersonal competence, cultural competence, resistance skills, and peaceful conflict resolution. Young people need to develop a positive identity where they have a sense of personal power, self-esteem, sense of purpose, and have a positive view of their personal future. Lerner et al. (2005) asserted both internal and external assets are resources required to support adequate development.

The Assets Model emphasises the 40 items that make up a set of skills, experiences, relationships and behaviours that aid healthy development known to assist young people to become well, caring and responsible. This framework of strengths has varied assets for different age phases as young people begin to develop noncognitive skills and social resources. Also derived from a developmental systems approach is the focus that youth accessing and being supported by their environment are able to effectively function and reach their personal goals (Benson et al., 2011). External assets, the many supports, opportunities and relationships young people need across all aspects of their lives, and internal assets, the personal skills, self-perceptions and values they need, enable them to make better choices, take responsibility and ownership for their life and in turn become independent and fulfilled (Search Institute, 2018).

In terms of related research, the contributions to knowledge and understanding that utilise the development assets profile are widely published in the positive youth development landscape and offer research insights about social-emotional development. According to the Search Institute (2018), international research utilising the assets framework has been conducted beyond North America, such as in Africa, Asia, Europe, the Middle East, Central and South America and Australia. However, at the time of writing there has been no known record of research of its application in Aotearoa New Zealand. Importantly, Indigenous knowledge

systems and related constructs of strengths in the Aotearoa New Zealand context differ from that of the US; that is, Indigenous Māori and Pasifika communities have their own ideas and knowledge systems of their inherent strengths.

The assets model does appear to map well onto Māori and Pacific models of health and wellbeing as it also considers the social and cultural context of youth and how whānau/family and kin maybe be support networks (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al., 2011); however, as noted above, the assets model is a US-based framework and has not yet been utilised in the Aotearoa context. The most notable and widely cited approach in Māori health and education, Mason Durie's (1994, 1998) Te Whare Tapa Wha model, posits distinct elements from an Indigenous lens with a holistic approach, utilising Māori constructs relevant to Māori. The model by Durie compares health to the four walls of a whare or house. The four walls of the house are all necessary to ensure strength and symmetry, as each wall represents a different dimension of health. Taha wairua represents the spiritual side, taha hinengaro represents the thoughts and feelings, taha tinana represents the physical side and taha whānau represents the family side of health. The four walls or sides of health were noted to be "key ingredients for good health" (Durie, 1998, p. 69). The reference to key ingredients to health from a Māori lens signals a self-determination of knowledge and understanding that Māori define their own priorities for health and thus what works best for Māori (Durie, 1998). Indeed, there are other holistic approaches to health and wellbeing specific to Aotearoa New Zealand which are further discussed in the latter part of this chapter (see Cultural Health Models). Despite the majority of literature in positive youth development having its origins in research work located in the US there has been a growing scholarly base of positive youth development more locally. The next section reviews the positive youth development literature using an Aotearoa New Zealand lens relevant to the current study.

Positive Youth Development in Aotearoa

In Aotearoa New Zealand, there has been growing interest in positive youth development drawing on the inner individual strengths or assets found in family and community contexts (O'Toole et al., 2019). Work by Simmonds et al. (2014) revealed that the indicators of positive youth development for Māori were taking collective responsibility, successfully navigating both Māori and Pākehā worlds, cultural efficacy, health and personal strengths. The authors posited relationships, activities, cultural factors, education, health/healthy lifestyles, sociohistorical factors and personal characteristics as contributing towards positive development. Notably, whānau relationships were positively correlated with a number of

indicators. This reinforces the idea that whānau/parents are central to Māori rangatahi (Edwards et al., 2007). An important facet of this work is that a strengths-based approach was taken, with rangatahi voices central and woven through the research design.

Likewise, the earlier work of Ware and Walsh-Tapiata (2010) ensured youth were an integral part in tikanga throughout the research process. They suggested that future research should utilise a more in-depth focus on cultural constructs relevant for Māori youth so that they might proceed in a self-determined Māori way (Ware & Walsh-Tapiata, 2010). The purpose of their study was to respond to the Youth Development Strategy Aotearoa and subsequent Rangatahi Development Package that they found did not adequately address the diverse realities and experiences of Māori youth. Rather, their study utilised a Māori youth research approach drawing on a combination of Māori-focussed research methodologies and action research that considered effective strategies for positive youth development with a group of young Māori (Ware & Walsh-Tapiata, 2010).

Ware and Walsh-Tapiata's findings emphasised Māori cultural constructs such as tikanga (values), whanaungatanga (relationship building), mana (collective integrity and responsibility) and manaakitanga (collective wellbeing). Important characteristics for youth to develop included maia (confidence), manawanui (resilience), ihumanea (innovation) and māhaki (humility). The authors contended that the environment in which Māori rangatahi develop must essentially be culturally conducive for these qualities and tikanga to be recognised and further developed (Ware & Walsh-Tapiata, 2010). This means contexts must enable rangatahi to proudly be Māori and break free from negative stereotypes, which will enhance their cultural capacity. Furthermore, future research must consider and be cognisant of essential cultural elements in youth mentoring programmes and in particular recognise rangatahi diversity and privilege Māori cultural and social practices (Ware & Walsh-Tapiata, 2010). This provides understanding of rangatahi Māori from a holistic viewpoint, which acknowledges that their diverse cultural and social contexts are embedded in relational communities, in contrast to the current dominant positive youth development theories that are often couched in evidence-based interventions that are Eurocentric. Notably, randomised-controlled trials focussed on statistical difference indicate a tendency towards intervening and fixing youth (Bendtro et al., 2014; Ungar, 2018). Indeed an authentic strengths-based approach would consider programming that includes Indigenous knowledge systems and frameworks that are holistic approaches to wellbeing that enable the self-determination and agency of the very communities targeted for youth mentoring programmes.

Whereas the work by Simmonds et al. (2014) and Ware and Walsh-Tapiata (2010) reinforced the importance of youth voice in research, eliciting the voices of youth enables researchers to better understand what works for Māori and other ethnic minorities such as Pacific youth. A positive youth-centred approach is also consistent with other transformative approaches such as Kaupapa Māori theory and Pacific approaches (L. T. Smith, 1999; Thaman, 2003; Vaioleti, 2006; 2013). Engaging youth participants and community is also consistent with developing research partnerships using a participatory research approach (Jennings et al., 2006). Both studies of positive youth development from a Māori perspective highlight the salience of cultural identity, focussed on understanding Indigenous history, culture and values critical to the wellbeing of Indigenous youth.

Similarly, Wexler (2009) suggested that resilient Indigenous youth have a better sense of wellbeing when they develop a strong cultural identity. She argued that youth who have a historical understanding of and affiliation with their culture develop a perspective that paves the way forward. Further, she posited that young people have improved psychological outcomes as a result of being armed with knowledge of shared historical trauma and thus craft renditions of themselves towards a shared future of wellbeing (Wexler, 2009). From a Pacific view, youth who exhibit cultural confidence and acceptance, and actively engage in the vitalisation of cultural values and language, may thrive (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010).

Youth who learn from Pacific role models draw from their strengths and positive outcomes (also known as positive deviance). Thus, youth acquire Polycultural capital, also known as a distinct Pacific cultural advantage, where youth negotiate difficult environments and stressors (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010). Pacific youth thrive as a result of successfully navigating distinct social and cultural spaces in the acquisition of Polycultural capital. In comparison to Western-centric theories, the approaches consider a strengths-based orientation as opposed to a problem-focussed orientation and emphasise the individual's context and social history. Furthermore, in contrast to current positive youth development theories predominantly located in prevention science, the local theories described above are underpinned by cultural constructs relevant to Pasifika peoples.

Postcolonial Theory

The nature of culturally responsive, culturally sustaining and culturally safe practice can be said to have its origins in postcolonial theory. Major theorists in the field such as Frantz Fanon (1952), Edward Said (1978), Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1990) and Homi K. Bhabha (1994)

have all contributed to postcolonial discourse of major interrelated themes of power, identity, ethnicity, race and subjectivity. Indeed, Ladson-Billings and Donnor (2008) asserted that postcolonial theory "helps to see the worldwide oppression against the 'other' and the ability of the dominant groups to define the terms of being and nonbeing, as civilized and uncivilized, of developed and undeveloped, of human and nonhuman" (p. 67).

The term *postcolonial* implies a celebration of perhaps the end of colonialism whereas Linda T. Smith (1998) queried "Post … have they left yet?" (as cited in Ladson-Billings & Donnor, 2008). Given the persistent socioeconomic inequalities of Māori as a result of settler colonialism and the argument that settler colonialism is not an event but a structure (Terruhn, 2019), the aim of this section is to bring attention to the way Indigenous scholarship and postcolonial theory might be helpful in understanding how youth mentoring programmes might address ethnic-minority or diverse youth health needs. Further, postcolonial theory that informs critical theory and thus critical mentoring (Weiston-Serdan, 2017) offers insight to a localised theoretical lens drawing on Indigenous knowledge systems.

As noted prior, given an abundance of research exists from the US with a steady uptake from Aotearoa New Zealand in the past two decades, this study aimed to draw on key theories relevant to the widening gap of understanding what might work best for Indigenous and ethnic minority youth. As a response to the call for research to examine the role of race, culture and ethnicity in youth mentoring, this study aimed to explore what the key ingredients are to practice that is responsive to, and sustaining of youth mentees cultural and linguistic backgrounds as well as honouring their inherent funds of knowledge form home (Gonzales et al., 2005)

Recent scholarship from Weiston-Serdan (2017) supports this approach to call programmers who are from non-minoritised and often the dominant group in society to examine the power dynamics from a systemic and structural level. This includes governance and planning in addition to within programme, mentor and dyad relationships that might sustain the ongoing effects of colonialism, by engaging in values and constructs to better understand Indigenous worldviews, in this study to support Māori and Pacific youth development. Whilst postcolonialism theory and critical theory underpins the work of Weiston-Serdan (2017), critical mentoring supports the current thesis by centring counter-colonial research methodologies (Ritchie, 2015). Her recent scholarship examining the relevance of critical theory and critical race theory framing critical mentoring creates a reimagining of youth

mentoring from an Indigenous lens and relational approach. Weiston-Serdan (2017) asserted that critical mentoring is about centring the voices of mentees themselves. A key tenet of critical mentoring is the self-work to acknowledge one's own biases and explore how one's youth mentoring practice might reinforce negative stereotypes or power and control issues around race, gender or class. Additionally, Weiston-Serdan (2017) asserted that checking one's privilege and exploring the motive or the "why" of youth mentoring relationships is vital. This is consistent with going beyond cultural competency, in a spirit of cultural humility (Tervalon & Murray-García, 1998) towards cultural safety (Curtis et al., 2019).

Recent scholarship by Curtis et al. (2019) echoes the move from cultural competency to cultural safety to achieve health equity. They argued:

> Cultural competency, cultural safety and related terms have been variably defined and applied. Unfortunately, regulatory and educational health organisations have tended to frame their understanding of cultural competency towards individualised rather than organisational/systemic processes, and on the acquisition of cultural knowledge rather than reflective self-assessment of power, privilege and biases … A shift is required to an approach based on a transformative concept of cultural safety, which involves a critique of power imbalances and critical self-reflection. (p. 15)

The assertion that research is in need of emancipation from not only hearing the voices of Western Europe, but also from generations of silence and seeing the world in one colour is relevant for the youth mentoring context (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Indeed, given the holistic nature of Pacific and Indigenous youth wellbeing discussed earlier, well established health and wellbeing models, calls for youth mentoring research that promotes cultural safety, and includes spirituality and non-Western communal forms of living, are validated (Chilisa, 2012).

Spirituality, however, can mean many things to many people. Both precolonisation and postcolonisation, spirituality has many diverse layers and evolves over time. Careful attention must be taken for every diverse young person and their community. A Samoan lens of spirituality, for example, for young people in the diaspora and in Aotearoa New Zealand, may base their spirituality in either the biblical sense and/or nonbiblical sense for those who do not ascribe to forms of religion or Christianity. Spirituality in a more contemporary form may also be seen as a space of mindful thought and reflection. The concept of "space" or "third space" by postcolonial writers such Bhabha (1994) is useful for negotiating and straddling two or more worlds where youth might navigate their identities drawing on multiple lenses of reality

(Webber, 2008). The construct of third space is also relevant to the va, a relational space which is discussed at the latter part of this chapter (see Relationality and the Va Relational Space).

Youth Mentoring Abroad

As a strategy of positive youth development, formal youth mentoring programmes originated from the US and have often been underpinned by deficit-oriented theories focussed on supporting youth who present with risk, pathology and problematic behaviour (Liang et al., 2013; Tolan et al., 2016). The earliest organised youth mentoring programmes were designed in the US to benefit vulnerable youth more than a century ago (Rhodes & DuBois, 2008). Explicit pairing of vulnerable youth with adults to support and guide them through adolescence developed as early as 1902 when the Big Brother and Big Sister (BBSA) movement began in the USA (Evans & Ave, 2000). This first formal approach of youth mentoring provided local boys in need to have a support system of "big brothers." Big Brothers, the earliest and biggest youth mentoring programme in the US and abroad, refers poor and mostly delinquent boys to one-to-one caring and supportive adults. Such young men are usually disconnected from their community with the goal of reducing risky behaviours (Schwartz & Rhodes, 2016). In the US, such formal youth mentoring programmes drew on charitable actions of volunteers with a concern to assist vulnerable youth (Eby et al., 2013).

Traditional approaches to formal youth mentoring usually occur in the context of a specific programme whereas informal mentoring occurs naturally in communities among younger youth who tend to be kin (Schwartz & Rhodes, 2016). Informal mentoring relationships with young people may also include coaches, teachers or other members of the community who usually tend to be kin (Schwartz & Rhodes, 2016). Formal youth mentoring programmes vary in nature, size and duration depending on the desired outcomes and goals of the programmes (DuBois et al., 2011; Schwartz & Rhodes, 2016). Although youth mentoring programmes are generally characterised by nonparental one-to-one mentoring dyads, there are also group (multiple youth matched with one mentor), team (one youth is matched with multiple mentors), or mixed (any combination of individual, group or team) delivery formats (Farruggia, Bullen, Davidson, et al., 2011). The study of formal youth mentoring and programme effectiveness has grown over the last 2-3 decades both internationally and has been described as one strategy to support vulnerable youth (DuBois et al., 2002; DuBois et al., 2011; Raposa et al., 2016). Although much of this research has focussed on traditional one-to-one dyads, youth mentoring programme effectiveness and associated outcomes benefiting youth participants have been widely documented (DuBois et al., 2011; Tolan et al., 2014).

Youth participating in youth mentoring programmes have been found to have benefited significantly in emotional/psychological, social competence, academic/educational and career/employment outcome domains (DuBois et al., 2002; Rhodes, 2005). The conditions necessary to maximise desired programme outcomes are close, strong, enduring connections that promote positive developmental change (Rhodes & DuBois, 2008). Youth mentoring programmes have been found to be particularly beneficial to youth who face a high degree of environmental adversity that would benefit from such connections (DuBois et al., 2011). Youth mentoring programmes have also been shown to significantly reduce risk and promote positive outcomes (DuBois et al. 2002; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Herrera et al., 2013). Other benefits include youth exhibiting a greater a sense of wellbeing, positive attitudes towards school and improved ability to navigate situations with drug and alcohol exposure (Eby et al., 2008; Tolan et al., 2008). Similar findings were echoed in a systematic review of effective youth mentoring programmes by DuBois et al. (2011); overall, they found effectiveness of outcomes across behavioural, social, emotional and academic domains of young people's development.

Although the positive impact of mentoring on young people is well documented, less is known about how different forms of delivery (e.g., group versus one-to-one) impact effectiveness. In addition, researchers have proposed that some formats (e.g., group) offer more culturally compatible alternatives for ethnic/cultural minority youth (Noonan et al., 2012) and provide benefits that traditional dyadic approaches lack (Kuperminc & Thomason, 2014). More recently, Haddock et al.'s (2020) randomised controlled trial organising mentor–mentee matches into small groups, to enhance treatment effects in a site-based mentoring programme for adolescents, showed no advantage and that rather youth might be able to gain benefit from both structures. This line of research is still developing and more research is needed to fully understand how the delivery format impacts effectiveness. In the Aotearoa context, it has been suggested that working in a collective group format maybe more suitable (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al., 2011); however, mentors must be culturally competent in meeting diverse needs. This is important for Indigenous or ethnic-minority youth populations who come from collective cultures, particularly for Māori and Pasifika in the current study.

The recruitment of mentors from helping-role professions and clear communication of expectations of conduct with youth in mentoring dyads have been shown to be effective in youth mentoring programmes (DuBois et al., 2002). Importantly, other factors identified as effective were supporting and involving parents, flexibility in using community settings to be

utilised for mentoring, mentor training and systematic monitoring and implementation (DuBois et al., 2002). It has been suggested that programmes should incorporate training around cultural responsiveness and identify needs that build on both mentors' and mentees' ethnic identity and cultural competence. This would assist in matching and promote interaction between mentees and mentors of different ethnicities or cultures (Kuperminc & Thomason, 2014). The present study will consider such factors when working alongside Indigenous and ethnic-minority youth where ensuring whānau/family engagement is central and also a collective support system is salient.

Alongside important factors of cultural training and recruitment are context, structure and goals of programmes; other critical programme elements are the content, infrastructure and dosage (Karcher et al., 2006). Dosage refers to frequency of mentor–mentee contact or total hours in a given period as well as the intensity or psychological and emotional strength of mentoring interaction. Dosage also refers to the duration or total length of relationship such as one semester or one school year (Karcher et al., 2006). Grossman and Rhodes (2002) posited that youth were not likely to benefit from shorter mentoring relationships given the lack of time available for a close enduring relationship to mature. Research estimates between 30%–50% mentoring relationships in supportive youth programmes last only a few months (Herrera et al., 2013), ending prematurely, which puts youth at increased risk of harmful health and social outcomes (Britner & Kraimer-Rickaby, 2005). Further, youth who have not received the maximum benefit of close enduring relationships and who enter programmes pre-existing with already poor academic, social or behavioural functioning were found to less likely have benefitted from youth mentoring programmes (Raposa et al., 2016).

The focus on dyadic relationships and the benefits of these has been central to the literature in the youth mentoring movement, in analysing the benefits that at-risk youth receive. Central to research studies are the benefits of the individual relationship between mentor and mentee and the resulting positive effects (Schwartz & Rhodes, 2016). A well cited model underpinning the conceptualisation of youth mentoring and understanding its processes and mechanisms is Rhodes's (2005) theoretical model of youth mentoring. This model emphasises the importance of a strong connection forged between mentor and youth where mutuality and trust are key.

Despite the abundance of research evidence outlining and analysing the benefits of youth mentoring not all research shows positive results. Although broad meta-analyses and conceptual reviews suggest mentoring holds much promise compared to other interventions

(DuBois et al., 2002; DuBois et al., 2011; Rhodes, 2002; Rhodes et al., 2008), studies also suggest that youth mentoring programmes show modest effect sizes with limited evidence showing continued positive programme impacts over longer periods of time (DuBois et al., 2011). Additionally, youth mentoring programmes are known as one of the first interventions using a controlled study to have produced negative effects as noted by Tolan et al., (2014). Such variance in quality of youth mentoring programmes has also been linked to the indiscriminate use of the term mentoring in the prevention field (Rhodes & DuBois, 2008). Definitions of youth mentoring vary but the most common element is the one-to-one relationships between mentor and mentee for the potential benefit of the mentee (Tolan et al., 2014).

Despite well-documented evidence regarding the importance of dyadic relationships between mentor and mentee and benefits for vulnerable youth (Rhodes, 2005), less attention has been paid to the important context of family (Schwartz & Rhodes, 2016). Moreover, there is an overemphasis on the individual and his/her disposition as a decontextualised child distinctly separate from their broader environment (Schwartz & Rhodes, 2016). Schwartz and Rhodes (2016) assert that the formal mentoring dyad remains central and a tight focus in terms of funding, practice and research in the youth mentoring field at the expense of the potential untapped resource of community supports and informal ties.

This aligns with Ware (2013) who asserted that mentoring programmes for Indigenous youth must consider the additional challenges of "dispossession, discontinuity of culture and intergenerational trauma" (p. 2). In addition her research in the Australian context shows alignment with Māori and Pasifika ecological systems where Elders are regarded as essential to youth mentoring programmes with Indigenous youth. Similarly, Evans and Ave (2000) contend that children with social advantages may have already well-established natural mentors in the form of whānau, to support them. Further, they argue that rather than imitating models from overseas, careful thought must be given to processes and principles involved in mentoring to support development of innovative programmes suited to the unique cultures of Aotearoa. The importance of natural environments that are mentor rich in the form of whānau, 'aiga or familyis discussed after the next section reviewing youth mentoring in Aotearoa.

Youth Mentoring in Aotearoa

In Aotearoa, it has been argued that natural youth mentoring was embedded in the social fabric long before it emerged and was recorded as a formal intervention in the early 1990s (Farruggia,

Bullen, Solomon, et al., 2011). Indigenous Māori have always prioritised and utilised tuakana-teina relationships within the whānau context. Tuakana-teina relationships usually involve an older or more experienced whānau member guiding, teaching and supporting a younger whānau member (Metge, 1995; Ware & Walsh-Tapiata, 2010). These are reciprocal relationships intended to support the welfare of the collective group (Edwards et al., 2007). In the Pacific context, specifically Samoan, values of tautua (service) and feagaiga (covenant or sacred relationship), va (space), va tapuia, (sacred space) are embedded in the social fabric of fa'aSamoa – the Samoan way (Anae, 2010; Muiava, 2017; Tiatia, 2012). Values central to Samoan culture are important in the context of youth mentoring, particularly in forming enduring positive relationships. The alagaupu, Samoan proverb, "*O le ala i le pule, o le tautua,*" "the pathway to leadership is through service," is an important value in youth mentoring relationships where a covenant to support another person's wellbeing is placed within a duty of care or sacred space (va tapuia). The literature on Samoan wellbeing in Aotearoa New Zealand refers to the Samoan self as relational or the "relational self" (Tamasese et al., 2005). In Samoan culture, the Samoan self would see themselves as part of and in relation to a collective of intertwined relationships. Thus, notions of service, covenant and sacredness are important in youth mentoring programmes.

The youth mentoring evidence base is relatively new in Aotearoa New Zealand compared to the US experience (Noonan et al., 2012). However, a systematic review of mentoring programmes in Aotearoa has shown similar results in line with the US (Farruggia, Bullen, Davidson, et al., 2011). Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al. (2011) highlighted the growth and scope of youth mentoring in Aotearoa New Zealand, indicating 23 programmes were active under the youth mentoring network across the country at the time of publication. Overall, 88% of the studies showed some level of effectiveness although the authors caution that results are tentative due to quality of research. The review also showed that the more effective programmes focussed on psychological and interpersonal factors as opposed to programmes focussed on educational, behavioural, vocational or cultural goals.

Studies included in the review of Farruggia, Bullen, Davidson, et al. (2011) revealed that 64% of mentoring programmes were a component of a larger programme as opposed to exclusively stand-alone programmes. Seventy-three percent were one-to-one programmes and few had mixed or group mentoring. Programmes mainly targeted low-socioeconomic status youth, and 56% of programmes targeted vulnerable youth. Approximately 54% of programmes had a high proportion of Māori and 19% had a high proportion of Pacific youth (Farruggia, Bullen,

Solomon, et al., 2011). Although family is an important context for both Māori and Pacific youth, only 29% of studies included some level of family involvement. Involvement of whānau/'aiga/family is a critical element of cultural appropriateness in programming given that Māori and Pacific youth are part of collectivist cultures (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al., 2011).

Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al. (2011) noted that programmes effective in the New Zealand context were more established, regularly conducted evaluations and incorporated best practice principles. Further they had adult mentors, used one-to-one (in a group context) or mixed mentoring, were likely structured and had greater expectations for the duration of the mentor–mentee relationship. Such programmes also worked with low- and mixed-socioeconomic status youth and delineated researchers from practitioners. Programmes aimed at youth from midlevel economic backgrounds were less effective in comparison to low- or mixed-socioeconomic background youth. The authors cautioned interpretation of this result as high levels of information were missing. Another key finding of the programmes evaluated was that highly effective programmes tended to be less culturally appropriate for Māori and those programmes that were culturally appropriate for Māori were less effective. Interestingly, no association was found for cultural appropriateness and effectiveness for programmes that had a significant portion of Pacific youth. Limitations noted by the authors were the variance in the quality of the research and findings as well as a possible bias of data, where more than one study of the same programme may have been included (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al., 2011). Despite the findings being a decade old this study highlights the need for a research that explores the lived experiences of a cross section of Pasifika and Māori youth and their communities. It is important to understand from the voices of participants themselves of how programmes might be effective from an Indigenous lens and culturally appropriate and safe.

Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al. (2011) also contended that youth mentoring programmes are still developing and future consideration should be given to incorporating cultural goals alongside best practice, particularly around identity. During adolescence, given the development of a positive identity is critically important particularly for Māori and Pacific youth who are both heterogeneous, sometimes with multiple layers of identity (Borell, 2005; McIntosh, 2005; Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010; Webber, 2008) positive social identity projects or activities are vital Positive identity development for youth wellbeing in a youth mentoring context, particularly in Aotearoa should draw on Indigenous Māori and Pacific worldviews, which is critical to designing future research that is culturally sound.

As noted earlier, future research conducted with programmes serving culturally diverse youth must consider cultural training incorporating both Māori and Pacific values for all staff and mentors (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al., 2011). Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al. (2011) also recommended the involvement of immediate and extended families in addition to acknowledging language and customs. Furthermore, they asserted that research must acknowledge cultural identity including family ancestral history and importantly engage the Indigenous communities in the research process. Moreover, Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon et al. posited that culturally appropriate methodologies must be drawn on in research with culturally diverse youth. Additionally, they recommended that youth mentoring programmes be aligned with the positive youth development framework as it seeks to emphasis youth assets.

It is vital that youth mentoring programmes draw on culturally grounded holistic approaches to wellbeing. A recent study by Dutton et al. (2018) suggested high-quality relationships were formed during the programme when primarily facilitated by mentors who showed a holistic view of mentees, and demonstrated attunement, critical self-reflection, and self-efficacy. Indeed, the results are insightful as the research was within a New Zealand school-based mentoring programme, thus responding to the call to investigate mentoring relationships in specific contexts, and focussed on one-to-one and group mentoring. However, the qualitative study included interviews where the key features and perceived influences on mentoring-relationship quality were identified alongside mentor portfolios, from the perspective of programme staff themselves, and did not include the views of youth themselves or their whānau/'aiga/family or community members or consider already well established scholarship related to Māori or Pasifika wellbeing

Existing models of health and wellbeing from both Māori and Pacific perspectives consider the whole individual in the context of the wider whānau/'aiga/family. Research suggests that culture in the context of whānau serves as a protective factor against a range of negative outcomes (Muriwai et al., 2015). Youth programmers must be attuned to the importance of a strong positive cultural identity. It is particularly important for youth mentoring programmes supporting vulnerable youth to consider the multiplicity of contemporary identities youth may hold as a result of balancing traditional and Western values (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al., 2011). Research in the area of youth mentoring programmes with positive youth development approaches must also be culturally grounded, and draw on the worlds of Indigenous Māori and Pacific in order to maximise goals of youth wellbeing.

There is an abundance of literature in Aotearoa New Zealand that pays significant attention to wellbeing from a holistic approach for youth, as opposed to thriving which focuses on an interventionist approach. Wellbeing in the context of Pacific youth health is described as how one perceives one's life in terms of quality of relationships, positive emotions and sense of resilience and the ability to realise one's full potential and satisfaction in life (Fa'alili-Fidow et al., 2016). A key theme that differentiates youth mentoring as a strategy of positive youth development from a localised lens is that collectivist cultures, such as Pacific and Māori communities, thrive and experience flourishing in the context of holistic health embedded in whānau/'aiga/family, strong in their cultural identities. The next section discusses the importance of Indigenous ecosystems of development, that is, the context of whānau, 'aiga or family.

Whānau, 'Aiga and Family: An Indigenous Ecosystem of Development

Given Indigenous Māori and Pacific youth are heterogeneous groups of people, the concept of thriving may hold different meanings for different groups. As noted by Edwards et al. (2007), the social and cultural context of whānau and a strong sense of cultural identity are key protective factors for Māori youth in health and wellbeing. Whānau is a vital and critical environment for rangatahi and a strong positive influence (Edwards et al., 2007). Extended family relationships including wider kin relations such as peer groups have also been identified as strong networks in times of tension. In the report by Edwards et al. (2007), over 70% of students surveyed reported wishing they could spend more time with their parents and whānau highlighting the salience of whānau connectedness for rangatahi Māori.

Existing local literature of positive youth development for rangatahi includes works from Keelan (2001, 2014) and Ware and Walsh-Tapiata (2010) that both support the centrality of the whānau context in their conceptualisations of Māori positive youth development. Similarly, in Simmonds et al.'s (2014) study, their model for positive development for rangatahi titled Te Kete Whanaketanga-Rangatahi identified contributing factors and indicators that enable rangatahi to develop positively. The three-part exploration that included an extensive literature review to identify relevant themes, an analysis of data from Māori participants (N = 2, 059) in a nationally representative youth survey (Youth'07), and focus group interviews with rangatahi (N = 8) indicated taking collective responsibility, including for whānau and parental relationships, was an important aspect of the framework. In addition, parental experiences of school were shown to affect experience for rangatahi. Importantly, creating contexts to learn

and experience Māori culture was important in both school and alternative schooling contexts for rangatahi development (Simmonds et al., 2014).

Similarly, Afeaki-Mafile'o (2007) in describing the importance of the collective in youth mentoring asserted "youth within Indigenous Pasifika communities have their own community assets" (p.173). Indeed the importance of understanding Pacific youth mentoring development from Pasifika themselves and the context of family relationships as important for Pacific youth wellbeing (Fa'alili-Fidow et al., 2016). The most recent Adolescent Health Research Group study focussed on Pacific young people from the Youth'12 National Youth Health and Wellbeing Survey by Fa'alili-Fidow et al. (2016) reported high levels of parent care and improving levels of happiness with family relationships. In comparison to their Pākehā peers, Pacific youth were slightly less likely to spend sufficient time with parents and reported they were more likely to have fun together with family. Pacific youth also reported their family relationships were positive with high levels of parent care and improved levels of happiness within family relationships. Pacific student behaviour was influenced by broader contexts such as their fanau or 'aiga, school, church, communities and close networks, highlighting family as a vital context for Pacific youth wellbeing.

Notably, Fa'alili-Fidow et al. (2016) asserted that interventions or programmes and services are likely to be more successful if youths' broader environments, for example, the family, school, church, community and wider political context are addressed, in addition to building individual skills embedded in a cultural framework. However the authors also maintain the Pacific community have their own knowledge systems and skills to develop their own solutions and in their conclusion stated:

> It is also our belief that the Pacific community has the knowledge and skills to create their own solutions – to ensure that all Pacific youth can be proud of who they are, can actively participate and contribute to their many skills to society. (p.7)

Emphasis on the importance of self-help to find solutions within one's own community is given by the authors through their citation of a well-known Samoan proverb "E fofo e le alamea le alamea". The translation of the Samoan proverb is that the starfish heals itself which reflects the notion that community driven solutions are best framed and driven by communities themselves. In Aotearoa New Zealand both Māori and Pasifika communities have developed holistic approaches in a self-determined manner to address health and educational outcomes.

Cultural Health Models

The most widely known and established Māori model of holistic health and wellbeing in Aotearoa is the Whare Tapa Wha model by Durie Mason (1994) which features in both health and education policy documents and research reports. It was developed to explain the health and needs of Māori from a Māori perspective as represented by the four walls of a wharenui (meeting house). The model takes a holistic approach, addressing the wide and varied needs of Māori. The model upholds the importance of taha wairua (spiritual) – the capacity for faith and wider communication; taha hinengaro (mental health) – the capacity to think and communicate; taha tinana (physical) – the capacity for growth and development; and taha whānau (extended family) – the capacity for belonging, connectedness, caring and sharing. Youth mentoring programmers must consider and incorporate these four dimensions of wellbeing and be prepared to ensure programme and activities address the four elements of hauora (Durie, 1994).

Similarly, Pere's (1991) cultural model of human development and wellbeing is a bioecological model called Te Wheke (the Octopus). The importance of whānau, hapū (tribe) and iwi (sub-tribe) is evident in her model – te whānau (the family) is represented by the head, waiora (state of total wellbeing of family) is represented by the eyes, and aspects of health are represented by the tentacles. Characteristics of the tentacles show how aspects of health are interwoven and connected. The Te Wheke model defines a family health approach to wellbeing and acknowledges the link between the mind, spirit, whānau as seamless and natural. Both models highlight the importance of individual wellbeing as part of and central to the collective wellbeing. Belonging to whānau and a sense of connectedness to one's cultural identity is central and important in cultural health models of wellbeing. Māori and Pacific students who feel positive about their cultural identity, group membership and cultural affinity are more likely to have been positively influenced by whānau and peers (Webber, 2012).

A third model originally developed to address Pacific mental health is called the Fonofale model (Pulotu-Endemann, 2001). The Fonofale model, which is similar to Durie's (1994) model, is graphically represented in the form of a Samoan fale or house. This model incorporates the collective values of family, culture and spirituality, among others. The foundation or the floor of the fale is the foundation of all cultures, namely the family/'aiga (Samoan), kopu tāngata (Cook Islands), kainga (Tonga), and magafaoa (Niue). The roof represents culture which is dynamic, constantly evolving and adapting. The four pou or posts

between the roof and floor represent the spiritual (determines sense of wellbeing from faith), the physical (relates to biological or physical wellbeing), the mental (determines the wellbeing of a healthy mind), and other (various variables directly or indirectly affecting wellbeing not limited to gender/sexuality or gender).

Surrounding the Fonofale is a cocoon or circle that contains dimensions influencing one another: environment, time and context (Pulotu-Endemann, 2001). Seiuli (2013) asserted that the "Fonofale Model was one of the earliest examples in the collection of health focussed approaches that interweave Pacific ideas within a generalised health orientation" (p. 51). Much like Durie's (1994) model addressing people's health and wellbeing, both models posit the consideration of cultural and spiritual values in addition to physical, social, mental and psychological wellbeing. Whilst the Fonofale model is seen as a pan-Pacific model, applicable across the Pacific region, it differs from the Whare Tapa Wha in that the former is theorised on Pacific epistemologies and ontologies and the latter is underpinned by te ao Māori (The Māori worldview).

Similarly, a Tokelauan Vaka Atafaga model of health was theorised by Kupa Kupa (2009). Much like the Samoan Fonofale model, and Whare Tapa Wha, the Vaka Atafaga model of health encourages health practitioners to consider clients' health from a holistic lens. The Vaka Atafaga model includes puipuiga o te tino o te tagata (environment), tapuakiga/talitonuga (spirituality or belief systems), maufaufau (mind), fakalapotpotoga/tautua (social aspect) and kaiga/pui-kaiga (family) as key components to ensure the functionality of the sailing outrigger as a metaphor for health. A notable difference is the metaphor and image of te vaka, a traditional outrigger vessel with a sail, to illustrate a Tokelau philosophical approach to health. The model sits well with Tokelauan communities as it was developed by Aotearoa Tokelau community including Elders who were positioned as expert navigators on the model depicted Notably, even though the other models do not explicitly refer to Elders as important to health and wellbeing, they are, as in most collective and Indigenous cultures, a vital part of Indigenous familial ecosystems.

All four models identify both the cultural and family context as vitally important for Indigenous Māori and Pacific youth development and wellbeing (Edwards et al., 2007). The development of the above health and wellbeing models relevant to Māori and Pacific youth provides a foundational base of scholarship for equity approaches to inform a culturally grounded perspective of youth mentoring practice that is culturally responsive, sustaining and safe for

Māori and Pacific youth, their whānau, 'aiga, kaiga, fanau, families and wider communities. A key idea of this thesis is that positive outcomes for youth are unique to the communities from which youth come. A holistic lens of positive outcomes for youth mentoring programmes must be considered in developing a framework that is responsive, sustaining and culturally safe. The next section reviews the concept of culture and discusses key concepts that conceptualise culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice.

Culture Matters – Conceptualising Responsive, Sustaining and Safe Practice

The previous section discussed the importance of using cultural models relevant to positive youth development and subsequent youth mentoring outcomes. Indeed, culture means different things in different places for different people (Bishop & Berryman, 2006; Bishop & Glynn, 2003; Castagno & Brayboy, 2008). However, more generally, culture is characterised by set of beliefs or behaviours and/or artefacts that have developed over time (Borofsky et al., 2001). Brayboy (2005) also suggested that culture is both fluid and static yet also fixed and stable, which means through time and space culture is both grounded in traditional Indigenous knowledge forms and shifts or changes. Similarly, Nakata (2003) asserted that culture encapsulates a whole system of knowing, being, and acting with particular emphasis paid to the knowing as opposed to a discrete body of knowledge. Youth mentoring programmers must consider Indigenous ways of knowing and being that provide insight into solutions that are derived within communities themselves. Despite the sparse literature of culturally responsive youth mentoring practice internationally and within the Aotearoa (Simpkins et al., 2017), the role of culture must be prioritised. Furthermore, researchers must be open to the intricacies and nuances that may be interpreted by Indigenous and ethnic-minority populations themselves.

The call to examine culture also includes the call to examine race and ethnicity, because often all three terms are used interchangeably. Limited research literature exists on the role of culture, ethnicity and race in programming because these terms are used interchangeably with little consideration to the definitions of each concept as a social construct (Sánchez et al., 2014; Williams & Deutsch, 2016). Despite this, the role of culture, ethnicity and race in youth programming and intervention services remains a key area of scholarship in programme effectiveness given that services are aimed toward Indigenous and ethnic-minority youth (Sánchez & Colón, 2005). Culture refers to the shared patterns of beliefs, values, ways of thinking, acting, and feeling learned by individuals and transmitted to others in society over time and through generations (Smedley & Smedley, 2005). Ethnicity has its roots in the Greek word *ethnos,* which refers to as people of a nation or tribe (Betancourt & López, 1993), and

refs to groups of individuals who have common cultures, nationalities, histories or religions to which they affiliate or ascribe (Williams & Deutsch, 2016). Race refers to the biological and genetic differences between groups based around phenotypic characteristics which attribute generalisations and stereotype formation to people of a racial group (Robinson & Howard-Hamilton, 2000). Having clarity about how race, culture and ethnicity impact on youth can assist youth programmers and intervention services to avoid assumptions that people of the same race are the same ethnicity and culture (Sánchez & Colón, 2005). Sánchez et al. (2014) asserted that it is typical for comparisons to be made between racial groups that assume differences are attributed to cultural variables such as values, ethnic membership or biological characteristics. This may be problematic when people who share ethnic labels have dissimilar life experiences but the same cultural beliefs and norms. Sánchez et al. (2014) suggested mentor, youth, and/or programme staff may possibly assume that youth share the same race despite the youth having very different cultural traditions, values and experiences.

Scholarship on culture is well documented in both education and health services as an equity approach. As a concept, culture forms the basis of theoretical frameworks of culturally responsive practice, culturally responsive pedagogy or culturally responsive schooling when meeting the needs of diverse populations both internationally and nationally (Bishop et al., 2009; Brayboy et al., 2007; Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2007; Santamaria, 2009; Siope, 2013). Brayboy et al. (2015) suggested approaches and frameworks should serve as a counter-narrative to cultural and linguistic barriers between practitioners and predominantly Indigenous and ethnic-minority populations (Castagno & Brayboy, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 2001). The counter-narrative as a statement of position rejects deficit thinking or theorising, and, in the context of youth mentoring, responsiveness puts youth or mentees' voices and interpretation at the forefront and explicitly values them. This is important in youth mentoring, particularly for Indigenous and ethnic or minoritised youth to speak back to dominant discourses that perpetuate oppressive agendas.

Theoretical frameworks of culturally responsive practice or schooling are equity approaches in response to issues related to racism. Building on the work of scholars of culturally responsive and culturally relevant practice as equity approaches, Paris (2012) suggested the term "culturally sustaining practice" to refer to practices that go beyond responding, and rather to nourish and sustain the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of ethnic-minority communities already present. Brayboy et al. (2007) asserted an equity approach necessarily acknowledges the important role race plays given the ongoing educational outcomes racialised groups such

as African American, American Indian, Latinos and Pacific Islanders face. Many of the listed ethnic-minority groups continue to experience immense racial inequities in schooling. Brayboy et al. (2007) also cautioned others to consider their "colour-blindness", that is, their unwillingness to see colour or talk about race and its implications. This means that individuals must confront their privilege and consider who might gain from racist structures. Similarly, in the context of health Isaacson (2014) referred to this notion as "seeing with closed eyes" and asserted that health practitioners must practice cultural humility as opposed to cultural competency when working with Indigenous American Indians on a reservation.

Drawing from the context of youth work in relation to social work in Aotearoa New Zealand, this may refer to supporting and sharing another's cultural values (Tsuruda & Shepherd, 2016). These concepts are consistent with notions of cultural safety referring to a safe space where others are mindful and respectful of others (Biermann & Townsend-Cross, 2008), and where values such as reciprocity, inclusiveness, nurturance and respect are practised. Importantly, in the Aotearoa context, youth mentoring programmes must adhere to ethics and culturally safe practice in reference to the Youth Workers Code of Ethics. The core values important to youth mentoring programmes are āhuatanga rangatahi – the programme is young person-centred; āhua whanaunga – there are strong connections that are relationship-focussed; tikanga me te horopaki – culture and context uphold the principles of the Treaty; and iwi whānau – the community contributes (Ministry of Social Development, 2011).

Taking a multidisciplinary approach, a synthesis of the above theories, equity approaches and ideas of scholars in multiple fields offers insight to the concept of cultural safety in youth mentoring. Considering the call for a culturally responsive approach to programme design to take into account the "multiplicity and fluidity of cultural practices, beliefs, and knowledge, and [convey] a dynamic, synergistic relationship between the provider" (Simpkins et al., 2017, p. 13), the current research draws on the aforementioned ideas connected to postcolonial theory and decolonising research. A central question of this thesis is what makes a programme and related research culturally responsive and sustaining and how is it culturally safe? In essence, what are the key ingredients that might be relevant to this phenomenon?

Despite the wealth of research on cultural competency in both education and health, inequities persist in Aotearoa. Whilst cultural competency supports aspects of cultural safety, cultural humility (Tervalon & Murray-García, 1998) towards cultural safety (Curtis et al., 2019) acknowledges that one cannot be fully competent in one another's cultural background.

Cultural humility entails listening actively to communities to support cultural safety in youth mentoring practice. Key to understanding cultural safety is remembering to listen to culture, in addition to remembering the inappropriateness of seeking solutions to Indigenous challenges solely from Western knowledge streams, rather than blending both Indigenous bodies of knowledge and Western bodies of knowledge (Macfarlane & Macfarlane, 2019). Secondly, it is important to remember that equity approaches and theories as described earlier often have their origins in postcolonial studies and decolonising performances (Swadener & Mutua, 2008). Indeed, as Graham Smith (2004, 2005) argued, the act of decolonising research is performative, recognising that the outputs and/or outcomes might instead reify hegemonic power structures reinforcing and recreating marginality. Drawing on Macfarlane and Macfarlane's (2019) call, any research that involves Māori peoples in the interest of seeking solutions to Māori challenges, or in this case challenges also shared by Pacific youth, with non-Māori involved in the programme, have to share their "control" of the research to maximise participation in the interests of Māori. So cultural safety in this context means understanding the sociocultural history of Indigenous peoples and how one might be an ally to support decolonising and indigenising agendas (see Chapter 3 – Methodology).

Relationality and the Va (Relational Space)

A central idea of this thesis is that the solutions to individuals' and communities' challenges are within their own knowledge systems, including their ancestral family rituals. Taking a strengths-based approach in the current study acknowledges and affirms youth having access to inherent funds of knowledge as part of culturally responsive and relevant practice (Gonzalez et al., 2005). As noted previously in this chapter, literature in positive youth development and youth mentoring internationally and nationally has shown a lack of cultural considerations within programme processes (Farruggia et al., 2010; Sánchez et al., 2014). Indigenous knowledge systems, structures and ways of being are embedded in holism and a holistic relationality of the self in the context of the individual's relationship with others, the cosmos, village and nation. This is evidenced in the well-known quote from Efi (2009) in the dedication of this thesis. The idea of individuality embedded in a larger ecosystem of the cosmos, sharing in divinity with the land, sea, sky and inheritance, with family, village and nation as the essence of belonging, speaks to the importance of culture as a context as an inherent asset from which Samoan youth specifically can draw.

Given that half of the Pacific group in Aotearoa New Zealand are of Samoan descent it would be a worthy and helpful exercise to draw on theories of social and relational "space" connected

to spirituality drawing on Indigenous references, specific to each Pacific nation, that are common yet differ in nuance. Moreover, Suaalii-Sauni (2017) asserted that the time might be right for Pasifika conversations alongside Kaupapa Māori scholars to explore our languages that are inherently unique yet similar in meaning.

One such concept is the view of living and relating to others. The concept of va (space) or wa in te reo Māori and Japanese is an example as Wendt (1996) asserted in his expression of the meaning of the "space between":

> Important to the Samoan view of reality is the concept of Va or Wa in Māori and Japanese. Va is the space between, the betweenness, not empty space, not space that separates but space that relates, that holds separate entities and things together in the Unity-that-is-All, the space that is context, giving meaning to things. The meanings change as the relationships/the contexts change… A well-known Samoan expression is "ia teu le va." Cherish/nurse/care for the va, the relationships. This is crucial in communal cultures that value group, unity, more than individualism: who perceive the individual person/creature/thing in terms of group, in terms of va, relationships. (n.p.)

Tuagalu (2008) pointed out that whilst the context of Wendt's (1996) article was about Samoan tatau (traditional tattoo) he is, in essence, describing a specifically Samoan world view. Moreover, the va gives context and is meaningful and subject to change as relationships and contexts change over time. Thus, in a communal culture, nurturing an individual is activated within the terms of the collective group. In his examination of texts relevant to va, Tuagalu (2008) also asserted there were at least 37 different types of va. He stated that there are

> many types of va. Va o tagata [is] the relational space between people; va feiloa'i … the protocols of meeting; va fealofani … the brotherly and sisterly love that people should show one another; va fealoaloa'i, the respectful space; and va tapua'i, the worshipful space. (p. 110)

Thus, the va is seen as a helpful organising principle for Pacific cultures (Suaalii-Sauni, 2017), and is seen to govern "all inter-personal, inter-group, and sacred/secular relations and is intimately connected to a Pasifika sense of self or identity" (Suaalii-Sauni, 2017, p. 163). Ka'ili (2005) noted that other than Mahina (2002), who theorised comprehensively on the cultural concept of va, there was up until that point little written on the va despite its fundamental significance in Tongan culture. Since then, Suaalii-Sauni (2017) noted that the most prolific authors of va are both Tongan and Samoan: Ka'ili (2005) described the va as "social space" in

the Tongan context; in the Samoan context, Wendt (1996) referred to the va as a space that is both relational and contextual: the relational space. Tuagalu (2008) highlighted aspects of the va referring to Aiono (1997) divisions of Samoan society governed by the va, as "determined by the interplay of the social roles and functions of the individuals engaging in va relationships. It is in a village context that people imbibe their fa'asinomaga [Samoan identity], learn about va relationships." (p. 112)

The va is also seen in Samoan and Tongan Indigenous knowledge systems as sacred or relational space (Anae, 2010; Kai'ili, 2008; Sauni, 2011, as cited in Koya-Vakauta, 2017). Mahina's (2002) classification of four dimensions of va as including the physical, social, intellectual and the symbolic are what Koya-Vaka'uta (2017) noted as informing the cultural practice of development, sustenance and maintenance of relationships. Notions of developing and nurturing the va – the maintenance of sacred or relational space in relation to and relationship with one another – is understood by Samoans as va tapuia and by Tongans as veitapui (Koya-Vaka'uta, 2017). Within tapuia is tapu – what is sacred. The relationships and knowledge within these relationships are sacred and therefore tapu. An important theme from authors of the va is when nurturing the va, we must not forget our sense of connectedness or disconnectedness is inextricably intertwined with our sense of relatedness.

The concept of relationality and relatedness are woven within space but also time and place. Relationality in this thesis refers to the va (relational space) between others. The va as a central construct acts as a guide or reference point to a Samoan way of being in relationship to others both socially and relationally. Shaped by the relational values and principles of the Pacific itulagi – the personhood – the individual in the context of mentoring Pacific youth includes the holistic and harmonious nature of family life. Youth mentoring practice in the Western sense might be shaped by individualistic Eurocentric models relevant to non-Indigenous youth, however to explore culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice, appropriate approaches must be aligned to the youth programmes serve.

The va relational space and va tapuia sacred space shared with Elders and the wider village in ancient times is still vital today for youth to draw on (Tupua Tamasese Taisi, 2009). A va relational approach includes the centrality of tautua to serve and teu le va – to nurture and tidy relationships through alofa (love) (Mo'a, 2015). The va between feagaiga as an ancestral concept reflecting the way families are organised in fa'aSamoa provides youth mentoring programmers clues to aid understanding of how young Samoans develop. As described in

Chapter 4 – Study 1, Indigenous constructs of relationships that are bound by va, or covenants, make explicit the fa'aaloalo (respect) and alofa to tautua (serve) in youth mentoring relationships.

The pastor–congregation and more recently brother–sister construct of relational covenant or feagaiga offers understanding of how youth mentors might consider their mentees to support and assist building positive relationships. Similarly, the principles of tuakana–teina from a Te Ao Māori context are vitally important to the youth mentoring context. Both concepts are bound by reciprocity and ako where the elder sibling or cousin might act as tuakana, or someone with wisdom and knowledge to impart. Additionally, the teina simultaneously learns and respectfully reciprocates teaching at other times with the tuakana. Importantly, what both feagaiga and tuakana–teina constructs offer in youth mentoring is a window to how old ways of being within the whānau/'aiga/family context are still relevant today for positive youth development. Furthermore, it is in the Indigenous knowledge systems that assets exist for youth programmers to respond to, sustain and maintain cultural safety in youth mentoring practice.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has reviewed theories of youth mentoring as a strategy of positive youth development in addition to the current landscape in Aotearoa New Zealand. A key central idea of this chapter is that culture matters, and in the context of youth mentoring programmes, there are several equity approaches across disciplines of health and education that inform culturally responsive, culturally sustaining and culturally safe practice. Important to the conceptualisation of culturally responsive, culturally sustaining and culturally safe practice are the origins of postcolonial theory in response to an otherwise Eurocentric research base of youth mentoring. The chapter ends by offering a va relational approach that privileges Indigenous ways of being, in this case, Samoan-specific constructs alongside existing Māori constructs of positive youth development. The following chapter describes the Methodology to answer the broad research question of this dissertation.

Chapter 3 – Methodology

Chapter Overview

The methodology chapter describes the theoretical assumptions underpinning this thesis and the methods utilised to answer the broad research question central to this research – including the three subquestions explored across Study 1, Study 2 and Study 3:

"What are the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice in Aotearoa New Zealand?"

   i.   What are the conditions present that determine culturally safe practice in youth mentoring?

  ii.   What are the actions taken by mentors that support culturally safe practice in youth mentoring?

 iii.   What features or indicators of the youth mentoring programme are representative and beneficial for rangatahi or youth of Aotearoa?

Following the call for researchers of youth mentoring programmes to examine the role of culture, race and ethnicity (Sánchez et al., 2014), this chapter describes the methodological framework. Informed by a review of youth mentoring literature, the methodological framework begins with the rationale for culturally responsive and multimethod approaches as part of a commitment to decolonialising and indigenising research (Chilisa, 2012; LT Smith, 2012). The next section discusses Moana theorisation to support a localised theoretical framework, that is, a va relational approach focussed on the sociohistorical relationship between Pacific/Pasifika and Indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand. Following is a discussion of the importance of relational ethical relationships between a diverse range of stakeholders and the knowledge systems and values of both Pacific and Māori theories congruent to my researcher epistemological positioning.

This thesis includes three studies that utilised the implementation and delivery of the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand as a vehicle to explore key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice. With this in mind, the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand, namely it's governance and programme structure is outlined to provide the context for this investigation and to preface a justification for a culturally responsive multimethod approach utilising tools of talanoa and participant observation. Talanoa, a pan-Pacific methodological tool (Vaioleti, 2006; 2016), is briefly explained, and the rationale for

using the terms talanoa and kōrero interchangeably is discussed. The chapter then gives a broad outline of the methodological tools, giving the reader an overall picture of participants across the three studies, the related procedures for each study, and the tools of analysis.

Culturally Responsive Methods, Multimethods, Decolonial and Indigenising Projects

As noted in Chapter 2, the literature base of culturally responsive and culturally sustaining theories situated in education discourse can be traced back to critical theory pedagogues such as Peter McLaren (1989), Paulo Freire (2000), and equity-focussed scholars like Banks and Banks (1995). Related theories of culturally relevant pedagogy and culturally responsive practice as equity approaches in education are also well established by scholars internationally such as Ladson-Billings (1995), Gay (2000), Brayboy et al. (2007) and Paris (2012, 2015). Locally, the research base and proliferation of scholarship concerning equity in education and health are underpinned by Indigenous models and scholarship by Pere (1991), Durie (1994), L. T. Smith (1999), Bishop (2008) and Berryman et al. (2014), among others.

Notably, and relevant to this thesis, are education and health equity approaches in the form of Pasifika research models and frameworks such as those by Pulotu-Endemann (2001) and Kupa (2009) which have focussed on culturally grounded ways to understand issues of educational inequity. Taking an interdisciplinary approach, the current research is informed by equity approaches underpinned by theoretical assumptions relevant to both Māori and Pasifika youth. As described earlier, literature that theorises the role of race, ethnicity and culture in youth mentoring programmes is scarce (Liang & Grossman, 2007; Sánchez & Colón, 2005). Thus, to explore the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice, the theoretical research framework of this study is informed by critical theory and critical race theories. It is underpinned by localised Māori and Pasifika research scholarship alongside positive youth development and youth mentoring scholarship.

Recently, Weiston-Serdan (2017) proposed a critical mentoring approach to analyse constructs of race, ethnicity and culture through her empirical work of critical mentoring. Her critical mentoring work was largely underpinned by critical theory, critical race theories and critical pedagogy (Weiston-Serdan, 2017) and contributed an examination of how marginalised and minority youth are served by mentoring organisations. Critical mentoring focusses on youth centrism and making sure that youth voice, agency and partnership are visible through programmes. In addition Weiston-Serdan (2017) asserts critical mentoring requires a collective effort for a paradigm shift where the work done is emancipatory, emancipatory and

transformative where youth have voice, power and choice. Indeed, her work is a response to research recommendations of Sánchez et al. (2014) who explored areas of "racial similarity/dissimilarity, oppression, ethnic identity, and cultural competence" (p. 10). However, Weiston-Serdan (2017) argued for a move beyond the language and actions of one-to-one relationships to the language discourse of programmes, communities and governments to address issues of systemic and structural racism. She called for a framework in youth mentoring that centres youth authentically, that is, by listening actively and responds to their needs, particularly for minoritised or youth of colour who experience marginalisation and discrimination daily. Her critical mentoring framework, born simultaneously from her interactions with young people and her PhD research work, posited the need for "self-work" and self-reflection of mentors and programmers to respond effectively and safely to intersectionality of race, class and sexuality.

As mentioned in Chapter 1, despite the burgeoning interest in youth mentoring programmes for addressing the needs of diverse youth populations, there is a dearth of culturally responsive research methods in the youth mentoring sector (Bullen et al., 2010). Although previous evaluations of mentoring programmes highlight the potential benefits of mentoring for the social, educational and health outcomes of young people (DuBois et al., 2002, 2011; Eby et al., 2008; Herrera et al., 2013) little is known about contextual influences such as culture (Farruggia, Bullen, Davidson, et al. 2011) or the programme as a system beyond the mentor–mentee dyad (Busse et al., 2018; Pryce et al., 2020). The current doctoral project contributes to this notable gap and explores at a systems level, that is, at dyad (mentee–mentor), whānau (dyad groups) and structural level (programme components), the context for culturally responsive methodologies drawing on both Indigenous and Western constructs.

Informed by empirical work of L. T. Smith (2012), the current research proposes a novel methodology that repositions the research gaze, strategically creating a va relational approach. It brings together multiple heterogenous knowledge systems that capture the complexities of enacting a culturally responsive multimethod approach. Similar to the work of an interpretive bricoleur described by Kinchloe et al., (2018) where methods are used actively rather than passively, the current research constructed the research method from the tools at hand, rather than "actively receiving the 'correct,' universally applicable methodologies" (Kincheloe et al., 2018, p. 245) and employed the tools of 1:1 talanoa/kōrero, focus groups and participant observations. The data from these approaches were pieced together as a set of representations fitted to the specifics of a complex situation (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018). Refiti (2013) refers to

the piecing together of methods as a psychedelic method, arguing that we enact what works or fits. This methodological approach is simultaneously pragmatic, strategic and self-reflexive.

The approach taken does not privilege a single methodological practice over another. Although there is a wealth of literature evaluating the effectiveness of youth mentoring programmes, scholars such as Pryce et al. (2020) have argued that there are critical gaps as a result of methodological limitations. Pryce et al. identified an overreliance of self-report measures as well as an overall lack of precision. The authors noted that despite increased knowledge about the relational processes involved in youth mentoring, the growing evidence is yet to translate into improved impacts for youth involved in mentoring programmes, claiming

> It may be that research approaches to date have been limited in the types of questions addressed and in the ability to answer those questions completely and comprehensively … research findings may not be generating actionable information that can be readily translated to improving practice in program settings. (Pryce et al., 2020, pp. 1–2)

In response to this, their paper proposed the advancement of the field through direct observational methods to address those concerns. Over the past 20 years, other scholars in the field have also highlighted the need for qualitative methods to gain an in-depth understanding of issues related to processes leading to outcomes (Futch Ehrlich, 2016; Larson, 2000; Larson & Tran, 2014; Lerner & Tolan, 2016); however, methodological limitations in research concerned with youth mentoring as a strategy of positive youth development remain today.

Alongside the need for qualitative methodologies that provide deeper analysis of youth mentoring processes and outcomes, there is a dearth of literature using a decolonial approach that privileges Indigenous theories as tools of analysis. A focus on naturalistic culturally responsive methodologies (Berryman et al., 2013) in this thesis invokes decolonising approaches that centre the voices and epistemologies of participants from diverse backgrounds, privileging Indigenous ways of knowing and being (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018; L. T. Smith, 1999). In her seminal work *Decolonising Methodologies*, L. T. Smith (1999) asserted "the term 'research' is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism." She stated that "the word itself, 'research,' is probably one of the dirtiest words in the Indigenous world's vocabulary" (p. 1). As a response, this thesis has prioritised local, culturally nuanced ethics, in this case va ethics, and designed tools and terms specific to the context and participants.

As a qualitative project using a multimethod approach, a salient component of this dissertation is cultural humility (Tervalon & Murray-García, 1998), that is, an understanding of the ongoing

work and need to respectfully traverse multiple worldviews. Similarly, Battiste (2008) went further by asserting that "most existing research on Indigenous peoples is contaminated by Eurocentric biases. Ethical research must begin by replacing Eurocentric prejudice with new premises that value diversity over universality" (p. 503). In the same vein, L. T. Smith (1999) asserted social science is founded on Euro-Western culture, histories and philosophies and described social science research as antagonistic to the history and cultures of non-Western societies, thus silencing the voice of the Other. Other Indigenous scholars have long advocated for local Indigenous epistemologies and worldviews to coexist alongside Western sciences (Chilisa, 2012). The perspectives of seminal authors in the field necessitate critical reflection on the values and worldviews of both the researcher and participants, the context of the phenomenon and the historical political climate. A research project underpinned by cultural humility requires the researcher to not just acknowledge diverse knowledge systems, worldviews and perspectives, but to amplify and give genuine consideration to their role in the research.

To contextualise the methodological approach taken in this thesis, a brief outline of where the research was situated follows. The current research study was conducted geographically in Aotearoa New Zealand at a large university. The research was undertaken by a doctoral scholar of Pasifika descent. The research project was based in a Western tertiary institution so it was important to operationalise a culturally responsive approach at every stage of the process (Berryman et al., 2013; Curtis et al., 2019. As noted in the Chapter 2, culturally responsive and culturally safe practice approaches across multiple disciplines must be cognisant of the common historical experiences of the colonised, including rangatahi Māori who continue to experience ongoing adverse educational and health effects. Just a decade ago, Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al. (2011) identified formal youth mentoring programmes as "an important social intervention for supporting at-risk youth" (p. 237).

It is with this in mind that the researcher has prioritised a methodological framework that delineates itself from the intervention and prevention science-oriented discourse. These discourses often frame minoritised ethnicities through a deficit-based lens, referring to at-risk youth as problems to be fixed. In stark contrast, a culturally responsive approach that utilises methodological tools relevant to the research context harnesses the energy and blending of multiple worldviews, in this case Māori, Pasifika and Western theoretical perspectives. A culturally responsive methodological approach seeks solutions that blend both Indigenous and

Western bodies of knowledge, creating an approach that is potentially more powerful than either knowledge stream might produce unilaterally (S. Macfarlane et al., 2015).

Whilst the field of youth mentoring scholarship over the past 2 decades has its origins in positive youth development, which is predominantly Eurocentric, the current research seeks to add to the field by utilising culturally appropriate methodologies and inductive strategies that prioritise local knowledge and practice. As noted earlier in Chapter 2 by Farruggia, Bullen, Davidson, et al (2011b), much of the research on mentoring has taken place in the US where youth mentoring is long-established and has many more wide-reaching programmes. The current research study in the local Aotearoa context sought to go beyond the call and recommendations made by DuBois et al. (2002) and Sánchez and Colón (2005) for cultural competency training. A decade ago, local scholarship in the field by Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al et al. (2011) recommended that cultural competency training for mentors and staff be incorporated into the programme framework and delivery, making visible the cultural values of the targeted youth, in this case, Māori and Pasifika youth. Beyond the inclusion of cultural competency training, the current research study incorporated the views, perspectives and preferences of Pasifika and Māori students, families, and community. It also, as much as possible, incorporated Pasifika and Māori cultural values and knowledge systems explicitly in the programmes.

Drawing on the growing Indigenous scholarship base in Aotearoa New Zealand, this thesis takes a localised approach that privileges Moana Pacific knowledge systems, foregrounding Māori and Pacific theories and values. Importantly, the tools employed seek to honour Pacific and Māori ways of being and knowing collectively. Thus, a va relational methodological approach focussed on the longstanding relationships between Pacific and Māori communities is used. Specifically, talanoa and participant observation are both used in a multimethod approach to draw a culturally nuanced understanding of interactions from Indigenous worldviews. Using the tools of talanoa and participant observation was in line with a decolonising research approach that was self-determining. At every stage, the research was informed by the participants' lived realities and views of what works within their own communities with Pacific and Māori youth. The project design also took into consideration the research brief from programmers which included the need to take an iterative approach, that is, Study 1 informed the research and analyses of Study 2, and Study 2 findings informed the research and analyses of Study 3. In essence, the design and direction of tools chosen for each study was largely influenced by what was culturally responsive and safe for the participants

themselves, whilst simultaneously balancing the needs of the research project itself. As such, a pragmatic approach was employed that upheld the mana of all parties involved.

Moana Theory, Relational Ethics and a Va Relational Approach

Historically, Māori and Pacific peoples have enjoyed a close relationship, not only through proximity of locale in the wider context of Oceania, but through social and relational genealogical ties. Like He Vaka Moana, a collective research project exploring teaching and learning supports for Māori and Pasifika student achievement (Wolfgramm-Foliaki & Smith, 2020), this project took an approach that honoured Māori/Pasifika genealogical relationships. It affirms Hau'ofa's (2008) assertion that we are all connected in Oceania by our shared ocean, emphasising our connection, vastness and strength. Wolfgramm-Foliaki and Smith (2020) asserted:

> it is timely for Māori and Pasifika peoples to come together in this space, to harness the strength of being citizens of Oceania, and to acknowledge that the vast Pacific Ocean, that encompasses all Pacific nations, including Aotearoa … Because we are of Māori and Pasifika descent, we are both citizens of Oceania. (p. 7)

Building on the collective ideas of interconnectedness through common values, the principles of harmony, a dialogical praxis, and reciprocity, these authors emphasised the integral nature of relationality in the va relational approach. Relationality refers to holistic and harmonious understandings of holism (Vaai & Nabobo-Baba, 2017). Through collectivist cultures and practices, ancient genealogies and connections are centred to invoke practices, rituals and values which are still relevant today. Woven together, va relational space and relationality prioritise the social, historical and genealogical relationships between Māori and Pasifika communities. Protocols and ethics that uphold a va relational approach involve listening to stories respectfully with care, maintaining fa'aaloalo (respect), manaakitanga (respect and care) and prioritising research relationships through teu le va (maintaining/tidying up the relational space). A key idea central to the methodological framework in this dissertation was to invoke a va relational approach, that is, woven constructs of va relationships that exist within multiple spaces over time.

According to Anae (2016), enacting Indigenous relational ethics includes a focus on the sacred or spiritual dimensions, which is in contrast to Western relational ethics. The consideration of respect and reciprocity embedded in sacred and spiritual knowledge supports the "positive outcomes" needed for transformative change across minoritised ethnicities (Anae, 2016). It is not limited to faith belief systems within an Indigenous relational ethic context. Drawing on

Anae's ideas of teu le va and Samoan relational ethics, a va relational approach was taken in the current research framework that sought to bind both Pacific and Māori knowledge systems and values in a relational space of culturally responsive methodologies. A va relational approach draws on the va as the central and organising cultural construct bringing both Kaupapa Māori knowledge and Pacific knowledge systems together (Suaalii-Sauni, 2017). This is Moana methodology in action.

Although a pragmatic approach was necessary, the priority for this project was the need for "culturally safe" research at the forefront of the development of the research design. Drawing on the work of L. T. Smith (1999) and Anae (2016), a key concern was for a methodological approach that acknowledged and affirmed the validity of Māori and Pacific epistemologies, ontologies and axiologies, that is, our ways of knowing and being as well as our values and attitudes, respectively, to ensure culturally safe and responsive research practice. To teu le va or tausi, that is, to make tidy or take care of the research space, was critical. The va relational space is active and constantly in flux or negotiated. Therefore, mediating any challenges required an intentional emphasis on accepting the diverse views between researchers, those participants involved in the research in which the research project contextualised. A core criterion of the Kaupapa Māori framework necessitates being Māori to carry out research; however, L. T. Smith (1999) asserted that non-Māori are not precluded from participating in research with a Kaupapa Māori orientation. The current study therefore prioritised research contextualised in cultural humility and the value of va relationships governed by va ethics approach (Anae, 2016).

The nature of the research question and subquestions around concepts of culturally responsive, culturally relevant, culturally sustaining and culturally safe practice are located in critical theoretical frameworks. Theories related to such constructs are driven by the study of social structures around power, control and oppression (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018). As a Pasifika researcher it was important to make research decisions that were suitably aligned with the lived realities of participants. As a result, multiple worldviews, knowledge systems and the context of the research work with Pacific and Māori communities as participants was a major consideration. To explore the phenomenon of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice, I used a va relational approach.

The deployment of culturally responsive methods in the current research design considered the heterogeneity of both Māori and Pacific youth and their whānau/'aiga/family/caregivers.

Wolfgramm-Foliaki and Smith (2020) affirmed the binding of Indigenous methodological approaches, arguing that both Māori and Pacific theories and methods are complementary and supported by sociohistorical genealogical ties. Building on the historical tuakana–teina genealogical ties between, through and within Māori and Pacific peoples is a key tenet of the methodological approach taken in this thesis. Importantly, a va relational approach is predicated by a lens of cultural humility (see Chapter 2) that activates and asserts the need for Māori and Pacific researchers to come together metaphorically and methodologically, building on Moana methodology and theorisation. A va relational research approach creates va relational space for Māori and Pacific research/ers to engage in the processual work and iterative nature of each study required in this thesis, thus contributing to Moana methodological approaches and theorisation as praxis.

Building research relationships with Elders who work with youth alienated and marginalised by mainstream education was an important aspect of this study. It involved lashing together stories and narratives to share provisions, knowledge and resources about how best to serve Māori and Pasifika, rangatahi/youth in the context of delivering an imported youth mentoring programme. Such research relationships are built over time and are long lasting. Importantly, relationships are at the heart of Indigenous methodologies and a central aspect of relationality, the "how" of engaging with Māori Elders (hereby referred to as Kaumātua, a term that refers to both males and females who are held in deep regard), was enacted (Suaalii-Sauni, 2017). The rules of engagement in the current research offer insight in relation to current discourses around Indigenous methodologies, that is, what seminal scholars assert as key facets and/or conditions of how to engage with Indigenous communities. In the current research, as a research practitioner I was actively engaging, in ways beyond the traditional Western ethics script, with Kaumātua, tutors, youth and their whānau, for example engaging in karakia/lotu (prayers), waiting on and creating safe space for Kaumātua to freely kōrero on their own terms and to self-determine where, how and who should be included (see Chapters 4, 5 and 6). This is consistent with Indigenous methodologies from a localised lens.

Despite the caution regarding the proliferation of Indigenous methodologies, including well-established methods under the Pacific research paradigm (Tualaulei & McFall-McCaffrey, 2019), the current research context called for pragmatism. A pragmatic approach meant using the methods that were culturally relevant and appropriate for each diverse study and group of participants. This also included using language like *kōrero* or *talanoa* (which can mean discussion, interview or dialogue) interchangeably in line with how the participants used the

terms. My engagement in researcher reflexivity and dialogue with the wider academic community, both at conferences and with critical friends in academic spaces, supported my developmental clarity and sustainability. As Tualaulei and McFall-McCaffrey (2019) pointed out, reflexivity and dialogue are critical to Pacific communities in terms of recognising and realising their aspirations.

Pihama (2001) has reminded us that long before the arrival of the colonisers, Indigenous peoples engaged in their own robust forms of research. Oceanic ancestors have long developed and drawn on their own methods and tested theories based on investigations embedded within Indigenous world views. Precision, foresight and tested procedures ensured their ability to criss-cross and navigate the world's largest expanse of ocean (Moana-nui-a-Kiwa – the Pacific Ocean) using intellectual systems and practices that drew on the natural, supernatural and cosmic domains. Methodologically, as a Pacific researcher, I drew on Indigenous knowledge systems to interact and build the va and enact cultural humility through tautua (service) and manaakitanga (care and hospitality). It is within this knowledge and intergenerational wisdom that my research positionality enabled me to push the boundaries of Western systems to bind and invoke a Moana-specific approach.

Epistemological Position – Researcher as Weaver

My position as a researcher whose ancestral ties are in the large expanse of Oceania and locally in the Moana of the Pacific is both a source of strength and challenge. I am of Samoan, Tokelauan and Fijian descent and as a primary school teacher and now lecturer in initial teacher education, I advocate for Pacific knowledge systems. I also make visible and explicit te reo Māori to ensure Pasifika/Pacific and Māori are achieving educational success, confident in who they are within my teaching practice. Born in Aotearoa New Zealand and connected to the place, people and the land of my relatives, I interact with ease with those around me in the Pasifika and Māori spaces I inhabit. However, like other research scholars such as Matapo (2018), the context of where I live and work, and where this research thesis is located, is a settler colonial territory and within a large Western-based institution. Navigating research space comes with challenges and tensions; however, what does not change is my ability to move out of epistemological borderlands and apply novel or new ways of applying tools that fit well with the methodological approach (Matapo, 2018; Reynolds, 2016). Essentially, this means the pragmatist in me is central to constructing a research design that works. I have been able to explore, select and weave tools that have honoured all research participants and stakeholders.

To weave is in my veins. The fale lalaga or the weaving house is where my grandmother, mother, aunties and nieces gathered to talanoa as well as exchange stories, jokes and engage in siva (dance). The fale lalaga is a unique space where generations have practised their many skills, and knowledge has been passed on and through these tama'ita'i (women) of Samoa. As a Pasifika researcher, I position myself within academia in a Western institution as a metaphorical fale lalaga or weaving house mindful of my va with the participants. The act of theorising new Indigenous methodology from old practices takes skill, dexterity and perseverance.

In the earlier stages of the research process, part of the weaving activities involved engaging in and facilitating conversations with the programme directors regarding the analysis of programme documents and the youth mentoring research publications from the US context. In addition, observing the programme in action at the US-based programme and consulting with stakeholders informed the research design. This process alongside a review of the literature informed the aim to examine the role of culture, identity and race with the initial 2017 cohort of the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand. Weaving included important lessons for the programmers, researchers and stakeholders and, most importantly, the participants. As a Pasifika researcher and metaphorical weaver, taking a research bricoleur alongside navigation is in my ancestry, I was able to weave, patch together, and navigate many aspects of the research design and importantly consider three worldviews in undertaking a pragmatic research approach. The next part of the chapter deals with a description of the governance structure of the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand.

Youth Mentoring Programme in Aotearoa New Zealand Governance

As mentioned earlier the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand which was used as a vehicle to explore key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice was adapted from a model that originated in the US at a large State University. The tiered US based programme that the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand was modelled on, involved college students from the State University serving as mentors as part of their multidisciplinary university-based service-learning course for youth who are in need of an extra support system. Similarly, the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand based at a university in Auckland Aotearoa had university students serve as mentors and mentor coaches as part of a structured university-based service-learning course where students use their therapy skills targeted at serving at-risk youth already in the alternative education setting.

The youth mentoring programme in New Zealand objectives were similar in that the programme aimed to provide an early intervention strategy through a structured, time-limited 12-week mentoring programme but with more emphasis on a wraparound support mechanism for youth in alternative education. The US based youth mentoring programme was specifically aimed at those at risk of entering the juvenile justice system or charged for early offences (Weiler et al., 2013). In the case of the youth mentoring programme in New Zealand the rationale was to also provide early intervention and wrap-around health services for at-risk students. In conjunction with a major national youth mentoring network in Aotearoa, the programme director sought to address what they saw to be a significant gap in positive youth development services for young people currently in alternative education who presented with a range of complex needs.

The programmers' overall intention was for young people to develop resilience and capabilities through a structured multitiered support system The youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand provided multiple learning opportunities and experiences for university students studying counselling, social work and youth work to learn to transition support and experience case management in an authentic setting. The data collected during the course of this thesis concurrently informed how the programmers culturally adapted the US mentoring programme in its first iteration in 2017 to serve "vulnerable" young people. The main aim of this study was to better understand the role of race, culture and ethnicity and explore what the key ingredients' to culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice were.

A key focus of this thesis in reference to the research subquestions was to explore what the optimum environmental conditions were to respond to diverse youth; to observe how the programme sustained youths' cultural and linguistic backgrounds; and to understand which aspects of the Aotearoa New Zealand programme were culturally safe and effective for youth from the perspectives of their tutors, youth themselves and whānau members. The qualitative data collected aimed to inform and support the cultural modifications in its first iteration and importantly provide insight into the key ingredients to ensure the programme was culturally responsive and sustaining and prioritised safe youth mentoring practice. It should be noted however that since the first delivery that is after Study 1, Study 2 and Study 3 were conducted in 2017, the year this research was conducted, the youth mentoring programme has partnered with an Indigenous cultural evaluation expert who has provided ongoing advice on culturally responsive practice and culturally responsive research.

Youth Mentoring Programme in Aotearoa New Zealand Structure

In the first cohort of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand, in 2017 when this research was conducted, the programmers planned to intake youth (13-15) who would be enrolled in alternative education and would receive 48 hours of mentoring over a 12-week period at the University campus in Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand. Similar to the original youth mentoring model of the US based youth mentoring programme, the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand included a tiered multilevel community of mentor–mentee dyads who were also part of a mentor family. All family groups, and in the case of this research study, whānau groups, had access to counsellors who were master's students undertaking therapeutic interventions training.

The purpose of the tiered design was to combine one-to-one mentoring within a structured group and through the mentor and mentee dyad, alongside additional pro-social relationships in the whānau group, build a sense of positive sense of belonging and mattering (Weiler et al., 2013). The weekly schedule was structured over nine sessions in which youth received wrap-around support at different times during Sessions 2 to 6 (see Table 1).

Table 1

Components of Daily Schedule for the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand 12-Week Youth Mentoring Programme

Wednesday sessions	Type of activity	Participants
1	Pre-mentoring briefing	Programme staff, mentor coaches, mentors, counsellors
2	Walk 'n talk	Mentors and mentees in dyads and whānau groups, mentor coaches
3	Supporting school success	Mentors and mentees in dyads, triads and whānau groups, mentor coaches
4	Shared meal	Programme staff, mentor coaches, mentors, mentees, counsellors
5	Pro-social activity 1	Mentors and mentees in dyads, triads, whānau groups, mentor coaches
6	Pro-social activity 2	Mentors and mentees in dyads, triads, whānau groups, mentor coaches

7	Post-mentor and mentee briefing session	Mentors, mentees, programme staff, mentor coaches
8	Post-post mentor and mentor coach debrief	Mentor coaches, mentors programme staff, counsellors
9	Post-post-post mentor coaches and programme staff debrief	Programme staff, mentor coaches

The tiered design supported youth who had been identified by the programme as being highly vulnerable or having complex needs to engage in health services such as counselling on a voluntary basis. The development of the design advocated for youth access to youth mentoring that aimed to address their social, emotional, behavioural and academic needs (see Chapter 1 for a detailed breakdown of each session).

The Research Design

The research design was influenced by several factors. Firstly, the phenomena under investigation calls for culturally relevant and responsive methodologies and tools to gain an in-depth view of the lived realities of participants. Secondly, due to the research project being aligned with the cultural translation of the programme, the research design was informed by practicality and pragmatism. In addition, critical conversations on the aims and practicalities during the earlier stages of co-design were key to understanding what might work and, alternatively, what may not work or be appropriate.

Cross-sectional designs, that is, studies in developmental research that are not cohort based have clear advantages and disadvantages. An advantage of a cross-sectional design is the snapshot the research provides of population at a particular time (Cohen et al., 2011). Given the transient nature of young people in alternative education in Aotearoa (Ministry of Education, 2019), it was anticipated that there would be a notable flux in the youth research participants across the three studies. Therefore, despite engaging in research with the same alternative education providers, it was expected that the resultant sample of youth participants would reflect a cross-sectional research design rather than a longitudinal design. As shown in Table 2, only one young person participated in all three studies, and different youth participated in the pre- and post-programme talanoa/kōrero. However, the majority of young people who were part of the observational research were also part of the postprogramme talanoa/kōrero.

Culturally Responsive Multimethod Approaches

Culturally responsive methodologies foreground Indigenous knowledge systems. Informed by current research, the current study enacted a contemporary culturally responsive methodological approach (Berryman et al., 2013; Vaioleti, 2006) using multimethods to elicit rich descriptive data to better understand culturally informed youth mentoring practice. This is appropriate given the participants of the current study were largely of Indigenous Māori and Pacific backgrounds. As such, it was critical that the thesis was grounded in decolonising methodologies (Denzin et al., 2008; L. T. Smith, 1999; Suaalii-Sauni & Fulu-Aiolupotea, 2014) drawing on both Kaupapa Māori theory (Bishop, 2014; L. T. Smith, 1999) and Pacific methodologies (Suaalii-Sauni & Fulu-Aiolupotea, 2014; Vaioleti, 2006).

Given a culturally responsive approach aligns well with relational ethics where research is undertaken "with" and "for" participants, this work also rejected practices of research "on" participants (Anae, 2016; Baba et al., 2004). Central was the deployment of multiple methods that aligned well with the theoretical approach, in this case, talanoa and participant observation. Talanoa has its origins in Polynesian language (Sualii-Sauni & Fulu-Aiolupotea, 2014). Drawing on the earlier work of both Halapua (2000) and Vaioleti (2006) who initially developed talanoa as both methodology and method, the current study utilised talanoa as a tool to engage participants in a culturally nuanced manner. Free flowing conversations were supported and guided by va relationships built. Given the nature of the research context in which a range of participants from mixed backgrounds (predominantly those from Māori and Pacific backgrounds) were involved, the terms talanoa and kōrero were used interchangeably. The rationale for this was to privilege the language backgrounds of the participants themselves, and in this context all members had tacit knowledge of the similarity of talanoa and kōrero. Importantly, the va space between myself and my participants afforded the opening of innate understanding of relationality between Māori and Pasifika peoples. In essence, the va relational space is predicated on relationships that have been built prior to sitting down and literally having a talanoa or kōrero with our kai and ipu kea (food and cup of tea).

Talanoa/Kōrero Focus Groups & Talanoa/Kōrero One-To-One

Talanoa/kōrero were held with a diverse group of participants across Study 1 and Study 3 who were sometimes of dual or mixed Pacific and Māori heritages. A mix of both talanoa/kōrero focus groups and 1:1 talanoa/kōrero, kanohi-ki-te-kanohi (face to face), and telephone talanoa/kōrero for whānau/'aiga/caregivers was used. Additionally, a participant observational

study was conducted for Study 2 thus creating an eclectic mix of multiple methods (Refiti, 2013).

Similar to semistructured interviews, talanoa (literal meaning is tala or to *talk, inform* or *relate* and noa meaning *of any kind, ordinary* or *nothing in particular*), theorised by Vaioleti (2006), is a pan-Pacific approach of free talk where social conversations occur without a rigid framework. According to Vaioleti, talanoa through critical discussion and knowledge creation makes way for rich contextual, interrelated information to develop as co-constructed stories. Thus, talanoa was an appropriate tool for participants of this particular study. Guiding questions related to personal aspirations for self and whānau/family, the types of activities one might enjoy in youth mentoring activities/programmes, and cultural identity. These topics were central to the talanoa or kōrero depending on which participants were involved.

The use of talanoa and kōrero, rich storytelling and sharing was characterised by respectful and deep friendships. Talanoa/kōrero also occurred in focus groups. Focus groups can produce considerable data from multiple participants in a short space of time (Braun & Clarke, 2013) and in the context of pushing the Western-bounded notions of interviews or structured focus groups, there was considerably more authentic dialogue. In addition, this method encouraged some of the youth to share their perspectives in a culturally safe manner collectively as a group. This method was used to elicit the voices of participants to investigate the social situation and collect descriptions of their subjective knowledge and life experiences (Tolich & Davidson, 2011). Utilising only Western methods was incongruous with the assumptions underpinning culturally responsive methods and not suited to the research participants and context in which the research was conducted. In essence, the research included a diverse youth population so it was vital that the research process was not only culturally relevant for the participants but also primarily served the interests of the research participants (Creswell, 2013).

Overview of Multimethods in Each Study

The following section provides a description of the qualitative multimethod approach taken using naturalistic methods for each of the three studies (Berryman et al., 2013). Each study is based on data collected during the first iteration of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand which occurred between July and November 2017. The time frames for each study are outlined below alongside the naturalistic method employed. The research design allows the reader to view each study in the context of each phase of data collection as it occurred. The methodological tools for each study were as follows:

- Study 1 – semistructured one-to-one, focus group talanoa/kōrero and telephone talanoa/kōrero

- Study 2 – participant observation study over three data points

- Study 3 – semistructured focus group talanoa/kōrero and telephone talanoa/kōrero

Overview of Participants for Each Study

All participants across each study were purposively selected. The invited participants in Study 2 and Study 3 participated in the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand between July and November 2017. In Study 1, the invited participants included youth experts and cultural experts who were not participants of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand itself nor a part of the postprogramme talanoa/kōrero. Following is a more detailed overview of the procedure, materials, analysis and ethical issues for each individual study. The data in Table 2 shows an overview of all participants who participated in the overall doctoral project study. A more detailed description of the participants for each individual study can also be viewed in their respective chapters.

Table 2

Overview of Participants for Each Study

	n	Study 1	Study 2	Study 3
Cultural Experts				
	3	X		
Youth Experts (YE)				
	2	X		
Alternative Education Tutors (AET)				
	5	X		X
Alternative Education Youth (AEY)				
	1	X	X	X
	2	X		
	3	X		
	4	X		
	5	X		
	6	X	X	
	7		X	X
	8		X	X
	9		X	X
	10			X
	11		X	X
	12		X	X
	13		X	X
	14		X	X
	15		X	X
	16		X	
Alternative Education Whānau/ʾaiga/Caregivers (AEW)				
	1	X		
	2	X		
	3	X		
	4			X
Mentors (MT)				
	10		X	
Mentor Coaches (MC)				
	4		X	

Study 1

Purposive sampling involves selecting participants on the basis that they will have certain characteristics or experience (Braun & Clarke, 2013). Participants from five groups in study one were all purposively selected. In Study 1 the first participants (referred to as YE1 and YE2) were youth experts in the field with extensive experience having worked alongside both Māori and/or Pacific youth within a specific region in part of a large urban city. The criterion for selecting participants was that they were either of Māori and/or Pacific heritage. The study required participants that had extensive experience working with diverse youth including those

defined as underserved or alienated from mainstream education. In addition, criteria stipulated that participants had to have extensive youth development and youth mentoring experience within the local community serving Pacific and Māori youth.

The second group of participants in Study 1 consisted of local Māori Kaumātua (CE1, CE2 and CE3). Kaumātua were local resident community members with extensive experience working alongside rangatahi in a marae-based court context as lay advocates. The primary role of two of the cultural experts (CE1 and CE2) within the community was to support rangatahi in the court process and liaise between youth, their whānau and the court about any relevant cultural matters and to represent the youth in court if whānau were unavailable. These cultural experts were key in supporting rangatahi to research their whakapapa (genealogy) through researching and preparing their pepeha (tribal acknowledgements) as well as building connections with their culture. CE3's primary role was to work alongside other kaumātua to kōrero with rangatahi about their goals and plans moving forward. At the time of the focus group kōrero, all of the Kaumātua self-identified as cultural experts when reviewing the structure of the youth mentoring programme's first delivery in 2017.

The third group of participants (alternative education tutors) in Study 1 were from two alternative education service providers, AESP1 and AESP2, in a large city in Aotearoa New Zealand. The study criteria stipulated that they be part of either one of the alternative education service providers in partnership with the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. Three of the five participants (AET1, AET4 and AET5) in this study were tutors of youth from AESP1 who attended the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. The remaining two of the five participants (alternative education tutors, AET2 and AET3) were also tutors of youth in AESP2 who attended the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. Both service providers predominantly served diverse youth who had been underserved in mainstream education. The majority of youth enrolled were of Māori and Pacific heritage with the exception of AESP2 which had predominantly youth who identified as Māori.

In terms of demographic profile, tutors self-identified as Māori/Cook Island (1), Māori/Cook Island/English (1), Tongan/Māori (1), and Cook Island (2). In terms of gender, two tutors were female and three male. Ages ranged from 26–50 years, ensuring a diverse range of experiences and backgrounds were available to draw from. Each tutor self-assigned their professional titles as "youth worker" with three out of five disclosing they were also qualified registered teachers.

One tutor was the curriculum lead for AESP2 and although having had 1 year of experience in alternative education she had over 22 years' experience in mainstream education. The remaining four tutors had between 2.5 to 6 years' experience working alongside youth in alternative education. All tutors were residents of their local community, indicating a wealth of lived experience working and living within the area of the youth they worked alongside.

The eligibility criterion of youth to participate in Study 1 was that the youth had to be enrolled in and attending AESP1. Youth in AESP2 did not participate in Study 1 as, at the time of the study, they were not part of the planned youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. Of the 17 youth enrolled with AESP1, six provided parental consent and assented to participate in the study. The six participants, AEY1, AEY2, AEY3, AEY4, AEY5 and AEY6, also had diverse backgrounds. Demographic details of youth include an age range of 13–16 years, with one female and five male students. Youth enrolled at AESP1 reflected diverse cultural backgrounds and self-identified as Māori (1), Cook Island/Māori (2), Samoan/Tokelauan (1), Pākehā (1) and Pākehā/Māori (1).

The final group of participants were four whānau/'aiga/caregivers of youth who consented to participate in Study 1. One of the four participants was a caregiver who was not the legal guardian of the youth. All four participants of the whānau/'aiga/caregiver group were female; their age demographic profile is unknown.

Study 2

Participants in Study 2 included youth and mentors, also purposively selected. The eligibility criteria for youth to participate in Study 2 were that they were enrolled in the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand delivered in July to November 2017, and returned full consent and assent forms. From a possible cohort of 22 youth enrolled across AESP1 or AESP2, at the time of this study was conducted, 12 youth had returned their consent and assent forms. The 10 youth who did not return their forms, at the time of this study were excluded from the participant observation study and interactions that occurred between those youth who did not meet the eligibility criteria and participants who did meet the eligibility criteria to participate were not included in this study. Of the 25 mentors who participated in the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand, 14 consented to participate in Study 2 and 7 were excluded because they did not consent or their mentees did not return consent or assent forms at the start of the programme delivery.

Study 3

Participants for Study 3, the postprogramme study, were also purposively selected. Study 3 eligibility criteria for youth and tutors stipulated that they had to have participated in the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand between July and November 2017 and had returned consent and assent forms. All five tutors from the two alternative education service providers participated in the talanoa/kōrero as well as 10 youth.

Overview of Procedures for Each Study

Study 1 – Study 3

Prior to selecting participants in Study 1, full ethical approval was obtained in accordance with the ethics review process outlined by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee (Appendix A). Youth expert YE1 was invited to participate in the study through a third party. This participant was known to the researcher and worked within a large urban Māori organisation. Youth expert YE2 was known to both the researcher and one supervisor and was a well-known member of the wider youth mentoring community. In line with culturally responsive methodologies, preresearch contact between both youth experts and the researcher involved a series of talanoa/kōrero over the telephone. During this process, existing connections between researcher and participants were shared openly, a vital step in building the research va to ensure research "with" as opposed to "on" the Māori and Pacific participants (L. T. Smith, 2012). Existing relationships and interconnections were important to build and promote trust as a foundation for safe research relationships. Contact by email was made with each youth expert which included information about the study prior to engaging in one-to-one talanoa/kōrero. The research aims, rationale and details of the researcher, supervisory committee, affiliate institution and guiding talanoa/kōrero questions were included in addition to the consent forms approved by the University of Auckland Human Ethics Committee (Ref 018107). Each youth expert was given the opportunity to ask questions and give their free and informed consent to participate or not in the research. Both youth experts were also given an example of what questions might be included in the talanoa/kōrero which was also included in the email contact. One week later, one-to-one talanoa/kōrero were conducted in the participants' place of employment. In both instances, the time and place of the talanoa/kōrero were determined by the participants.

The recruitment of cultural experts occurred in an organic manner. As a researcher of Pacific descent, I had no known contacts with local Kaumātua from this specific region of Auckland. The initial contact with cultural expert CE1 was at a youth community event where youth

workers, youth mentors, social workers, police and youth justice workers were present. I was invited by CE1 to share about my work and the research project. Three months later I was then invited several times to the whare (home) of CE1 where we spent time sharing information about our backgrounds, our lived stories with 'aiga/whānau and the community work we were both involved in within the education and mentoring contexts. The process of building the va (research relational space) with CE1 was a steady and slow process that evolved into a sacred space (va tapuia). This resulted in an ongoing relationship that lasted well after the research collection phase was finished. CE1 worked in the youth justice system and offered the opportunity for me to informally observe how the youth courts worked when culture and tikanga was central to practice. I was able to observe and be involved in the process of pōwhiri (welcome and calling) of manuhiri (visitors) onto the marae and observing mihi (greetings) from Kaumātua who acknowledged the young person's whānau, hapū and links with iwi. I was also able to observe Kaumātua assist the young people to recite their pepeha (traditional greeting citing their whakapapa). The kuia also kindly assisted my pronunciation of my own pepeha during the process of whakawhanaungatanga (familiarisation/relationship building).

After a period of 3 months in which I informally observed the day-to-day mentoring of rangatahi in a Māori context, I was given an opportunity to engage more formally with the other Kaumātua and present the aims of the study. The kōrero included the process of my journey meeting CE1 at the youth hui held 3 months prior. Kaumātua were then invited to share their views and their collective stories about working with rangatahi. Kaumātua then discussed whether I was the correct person to present views on key environmental conditions and actions that were important to their work. Once it was established that the research project would be useful for youth and the community, all Kaumātua (CE1, CE2 and CE3) offered to schedule a focus group kōrero with me face to face, kanohi-ki-te-kanohi, at the whare of CE1. The manner in which data were collected was determined by the Kaumātua themselves. They self-determined their involvement by way of a focus group kōrero, at the whare of CE1, around a cup of tea and sharing of kai. After having spent time building the research va with the Kaumātua I knew that none of them drove, so I offered to organise transport. At their request, they directed the order in which I was to pick them up, starting with CE1 and then CE3. CE2 found her own way to the whare of CE1 where the kōrero took place. Five months from the initial meeting with CE1, the focus group kōrero took place in the whare of CE1.

The cultural experts were open and asked me to lead the opening karakia (prayer) and bring kai to share during the kōrero that lasted approximately 2–3 hours. After karakia and kai, the

cultural experts were reminded about the aims of the project and were given time to read over the participant information sheets and consent forms. They were also given an example of the structure of the programme and they pointed out to each other and myself that they were the "cultural experts" as indicated on the graphic of the proposed youth mentoring programme structure. The cultural experts were reminded that their participation was voluntary and their welfare and privacy were the utmost priority. They were then asked to complete a form indicating their interest to engage in the focus group kōrero. Under the principle of manaakitanga, a koha (gift) was given to each Kaumātua for their participation and time.

Recruitment for alternative education tutors, youth in alternative education and their whānau/caregivers was facilitated through an alternative education consortium. The youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand made initial contact with alternative education consortium directors to hold a hui (meeting). The aims of the research were then presented to the directors. The directors contacted the alternative education service provider (AESP1) describing the research aims behind the proposed youth mentoring programme. The organisational information sheet (Appendix B) and consent form (Appendix C) was then issued to the directors. The form explained the researcher's desire to recruit alternative education tutors, young people who are or have been in alternative education, and whānau/caregivers of young people who are or have been in alternative education. A request was made for their assistance in reaching out to suitable participants. The organisation was asked to support with recruiting participants by providing a brief verbal description of the research project and providing the researcher with the contact details of any participants who might be interested in taking part. Contact was then made with each individual, in which they were invited to participate and provided with further details. The researcher answered any participant questions and confirmed times for the focus groups and interviews.

Alternative education tutors who were interested in participating in the research were invited to attend a focus group/kōrero/talanoa with other alternative education tutors. The focus group/kōrero/talanoa lasted approximately 60–90 minutes and was conducted at a time and place that was convenient for the alternative education tutors. Similarly, young people who were interested in participating in the research were invited to attend a focus group/kōrero/talanoa with other young people lasting approximately 60–90 minutes at a time and place that was convenient for them. Finally, whānau/caregivers were invited to participate in a semistructured telephone interview lasting approximately 30 minutes at a time that was convenient for them. As a koha/reimbursement for their time, all participants received a $20

Warehouse voucher. Participants were advised their involvement was completely voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study at any time.

In Study 2, youth from AESP1 were initially approached by their tutors to participate. From a potential pool of 17 students, six participants returned their assent forms to participate and were, at the time of the study, in attendance at AESP1, with a view to participating as mentees in the youth mentoring programme later in the school calendar year. It is important to note that at least three more youth signalled their interest to participate but were excluded from the talanoa due to lack of assent from parents and/or legal guardians. Five youth eventually attended the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand as mentees. Although AEY3 participated in the talanoa prior to youth mentoring programme delivery in 2017, due to the unpredictable nature of alternative education she was no longer on the roll in AESP1 at the time the youth mentoring programme started and therefore did not attend the programme. All Study 2 youth resided within a large area of Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand and had previously attended mainstream education before transferring over to alternative education. All youth, who were of Pacific and Māori descent, also resided in communities with a high proportion of Pacific and Māori peoples. Participants for Study 3 were recruited in the same way as Study 2.

Overview of Analysis

Study 1 – Study 3

As a qualitative researcher and analyst, my focus for each study was to ensure an iterative and reflexive process informed the analysis, that is, analysis started during the data collection as opposed to after (Stake, 1995). Further, the data analyses focussed on the interrelated aspects of the data collected as a whole, rather than as separate data sets, to bring a fuller picture of what might be happening in the research context. The analysis started in Study 1 with one-to-one talanoa/kōrero and focus groups for all participants. Data were transcribed within 24–48 hours. Confidentiality was maintained by assigning codes to participants relevant to their group and unique number, for example, CE (cultural experts: Kaumātua), YE (youth experts in the field), AEY (youth in alternative education), AET (tutors in alternative education) and AEW (whānau/caregivers of youth in alternative education). An example of unique numbers was for youth experts in the field who were assigned as YE1 Youth Expert 1, or YE2 Youth Expert 2.

I recorded initial reflexive notes immediately after each talanoa/kōrero, which also informed the coding. For example, talanoa/kōrero that included constructs such as fa'aaloalo (respectful)

or manaakitanga (ethic of care, hospitality) were grouped under the codes "culturally safe space" and "culturally safe relationships." They were then merged to "culturally transformative relationships."

In Study 1, the analysis involved both an inductive and deductive process. This was because the initial codes and notes undertaken using reflexive thematic analysis procedures outlined by Braun and Clarke (2019) were guided by the initial literature review which included Indigenous wellbeing constructs and relevant cultural concepts in Pasifika and Kaupapa Māori theories. For example, talanoa/kōrero that included constructs such as whakapapa or gafa (genealogy) were coded under "history" or "identity" which subsequently led to a second tier related to "social identity" and "cultural identity" Other concepts such as feagaiga or tuakana–teina were coded under "covenant relationships" that spoke to the importance of ancestral social relationships. Narrative quotes were recorded verbatim to express the participants' lived realities of the programme.

In Study 2, the participant observational data were analysed during and immediately after using a reflexive thematic approach (Braun & Clarke, 2019). A six-phase process enabled flexibility to actively engage in reviewing coded data to generate themes. Provisional themes were noted (Braun & Clarke, 2020) after active engagement with data field notes that included notebook entries, detailed journal entries and initial reflexive thoughts post-talanoa/kōrero with participants, including mentees, mentors, mentor coaches, tutors from AESP1 and AESP2 present at the programme, and a programme director who was also a member of my doctoral supervision team. Several re-readings were taken to familiarise myself with the field notes taken. The data was systematically coded as well as notes about my initial thoughts. Again, as an iterative process, the codes were also guided by the literature review conceptualising culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice. Similarities and divergences of coded data and themes from a cultural lens were drawn from critical Indigenous Pacific theory and concepts in te ao Māori as a consequence of the initial literature review in Chapter 2. A recursive approach reviewing and generating themes from the initial provisional themes is consistent with reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2019, 2020; Terry et al., 2017).

Overview of Ethical Issues

As discussed above, this thesis drew on the cultural concept of va (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010) and other principles that guide ethical practice – by researchers of Pacific descent, with and for participants of Pacific descent, and in line with core values of Pacific research

methodologies (Anae, 2010; Mila-Schaaf & Robinson2010). As an overarching principle, va is drawn from the Samoan term va fealoloa'i which means to mutually respect and maintain the sacred space within relationships (Autagavaia, 2001). In addition, this thesis considered the ethical principles for non-Māori researchers engaging in research with Māori (Hudson et al., 2010). This relational approach was an appropriate response for a Pacific researcher activating their collective ancestral ties by engaging respectfully with Kaupapa Māori research (Naepi, 2015; Suaalii-Sauni, 2017).

As a Pasifika researcher in a Western institution working alongside Kaumātua, tutors in alternative education, rangatahi and their whānau who self-identified as Māori, it was important for me to ensure research was consistent with ethical standards (see Appendix D, Appendix E , Appendix F). These are examples of some of the ethics forms covering a wide range of participants over 3 studies. Additionally, given that one of the aims of culturally responsive methodological approaches is to privilege diverse epistemologies and ontologies, in this case, Pacific and Māori ways of being and knowing, I also considered ethical practices in line with *Te Ara Tika: Guidelines for Māori Research Ethics* (Hudson et al., 2010) and the Pacific Health Research Guidelines (Health Research Council, 2004). Overall, as a researcher conducting and enacting a culturally responsive multimethod approach to collect the data, I felt very challenged. Throughout the whole research malaga (journey) it was important to remain reflexive and consider my positionality, my possible bias and my limitations as a Pasifika researcher working within the boundaries of a Western institution.

To ensure the protection of participants for each study, importance was placed on engaging in critical reflexive practice and critical conversations with my supervision team. A key concern for me as a researcher, and my positionality as a Pasifika researcher, was the question of whether Māori truly had sovereignty over the research process – particularly the Kaumātua in Study 1 given they were not part of subsequent research studies. To mitigate these tensions, I have maintained my relationship with Kaumātua and other participants such as tutors past the period of data collection and will continue to uphold their voices in my subsequent work. My main supervisor, who is of Māori descent, regularly encouraged me as a researcher to consider my methodological approach, including the way data might be collected alongside participants and treated as taonga (treasure or gift). Both of my supervisors, one of whom is non-Māori, reminded me to consider how the research project might proceed to honour all participants, particularly given the heterogeneity of participants self-identifying as Māori, Pacific/Pasifika included Pākehā or multiple ethnicities.

Participants' rights to confidentiality were upheld by removing all identifiable details such as participant names, workplaces and geographical name locations. Voluntary participation and the right to withdraw were also fully explained to participants at the beginning of each study. Importantly, informed consent and assent, where applicable, were gained, and appropriate time was afforded to participants to consider whether or not they agreed to take part in each study. For participants under the age of 16, parental consent and assent was also gained to ensure ethical procedures were followed as per.

Study 1 – Study 3

As mentioned in the rationale of this thesis, as a researcher I was invited by the Programme Directors to engage in this research, as a part of a larger programme of research out of their desire to better understand culturally responsive practice. It should be noted that one supervisor of my doctoral supervision team is also a Programme Director of the youth mentoring programme of which this thesis utilised as a vehicle. To mitigate any bias and facilitate possible tensions my main supervisor was able to engage at various times throughout the research study and provide impartial advice to ensure the needs of participants, particularly the mana of Māori rangatahi, whānau and Kaumātua within the research were being upheld and honoured. I began consultation and relationship building with Kaumātua from the local community through various visits as part of Study 1. The involvement of Māori cultural experts to inform the cultural translation of the youth mentoring programme in this thesis was also an ethical and culturally responsive act to ensure tikanga Māori was upheld throughout each study.

Prior to first delivery of the youth mentoring programme in 2017, a hui was held with the youth mentoring programme directors, at which my supervision team were present, where the preliminary results of Study 1 were communicated, and an ethical dilemma was encountered. The cultural translation of the programme for Study 2 and Study 3 did not involve Kaumātua from outside of the university context. As the researcher, I was faced with advising Kaumātua that the cultural translation of the programme for Study 2 (during the programme) did not require their participation. This also meant they were not required for Study 3 post-programme talanoa/kōrero to provide insight of what worked well from a cultural lens. Kaumātua were not able to participate in Study 3 as they did not participate as part of Study 2. As a Pasifika researcher, to manage the situation and uphold the mana of Kaumātua the action I did take within the parameters of the research context was to convey the advice given to me as a researcher to Kaumātua. The advice at the hui was the youth mentoring programme was adapted from a US licence and did not allow for their engagement in delivery aspects. A

reminder to the reader, it should be emphasised that since the first delivery in 2017, the year this research was conducted, the Programme Directors have partnered with an indigenous cultural evaluation expert who has provided ongoing advice on culturally responsive practice and culturally responsive research.

Limitations

Study 1 – Study 3

A limitation of this research is having the governance and oversight of youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand exclude Kaumātua during July to November 2017, even though the youth mentoring programme involved both rangatahi (Māori youth) and Pacific youth. The findings showed that although both youth experts and the four cultural experts (Kaumātua) advised their oversight and inclusion was an important element, they were not included in remaining phases of the implementation of the programme. Insight into the cultural responsiveness and safety of the actual translation and implementation of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand for rangatahi was limited to the views of the youths' tutors in alternative education, the youth themselves and one family member. The intergenerational knowledge and cultural wisdom of the Kaumātua could have provided a more rigorous and experienced perspective on how the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of youth were responded to, sustained and safely managed.

Evaluating Rigour and Quality

Given the nature of interpretative research and the influence of subjectivity from multiple perspectives, objectivity can be challenging. Research scholars, Guba (1981) and Punch (2005) posited the term *credibility* to describe an approach to consistency that avoids researcher bias. As the researcher in the research study, I spent a prolonged amount of time, a total of 13 months, collecting data from the field. To avoid researcher bias I ensured that I not only took just over a year to collect the data, but I also spent ten days abroad in the US to gain an in-depth understanding of the youth mentoring programme in action before it was culturally translated here in Aotearoa. In addition, I spent 7 of the 12 weeks, just under two-thirds of the total duration of the programme, in action as a participant observer of the programme as well as visiting and engaging with participants prior to and after the programme. The design of three studies to explore the phenomena and subsequent triangulation also supports the credibility of the data. A systematic triangulation of perspectives refers to the researcher taking on different perspectives, in this case two different tools, to answer the research question (Flick, 2018).

To ensure *dependability,* that is to ensure reliability and consistency across data collection and analysis techniques (Guba & Lincoln, 2005), I took a systematic audit approach to data analysis. Comprehensive records were kept, alongside several research log books detailing every researcher observation, interaction and thinking process aligned with the collection and analysis of data. Personal thoughts, ideas and contributions became key elements of the data analysis process. In addition, researcher notes assisted me to recall important conversations with my critical academic peers, both in the research and youth mentoring community. Research decision junctures were also recorded and reflected on (Guba, 1981).

The last criterion of trustworthiness or rigour is *confirmability.* This refers to verification that the researcher acted in good faith to avoid researcher bias and maintained self-reflective practice. I achieved this by engaging in regular discussions with my supervisors and critical PhD peers. They challenged the research at various stages of peer debriefing to ensure the findings were indeed shaped by the participants themselves rather than the qualitative researcher (Guba, 1981; Creswell, 2013).In addition, to increase the trustworthiness of the current study; consent forms, audio tapes and transcribed interviews were kept secure by the research supervisor overseeing this study as the storage of data is often neglected in literature (Creswell, 2013).

Chapter Summary

In conclusion, this chapter described the theoretical assumptions underpinning this thesis and the culturally responsive multimethods utilised to answer the broad research question central to this research. The chapter also provided the reader the rationale of the localised lens to this thesis, utilising research tools drawing on Moana Theory and relational ethics to present a va relational approach focussed on the sociohistorical relationship between Pacific/Pasifika and Indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand. Overviews of each study were also outlined including a table showing all participants over the three studies conducted. The next chapter describes the findings of Study 1 Preprogramme.

Chapter 4 – Study 1 Preprogramme

Fa'alogo mai, Whakarongo mai, Akarongo mai, Fanongo mai – To Listen

O fanau a tagata e fafaga i upu, a o fanau a manu e fafaga i fugaaau – The young birds are fed with blossoms of trees, but the young of humans are nurtured with words.

–Samoan proverb

Chapter Overview

This is the first of three studies conducted to explore and address the overarching question of this dissertation "What are the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice in Aotearoa New Zealand?" Study 2 and Study 3 will follow in Chapters 5 and 6, respectively. The current chapter analyses the talanoa/kōrero conducted prior to the first iteration of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand youth mentoring programme to address the following subquestions:

  i.   What are the environmental conditions present that determine culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice in youth mentoring?

  ii. What are the key actions taken by mentors and/or youth programmers that support culturally safe practice in youth mentoring?

The current study and the two other study chapters that follow are prefaced with a Samoan proverb and key terms that provide an Indigenous frame of reference in which I locate myself in relation to my participants, to this study and to the larger shared context of this dissertation. In this study, the alagaupu, Samoan proverb, that begins the current chapter refers to active listening and nurturing relationships. In Study 1, I prioritised listening and nurturing – or building the va (relational space) with Māori and Pasifika communities, in the context of a tertiary institution project team with the aim to implement a culturally translated youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. The Samoan proverb prefacing Study 1 refers to the responsibility of the entire family, village and community to nurture, discipline and guide the younger generation. The proverb highlights the criticality of raising youth with more than physical nourishment or sustenance.

A priority for this dissertation includes advancing scholarship in self-determining and culturally responsive approaches to youth mentoring (Berryman et al., 2013; L. T. Smith, 1999) built on relational ethics of practice (Manuela & Anae, 2017), in this case the context of youth

development and mentoring for Māori and Pacific youth. A va relational framework was developed to provide a deeper understanding of the role of culture, race and ethnicity (Sánchez & Colón, 2005; Sánchez et al., 2014). Through a Samoan lens, in the diaspora of Aotearoa New Zealand, I utilise the va as a key ancestral concept to discuss key ingredients important for Indigenous and ethnic-minority youth in mentoring programmes from the perspective of the communities themselves.

Literature Review

In Aotearoa New Zealand, the Indigenous people of this land – tāngata whenua Māori – and also Pacific people in the diaspora, are heterogeneous peoples who come from long lines of rich Polynesian heritage. In the Moana, a common name for nations connected by Te Moana-Nui-A-Kiwa – the Pacific Ocean (Wolfgramm-Foliaki & Smith, 2020), are collectivist cultures that share a common holistic and harmonious lens of relationality. The term *relational* used in this study is:

> Shaped by the many relational values and principles of the Pacific itulagi, such as the embodiment of life, interconnectedness of all, harmony, dialogical communication, practical reciprocity, reception of all other who is different, as well as truthfulness. In this sense, "relational" is not top-down or monarchical, but rather holistic and harmonious. (Vaai & Nabobo-Baba, 2017, p. 11)

A holistic and harmonious approach was used in this study in that it focuses on the perspectives of contemporary ancestral wisdom carriers – Elders, in this case Kaumātua, as well as experienced youth experts in the field, tutors of youth, whānau/'aiga (family) of rangatahi (youth) themselves. In many Indigenous cultures, Elders are seen as key holders of ancient wisdom who are imbued with mana (Chilisa, 2012 Kovach, 2009; L. T. Smith, 1999; Tupua Tamasese Ta'isi, 2009). A positive youth development approach from a Pacific, Samoan-specific lens recognises the assets within Indigenous values. According to Tupua Tamasese Ta'isi (2009), the impartation of cultural values is integral for good thinking and behaviour, and for the development of a moral compass and is a "responsibility shared by parents, Elders, matai [high chief] and the village hierarchy ... nurturing is to identify, teach and respect the boundaries between child and parent, child and elderly, child and matai, child and child, and child and village" (p. 55).

Purpose of the Present Study

To answer the research questions underpinning Study 1, as a researcher I listened to the perspectives of Kaumātua, experienced youth experts in the field, tutors of youth, whānau/'aiga of youth and rangatahi. Given the diversity across all five groups, this important research work required the use of appropriate Māori and Pasifika protocols and methods negotiated within a Western context.

Method

Study 1 is a qualitative study that employed talanoa, a pan-Pacific interviewing technique underpinned by Pacific worldviews and knowledge systems (Suaalii-Sauni & Fulu-Aiolupotea, 2014; Vaioleti, 2006). As a Pasifika researcher in a Māori, Pacific and Western context, this study required a pragmatic methodological approach. I employed culturally relevant and responsive research methods reflective of the participants' lived realities rather than reproducing what Fa'avae et al. (2016) called "Western methods of research" (p. 129). The principles of fa'aSamoa (The Samoan way of life) that include fa'aaloalo (respect) and teu le va (nurturing, caring for and maintaining the relationship) were prioritised and enacted with all participants regardless of racial–ethnic background.

Participants

Participants for Study 1 consisted of members of the Māori and Pacific community with extensive youth mentoring experience and Kaumātua in the local community working with youth termed as "at-risk" [3] (herein referred to as *underserved*) in the youth justice system. Other participants came from one youth alternative education provider, consisting of a diverse ethnic group of youth tutors, youth, and whānau/'aiga from the same alternative education provider. Data collection for this study occurred between January to June 2017 in one region of Auckland, New Zealand's largest city, in locations that participants preferred.

Study 1 comprised talanoa/kōrero either in a one-to-one interview or as a focus group. The majority of talanoa/kōrero were conducted face to face except for whānau/'aiga/caregiver interviews, which were conducted via telephone. Table 3 shows two one-to-one talanoa/kōrero with youth experts (*n*=2); one focus group talanoa/kōrero with Kaumātua (*n*=3); 1 one-to-one talanoa/kōrero (*n*=1) and one focus group talanoa/kōrero (*n*=4) with AET, two focus group

---

[3] "at-risk" is used within an original reference.

talanoa/kōrero (*n*=3 and *n*=3) with AEY and 3 one-to-one talanoa/kōrero (*n*=3), via telephone, with individual whānau/'aiga or caregivers of AEY.

Table 3

Participants' Preprogramme 1:1 and Focus Group Talanoa/Kōrero

Group	*n.*	Average age	Gender	Ethnicity
Cultural experts / Kaumātua	3	Unknown	F (3)	Māori (3)
Youth experts	2	38	F (1) M (1)	Niuean (1) Samoan/Tokelauan (1)
Tutors in alternative education	5	39	F (2) M (3)	Cook Island (2) Māori/Cook Island/NZ-European (1) Māori/Cook Island (1) Tongan/Māori (1)
Youth in alternative education	6	14	F (1) M (5)	Māori (1) Cook Island/Māori (2) Samoan/Tokelauan (1) NZ-European/Māori (1) NZ-European (1)
Whānau/'aiga/caregivers of youth in alternative education	3	Unknown	F (3)	NZ-European (1) Samoan (1) Māori (1)

n. = number of participants

Procedure

Inclusion criteria for this study across the five groups were that participants were of Māori and/or Pacific heritage and were familiar with the youth development work and/or youth space. Additional inclusion criteria for youth were those currently attending an alternative education service provider programme, and their family/caregivers. The inclusion criteria for two youth experts in the field were that they were well-established, experienced Māori and/or Pacific experts in the youth development/mentoring field; and Kaumātua, Kaumātua who self-assigned as cultural experts, within the community of youth in alternative education targeted for the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand 2017 intake.

Participants had the choice of which method they preferred, for example one-to-one talanoa/kōrero or focus group talanoa/kōrero. The one-to-one talanoa/kōrero was used for both youth experts in the field because they were from different organisations and unknown to one another. The three Kaumātua who work alongside youth underserved at the Māori youth court

declined one-to-one talanoa/kōrero and preferred to have their talanoa/kōrero in one focus group. Of the five youth tutors, four also had one talanoa/kōrero focus group due to one tutor overseeing youth activities at the AESP1 facility at the time of data collection. In addition, one-to-one telephone talanoa/kōrero interviews were conducted for three whānau/family/caregivers of youth in alternative education for practicality purposes and to respect the tutors' request to allow them to make the initial contact. All talanoa/kōrero 1:1, talanoa/kōrero focus group and talanoa/kōrero telephone contact for Study 1 was conducted prior to the delivery of the youth mentoring programme in July – November 2017.

Analysis

In the current study, one-to-one and focus group talanoa/kōrero for all participants were transcribed within 24–48 hours. To ensure confidentiality, names of the participants were assigned codes relevant to their group, for example, CE (cultural experts: Kaumātua), YE (youth experts in the field), AEY (youth in alternative education), AET (tutors in alternative education) and AEW (whānau/caregivers of youth in alternative education). All participants were informants of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand youth mentoring programme due to be delivered in July–November 2017. Data analysis considered all the researcher's notes, and initial reflexive notes taken immediately after talanoa/kōrero took place, in addition to the transcriptions.

The inductive process of analysis was undertaken using reflexive thematic analysis procedures outlined by Braun and Clarke (2019). The process utilised the key cultural constructs identified in the literature review. For example, talanoa/kōrero that included constructs such as whakapapa or gafa (genealogy) were coded under "history" or "identity." Other concepts such as feagaiga or tuakana–teina were coded under "covenant relationships" that spoke to the importance of ancestral social relationships. The narratives and stories through quotes were recorded verbatim to express the participants' lived realities of the programme. Full details of the analysis, procedure and methodological approach can be found in Chapter 3 – Methodology.

Results

The results of Study 1 are centred on three interrelated themes that can be seen as key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice in youth mentoring practice in Aotearoa New Zealand. They are (i) culturally safe spaces, (ii) positive social identities, and (iii) covenant relationships. The themes are sourced from the narratives of three Kaumātua (the

terms *Kaumātua* and *cultural experts* are used interchangeably), followed by the voices of two youth experts. The voices of five tutors in alternative education, six youth in alternative education and three whānau/'aiga/caregivers of youth in alternative education are also presented in the aforementioned themes. In Study 1, a key finding is that culture played an important role in the lives of youth, their whānau/'aiga/caregivers and community in the youth mentoring context. Cultural experts, youth experts, whānau/'aiga/caregivers and rangatahi expressed how the role of culture manifested in various ways, essential for culturally safe spaces.

Culturally Safe Spaces

Over the past 2 decades, a burgeoning interest in culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice has gained considerable research momentum across disciplines of health, youth justice and education. A culturally responsive and sustaining approach to practice in the educational context considers the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of youth and their whānau/'aiga/family/caregivers (Paris, 2012; Paris & Alim, 2017). In youth mentoring programmes where activities are structured, the term *responsiveness* takes into consideration the multiplicity and fluidity of cultural practices, and the knowledge and beliefs of youth, in what Simpkins et al. (2017) posited as a dynamic and synergistic relationship between the provider and adolescent participants.

In Study 1, culturally responsive and sustaining youth mentoring practice included culturally safe environments and practices where a holistic approach to Māori and Pacific youth wellbeing was at the forefront (Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001). That is, the holistic needs that include the familial, cultural and spiritual values in addition to mental, physical, social, emotional and psychological needs for youth wellbeing are considered in uniquely Pacific and Māori ways of being and knowing. Participants across all four groups identified the importance of creating non-judgemental, culturally safe spaces, where key people such as Kaumātua are accessible, and marae-like environments where tikanga (cultural rituals or protocols), such as karakia (prayers), can be practised. In line with Pacific and Māori Indigenous models of wellbeing, where approaches are both holistic and intergenerational, accessibility of Kaumātua provides a source of nurturing, where alofa, aroha (love and care) may feed the spiritual, social and emotional needs of youth (Mo'a, 2015; Tupua Tamasese Ta'isi, 2018).

Importantly, culturally safe practice considers Indigenous and minoritised youth wellbeing in relation to their cultural identity development. A strong body of evidence supports the relationship between ethnic identity and optimum wellbeing, specifically for Māori and Pacific peoples in Aotearoa New Zealand whose ethnic identity is important to their self-concept (Manuela & Anae, 2017; Mila-Schaaf, 2011; Webber, 2012). Indeed, youth mentoring research posits the importance of identity development alongside socioemotional and cognitive skill development within close and enduring relationships (Rhodes, 2005). However, there is still little known about the mechanisms of relationship quality, an integral mechanism of change (Rhodes & DuBois, 2008), particularly for identity development to occur.

Rhodes (2005) asserted the three interacting processes: identity development, social-emotional development and cognitive development, are developed within the mentoring-relationship dyad for positive outcomes of youth wellbeing. However, a key argument in this study is that identity development is a vital ingredient for Indigenous, Pasifika and Māori youth in order for the other two processes (cognitive and socioemotional development) to develop for positive outcomes on youth wellbeing. Importantly, a key limitation with Rhodes's youth mentoring model is that it does not consider Indigenous-specific wellbeing constructs as an outcome, but rather posits a generic Western outcome of wellbeing.

The current study was concerned with how youth mentoring programmes, in this case a youth mentoring programme developed in the US designed for at-risk youth, might be delivered in a culturally safe way in contexts outside of the US. Importantly, how the safe cultural translation of the programme might prioritise Indigenous, Pasifika or Māori youth identity in reference to holistic wellbeing models in the Aotearoa New Zealand context (Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001). Alongside the narratives of key participants, this study drew on Indigenous Pasifika and Māori wellbeing scholarship to discuss key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice.

Mila-Schaaf and Robinson (2010) argued that "Polycultural capital" enables adolescents a sense of agency and the ability to efficiently reference more than one knowledge tradition. Youth might choose to respond selectively and efficiently as abled participants in the youth mentoring relationship. This is of course dependent on context and purpose. If youth are exposed to culturally coded spaces such as youth mentoring programmes within Western institutions, such as a university, there is potential that youth might not fully exercise their cultural pride and bring their cultural identity through the door. In contrast, youth mentoring

programmes that engender Māori and Pacific values through including role models as part of their cultural group might afford participants the experience of a positive sense of identity, negotiating and accumulating values, language, cultural knowledge and a feeling of acceptance without judgement by peers and others. Youth mentoring programmes that enable access to cultural forms of capital in addition to capital sourced from dominant spaces afford a stronger position and agency where Mila-Schaaf and Robinson (2010) described as having the best of both worlds – increasing their cumulative advantage.

Environmental conditions must both respond to and sustain the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of youth and include access to te ao Māori (the Māori world) through Kaumātua (This will support youth development, their aspirations as Māori, and invoke feelings of cultural safety for rangatahi; Muriwai et al., 2015). The cultural experts in this study believed that rangatahi felt a sense of reassurance and manaaki (care, nurturing) in spaces inhabited by Kaumātua and among other Māori peers in a whānau-like environment. CE3 stated "Yes they need Elders" and CE2 argued that "safe" space is important for youth in terms of forging strong and enduring relationships where they feel nurtured, secure and accepted. They also mentioned the role that a physical marae plays in creating this space. CE2 stated:

> The whānau is there to participate – they get pōwhiri'd [welcomed] on and then they stay there and have a graduation lunch and then the good thing about our marae is that they're [Kaumātua] there all the time. People are there all the time.

The above quote from CE2 was similar to CE3's kōrero about rangatahi feeling safe in a community-like environment. It is important that Māori youth experience a sense of connectedness or belonging within the marae, which is in essence, a whānau environment. The Kaumātua narratives indicated the importance of rangatahi having access to a space where youth could be fully themselves as Māori without the feeling of being judged while also being held accountable for their actions.

Consistent with Quince (2017), this study asserts that kaumātua have a vital role to support rangatahi as part of a strengths-based whānau approach. Critical factors to the success of rangatahi in youth mentoring contexts include youth feeling welcome and respected, knowing that their self-identity and cultural identity is valued and will be strengthened. Importantly, the cultural processes of the marae also played an important role to ensure relationships of respect and communication lines between the families, the court and stakeholders were maintained.

Elders or Kaumātua play an important role in positive youth development in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The narratives of Kaumātua highlight the seriousness of the role they take as Elders and lay advocates working alongside rangatahi. Indeed, they foster connections in facilitating successful family group conference[4] as part of a process to help rangatahi integrate back into the marae community. This integration includes:

> Fostering a positive Māori identity, including personal knowledge of whakapapa [genealogy], te reo and tikanga Māori [Māori language and custom]. Each young person is tasked with learning and then reciting their pepeha [an introduction to themselves in Māori terms] by identifying themselves with their own territory via landmarks such as mountain, river, waka [canoe]; and their people such as tribe, subtribe, and chiefs. (Quince, 2017, pp. 46–47)

In addition to rangatahi having a sense of connection and community embedded in the support of Kaumātua, they also offer insights for youth practitioners in Western institutions. The narratives of the Kaumātua highlight the importance of youth workers working alongside esteemed knowledge holders. They are respected within the community and have imbued mana to offer culturally sustaining guidance so youth can be held accountable in a safe and supported manner. CE2 explained:

> It's important for me to make rangatahi feel safe. Secondly, that they feel welcome and not judged. Also, that he feels he can make his own decisions and not feel judged about his individuality. He also needs to feel accepted regardless of whether he's haututu! [mischief] Although we will correct him gently by giving him a growling.

CE1 described the role that Kaumātua held with both blood and nonblood-related rangatahi, to awhi (support) and put rangatahi at ease. During her kōrero she shared her thoughts about the counselling that would be offered to rangatahi as part of the wrap-around services in the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. CE1 shared her doubts about how professional counsellors might not have the mantle or depth of understanding that Kaumātua have. She stated:

---

[4] Family Conference Group or FCGs are formal meetings with a whole-family approach, with professionals to discuss plans in the best interests of child safety and care.

Um for me I would prefer to come back to our pakeke [adults]. There's nothing better than your own to awhi [support] your own. Now it may be blood related but it's that understanding. A Māori can look after a Māori rangatahi with ease whereas if it's a professional counsellor they're guessing because they're going by the paperwork and the square that they have to work in. Whereas a Māori, whether it be a nanny or a pāpā they come and open their heart to them, and they embrace them it doesn't matter what that rangatahi is like – they embrace them. Whereas the people that have got this piece of paper [professional practitioners] … unfortunately, over the years I've found that they judge our rangatahi. There's been many times when I've had to stand up for our rangatahi [and say] that his counsellor is not right for this rangatahi. They're not ready for that sort of counselling but we've then taken that rangatahi to a nanny or to a pāpā that we know that the rangatahi feels comfortable with whether they're [counsellors at the proposed youth mentoring programme] accessible or not I still have my doubts. Unless I find the right one for our rangatahi [I am not so sure].

The above quote highlights the aspirations of Kaumātua to provide a loving, wrap-around support for rangatahi in a way that nurtures the young person. The role of Kaumātua is to ensure that rangatahi feel loved and secure. The narratives of Kaumātua in this study are consistent with the success of Elder's roles and work outlined in Quince (2017) particularly with underserved youth in the Rangatahi Court system. The current study offers youth programmers insights into the role that Kaumātua can play, as part of a wider youth mentoring whānau. The data are consistent with Quince's study and how Kaumātua operate in the context of an urban marae working collectively to support rangatahi. The narratives of Kaumātua in this study highlight their concern as well as their role working actively to advocate for rangatahi in a discerning manner, rather than simply clinically diagnosing youth from a counsellor practitioner lens with a view to fixing them. Kaumātua see their role as providing a network of aroha (love) to embrace them without judgement, where youth feel nourished and connected.

Similarly, youth experts in the field discussed the critical importance of the presence and oversight of Kaumātua in programmes. The youth experts spoke of acknowledging and affirming the Elder's position as Indigenous or traditional knowledge holders and the mantle or "mana" they hold. One youth expert in the Pacific youth mentoring context explained that when a youth mentoring programme engages well-respected Elders who are recognised in the community as spiritual leaders, they bring oversight and validate or affirm the programme by giving their blessing. They stated:

Yeah, I would say it stronger than "a suggestion," I would make it mandatory that people in the community are contacted and these are people that we trust. So, when you're getting people, don't just grab the Islander off the street aye. Go with the person who has a built respect and reputation in the community. So, I was fortunate. My Dad was a faifeau [church minister] so people thought "oh wow." I mean, they trusted Dad more than me, but they thought oh well [YE2] must have a blessing because his father's a faifeau. Then I would get people like my Dad or other ministers to offer us some kind of spiritual guidance or oversight of what we were trying to do ... bless what we were trying to do ... but as well as that you've contacted the community for the programme. But then you need that [community] group giving you oversight through the programme ... they're all part of the whole package. (YE2)

One caregiver and one whānau member also shared the same beliefs about the importance of Kaumātua. A caregiver (in a professional capacity – AEC1) stated:

I think … that with Elders or kaumātua there is a sense of respect that teenagers recognise. It is kind of an unspoken agreement; you know what I mean? … Yeah, absolute presence, that young people feel more obliged too. Yeah, if their presence is felt to follow their path or follow their recommendations and at the very least respect them and their opinions.

In collectivist cultures such as Māori and Pacific communities, respecting one's Elders is a core fundamental cultural value, and an important aspect of Māori and Pacific youth development. Indeed, these data are consistent with research that emphasises the role Elders play in Indigenous communities with youth where they provide guidance and support to encourage positive development (Pryce & Aschenbrener, 2019).

Consistent with the work of Webber (2015), the statement above by AEC1 indicates the ways that the social identities of youth are subject and vulnerable to the variables in a context. The presence of respected in-group members (especially Kaumātua) may mean that youth adjust their behaviour for social/cultural acceptance and retain a sense of connectedness and relatedness to Kaumātua present. Youth who feel threatened, judged or shamed in some manner might withdraw from that context (Tajfel, 1981). The participant comments above suggest that youth may be less likely to feel threatened with the calming presence of a Kaumātua with mana in the room, as insiders to culturally discern ethical actions (Meo-Sewabu, 2014).

Programmes must consider the multiple experiences youth may have that inform their self-esteem, self-concept and sense of belonging or connectedness to their in-group or any out-groups (Tajfel, 1981). This is important for youth mentoring programmes seeking to sustain and ensure safe practice, for two reasons. Firstly, family and community are important assets for rangatahi to develop positively. Secondly, these data suggest that programmers might reinforce their commitment to ethical practice by enacting whanaungatanga (an ethic of care through strong relationships) and maintaining the va by making space for the provision of Kaumātua with the mantle and mana to carry parts of the programme delivery and oversight.

Appropriate training and education for both mentors and programmers with the help of Elders might be essential to buffer or ameliorate potential unsafe feelings for mentees. Mentors or mentees who have experienced some degree of oppression or discrimination may have negative experiences if the programme environment reinforces any negative stereotypes held by society (Sánchez & Colón, 2005). The presence of Kaumātua, or at least some form of whānau in a wider sense, might serve as a support system on programmes as the data below suggests.

One whānau member, when asked if the presence of Kaumātua may or may not be important on the programme, stated:

> I reckon it would be good because for my ones ... both their grandparents, my Mum passed away, their grandfather has passed away, their great grandparents have passed away and they were the ones they [children] always used to attach to when they were alive and ask some questions …. find out about their living and why we do things certain ways. Now that they have gone, they don't really latch to old people as much because they are too scared to get close to them and lose them. But I reckon Kaumātua and Kuia are really good to have for our youth. (AEW3)

This quote indicates that whānau and caregivers also understand the importance of Elders as key participants in programmes that support opportunities for youth to explore and access culturally distinct experiences that develop their cultural assets and cultural capital (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010). These data affirm Kaumātua as key knowledge holders who are able to offer support for rangatahi to develop understanding of tikanga and distinct ways of being as Māori.

An interesting finding was that three other tutors (AET3, AET4 and AET5) did not offer comment on the importance of Kaumātua in their talanoa. One tutor (AET2) expressed that she might feel threatened with Elders present observing her practice. She drew on the example of

formal observations as a registered primary school teacher and the discomfort she felt from this experience as a feeling of being watched and judged. This has important implications for practice as culturally safe spaces must not only meet the diverse needs of youth, they must also ensure youth mentors understand the presence of Elders as being a key positive influence and providing wider support and knowledge to a programme, rather than being there to judge practice.

Although this was the perspective of only one tutor, it provides some understanding of the possible shame and judgement mentors may feel about being "observed" by Elders. Notably, 18 other people did not mention potential shame or judgement with the presence of Elders. This suggests, in this study, that the presence of Kaumātua is an important consideration for cultural safety.

Youth from AESP1 commented more generally about family involvement such as family or more elderly people around the programme. AEY4–6 all stated "Yes" to having elderly people around and focussed their own discussion on their grandparents "My grandpa will come in every day," suggesting that AEY6 had an openness to Elders or an elderly presence. He added "Yes, it is [good to have grandparents around the programme]" but when asked "What if they're not related to you … you might go to the marae, and then like a whaea, an aunt or a nanny [may be there], is that important for people like that around the university?" He commented "No, if it's like my nan, yo" (*yo* means to be emphatic in youth slang), suggesting that relationships would indeed need to be developed, regardless of the adult present at the university programme. Two comments from youth indicated that Māori and Pacific youth have an innate sense of the connection to Elders and those who are still present in the spiritual sense. Given the findings across cultural experts (Kaumātua), youth experts in the field, tutors and whānau/'aiga/caregiver members, alongside youth responses, Study 1 indicates that the role of Kaumātua is important for youth development, where rangatahi experience the alofa/aroha (love) and tausi/manaaki (care) that enable youth to experience a wrap-around form of support as part of youth programmes.

Positive Social Identities

Adolescence is a delicate period where young people begin to explore and question "Ko wai au? O ai a'u? Who am I?" It is during this time that youth begin to make sense of, or develop, a sense of who they are within the social groups they may belong to (Tajfel, 1981). Youth may conceptualise themselves, in relation to their Māori or Pacific school peers, either positively or

negatively (Tajfel, 1981). The way in which an adolescents see themselves reflected in educational contexts may have already impacted their personal identity negatively before their entry into the youth mentoring programme.

In Study 1, many of the youth had already experienced marginalisation from their in-group peers via their removal from the formal education system. Consequently, at the time of this study, they were current attendees of an alternative education programme. Tajfel's (1981) social identity theory was therefore an important concept for exploring what the key ingredients might be to respond to and sustain their cultural and linguistic backgrounds and ensure safe practice in youth mentoring practice.

An important ingredient for culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring is the provision of an environment and activities conducive to youth exploring and understanding who they might be as part of their Māori and Pacific whānau and 'aiga. Recent work by Webber and O'Connor (2019) asserted that learning about one's whakapapa as a pedagogical tool in education reminds students they descend from greatness. In other words, their cultural identities, when acknowledged and celebrated through activities, encourage cultural pride. The data suggest participants see an environment with activities that support the positive development of their racial–ethnic background and social identities as being responsive and sustaining their cultural identities.

Given that the cultural and racial–ethnic experiences of participants varied across all five groups in Study 1 (see Table 3 for list of ethnicities), the current chapter explores what components might meet the needs of a diverse cohort of youth. Specifically, this study explored key ingredients of a responsive environment, including those activities that sustained diverse youth cultural and linguistic backgrounds, as constructed by participants themselves. This study offers youth developers in-depth understanding of components of identity that are important for participants and culturally specific activities where youth feel they are in safe space to develop their cultural identities.

As noted in Chapter 2, youth programme intervention goals must consider the heterogeneity of both Māori and Pacific identity development, and draw on Māori and Pacific theories and constructs. This is particularly important for youth mentoring programmes that aim to produce positive outcomes such as reduced health risk, and better psychological outcomes or wellbeing (Rhodes, 2002, 2005). Māori and Pacific youth often navigate multiple identities, including their racial–ethnic and gender identities, their sexual orientation, ability and, in particular for

Māori and Pacific youth, their religion or spirituality identities. Clearly, a one-size-fits-all approach to culture and identity is unhelpful for youth mentoring programmes to assume when understanding positive social identities of ethnic groups that have been minoritised and historically marginalised.

The current study showed that an important ingredient of youth mentoring was to provide youth with experiences that instil a sense of cultural pride and social belonging. Having a positive social identity as Māori or Pacific assists rangatahi to understand who they are in relation to their whakapapa, their faith systems, and worldviews. This notion was a common discussion across all four groups of adult participants.

Consistent with previous research, cultural experts spoke of their aspirations for rangatahi to fulfil their potential by having a firm foundation of understanding of who they are as Māori or Pacific. Cultural expert CE3 explained that her aspiration for rangatahi was for them to understand their place in the world and her statement below was met with a resounding "Yes" by CE1 and CE2:

> For me … the thing I would want for rangatahi, is for them to know who they are, to start understanding themselves. When rangatahi have a sense of who they are, they begin to have an understanding of their parents. They are then able to lead themselves, rather than being [mis]lead by others. That's the way I see it. So that they can be the leader not a follower.

CE3's comment reflects her deep understanding of how rangatahi must first know who they are as Māori in a blended society of diverse cultures in Aotearoa New Zealand. Her aspiration for rangatahi is for them to know themselves and explore who they are within their whānau, their iwi (extended tribal kin group) and hapū (section of large kinship group). She wants them to have a sense of turangawaewae or tu'ungava'e – a place to stand (Brown Pulu, 2002). However, the diverse backgrounds of participants also mean that culture and identity meant different things for different people across groups and within groups of participants. The concept of culture and identity are both separate yet intertwined, that is, the talanoa/kōrero emphasised the salient components of culture and identity that were both important, and in some cases not so important.

The fluid nature of culture and identity in the context of physical, mental, spiritual, collective/community and environmental health is consistent with holistic approaches to

wellbeing for Māori and Pacific (see Chapter 2 for a description of health and wellbeing models; Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pere, 1991; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001; Tu'itahi, 2005).

Consistent with Borell (2005), the findings of this study showed positive social identities are developed when youth are exposed to positive cultural experiences towards a secure social identity. However, it is also important for programmers that target their intervention programmes at Māori youth identified as at risk to consider that not all youth or participants may share the same notions of a *secure Māori identity*. The work of Borell (2005) referred to a traditional Māori identity as meeting the criteria of speaking "te reo Māori, understanding tikanga, knowledge of marae and whakapapa." (p. 369). However, due to colonisation and urbanisation, such criteria may be out of reach for many young urbanised Māori and seeing such markers as necessary to a "positive" cultural identity may further alienate some youth. As discussed in Chapter 2, Māori identities and Pacific identities are both necessarily multilayered and fluid. The way rangatahi or youth identify as Māori and/or Pacific, can be complex yet manifest in common and uncommon ways of ritual and practice.

Whilst some youth might be comfortable and secure in their social identities as Māori and/or Pacific, some may benefit in having access to spaces that support building Polycultural capital, that is, a space where they can build their distinct Pacific cultural advantage to navigate difficult environments and stressors (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010). Youth mentoring programmes that value and acknowledge the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of youth and their communities, by drawing on the rich knowledge systems and experiences from home, may activate a "space" where youth can develop a sense of cultural pride and confidently walk in multiple worlds.

In this study, cultural experts (Kaumātua) talked about the importance of programmes including the practice of karakia and waiata (song) to enable youth to access and have exposure to te reo Māori, tikanga and cultural activities. They believed that this would ensure youth have an opportunity to experience a sense of value, while developing a sense of pride in their cultural identities. Other examples were knowing te reo and tikanga and having confidence to share this with others where they feel proud of being Māori and spiritually aware (Simmonds et al., 2014). Consistent with Simmonds et al. (2014) one Kaumātua (CE2) expressed how in the context of her work, the learning of who one is in relation to one's maunga (mountain), awa (river), waka (canoe) and tupuna (ancestors) is a good start for identifying positively as Māori:

> They start to identify with the marae ... they get that initial feeling to start off with in their haka … to get a sense of connection to the marae. That's what they do here with rangatahi. Because it's on a marae and any marae is good to start with ... and as they keep coming, they learn more "oh well I do want to see my maunga." Then they feel you know good "Oh, I've learnt that's my mountain."

CE2's comment suggests that a positive sense of self-concept and awareness of being Māori, in this case immersed in te ao Māori at the local urban marae, is important to building a sense of self, so rangatahi feel connected and able to relate well with others. This is consistent with a relational process of enacting positive racial–ethnic identity where rangatahi feel a sense of belonging and affirmation (Webber et al., 2016). Consistent with social identity theory, this comment suggests self-concept is derived from one's membership of one's social identity group, in this case being immersed in an urban Māori setting where youth can access adults such as Kaumātua, or other individuals they might refer to as whaea or mātua, in the wider collective, who help to affirm their cultural identity.

The participants had diverse views of the importance of identity when thinking about youth mentoring activities. For example, YE2 shared his perspective about the importance of identity development from a spiritual lens. His comment suggested that a strong sense of social identity for Pacific youth is underpinned by faith-based systems of young people who understand they are loved and supported by a higher being, that is, in this case, God. His comment also suggests that their faith-based belief system, a social and cultural context in which they have a sense of belonging and connectedness, is vital in positively developing youth. He stated:

> Oh yeah identity is massive, but you know I think they're all intertwined aye because … we get into the silly arguments over what identity is. All our kids want to know is that they're loved, that they have a purpose in life and that they're gonna have a group around them that are gonna walk with them and I think if we can keep identity ideas as basic as that then we can build off that then we can get into all the written academic work but let's deal with what they believe their identity is and that's the basis … you've gotta start from where they're at. You undergird it with a serious spiritual belief that God's keenly interested in them and then I think we've got an identity structure that they can work with.

YE2's comment is consistent with identity development research that posits that youth who experience a sense of unconditional love, connectedness and belonging experience a positive

sense of identity development (Webber et al., 2013). The data are also consistent with the assertion that youth are adaptive; and with the right tools and nurturing, for example nurturing their spiritual wellbeing, positive outcomes are possible (Farruggia & Bullen, 2010). Similarly, AET1 commented on the underpinning philosophy of the service provider as a faith-based organisation.

> I don't know if you know [AESP1] very well but there is a definite [commonality] that we all have faith. We all have our own values and we model, not covertly, but we pray every day, we can have one-on-one conversations with kids and because our children are predominantly Māori Pacific, they will have an affinity with that. It's not new to them. And then when you've got men who are role models who are sporty and you've got all of that in one kind of package that they see and it's quite high viz and its every day, 5 days a week, that is a real asset.

The above comment aligns with Farruggia and Bullen (2010) who noted faith-based youth programmes yielded positive outcomes. For example, positive experiences were related to identity, emotional regulation and interpersonal development in comparison with other activities. Faith-based programmes also engage in pro-social activities which provide opportunity for leadership, as well as normalising karakia in response to the spiritual component of wellbeing for Māori and Pacific youth (Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001), and create environments that protect the cultural identity and holistic wellbeing of Māori and Pacific youth. In addition, faith-based perspectives are diverse, which is reflected in the comment by AET5 who discussed the importance of karakia from a Māori lens. He stated:

> I think it's not really like a religious but a culture thing … [there is] prayer as well. I think about my Māori side, they pray after cutting down the tree and … there is always a prayer. I think all of the Pacific Islands, they do prayers, starting the session with a prayer and even finishing with prayer, bringing a spiritual element to it … We do the Māori karakia before we have kai [food].

In a similar vein, YE1 commented on her practice by acknowledging diverse views of spirituality and incorporating karakia from various backgrounds. She stated:

> There's opportunity … so there's always an invitation ... we've had karakia in African, in Muslim, in Pacific Island [language] … you know in different languages and not necessarily within Christianity, but within faith … it's done in whatever spiritual form

… that they have belief in so it's just open you know for whoever would like to … [say karakia].

The data indicate the importance of providing activities that assist Māori and Pacific youth to develop a secure social identity both within their peer groups or in-groups in society (Tajfel, 1981). In Aotearoa New Zealand, research suggests that when thinking about positive youth development for Māori rangatahi in particular, youth programmes should create supportive environments that are challenging enough to push youth expectations and encourage responsibility, self-reflection and teamwork (Hollis et al., 2011). In terms of activities, youth programmers could potentially incorporate activities that are mana enhancing and which draw on cultural constructs such as tikanga (values), whanaungatanga (relationship building), mana (collective integrity and responsibility) and manaakitanga (collective wellbeing). Activities should foster important characteristics for youth to develop maia (confidence), manawanui (resilience), ihumanea (innovation) and māhaki (humility). Further, the environment in which Māori rangatahi develop must essentially be culturally conducive for such qualities and tikanga to be recognised and further developed (Ware & Walsh-Tapiata, 2010).

These findings are also consistent with Pacific and Māori adolescent development theories that draw on the rich cultural strengths of each group towards positive socioemotional development and identity development (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010; Tupuola, 2004; Webber, 2012). Positive social identity and racial–ethnic identity development theories align well with Māori and Pacific youth who have existing assets and funds of knowledge within their communities to support strong cultural identity development and positive outcomes (Gonzalez et al., 2005).

Youth programme developers, particularly in Western contexts, should explore a more in-depth understanding of culture, race and ethnicity theories absent from the youth programme literature (Benson et al., 2006). The current study offers insight into the role of culture, race and ethnicity in youth mentoring programmes and the potential space for youth to develop culturally flexible identities with a strong sense of self-efficacy and self-determination. Youth mentoring programmes with goals of identity development, in this case with Māori and Pacific youth, must develop their programmes from a standpoint that posits that these communities have strengths, that Māori and Pacific youth have existing funds of knowledge, and assets to draw on. This approach is in line with a va relational approach that taps into their sense of spirituality within their cultural context. This may mean going beyond employing tikanga such as karakia and engaging with community, by also engaging Kaumātua or members to share

their expertise of the social, cultural and political context of karakia, whakataukī and pepeha, or lotu, alagaupu and gafa from a Samoan lens.

As mentioned previously, spirituality is regarded as an important component to health and wellbeing (Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001). In this study lotu/karakia or prayer was considered a "norm" for all participants. Participants were open and expected karakia before the process of building the research va (relational space) or, in Māori, the process of whakawhanaungatanga was prioritised before and after talanoa/kōrero or focus groups. Further, youth and their tutors talked about this important ritual/protocol/tikanga as part of their everyday life. YE1 commented on practice specific to her youth work stating "That's tikanga-based connection between tikanga and practice … there's definitely a use of karakia and there's definitely a use of language that's delivered within the programme." AET2 also commented on karakia, stating:

> Yes. We've got our new ones [karakia], we've got it up on the wall, just the morning one, but they seem to click on just by listening to it every day, it's repetitive and definitely before we have kai … and they know it straight away now, it all ties off with the boys [karakia recital]. I suppose just for AET3 and I because we have been brought up Māori style, so we talk about I suppose when our conversations go quite big as [AET4] was saying, you might bring up something and then it expands the conversation. Ours or in our past upbringing, what we have seen. Only a couple of them will know what it's like being on a marae or going back to their own island. Actually, I don't think any of ours have been back to the island, eh, which is sad because you can see the expression in their eyes that they wish they knew more about their culture.

AET2 suggests karakia is a component of culture that may act as a conduit or segue to discussion around youths' backgrounds that may evoke conversations about their cultural identity. Such a finding offers new understanding for programmers to realise the assets of youth, and in this case to tap into their culture and spirituality as part of culturally responsive and sustaining practice (Paris, 2012). Similarly, in both the youth talanoa/kōrero focus groups and one-to-one talanoa/kōrero with whānau/parents/caregivers, comments were also made about the importance of karakia:

> AEY1: Yeah, because it [prayer] helps us during the day.
> AEY3: Yeah, it's important we pray every morning
> AEW3: Karakia is important … yeah, because we do a lot of that at home.

Consistent with Māori and Pacific wellbeing models, spirituality is one of the, if not the most, important pou (pillars) of health and wellbeing (see Chapter 2, for a discussion of holistic health and wellbeing models). YE2 also considered, in his practice, the importance of providing Pacific youth with a platform to understand their identity from a Pacific context within the church worldview. He shared a story about how as a mentor he facilitates identity development and notions of belonging by ensuring youth consider their identity in the spiritual context, in this case, their Christian faith values:

> So that's perhaps what we were trying to give them – a visual of what it meant to both follow the Lord first and foremost. Be strong in their faith because I think it's when you're strong in your faith, aye it's that old saying "you never know who you are until you know whose you are" and I think as long as they've got a deep sense of identity in God then I think we're okay. Well, we're not okay, but we've got the ability to springboard off something because we can't just draw from the possibility that I came off a rock or something. Ok, this is actually something deep. Especially for our young people they wanna know that they belong and it's "who do I belong to?" and we can espouse the idea that you belong to a creator that first and foremost you belong to a creator that loves you, who took time out to design you then you're special and you don't need to continue down the scrap heap path which is "oh yeah I'll just find a boyfriend or girlfriend and do whatever." This is about saying God's got big plans for me and I want to fulfil those dreams that He had for me and now I have for me too.

YE2's comment is consistent with Schoone's (2017) statement referring to achievement as both students developing a sense of identity and vision for their lives and achieving academic credits. His response also aligns with existing Indigenous and Pacific wellbeing models that assert spirituality as a vital component of holistic health and wellbeing (Kupa, 2009; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001). YE2's comment is also consistent with positive youth development in terms of harnessing the potential of young people (Damon, 2004). Furthermore, the data suggest that youth programmes should take into consideration the importance of spirituality as a component of programmes towards positive psychosocial outcomes. A noteworthy question this study poses is: Is encouraging the potential of young people enough?

The current study suggests mentoring Indigenous and minority youth includes providing support to explore and strengthen their spirituality as part of their social identity. Consistent with Schwartz and Rhodes (2016), the data suggest tapping into the existing external assets of 'aiga/whānau. This is one way to support the exploration and development of spirituality as a

component of holistic wellbeing to build a positive social identity. An inclusive model of mentoring should focus on tapping into existing assets of family and community, in this case, into intergenerational connections of Elders. As part of a wider community, they can support youth in this exploration when thinking of activities and programme environment alongside programmers collaboratively.

Covenant Relationships

Quality, close, enduring relationships are critical components of the success of youth mentoring (Rhodes & DuBois, 2008). Close and enduring relationships between dyads in formal youth mentoring programmes are often guided by some type of contractual understanding between mentor and youth whereby rules, boundaries and expectations are established. Relationships in youth mentoring are also characterised by open-ended, active participation where quality relationships are mutually beneficial and partnership focussed (Sercombe, 2010).

The concept of a *covenant relationship* refers to a promise made by two or more parties bonded by loyalty and trust. In youth work, quality relationships are a type of partnership as opposed to a contract (Sercombe, 2010). Quality relationships in youth mentoring have the potential, as covenants, to manifest in partnerships that are about supporting a young person's sense of collective belonging, exploring common interests between mentor and youth and enhancing identity.

In this study, covenant relationships from a va relational approach draw on the concept of feagaiga (covenant relationship), signalling a deep sense of fa'aaloalo or respect (Amituanai-Toloa, 2006). Covenant relationships from an Indigenous lens have a nuanced meaning of reciprocity, mutuality and partnership between mentor and mentee that considers the role of culture. A feagaiga, that is, covenant relationship, within the context of youth mentoring offers another layer of understanding the transformative power in youth mentoring underpinned by va tapuia – that is the sacred relational space (Mo'a, 2015).

The findings of the current study showed the importance of covenant relationships, from a Samoan lens. The feagaiga covenant relationship goes beyond close, enduring relationships for transformative change, as an important ingredient of culturally responsive, sustaining, and safe practice in Aotearoa New Zealand. Indeed, existing research shows close, enduring relationships where trust is built and mutuality and empathy are present are important components of effective youth mentoring between mentor and mentee (Rhodes, 2002, 2005). However, a limitation of the model posed by Rhodes (2005) is the lack of culturally nuanced

understanding between mentor and mentee that might promote positive outcomes. The existing research indicated that covenant relationships drawing on the concept of feagaiga are embedded in an Indigenous ontological lens useful for understanding the mentor–mentee dynamic.

This study centres the concept of partnership, an important Indigenous-specific notion of relationality, and other related key ancestral concepts including feagaiga (covenant relationship). Feagaiga, a construct relevant to this study, refers to the brother as the protector and guardian of his sister, whose role is to ensure her dignity and honour is kept. Feagaiga has clear roles and obligations and offers youth mentoring practice insight into ways in which tautua (service), fa'aaloalo (mutual respect) and alofa (love/compassion) are enacted. Such values are vital for youth development, particularly for Samoan young people who might not have access to ancestral knowledge systems.

The alagaupu, Samoan proverb, "O le tuafafine o le mea uliuli I le mata o le tuagane" translates to "the sister is the pupil of her brother's eye." Importantly, this proverb suggests that relationships are sacred and deemed a central organising feature of fa'aSamoa (the Samoan way of life). As described by Muaiava (2015; 2017) and others (see Efi, 2008;Schoeffel, 1995), feagaiga is founded on "mutual and reciprocated values of tapu (taboo), fa'aaloalo (mutual respect), and va tapuia (sacred and relational space) that promotes peace and harmony between the feagaiga and her tuagane" (Muaiava, 2017, p. 31). The feagaiga or covenant relationship therefore is one of reciprocity and mutuality, with foundations in sanctity and honour. The findings in this study show the potential of exploring Pacific youth mentoring practice drawing on values, concepts and constructs that contribute new understandings of how to better serve youth.

Pacific collectivist ways of being and knowing manifest in culturally specific ways of "doing" youth work or mentoring. In the case of the present study, a culturally responsive, sustaining, and safe approach encourages mentors and programmers to go beyond the job and make a commitment that extends past the programme time frame. In the youth mentoring context, the sensitive and/or vulnerable nature of mentees must also be protected and honoured by mentors who understand their role as covenantal, carrying specific duties to serve and protect with honour and dignity. Similarly, mentees should understand their role as key to the reciprocal relationship of mutual understanding and humility, learning and gleaning from their mentors, and sharing, in due course, their experiences in partnership.

In Study 1, cultural experts gave many examples about the importance of building trusting relationships and going the extra mile with rangatahi as part of their work with underserved youth. This study showed how cultural experts have their own unique way of forging trust and building relationships; they go the extra mile when mentoring youth.

> CE2: Yeah so the other example I'll go down to the school and talk to the school … [they say] you can't ... yeah, but the mother that hasn't done it so I'm going to do it because you know I'll do it – I know the kura … I know the schools … like Whaea I went to pick up [male youth] and bring him here. Then pick him up tomorrow and then take him home because he needs to get this reparation done. I jacked it up between ourselves, between [CE1] and myself, and we're not even the lay advocates [laughter]. Yeah we're not even the lay advocates!
>
> Interviewer: So, you're not even in the position (of lay advocate assigned to youth)
>
> CE1: No that's right and not we are not even the lay advocate. We're jacking that up between ourselves ... you know I'll take him home because if that's what the transport is ... getting him to and from there then that's what we do!
>
> Interviewer: So that's a very different way from the norm? You talked about the Māori way.
>
> CE2: It's the AROHA way.
>
> CE1: Yes, that's what it is.
>
> CE3: Yeah, Yeah.
>
> CE1: And that's what it's about
>
> CE2: For our iwi, we are helping the whole tribe not just the individual family.

The kōrero between the Kaumātua and myself went on for well over 2 hours. Their responses above reflect a unique approach to mentoring underserved youth, much like a whānau approach where aroha (love, nurture, care, and compassion) is at the heart of their mahi (work). Although they didn't mention tuakana–teina specifically in this context, it was obvious to me as a researcher that clearly the care and aroha Kaumātua had for rangatahi was an age-old ancestral practice relevant today based on older whānau members guiding and supporting younger whānau members.

YE2 offered a deep talanoa on the importance of feagaiga. Consistent with the literature, he discussed the importance of youth developing an understanding through role-modelling the ancestral wisdom of the feagaiga in fa'aSamoa. He explained this unique and important way of relating to one another, to protect, safeguard and serve. He stated:

Now that I understand it better … I think there's real notions. The va is a real so … o le … yeah when you stretch the sentence o le va ole feagaiga aye and the feagaiga is a covenant that we hold between ourselves as brothers and yourselves as our sisters a? e? and as I grew up in New Zealand I didn't see a lot of this? My schooling in Samoa gave me a real insight into this and it's how we protect our sisters it's how we look after them it's how back in Samoa I wouldn't go into my sister's room and you sit outside and whatever the sister wants aye really … even if it's the craziest request that's your role as the brother. Because you're protecting them … the same way when the brothers are angry and upset the only one that can really change, that is the sister. The sister's job is to facilitate the peace that's one aspect of it but it's only now that I look, and I think man that's really important aye? And I think if that's how I should be treating my wife that's how I want my daughter to be treated then as men we need to understand. So that's what I mean we have got these romantic ideas about Samoa but when we bring forward what that means what that feagaiga means I think we will stop treating women the way we do aye? I think it will become really real to us that actually we should be not glorifying them … you know what I'm trying to say? It's like we hold them in such high esteem. We're not glorifying [them] ... but we hold them in a place of such deep respect in care, and protection and love that we would never want to do it. Aye you don't want to break that va because they're too special. That's what I want to work on with the boys ... but if we can start to understand what that feagaiga means what that va means ... and that va isn't just space it's a holy sacred space and when we start to understand … the holiness of that space the sacredness of that space I actually think its gonna set us apart.

YE2's comments provide insight into how mentoring or nurturing close relationships, taking care of and nurturing between siblings was a central way of how fa'aSamoa organised social life. From this standpoint, the feagaiga, can be considered as a conceptual model of youth mentoring from a Samoan lens. Similarly, ancestral knowledge and/or Indigenous references such as tuakana–teina provide clues about how covenant relationships are manifested.

In the Māori context, nurturing and caring for each other as whānau, or youth mentoring, is not new. The Māori tradition of tuakana–teina has been embedded in the social fabric of life in Aotearoa since Māori first settled here (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al., 2011). The principle of reciprocity between senior and junior, within the relationship, where the tuakana (older siblings, cousins or senior) is responsible for leading the relationship and eventually the teina

(younger sibling or cousins) emerges as leader (Metge, 1995), offers insight of close sibling relationships in youth mentoring. Although the term tuakana–teina has its origin in traditional settings in te ao Māori and the term feagaiga has its origin in fa'aSamoa, they are key understandings of the nature of teaching and relationships across education va or space. Both feagaiga and tuakana–teina from a Samoan and Māori lens respectively provide youth mentoring programmers a nuanced understanding of how covenant relationships are sacred and aligned with inherently Samoan and Māori ways of being.

When YE2 explained the depth of relationship building, of reaching out and closely walking alongside young people to gain their trust in other ways, he highlighted how feagaiga is manifested:

> So, if they've got someone they can trust in their lives they can say well how did you do it? Or even not how did you do it [navigate culture at university] but how can we navigate this together? So, when I was at university we came up with a concept called [name of youth mentoring programme] … taking the concept of the pan-Pacific warrior strength courage alongside the denotative word of mentor which is just an example or a guide and example. For us what we believed mentoring was, was I will stand beside you, hold your hand and I will walk with you. I'll come with you and drop off the thesis, I'll walk with you in the meeting into the dean who's not happy with your marks and that's where I think there's a difference to mentoring.

YE2 describes the reciprocal nature and partnership of mentors attuned to the care and honouring of mentees. Similar to that of the feagaiga, the relationship is harmonious or balanced, and the role of mentor functions as a protective and nurturing role. Consistent with Muaiava (2017), the conduct or ways of behaviour between people face to face should not be limited to good moral behaviour between the two parties, but also the concept of social order where balance and harmony is a priority. The act of walking literally and metaphorically in partnership as mentor and mentee are important facets of covenant relationships.

In a similar vein, when asked about what might work well for Māori and Pacific youth, YE1 explained the importance of relationships in a more practical sense, yet still in a way that is affirmative and strengths based. Her understanding of being able to discern the needs of youth initially seems quite generic but further on she elaborated on how she connected with her audience through presenting herself as relatable.

> Yeah, it's, you know, the practical, it's the building relationships, it's the engagement you know with young people ... it's about how you engage with the young person

whether it's individually or whether it be in a group [situation]. It's just about looking for ways in connecting with your audience ... through using positive affirmation, recognising the positives and strengths that a young person has, and just the practice of always encouraging positivity where the young people can relate and respond to well. (YE1)

YE1's comment is consistent with the importance of building the va or relational space with a mentee. The va or space between mentor and mentee is an active space and never empty (Wendt, 1996). Rather, the va between mentor and mentee involves having a depth of knowledge about young people that is tacit through lived experience. Similarly, Pryce & Aschenbrener (2019) posited that mentors should have a sense of attunement which refers to a "broad strategy to elicit, read, interpret and reflect on youth cues" (p. 356). The Samoan ancestral reference to the va (the relational space between mentor and mentee) encourages the mentor to understand and build on the strengths of a young person.

When asked what YE1 meant by relating to and responding to young people, her kōrero showed a consciousness of how young people are likely to respond positively to building close relationships if they feel they can relate to a mentor in a way that they feel familiar with. With a cautious tone she shared:

I can be both in terms of relating to, if I'm real first and foremost, the way you look ... just from the feedback from young ones, you know from seeing mentors who kind of look like them, who kind of sound like them, understand them, those are the ones you know who feel encouraged to trust and open up more.

This indicates YE1's acute awareness of youth having trust issues with non-Pacific or non-Māori youth workers/mentors. Her concern was similar to the tutors' expressions of youth requiring deep relationships with students' mentors – relationships that are characterised by trust and "coming through" on keeping promises, and not letting young people down. This was consistent with Dutton (2015) who found a sense of dependency, security, positive feelings, emotional engagement, trust and support are important relationship-quality descriptors for youth mentoring contexts. From a Samoan lens, this is consistent with nurturing and protecting the va between important adults who do not let them down. Similarly, this is also consistent with the Māori value of manaakitanga where mentors nurture through aroha, protect and cherish the mana of rangatahi and vice versa. AET2 stated:

Some of our students, they've got social workers and stuff, some of them don't show up and then they promise them they will be here next week and then they don't. So not

only one on one but making sure that one person will show support and is generally interested in their life. Not just going there for work eh, that's my job, that's what I've got to do, tick your box and see you later next week. The big thing I learned working with youth is that sometimes it goes beyond the 9 to 5 role and not saying that I meet up with them after 5 o'clock but like working with youth, you need somebody that goes beyond sometimes, goes even beyond like what the job requires them to do. If you really want to see like the transformation change it requires transformational work and stuff like that. It's not 9 to 5 is it? (AET2)

These data suggest the potentially transformational work of covenant relationships within youth mentoring. These data show that both Kaumātua and tutors see youth mentoring in a Māori and Pacific context as commitment to go beyond the official parameters of a structured youth mentoring contract, with a view to providing support in ways that are culturally responsive, sustaining and safe. During the talanoa/kōrero AET3 chimed in when I asked AET2 whether this meant more support than usual and stated:

Interviewer: So, do you mean more one-to-one support?

AET3: Yeah, one to one, but one person, whoever is with them is actually keen. To make the connection, make that bond with them, build the relationship and then show them hey I've got your back bro, I'm here for you guys. Genuine, they are genuinely there to support them in any way you can. Instead of this is what I have to do.

Interviewer: You mean go beyond that?

AET3: Yeah. One to one.

The tutor's comments indicate a commitment to unconditional positive regard (Spencer, 2012) that fosters trusting relationships beyond one's job parameters. It also suggests a duty of care that is sacred, respectful and compassionate. This is consistent with Bozarth (2007) work regarding unconditional positive regard where an attitude of grace and acceptance and feeling valued without judgement is central to the relationship.

The youth's comments about trusting such conversations in the mentoring relationship suggested cultural mistrust. Member, AEY6, shared his discomfort in checking in with a counsellor at the programme, stating "The only person I trust is my social worker. To speak about family stuff." AEY4 also shared his discomfort about the possibility of engaging in discussions with another person about his "personal stuff" at check-in, stating, "I speak to the mirror." AEY4 also spoke about how it was important to have built a deep sense of trust with members of his in-group. When asked how might it be different speaking to someone at check-

95

in, given he was now speaking to the researcher (an outsider) who had had little contact with him and others in the focus group, he stated, "Because people like you can talk until [inaudible sarcasm]." The talanoa/kōrero focus group members at this point collectively joined in joking about my background as a researcher. On audio it is inaudible; however, the participants, in this case young males, each chimed in over one other about understanding them. The data suggest a sense of trust or familiarity with myself as an in-group member, in this case, a female Pasifika researcher. Although there is an age group difference, my background as a Pasifika community member and the whanaungatanga created a space of respect and safety.

Whakawhanaungatanga included sharing of who we were as Pasifika and/or Māori people and our family background. The talanoa/kōrero with the young men included topics of rugby league after we opened with karakia and shared kai. These data suggest there were some reservations about sharing of personal matters with potential out-group members in the university context in the form of counsellors in the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. These data also suggest the importance of whakawhaungatanga when conducting talanoa/kōrero between both Māori and Pasifika in Aotearoa. Gillon (2020) asserted that central to whaungatanga is relationality within whānau and extended familial relationships both literally and metaphorically. Her work provoked researchers to think about relationships as central to ways of being as Tāngata o Te Moana of the Nui a Kiwa that includes both Māori and Pasifika and, further, to critically think about how both researchers engage with one another as whanaunga and kaihana. Given the pervasive negative stereotypes of Pacific and Māori youth that exist, programmers need to mitigate cultural mistrust by providing appropriate training to support the development of covenant relationships.

The dialogue from all but one youth voice suggested unease with sharing or engaging in counselling check-ins in the proposed youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. Their talanoa/kōrero shows that a trusting relationship is possible if a mentor works alongside them and respectfully waits till a deep relationship is forged, or until youth are ready. A culturally responsive approach to building relationships is needed, that incorporates Indigenous knowledge and values to further understand key concepts within whānau/'aiga/family systems applicable to youth mentoring Māori and Pasifika youth or Indigenous young people. The data highlight the need for mentors to be culturally attuned, trained and understand the importance of Māori and Pacific worldviews.

A parent of a female youth mentee indicated that youth, particularly those who are in alternative education, marginalised from their peers in mainstream education, require care and sensitivity. The parent shared how her daughter had a negative experience previously with other adults in the school context. The parent was anxious about the potential trauma her daughter might experience in the new programme. The quote below suggests that youth programmers should be conscious of previous experiences of trauma and/or mistrust and find ways to explicitly show empathy and respect, to treat the youth mentoring covenant as sacred for each young person.

> For me it would be the trust of her tutors. That would be mine because when she was going to school, school is meant to be a safe place and you are meant to be able to go to a teacher if you are in trouble and stuff. Well, she didn't find that in the school. And then when she went to [AESP1] I noticed she slowly started opening up to me, made me feel that she actually felt safe there and she was being listened to. So that would be, my one would be trust in the tutors or whoever. She has a big trust thing. Like she will speak out openly if she is hurt or something is on her mind or whatever, like she will speak openly about it, but they might mock her kind of a thing. She won't speak to that person again. So, trust in the tutors, yeah. (AEW3)

Consistent with Rhodes's (2005) model, enduring relationships built on trust, empathy and respect as well as mutuality have the potential to be established however may take some time. Given that the mentor–mentee relationship is integral to ensure programme outcomes are achieved, having a deepened understanding of the dyad mentor–mentee from a culturally nuanced approach offers important insights that programmes need to be tailored that include Indigenous knowledge systems to better understand adolescent development. The results of this study showed that for Māori and Pacific youth, their whānau/'aiga and communities, programmers and mentors must understand the already existing ways of mentoring and draw from constructs of reciprocity and sacred space such as feagaiga (Fepuleai, 2016) and tuakana–teina (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, et al., 2011). This is consistent with Schwartz and Rhodes (2016) suggesting the importance of recognition and cultivation of positive resources that may already exist within children's broader relational and societal contexts are important.

Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed study one's findings to explore the key ingredients to culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice. Themes developed offer insight as to what currently works for Māori and Pasifika youth from the perspectives of youth themselves, their whānau,

tutors as well as youth experts in the field and Kaumātua. The next chapter describes the findings of Study 2, a participant observational study.

Chapter 5 – Study 2 Programme

Tausi – To care for, observe or keep command

O le ala i le pule o le tautua – The pathway to leadership is through service

–Samoan proverb

Chapter Overview

This chapter presents Study 2 results, a participant observational study that drew on tenets of ethnography (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Guided by the literature review and Study 1 findings, the current study focussed on exploring how a youth mentoring programme responded to and sustained youths' cultural and linguistic backgrounds and enacted safe practice from a culturally nuanced lens. This study draws on learnings from key Indigenous constructs and values including tausi, tautua, manaakitanga and kaitiakitanga.

The current chapter addresses the subquestions:

   i.   What are the environmental conditions present that determine culturally safe practice in youth mentoring?

   ii.   What are the key actions taken by mentors and/or youth programmers that support culturally safe practice in youth mentoring?

Study 2 opens with a Samoan concept "tausi" – a concept central to the va relational approach this dissertation takes. Tausi refers to "care" and is similar to teu le va in the context of research (Anae, 2010). The term *tausi* means to observe or keep command in the context of maintaining and keeping good relations within the village (Tuagalu, 2008). Similar to alofa, tausi is found in concepts like *tausi-soifua* (custodian of life and wellbeing), *tausi mavaega* (custodian of inheritance) and *tausi eleele* (custodian of land) (Mo'a, 2015). Similar to manaakitanga and kaitiakitanga – Māori terms that refer to caring for others, showing hospitality and kindness towards others, and custodianship or guardianship – tausi refers to the care and guardianship for the whole person in relation to their physical, spiritual, emotional and relational wellbeing.

A Samoan worldview stipulates that a trusting, caring relationship is seen as a role of responsibility to, and for, another, through tautua (service). Tautua is a critical component of deep quality relationships in the context of mentoring. The well-known associated alagaupu, Samoan proverb, "O le ala i le pule o le tautua" – the pathway to leadership is through service – is a key relevant reference for this chapter. In fa'aSamoa, the concept of tautua is a central

value practised in everyday life at all levels of the collective 'aiga. Youth mentoring from a Samoan-specific lens is often seen as tautua or service to care for others through alofa and tausi or care for as custodians of one another. Tausi and tautua alongside manaakitanga and kaitiakitanga are key concepts in the context of this study of youth mentoring.

To answer the subquestions underpinning Study 2, this study observed how the programme took into consideration the role of race, ethnicity, culture and cultural processes that played a role in the positive development of the youth involved in the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. The importance of culturally safe space, positive social identities and covenant relationships, as discussed in Study 1, alongside Indigenous values that are important to 'aiga/whānau, guide this study to have a wider focus and consideration of positive developmental outcomes (Anae et al., 2002; Farruggia & Bullen, 2010; Simmonds et al., 2014; Ware & Walsh-Tapiata, 2010).

Literature Review

Although youth mentoring has been found to be a promising intervention in promoting a wide range of positive youth outcomes, effects have been modest (DuBois et al., 2011). Such findings point to the need to understand the processes that contribute to programmes' effectiveness and importantly, the role of racial, ethnic, and cultural processes related to mentoring relationship and quality outcomes (Sánchez et al., 2019). Given the critical role culture plays in enhancing youth development (Sánchez & Colón, 2005; Sánchez et al., 2014), it is surprising that there has been very little research exploring the ways in which culture, race and ethnicity influence programme effectiveness (Sánchez & Colón, 2005; Sánchez et al., 2014; Weiston-Serdan, 2017). The current study focuses on how culture, race and ethnicity, and related key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice, might be enacted by drawing on the understanding that mentoring-relationship quality is a salient mechanism of effective mentoring (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009).

As described earlier in Chapter 2, a va relational approach refers to the all-encompassing act of serving as custodians, drawing on concepts of love and care, nurturing quality relationships. Love and care through service or tautua is significant in nurturing relationships because it includes an act of alofa or love (Mo'a, 2015). Indeed, Mo'a (2015) pointed out that culture as a foundation of care is multidescriptive and often expressed as alofa whereas a noncaring approach is described as le alofa (without love), agaleaga (without kindness), tuulafoa'i (abandoned and neglected) and agavale (heartless and inhumane). It is interesting to note that

Mo'a asserted the word *care* as connected to the nuanced word tausi, which translates to tausi-ma'i or tausi-soifua. The two words tausi and alofa go hand in hand. Tausi is similar to kaitiakitanga and both can be translated to custodian.

Purpose of the Present Study

The rationale of the participant observational study was to focus on what youth actually experience in their encounters and exchanges with their mentors. By focussing on the nature of the mentor–mentee relationship, also referred to as the "point of service of mentoring" (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009, p. 50), the researcher aimed to gain a deeper understanding of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice focussed on the interactions at dyad, whānau and programme level. This allowed for a more nuanced understanding of the complex role culture, race and ethnicity plays in youth mentoring relationships, (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009). Given observation in youth mentoring is rare (Pryce et al., 2020), having a multifaceted approach such as direct participant observation provides considerable value in exploring the identification and elaboration of the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice.

Method

As a researcher, a strength of participant observation allowed me to gain a more holistic understanding of the phenomenon of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice as both "insider" and "outsider" (Pryce et al., 2020). As a qualitative method, naturalistic participant observation allowed me to draw on tenets of ethnography and observe relationship behaviours as they unfolded naturally in the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand context. Similarly, Deutsch and Spencer (2009) asserted a key strength of participant observational study is the ability to allow real-time data collection of both dyad and group relational processes. This overt approach allowed me to become part of the study group as an insider and gain an in-depth view of human realities of those participating in the programme.

Direct observational methods such as participant observation are appropriate for site and group-based mentoring programmes where researcher visits can focus on observation dyads engaged in activities in a location (Pryce et al., 2020). In terms of analysis in their framework comparing direct observation for mentoring research, Pryce et al. (2020) also noted that naturalistic observation is typically inductive where the generation of thematic codes emerges from data. However, naturalistic observation also allows for deductive analysis if using theory-based coding with predetermined attention to capture relevant behaviours. In line with Braun and

Clarke (2013), analysis in the current study took into consideration a situated and interactive process, that is, both data and the positionality of myself as a researcher and context of the research were important factors. The nature of the iterative process of the research design of the entire study, which is in essence a qualitative project is a subjective process. Therefore, themes from Study 1 also informed the codes generated in the current study, and subsequent themes for Study 2.

Notably, Pryce et al.'s (2020) framework also acknowledged that whilst there are rich insights provided when collecting data on behaviours of mentors and mentees in context, the analysis is limited due to data being captured during a time-limited period. Whilst naturalistic observation mitigates the potential weakness of observation and can be intrusive and time intensive (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009), particularly in laboratory-based observations; as a participant observer I was unobtrusive, enacting key Pacific principles of fa'aaloalo (respect and humility) and ensuring the va research relational space was maintained (Amituanai-Toloa, 2006). Furthermore, a culturally responsive approach to participant observation meant that building the va or relational space between myself as a researcher and participants, characteristic of va tapuia, was a culturally nuanced approach taken.

As discussed previously in Chapter 3 – Methodology, taking care of research relationships is a vital component of culturally responsive approaches. A va relational approach must ensure the va or relational space (Suaalii-Sauni, 2017) is treated with utmost respect (va fealoloai) and research relationships must be viewed as sacred space (va tapuia). Relationships in observational research, particularly when researching alongside participants of Māori and Pacific descent, are vitally important.

Participants

A total of 22 youth participated in the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand; however, only 11 returned consent and assent forms at the time the study was conducted to participate in the research. Of the 25 mentors who participated in the programme, 14 returned consent forms and 11 were not included in the study as they either declined to participate in the research or their mentee did not consent to participate in the research study. It's important to note that of the 14 mentors; 10 were mentors and 4 were mentor coaches and as mentor coaches supported multiple groups. A description of participants in the research is presented in Table 4 which outlines demographic details of the participants in the study.

Table 4

Participants, Programme Observational Study 2

Whānau group	n.	Dyad/team MT–AEY	Gender MT–AEY	Ethnicity MT–AEY
Whānau Tahi A				
Mentors	2	MT1–AEY13	F, F	NZ-European, Māori/French
Mentees	2	MT2–AEY6	F, M	Tongan, Māori
Whānau Tahi B				
No consent/assent				
Whānau Rua				
Mentors	3	MT3–AEY8,	F, M (2)	Tongan, Māori, NZ-European/Māori
Mentees	4	AEY12	F, M	Samoan, NZ-European/Māori
		MT4–AEY16	F, M	Samoan, NZ-European
		MT5–AEY1		
Whānau Toru A				
Mentors	2	MT6–AEY14	F, M	Samoan/Tongan, Māori/Samoan
Mentees	2	MT7–AEY9	F, F	
Whānau Toru B				
Mentors	2	MT8–AEY7	M, F	Tongan, Māori
Mentees	3	MT9–AEY11,	F, M (2)	European, Cook Is, Māori
		AEY4		
Whānau Wha				
Mentor	1	MT10–AEY15	F, M	NZ-European, NZ-European/Māori
Mentee	1			
Mentor coach	4	MC1Toru/Wha	M	NZ-European
		MC2 Toru/Wha	F	NZ-Māori/NZ-European
		MC3 Tahi/Rua	F	NZ-European
		MC4 Tahi/Rua	F	NZ-European

Note: MT = mentor; AEY = youth in alternative education; MC = mentor coach

Procedure

The aims of the research were presented to the first service provider, AESP1, 2 months before the commencement of the 12-week programme that took place in July to November 2017. Youth were purposively selected based on their enrolment at the alternative education service provider. To remind the reader (see Chapter 1), prior to engaging in contact with AESP1 to propose the research study, rangatahi enrolled at AESP2 had an existing arrangement with AESP1 to spend every Wednesday at the site of AESP1. The purpose of this arrangement was for tutors at both service providers to undertake professional development as part of their ongoing professional practice in the alternative educational context. This existing arrangement meant all youth enrolled at both service providers participated in the 12-week youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand every Wednesday, despite the original plan of to involve rangatahi from AESP1 to participate due to being unable to service numbers of youth from both service providers. However, from W1 through to W12 through July to November 2017

youth from both service providers participated as the decision was made by programmers to include all youth enrolled who arrived to the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand from Day 1 regardless of the unplanned nature of the arrival of AESP2 rangatahi.

As a result, this meant the aims of the research were presented to AESP1 and AESP2 by the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand at two separate time points prior to commencing the programme in July 2017. The aims included an explanation of wanting to assess the cultural responsiveness of the programme from the perspectives of mentees, their whānau, and alternative education tutors. Participant information, consent and assent forms to participate in the research were distributed by the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand to both the AESP providers as well as whānau and caregivers and youth themselves. Potential participants were reminded that participation was voluntary and would not have any impact on their relationship with programme staff or their organisation should they choose not to participate. Potential rangatahi and their whānau/caregivers, were also given the same assurance, as participants to the research, that their participation or decision not to would not affect their enrolment in their alternative education programmes in any way. All participants were offered Warehouse gift vouchers of $20 for their participation as koha/remimbursement for their time.

Eleven rangatahi, from alternative education service providers AESP1 and AESP2, returned ethics consent and assent forms to participate. On the first day of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand, tutors and rangatahi were briefed of my presence and the research aims. Given the participation of rangatahi from AESP2 in the youth mentoring programme was unplanned, programmers on the first day of the 12-week programme restructured dyads to accommodate rangatahi and allocate mentors for new mentees, some of whom were placed in a triad (one mentor and two mentees).

Participation of AESP2 youth was based on voluntary participation in the programme, as well assent and parental consent for those under 16 years of age to participate in the research. The initial intention was to conduct data collection at specific time points, specifically the beginning, middle and end of the first iteration of the 12-week programme (Week 1, Week 6 and Week 12). However, due to a delay in the distribution and return of consent and assent forms, participant observational field notes were taken at Week 1, and then between Week 6 through to Week 12 for those consented and assented youth at each observation point. Notes were taken in a notebook during the observation and written up more fully in a reflection

journal immediately after the observation or within a few days. Anecdotal notes of relevant literature were also noted for initial analysis. The details outlining the recruitment of participants for the current observational study are identical to Study 1 and can be found in the previous chapter. The next section provides the rationale of the observational study design.

Measures/Materials

The current study initially included a timed interval observational protocol (Appendix G). The protocol was developed in March and April 2017 and designed using key cultural constructs drawn from an extensive literature review on Pacific and Māori wellbeing health models in relation to positive youth development at a local level and with an aim to explore key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice. Prior to the observational study commencing, advice was sought from the ethics office to test the protocol in a like environment, in this case, the protocol was tested in two environments. The first series of tests was conducted in May and June 2017, observing tertiary undergraduate students in a mentoring programme on a separate campus of the university, and the second series of tests was conducted in an after-school care programme observing students of primary school age. Given the researcher had conducted numerous observational studies in a teaching context at primary school level with a curriculum focus, it was important to gain understanding of observations within a study in a mentoring context.

Key learnings were taken from the first testing of the observational protocol where the fono between myself and the other observer, who was of Pacific descent and a critical PhD colleague, included critically analysing and engaging in robust discussion about what each cultural construct from a Pacific lens looked like in action. For example, it was agreed that more space was required to record a narrative of what was happening within dyads and groups so that real-time data about relational processes could be recorded and perhaps comparisons across dyads made (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009). The observational protocol was then modified based on the critical conversations that took place.

Another example was that there were differing views of how va tapuia (sacred space) might manifest in relation to whether a mentor considered a mentee's spirituality respectfully. The unpacking of each construct was invaluable when considering the observational approach in the current study. Given the depth of meaning attached to each cultural construct it was agreed that tallying incidents was less effective than writing notes in narrative form. Critical discussion on interrater reliability and the utility of developing the observational protocol as either being

mis/aligned with a Pacific lens was also significant to the fono. Specifically, talanoa around the process of interrater reliability scoring associated with a coding reliability approach, which measures a level of "agreement" between coders, usually >.80 (using Cohen's kappa) was a central point of discussion. Although over 80% agreement was achieved between myself and the observer, there was considerable disagreement about the complementary nature of nonparticipant observation and the ontological and epistemological appropriateness of culturally responsive approaches. An example of enacting research that may not align with what was intended reflected that research can be indeed messy.

Despite the tensions discussed I forged on to test the tool a second time. The second observational protocol test in a like environment was less interactive in terms of discussion between myself and the other observers. This could be attributed to the fact that in the context of the after-school mentoring programme, the observation timing was less effective as students were engaged in supporting school success and quietly reading. There were fewer "interactions" and therefore material or data to observe and test the protocol compared to the first like environment. Notably, the second observer was less inclined to engage in a robust discussion of the cultural constructs utilised in the protocol as she was busy overseeing a whole group across varying age groups to mentor in the reading activity.

As a consequence of the above tensions experienced testing the protocol, I decided to reengage with the scholarship around data collection tools and analysis. I also engaged in critical conversations with supervisors about my decision regarding interrater reliability and my ontological and epistemological research approach. Interrater reliability is underpinned by realist or positivist assumptions which assert that reality exists within the data and can be captured using appropriate techniques such as agreement between coders using a frame (Braun & Clarke, 2019). However, the aims of the research and related methodological approach, that is, to explore what the key ingredients are in culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice utilising culturally responsive approaches, meant the protocol and approach were incongruent (Koro-Ljungberg et al., 2009).

As mentioned in Chapter 3 Methodology, according to Koro-Ljungberg et al. (2009), researchers must have a sense of epistemological awareness and instantiation of methods in qualitative projects assists understanding the access and justification of appropriate tools to answer one's research question or explore phenomena. Going through the process of trialling the protocol and making meaning between observers, critical colleagues and a member of my

supervision team was an important step within decision junctures. The ultimate goal was to ensure methodological congruence (Morse & Richards, 2002) where the Indigenous theories and my epistemological position as a Pasifika researcher were aligned with the purpose statements and research questions. Additionally, it was important to ensure the process of data collection and analysis are interrelated and serve the epistemological goals of Indigenous knowledge theories (Greckhamer & Koro-Ljungberg, 2005), in this case, a va relational approach.

In line with Koro-Ljungberg et al. (2009), and Greckhamer and Koro-Ljungberg (2005), and drawing on the work of Morse (2018), regarding validation and verification strategies in qualitative soft data, I decided to abandon the development of the observation protocol for the research study. According to the framework developed by Morse (2018) when evaluating rigour, using interrater reliability as a strategy would invalidate the soft data of my interpretative approach to the research. As a Pacific researcher, it was also essential to consider the critical feedback and advice of critical peers who questioned the validity of adopting a timed tally observation protocol in the context of culturally responsive research methods where researcher relationships and building of the research va is important ethical practice (Anae, 2010). A protocol tally approach was unlikely to result in rich nuanced data that captured the essence of the relationship.

In addition, the needs of mentees were important considerations in determining how the observation was conducted. Their comfort and interest in my fuller participation was more important from a va relational lens where fa'aaloalo (respect) and manaaki (care and hospitality) was crucial in maintaining research relationships. Had I had forged ahead and used the protocol I would have faced the barrier of not having the benefit or resource of a second observer to conduct interrater reliability. Importantly, as mentioned above, the philosophical assumptions of interrater reliability were methodologically incongruent (Koro-Ljungberg et al., 2009) to culturally responsive approaches. A note-taking narrative approach using a journal, noting incidences of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice, and drawing on cultural constructs, was therefore more appropriate and practical. The original study design was to conduct observations at the beginning, middle and end of the programme. However, to allow time for the youth and mentors to settle and to connect in this new programme, combined with challenges associated with obtaining youth consent and assent, changes were made to the observation schedule. In Week 1, only programme-level activities and mentors were observed reviewing the more general processes of the programme environment and really to allow for

the youth to settle in. Observations at programme level and within whānau and dyad level of youth who consented with their mentors began in Week 6 and concluded in W12 The rationale behind this was because the youth mentoring programme advised that consent forms were sporadically coming in for youth, particularly those under 16 requiring both consent and assent forms.

Analysis

Consistent with the previous chapter (Study 1), the data collected in this study were analysed using a reflexive thematic approach. Reflexive thematic analysis utilises a six-phase process, as outlined by Braun and Clarke (2006), and allows flexibility to actively engage in reviewing coded data, generating themes and then considering provisional themes (Braun & Clarke, 2020). Active engagement with data field notes included notebook entries, detailed journal entries and initial reflexive thoughts after conversations with participants, including mentees, mentors, mentor coaches, tutors from AESP1 and AESP2 present at the programme, and one of the programme directors who as mentioned prior was also a member of my doctoral supervision.

After several rereading's to familiarise myself with the field notes taken, data were systematically coded, and I made notes about my initial thoughts. These codes were also guided by the literature review conceptualising culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice, and the mentees and their whānau/'aiga/caregivers' multilayered cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Notes about any similarities and divergences of coded data and themes from a cultural lens were drawn from critical Indigenous Pacific and concepts in te ao Māori from the emerging framework developed as a consequence of the initial literature review in Chapter 2. This recursive approach of actively reviewing and generating themes from the initial provisional themes is consistent with reflexive thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2019, 2020; Terry et al., 2017).

Results

The results of Study 2 are centred on two interrelated themes that help to answer the overarching research question: What are the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice in Aotearoa New Zealand. The two themes identified are (i) a culture of self-determination and (ii) a culture of honour. To understand the content and nature of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring, key programme elements and mentor interactions with mentees were analysed and aligned with aspects where young

people's cultural and linguistic backgrounds were responded to and/or sustained throughout the programme. Although there were multiple examples throughout the participant observational study over 7 of the 12 weeks observed, examples are given at programme level, whānau group level and at dyad level. The programme environment where youth mentoring-related practices were culturally responsive and sustaining at dyad, whānau group (multiple dyads) and programme level were of interest in the current study (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009).

Culture of Self-Determination

The capacity for adolescents to make intentional conscious choices for themselves is vital for adolescent development. Having a sense of satisfaction by willingly asserting oneself to master or become competent in something and have a sense of relatedness are key components of self-determination (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The innate psychological need for autonomy, competence and relatedness within a social context where youth are supported is said to be important for quality of life for self-determining adolescents (Nota et al., 2007). The idea of having autonomy to determine one's actions is a powerful humanistic behaviour for youth to develop positively.

From a Pacific and Māori lens, self-determination, as a psychological construct of positive youth development, is an essential aspect of youth mentoring. Given rangatahi are embedded within social and cultural contexts unique to their multilayered identities, self-determination for Pacific and Māori youth comprises culturally nuanced understandings. Although self-determination might be viewed as a Western concept (Toki, 2017), self-determination for Māori rangatahi in the local context is understood as tino rangatiratanga (absolute chieftainship, leadership or governance over oneself). The principle of tino rangatiratanga as a self-determination principle in Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Māori version of the Treaty of Waitangi) refers to having more meaningful control over one's life and cultural wellbeing (Pihama et al., 2002).

Similarly, for Pacific or, more specifically, Samoan youth, self-determination considers values of tautua where the pathway to leadership is through servanthood. In other words, individual choice or autonomy, and consideration of mastery and relatedness, might be relative when thinking of the needs of the collective (Liang & Grossman, 2007). Given an individual's multilayered nature of identity is embedded within the wider collective, self-determination for Pacific and Māori youth includes consideration of sustaining youth heritage cultures. The following incidents at programme level, whānau and dyad level, describe how a culture of self-determination was fostered.

To remind the reader, the 12-week youth mentoring programme targeted at-risk youth outside of mainstream education, specifically youth aged 12–16 years old already in an alternative education service provider. The youth mentoring programme was embedded in an undergraduate service-learning course. Master's counselling students also attended the programme for placement hours towards their counselling degree. Students, mentors and counsellors met for 1 hour before the youth arrived as part of a flipped-classroom lecture. Once the youth arrived at the campus, the programme began with a brief walk around campus, followed by tutoring and goal planning, a shared meal and two pro-social activities facilitated by the students themselves acting as mentor coaches and mentors. The youth then left the campus and the student mentors and counsellors engaged in individual and group reflection.

Programme Level

As noted above, the observational study was conducted at Week 1 (W1) gauging a more general overview of the moment-to-moment running of the programme. From W6 (midway) through to W12, a systematic observation of whānau groups and mentor–mentee dyad and triads was made observing different components of the programme where possible. The process to identify participants for observation was guided by the programme giving confirmation of who returned consent and assent forms and their attendance on a week-by-week basis. Given the uncertainty around attendance and check-in (counselling sessions) for youth, the ability to observe in a planned systematic manner was challenging.

At a programme level, my observations of the programme were initially focussed on the beginning of the programme (W1) and the end of the programme (W12). Some elements of culturally responsive and sustaining practice were incorporated, that is, sensitivity to the cultural values of Māori rangatahi. Consistent with scholarship conceptualising culturally responsive and culturally relevant practice (Gay, 2000, 2002, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995), it was observed that the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of Māori rangatahi were taken into consideration and incorporated throughout the programme. One example was the inclusion of aspects of tikanga, for example use of the faculty marae as a site for programme delivery where pōwhiri, poroporoaki, karakia and waiata were visible. Pōwhiri is a relatively normalised practice in Aotearoa New Zealand, giving effect to bicultural obligations as Treaty partners. In addition, programmers used te reo Māori (the Indigenous and one of two official languages of Aotearoa New Zealand) within the programme discourse.

Throughout the 12-week programme, specifically in the pre-brief briefing programme component with mentors and mentor coaches I observed a time was set aside for reflection, reciting whakataukī (proverbs) and opening the floor for discussion. However, I did note no reference to alagaupu (Samoan proverb) or other Pasifika references. As a participant observer, nor did I witness a detailed explanation of the whakataukī cited as part of the programme of the social, cultural and historical significance. This was a lost opportunity for teaching and learning from a tuakana–teina lens. Another observation was that there was little dialogue between mentor coaches and mentors on the significance or relevance of the whakataukī.

Although the inclusion and use of whakataukī was a possible attempt at culturally relevant practice and well-intentioned, the action did fall short of being "for Māori by Māori" through a Kaupapa Māori lens (Pihama et al., 2002). Indeed, Paris (2012) and Paris and Alim (2017) suggested it is not enough to be sensitive to students and their families' cultural values and a rather more effective practice would be to protect the cultural values of students to help sustain their heritage culture. The examination of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice invokes the question raised almost 20 years ago by Pihama et al. (2002): "can real Tino Rangatiratanga be achieved in existing Pākehā-dominated institutional structures?" (p. 34). In this light, how might Pacific ways of self-determination also be incorporated by referencing Pacific knowledge systems and values such as tautua and fa'aaloalo through a va relational approach?

One way of doing this, as suggested in Study 1, would be to strategically ensure the role of whānau/'aiga considered (Durie, 1994; Pere, 1991; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001). As noted in Study 1, Kaumātua, as respected knowledge holders (Kupa, 2009), and members of whānau are considered essential to the development of programmes seeking to work alongside Māori or Pacific youth. This approach aligns with Weiston-Serdan's (2017) critical mentoring theoretical approach concerning mentoring marginalised or underserved youth. A youth-centric approach from a localised lens would mean including their communities to build bridges between students' homes and youth mentoring programme experiences. As a result, self-determination, including a sense of competence, autonomy and relatedness, as framed by Deci and Ryan (2000), may be developed. A localised culturally informed lens of fostering self-determination requires an analysis of unequal power relations that considers the oversight of referencing knowledge systems to safeguard youths' heritage culture and language.

Additionally, fostering self-determination from a Māori or Pacific lens needs to go beyond ensuring cultural activities and specific values are centred. Activities like karakia, whakataukī and kapa haka (Māori group dance) are useful; however, deeper engagement with the collective strengths and abilities of the youth is required, referencing and drawing on the multiple knowledge systems and languages they bring to the programme. Emphasis on youth collaboratively planning activities based on their interests and cultural and linguistic backgrounds might have been an empowering mechanism to establish high levels of competence, mastery and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Other learnings taken from the current study would be that although Māori rangatahi and Pacific youth were exposed to key activities such as kapa haka taught in one session during W10, the focus was specifically on mau rākau (performing art of weaponry). Future iterations could perhaps include a follow-up for rangatahi interested by coordinating links to their own communities for continued kapa haka experiences. Certainly, kapa haka includes other elements important to te ao Māori and is asserted as an Indigenous-based inclusive pedagogy (Whitinui, 2014).

Engagement with whānau and community as follow-up to encourage rangatahi to engage further and support positive youth development is a vital step to improving educational outcomes for Māori rangatahi. Notably the female mentees were noted as thoroughly enjoying the challenge of learning mau rākau. The male mentees on the other hand were less inclined and their body language and facial expressions exhibited signs of apprehension. After some time had passed, the male mentees took courage from other female mentee participants and from the instructor who took time to manaaki all participants. All rangatahi who signed up for this activity did so by their own volition reinforcing their right as Māori to participate in a self-determining way meaningfully (G. Smith, 1997).

The pro-social activity to design a cultural mural in W10 was perhaps a purposeful activity to foster strengths-based outcomes and a positive ethnic identity. Mentees were encouraged to think about an image or express themselves creatively by designing tiles. MC2 and MC3 encouraged all mentees present, especially Māori rangatahi, to incorporate their culture and language within their designs. The use of resources at the university was appreciated by mentees and from their respective service providers. During the activity, a key observation was mentees and tutors were excited to experience a university class environment where self-expression and building positive ethnic identities were encouraged.

Notably, in W1, and W6–12, there was an absence of important identity development activities that incorporated the inclusion of whānau members such as the opportunity for youth to learn their whakapapa, gafa or 'afa (genealogical connections) in meaningful ways which might have provided opportunity to foster a positive racial–ethnic identity so students could feel a sense of belonging and connectedness as Māori and Pacific youth (Webber, 2015). Given the findings in Study 1 showed youth exploring who they are in relation to their genealogical connections is vital to building positive social identities as Māori and Pacific youth, the programme could have more purposefully planned activities that supported the youths' racial–ethnic identity development

In W1, the preprogramme session for mentor coaches and mentors was based on basic communication skills and recapping their mentee profile review. W6 course content included trauma-informed practice, supporting behavioural and emotional self-regulation in youth; in W7, just over halfway through the 12-week course, mentor coaches and mentors were presented with Weiston-Serdan's (2017) critical mentoring theory and the importance of fostering a positive ethnic identity. Course content for W8 included relationship closure and W9 was focussed on supporting positive transitions before the course break of 2 weeks to allow for a set school holiday break. Upon return in W10, the course content was based on creative youth expression, with W11 focussed on celebrating youth achievement in preparation for W12's course graduation for mentees and their whānau. The course content planned for W12 included a recap and addressed student-identified practice gaps.

Youth development theories presented and discussions of course material and their application were primarily underpinned by Western scholarship and constructs in relation to positive youth development or youth mentoring practice. A few exceptions were references to a handful of texts referring to an international text, critical mentoring Weiston-Serdan (2017) and from a local lens, *Ngā Reanga Youth Development Māori Styles* from Keelan (2014). The lack of Pacific scholarship is an indication that perhaps little exists, and a lost opportunity for youth mentoring practitioners to reference Indigenous knowledge systems and frameworks that are well established in health and education.

A key aim of the cultural translation of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand was to meet the diverse needs of Pacific and Māori rangatahi, by providing a wrap-around support mechanism of therapy in the moment. Observation notes showed scholarship across counselling, human services and social work regarding positive youth development and

youth mentoring however there was an imbalance of visibility of Pacific and Māori theories or references. Although Pacific and Māori theories were not observed during the 12-week observation, models were briefly covered in the training prior to the programme commencement which included culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice drawing on well-established education and health and wellbeing models such as Whare Tapa Wha (Durie, 1994), Fonofale model (Pulotu-Endemann, 2001), Te Wheke (Pere, 1991) and Te Vaka Atafaga (Kupa, 2009).

At programme level, I observed a key aspect of ako (teaching and learning) missing, that is the use of knowledge holders within Pacific communities. Inviting guest experts from Pacific communities with experience and knowledge of working with youth to speak about their tautua across working with youth would be an invaluable strategy to complement a culturally responsive, sustaining and safe environment and practice.

It is important that programmers, mentor coaches and mentors design purposeful activities that foster strengths-based outcomes aligned with the world views and lenses of Māori and Pacific in relation to wellbeing and identity development. Additionally, designing activities for goal planning must go beyond the promotion of conscientising and critically thinking about the social and cultural contexts from which their mentees come (Weiston-Serdan, 2017) and instead explicitly engage in including self-determination from a Māori or Pacific lens. An example of this is the inclusion of knowledge holders who can transmit intergenerational knowledge systems through practices such as tuakana–teina and tautua in culturally appropriate and sustaining ways.

Important aspects of culturally relevant approaches such as using the faculty marae as a site for programme delivery, incorporating tikanga (procedures) and kawa (protocol) throughout the programme via pōwhiri, poroporoaki, karakia and waiata were critical to the translation of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa. However, further attention to embedding a va relational approach that recognises the heterogeneity of cultural identities of youth may have enhanced culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice. This would mean creating a va (relational and social space) where a weaving of both the Western and Indigenous knowledge systems of the youth was visible and centred.

An environment that is culturally responsive and sustains the heritage, languages and cultures of youth is vital when considering safe and purposeful activities. Activities that enable rangatahi to develop in self-determined ways build their self-concept and directly have an

impact on enhancing their mana. In the current study, the design of activities that are culturally responsive, sustaining and promoted culturally safe practice across the initial 12 weeks was an important starting point or baseline to foster the strengths of youth. The next step from a critical theoretical lens might be to go beyond supporting engagement throughout for all and addressing systemic and structural levels of unequal power relations to further unpack elements of race, ethnicity and culture in deeper and more meaningful ways that strategically include collaboration with whānau and community members.

Mentor Whānau Level

At the mentor whānau level of the youth mentoring programme, participant observations were focussed on key aspects of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice between groups of up to four pairs/triads. In general, the mentor coaches and mentors participated fully in the course programme content. At the mentor whānau group level, I observed the interactions between whānau members specifically in relation to the culturally translated activities. A notable observation was the diversity of matched pairs or dyads (mentor–mentee). In some cases, whānau groups included teams that were triads (mentor – x2 mentees) who were diverse in relation to their racial–ethnic identity (see Table 4).

Drawing on the conceptualisation of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice literature and theories reviewed in Chapter 2 a key point of observation at the whānau group level were the interactions of cultural responsiveness and sustaining practice where a mentee's cultural and linguistic background was taken into consideration. Also noted was when mentees' holistic health and wellbeing were considered, attending to their taha wairua (Durie, 1994; Pere, 1991) or spiritual health (Pulotu-Endemann, 2001), emotional/mental and physical wellbeing. Drawing on tenets of a cultural safety lens, notes and reflective journal entries were taken weekly of instances where assumptions, biases and values, and any power imbalances, were considered, to support the development of self-determining mentees.

In W11, Pro-Social Activity 1 was a spoken-word session. Focussed participant observation noted how Whānau Group [WG] Toru B worked collectively as the during the session. Below is an excerpt of notes taken immediately after a session, noting the interaction between , a mentor (MT6) and her mentee (AEY14) and myself as a participant observer.

> AEY14 "I'm not feeling the slam poetry. It's out of my comfort zone" AEY14 looked disengaged at this point.

He shares his slam poetry with a peer AEY1. AEY14 shares his poetry NOT with his mentor or myself but with a fellow peer AEY11. He says, "Because he's my uso [brother]" Jokingly, we both reply, "oh it's like that, is it?" and all we laugh. (W11, WG 3)

The activity was designed to foster positive identities where the recognition of the mana of their name was a priority. Notably, the whānau group also worked collectively and intuitively together with a respect and understanding of the sacredness in sharing their creative pieces with each other as peers. Mentees experienced autonomy in creating poetry how they saw fit, and a challenge from which they experienced competence or mastery. In addition, their ability to have each other's backs indicated a sense of relatedness which is a key component of self-determination. In terms of tautua, the mentor was able to utilise her own Polycultural capital (Mila-Schaaf, 2011), knowledge and local humour and language her expression in a way that signalled to her mentee that he was perfectly fine to share with his peers and not herself as a mentor. As participant observer of Pacific descent, I also was able to engage in culturally distinctive ways with rangatahi and recognise that youth don't always need to share with adults or mentors in the room. Rather youth can be self-determining of who they choose to invite into their va relationships at different times. As this affirms the richness of Indigenous ways of being and knowing and how to tausi le va (care and nurture the relationship) from a relational approach in the youth mentoring context.

Dyad Level

Similarly, at the dyad level, I observed incidents that were focussed on key aspects of practice that were responsive, sustaining and culturally safe. An example is in W8 during Supporting School Success where I noted the cultural and linguistic background of a mentee was considered, drawn on and utilised to support a culture of self-determination. This incident is an example of a dyad working together where the mentor has come to the session prepared and has critically thought about how she can support strengthening her mentee as a young Māori woman through learning te reo Māori both at the youth mentoring programme and as an extension to her current alternative education service provider learning.

In Supporting School Success. Mentor (MT8) and her mentee (AEY7) are engaged. I can see her facial expression and tone appropriate to mentee, smiling and laughing all the way through. MT8 and AEY7 quieten down together working on goals. They are working on a find-a-word in te reo Māori. MT8 is fluent in te reo and speaks and teaches AEY7 key words and phrases. AEY7 tells me she enjoys learning te reo on a weekly

basis. This is good for AEY7 as it flows from with her alternative education tutors back at AESP2 who both speak the reo. AEY7 tells me "I attempt to pronounce a word. Sometimes it's incorrect but she doesn't care"

AEY7 has MT8's complete attention. Watching her body language, she bends down low and crouches at same level or lower than AEY7. MT8 seems cautious of body position and placement and what this might mean for power sharing? (W8, WG3)

These data suggest that the mentor has a clear goal to mentor her mentee in culturally responsive and sustaining ways, that is, she is drawing on the Polycultural capital of not only herself but that of her mentee to achieve a course learning outcome. Specifically, she is mentoring in a way that shows her consciousness of the importance of culture, self-efficacy and identity by prioritising language acquisition and development in the mentee's learning, in this case te reo Māori. Consistent with Webber (2012), this directly influences a stronger sense of racial–ethnic identity where Māori rangatahi are able to "repel negative stereotypes and accommodate other positive attributes, such as academic achievement, into their Māori identity" (p. 26).

Furthermore, the mentor is exhibiting a critical consciousness of power imbalance and adjusts her body language, accordingly, meeting her mentee at a neutral level. The mentor's intention in this interaction is to foster and build relational trust to further support a sense of belongingness and relatedness. Drawing on culturally responsive practice in education where success for Māori and Pacific students has been well documented as having strong positive student–teacher relations, the data are consistent with such ideas that culturally responsive pedagogies develop relationships (Bishop et al., 2009).

Culture of Honour

The theme "building a culture of honour" refers to distinctive Māori and Pacific constructs where mentees' identities and socioemotional and cognitive needs were responded to (Rhodes, 2002, 2005). Key constructs from a Pacific, Samoan-specific context included practices where alofa, tautua and fa'aaloalo were enacted. Similarly, in a Māori context, honouring rangatahi included ensuring the programme environment and related mentoring practices were mana enhancing, and focussed on concepts like aroha, manaakitanga, whanaungatanga and mana (Ware & Walsh-Tapiata, 2010). As mentioned earlier, in the current study, tausi (care, observe and keep command) within Pacific youth mentoring relationships is an important component for care and guardianship of young people from a holistic lens.

Programme Level

At a programme level, the environmental conditions and programme activities were developed in ways that sought to honour young peoples' cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Environmental conditions and mentor actions were informed by the initial findings of Study 1, the environment and activities might be considered culturally safe space, positive social identity development and covenant relationships. A culture of honour at programme level refers to a genuine approach to enhancing the mana of young people in terms of the use of tikanga – including the important ceremony of pōwhiri, in addition to whaikōrero (formal speeches). Common Pacific ways of knowing and being such as karakia or lotu were enacted in addition to attempts to perform ceremonial rituals such as the honouring of ula-lole (traditional honouring ceremony of ula/neck garland), a culturally responsive and relevant approach to acknowledging the importance of achievement and honour.

In W1, I observed enactments or moments in time of cultural responsiveness to the backgrounds of youth, and their whānau/'aiga. I noted in the following data excerpts of my journal:

> The youth mentoring programme held a formal welcome at the university marae. As a researcher who was invited to conduct the research to inform the cultural translation of training for mentors it was important to observe the tone of the programme set from the beginning. This was an important signal to stakeholders of the commitment of the programme to a bicultural approach. The important role of culture was embedded, where mentors were involved in the whaikōrero usually reserved for those representatives on either side to speak in te reo Māori. Two male manuhiri engaged in whaikōrero in their mother tongue of lea faka Tonga (Tongan language) and another in gagana Samoa (Samoan language). The wairua (spirit) of the pōwhiri process was felt by youth and mentor participants who were visibly affected by the wairua of the formal welcoming. Rangatahi from AESP2, a space culturally grounded in te ao Māori seemed very relaxed in comparison to rangatahi from AESP1 who had more diverse racial–ethnic backgrounds …youth were able to observe both those known to them and mentors [who were new faces to youth] participating in pōwhiri. (W1)

The above excerpt suggests that the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand were conscious of the cultural translation of the programme and prioritised the enactment of culturally responsive protocols to ensure a bicultural approach was taken. Thoughtful consideration of the role of culture and key aspects of te ao Māori and Pacific worldviews

ensured the participants experienced warmth or alofa and aroha. Additionally, mentors were valued when they were called upon to tautua in ways that highlighted and celebrated their mother tongue.

Recent work by Napan et al. (2019) suggested the utilisation of the marae as an inanimate taonga and cultural pedagogical approach for transformative learning. Consistent with Napan et al., the marae was more than a building situated in the tertiary context with deep cultural significance. The existence of marae as an inanimate physical being offered a space where reciprocity of relational being, mutual respect and openheartedness was enacted through protocol. The marae as cultural pedagogy, offered a space, or va from a Pacific lens, of aroha or alofa. There was indeed a depth of care and guardianship where non-Māori members from abroad perhaps felt honoured.

The practice of cultural values in the programme such as whanaungatanga, mana and manaakitanga evident in W1, may well be a starting point to provide opportunity for rangatahi to develop a positive racial–ethnic identity (Webber, 2015). Mentors may have been seen by mentees as tuakana with confidence, displaying their Polycultural capital, navigating both worlds of their Indigenous selves in a Western-centred context of the university. Through the engagement of cultural protocol and practices, youth were able to observe examples of those known to them from their service provider space and mentors exercising their strengths and mana in navigating multiple spaces. The tertiary space is inherently Western, whereas the marae space in the university context is embedded in te ao Māori and underpinned and governed by specific tikanga and kawa. Within this space were youth with multilayered racial–ethnic identities. Given youth were mainly Pacific and Māori, in alternative education and yet to experience success in mainstream education, it was important for themselves and others to perceive their racial–identity in a positive manner. Importantly, having a view of themselves as part of the collective group from a strengths-based lens was vital to experiencing a sense of connectedness and belonging to their racial–ethnic group (Webber et al., 2013).

An important finding of this participant observation study was that creating a culture of honour in youth mentoring environments may also mean tensions arise. During W1 just before the formal pōwhiri taking place, there was visible tension in the room. It appeared the processes of the youth mentoring programme for the formal welcome did not go according to plan. An incident occurred where flexibility was required by the youth mentoring programme to access cultural expertise when the planned for, appropriate staff member was unavailable to lead the

formal pōwhiri welcome. The incident highlighted a moment in time where things don't always go to plan and processes for youth mentoring programmes are developed as a result of such experiences. Generally in Aotearoa New Zealand, particularly in a university setting, a bicultural approach includes formalities guided by pōwhiri (a formal welcome) as part of upholding tikanga, and at times key people are not present for unforeseen circumstances.

This is not a new challenge in organisations or institutions where the very few Māori staff are often uninated with requests to fulfil cultural obligations. The youth mentoring programme process challenged where key people with mana and standing are not available to support tikanga, there can be times of unease for youth mentoring programmes, as in this case. Processes in programmes sometimes require a quick response to enable formalities such as a welcome to flow seamlessly. However, there this is not always possible and can create a tension where programmes that may have non-Māori staff or a lack cultural capital or sometimes Polycultural capital (Mila-Schaaf, 2011) to assist such formalities are faced with challenges. Back-up plans to help support a programme in developing a culture where people, particularly manuhiri feel welcome and honoured takes careful planning and building of relationships As a researcher what I observed at programme level was the programme processes in place at the time were less than responsive. A hurried last minute solution was found as part of the process taken,. Torepe et al., (2018) in his study of Māori teachers in the Aotearoa context burdened with cultural obligation often 'expected to organise and facilitate ceremonial roles such as kaikaranga or kaikōrero in pōwhiri that were often truncated or restricted by the requirements of mechanical time and/or … timetable" (p. 54). Creating a culture of honour where manuhiri see a seamless process in programmes, particularly with pōwhiri welcome ceremonies requires prior mahi or work where the va relational space is built. This supports building a strong culture of honour for all involved particularly when aiming to co-design a programme with partners to serve Māori rangatahi and all youth.

In the moment, when the programme went live, decisions needed to be made quickly. Although there were unforeseeable circumstances that altered the programme, a culturally responsive approach calls for flexibility and understanding. Drawing on the work of Mo'a (2015) where culture is referred to as a foundation of care, that is, where there is alofa and tausi-ma'i or tausi-soifua (guardianship), there is indeed an opportunity for programmers to understand the importance of cultural oversight when hosting guests. A key aspect of culturally responsive

and safe youth mentoring practice is to care for and be hospitable, or from a Pacific lens to tautua, and similarly from a Māori lens to ensure the value of manaakitanga is felt.

Doing things correctly in a way that honours others means ensuring that people are cared for in culturally respectful ways. The data above offer insights of culturally responsive and safe practice at the "point of service" within interactions between the youth and their communities that are being served (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009). Additionally, the data suggest that key cultural or Indigenous constructs relevant to youth mentoring offer a deep consideration of the multiplicity of racial–ethnic youth identities and the importance of creating environments and that are culturally safe and safe practice. Given this was the first implementation of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand, there were expected teething problems and tensions. The cultural translation of the programme was about getting things right for future iterations and taking learnings from this. At multiple points in the study, the role of culture, race and ethnicity in youth mentoring was confirmed as critical (Sánchez et al., 2014).

As mentioned earlier in planned activities in the youth mentoring context working alongside youth in the alternative education space do not always go to plan. Mana-enhancing moments in time also do not always go to plan. For example, interactions did not always go well with mentees and as expected in a new youth mentoring programme, youth might feel upset or challenged by processes within the programme that mentees may not agree with or where they feel their expression or creativity is unwanted. As a researcher participating in the programme itself, observing the processes to deal with high tension or challenging mentee personalities were followed with caution by mentors themselves. This was to ensure the safety of other participants in the programme itself and as a result emotions may run high for different participants. Emotionally charged situations are inevitable and may result in the participant or mentee feeling that their dignity and mana has being compromised. This could also happen for staff members or peers.

The study showed that creating a culture of honour and ensuring that Indigenous and all student wellbeing is central. Suitable training so members of the programme are ready for appropriate responses prepared can be challenging. The youth mentoring programme processes highlighted the degree to which mentoring programmes might be youth centric, where youth voices are truly heard, where youth feel empowered and have choices (Weiston-Serdan, 2017). The process for youth mentees to avoid feeling a sense of shame or whakamā when challenged from an authoritative stance is a focal point for youth mentoring programmes in relation to

cultural safety. Youth may act out or feel triggered in different parts of the programme and therefore the programme process need to include appropriate attention and time. This allows for mediation and youth to calm down and gain a sense of composure before heading off back to the service provider at the end of the day. The post brief for mentors and mentor coaches is useful for reflective practice, however, processes must be in place to ensure mentees feel culturally safe.

In the postmentoring brief session, the negative behaviour of the said mentee was discussed with MT4 referring to her approach as "I started to get firm with them. Mad respect to MT3. They're [two mentees] troublemakers together," whereas MT2's strategy was observed as "sitting at the back to break up the boys at kai," so she could mitigate any potential abruptness or unruliness by distracting them and carefully encouraging them to part ways. I noted MT2 was similar-race matched with her mentee.

Interestingly, MT9 was less bothered by the incident, perhaps through lack of understanding as is evidenced in her statement "I don't know the bad words or gang signs." Although MT9 had a dyad of very active male mentees and was not same-race matched, she had a sense of ethnocultural empathy that demonstrated care and dignity for the young men. Creating a culture of honour in youth mentoring programmes where mentees feel affirmed, connected and loved is vital. The current study aligns with key findings which have found that youth generally feel more positive in the context of alternative education than their mainstream school and are significantly more likely to feel they are treated fairly in comparison to mainstream students (Clark, Smith, Raphael, Jackson, Denny, et al., 2010). The ongoing challenge for youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand will be to prioritise creating a culture of honour where students feel valued and safe.

Whānau/Group Level
At a whānau/group level in the Pro-Social Activity 1, the Chocolate River Debrief included a "teamwork" discussion around what worked well. The main premise of the chocolate river activity was to encourage the development of communication and teamwork skills. Developing a culture of honour was evidenced when MC1 intentionally asked AEY1 what worked well. This open-ended question may seem like a standard reflective exercise; however, when thinking about the transformative power of encouragement and words that honour mentees, the potential to forge deeper relationships to foster socioemotional development was maximised. MC1 "I thought you had good leadership skills [AEY1]." MT5 added on to MC1 and said "We

were all in the same waka – working together." MT5 thanked AEY1, saying "thank you for being considerate of other people, because I don't know if I could have" – clearly and deliberately acknowledging AEY1 for his part.

The data above suggest that the multiple layers within the programme structure, including mentor coaches, mentors and peers (youth), worked together to provide a network of support that encouraged the participants to honour one another in ways that drew on cultural references. Although MT5 was not of Māori heritage, she was able to articulate the importance of kotahitanga (unity) or ways to awhi or show manaaki to one another emphasising the need to work collectively on the metaphorical waka. What is visible is the importance of ensuring one's mana is honoured in relationships through whanaungatanga and manaakitanga (Ware & Walsh-Tapiata, 2010). Similarly, from a teu le va lens, both mentor coach MC1 and mentor MT5, in a familial approach, nurtured and valued the strengths of mentee AET1. The va, that is, the relational connection between all members reinforces the idea of honouring one another in a whānau/'aiga approach.

Similarly, within the WG Rua, AEY12 and AEY8 were invited to lead the activity. Their mentor MC3 encouraged them by stating "I think you've got some great leadership skills." Her way of honouring the two mentees to remind them of their competence or mastery in leading the game with the whole whānau group. The autonomy given to both mentees to have freedom of choice to step out of their comfort zones was also a segue to building a sense of connection to the group and relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2008). The data suggest that the mentors worked hard to establish and maintain a culture of honour where youth felt valued at both dyad and whānau/group level. This was important to ensuring the va relational space was harmonious and conducive to learning.

In the postmentoring briefing session, MT5 sought advice from the mentor coaches about whether she should eat the cake that her mentee AEY1 gifted. The mentor coaches advised that in the interest of safety, she should show gratitude, sensitivity and accept the mentee's act of aroha. The interaction showed AEY1's deep and close relationship with his mentor MT5. AEY1 gifted it to her with a heart to communicate his close connection. This example from the data shows covenant relationships between mentors and mentees whereby their mana was central and valued. In a fa'aSamoa approach, it is seen as offensive to decline measina (gifts) offered with alofa. As part of tautua in mentoring, it would also be inappropriate to decline a mentee's gift. Understanding the nuances of culture within youth mentoring programmes,

whereby mentees' and mentors' cultural backgrounds are considered, is beneficial for programmes to get the best out of their people. In line with Mila-Schaaf and Robinson (2010), the importance of building the capacity and cumulative advantage of Māori and Pacific youth and their communities is vital. Importantly, understanding cultural values and associated protocols are key sources for opportunity that programmers can draw on in future iterations.

Acknowledgment was given for MT5 specifically for the way she ushered her mentee "carefully like an older sister to a little bro" and continued to share with the wider group the progress made between both mentor and mentee. The way mentor MT5 had showed alofa and manaaki over time and specifically at this point of the programme was evident that she could access her inherent Polycultural capital drawing on her own experiences of caring for perhaps younger siblings or cousins. She was able to quickly and critically reflect to switch between both Western and Indigenous ways of thinking and being. MT5 replied:

> We're all different here but have one goal. We are on the same journey. We are laying it all down. I was just real. Not the Samoan way but a calm approach. I talked to AEY4 about not giving MT9 a hard time. I spoke to AEY11 and reminded him that he influences AEY12 and that we're whānau [finger snaps].

The culture of honour through shout outs to MT5 and her "aunty" approach to bullying were well received across all whānau groups collectively. MT5 explained that there were "no hard feelings and so she and her mentee shook hands." This is an example of mentors using their cultural capital to remedy a tricky situation. In this example the mana of all participants was upheld. This is an example of culturally responsive youth mentoring where the mana and needs of mentees are prioritised utilising culturally specific ways to support young people. The culturally nuanced way of mentoring through body language, eye contact, voice tone and demeanour is culturally distinctive to the mentor who is Pasifika (Mila-Schaaf, 2011).

Another example indicates the frustration over time for MT5 and the way well-meaning others would interfere with the mahi she was trying to do with her mentee AEY1. In W7 Post-Brief Shout Outs, MT5 shared about her journey with AEY1 "I'm just so proud of him … the real AEY1 is coming out. I enjoyed our conversation. It took 7 weeks but it was a mean day. He's grown on me, I told him I enjoyed the cake." The dialogue from MT5 shows a progression of forging close bonds and trust with her mentee. However, a couple of weeks later, in W9, there were noticeable challenges within the dyad and whānau group. MC2 had good intentions and tried to support negative tension building between MT5 and her mentee AEY1. The incident

that occurred included MC2 giving AEY1 advice that contradicted his mentor's instruction when he pushed the boundaries.

In W9 Post-Brief there were signs of frustration with interference within the whānau group between MC2 and MT5. MC2 gave a shout out to MT5 for persevering with her mentee AEY1, who was pushing the boundaries of behaviour in the pro-social activities. It was noted that MT5 responded back in frustration.

> Mentor MT5 had a moment and snapped at her fellow mentor, saying "Stay in your lane. Come in the conversation but not siding [with AEY1]. It's not cool when it's reversed." MT5 explained: "His whole attitude from supporting school success, just the whole day. You need to respect the [space] ... and he knows what he's doing because he's [AEY1] like 'but you can't touch me.'" MT5 is visibly upset at MC2 interjecting in her mentee relationship but recovers. She then shares how she might approach it next time by asking AEY1 questions like "Do you think there were challenges today?" "Would you treat your Mum this way?"

The data highlight an interaction within the whānau/family group where multiple dyads were all co-existing and sometimes co-operating with one another much like a family unit. AT5, who is of Samoan descent, mentioned the importance of mentoring her mentee with some degree of autonomy, that is for the mentor coach to work alongside in a supportive way but to "stay in her lane." The mentor emphasised the importance of respecting her space, which is an important element of ensuring her mana as a mentor was respected and honoured. There was an absence of respect in the va, that is the relational space between the mentor and the mentor coach.

Additionally, an interesting point in the interaction was the mentor's humility to set aside her frustration and focus on reflexively thinking how she could serve this young person better next time. The significance of the va relational space is evident in the interaction in which honouring one another as a whānau group, much like a family unit, can be challenging and therefore require them to "teu la va" or tidy the space. Similarly, the Samoan constructs of feagaiga and fa'aaloalo prioritise humility, respect and reciprocity (Amituanai-Toloa, 2006) and are vital Indigenous references for youth mentoring programmes to unpack tricky interactions like the ones described above.

The data suggest that youth mentoring programmes must examine the role of culture, race and ethnicity and consider the importance of Indigenous values of the communities in which their

mentoring is located. Certainly, the data highlight the importance of values such as whanaungatanga, mana and manaakitanga and va relationships through tautua being explicitly enacted and referred to as key values across the programme. Making visible Indigenous references to concepts of tuakana–teina and feagaiga (covenant relationships) as well as cultural constructs of aroha, alofa, tautua are important components of practice that mitigate tensions as they arise.

A key consideration for programmers would be to enlist key knowledge holders and community members as part of the programme to actively impart knowledge and their experiences of how to enact these constructs. Further, youth mentoring programmers should utilise community members for mentors to inform both their practice and how they might interact with mentees and their whānau/aiga. In turn this would help to sustain the cultural knowledge systems and values that stem from Indigenous ways of knowing to support healthy development of Māori and Pacific youth. It is important of develop a programme culture that honours relationships, culture and identity and embeds these elements into all activities in collaboration with mentors and mentees of diverse backgrounds.

Dyad Level

At a dyad level, a culture of honour was manifested through interactions between mentor and mentees, in this case, mentees' ethnic identities and languages were responded to and sustained. In W7, there was a notable dyad interaction between MT7 and AEY9. On arrival of her mentee, MT7 made a concerted effort to chat. It was noted that prior to this, MT7 discussed the importance of more support for mentors on the day with the mentor coaches and programmers. This suggests that she was feeling unsupported or, at just over the halfway mark of the 12-week programme, feeling tired and requiring extra support or encouragement. Regardless, MT7 navigated the space respectfully with her mentee in a way that meant AEY9 felt like she could be transparent and talk about her fears. This is evidenced in the excerpt that follows:

> AEY9 – Her mentee upon arrival talks about being "only me here as a mentee" MT7 replies "who cares man it's about being independent." MT7 is encouraging her mentee to stand alone and strong in who she is without peers.

As the morning went on, I observed them in deep conversation in which the mentee was fully engaged. The notes detail the intensity:

> Mentor is fiercely engaged; I can hear her selling Matua's cultural activity next week. AEY9 talks about kapa haka and how she's done it before. MT7 asks her mentee about

an activity in supporting school success but gives her the options of both. MT7 says "Don't mock me" jokingly but still gives her the option.

Mentor MT7, who is not of Pacific or Māori descent, promoted the cultural activity of kapa haka despite feeling uneasy about not being competent in kapa haka. The data suggest the mentor had ethnocultural empathy, that is, as part of her service learning in the youth mentoring programme, she already had or developed cultural competence skills and knowledge. Although some proponents of cultural matching argue for the positive impacts of closeness and efficacy in addition to mentors of colour responding better to promote mentees' ethnic identity development, consistent with Peifer et al. (2016), the data in this study suggest that non-Pacific and non-Māori mentors have the potential to impact mentees who are rangatahi Māori and/or Pacific through their own solidified cultural identity and willingness to explore identity. The challenge lies in programmes and mentors that support minoritised and racialised ethnicities, through structured mentoring, to consider thoughtful and responsive ways to enable all youth to sustain their cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

The data supported Simmonds et al.'s (2014) ideas about the indicators of positive youth development for rangatahi Māori. Positive relationships, activities and cultural factors were important considerations for dyads alongside an awareness of sociohistorical factors, education and health or healthy lifestyles. The positive relationship formed between mentor and mentee during cultural activities shows that the mentor understood the importance of her role in encouraging cultural activities despite her fear of being judged when she is in a learning position. Further, the interaction suggests from a tuakana–teina lens, that her role shifted from one as tuakana, to one as teina – the balance of power shifted.

Creating a culture of honour where mentors have a solidified cultural identity and willing to reflect and explore their own status or privilege, may activate mentees to engage similarly and explore or strengthen their own cultural identity development (Rhodes, 2002, 2005). The data in this study suggests MT7 honoured and respected her mentee in a way that was culturally responsive and sustained her mentee's cultural identity. Consistent with the theme of honouring and taking care or nurturing her mentee, the above interaction shows the relational process as active and bound by key constructs and values important to rangatahi Māori and Pacific youth. In this study it was noted that the mentor and mentee were not same-race matched yet they appeared to have forged a respectful relationship that is close and enduring (Rhodes, 2002, 2005).

Additionally, in W7, I observed playful banter between the mentor and mentee where I saw a mentor who was visibly tired asking for support, assume her role in a way that was still responsive and honouring of her mentee. Instead of MT7 pushing her agenda of wanting her mentee AEY9 to really give kapa haka a good go, she accepted that her mentee initially seemed disinterested as she had already been exposed to kapa haka prior to the programme. The end result was her mentee did sign up to participate alongside her peer AEY7 of her own volition.

As an observer and participant, I observed both mentors and mentees participate fully alongside others. The female mentees were highly engaged and confident in mau rākau and really enjoyed themselves as experts encouraging their mentors. Although MT8 was fully fluent and immersed in her cultural identity as Māori there was a complementary relationship where both naturally honoured one another in their interactions throughout. A culture of honour was more explicit with MT7 and AEY9 as they were not same-race matched.

Chapter Summary

At a programme level, there were tensions in responding in culturally responsive ways to mentees. Although the data highlighted ways in which mentees' cultural identities were honoured, and ways in which a culture of self-determination were cultivated at different points of service, there were also programme processes noted where cultural safety of mentees participants may face challenges and tension. Culturally safe practice includes critical analysis of power imbalances at programme, whānau group and dyad level. Respectful acknowledgement that draws upon certain aspects of Māori culture were insufficient as they were implemented at a surface level without consideration of the deeper cultural meanings behind them. Research suggests that the time frame of forging quality relationships, in this case 12 weeks, may adversely affect the achievement of programme goals. However, the programme was over an intense period of 1 day a week. The study provides insight and perhaps raises questions of how things might have been done differently if the programme was over 2 days a week, or longer than 12 weeks so mentoring relationships, and in particular va relationships with youth could be solidified over a longer period of time. Developing a culture of honour takes time and intention. A key learning from the current study is that culture, race and ethnicity must play an integral role in youth mentoring programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand. Importantly, this study offers insights into the nuances of culture in youth mentoring and that programmers must be cognisant of diverse backgrounds and continuously self-reflective to recognise power imbalances and their own biases to ensure cultural responsiveness and safety.

Chapter 6 – Study 3 Postprogramme

Sau ta talanoa, kōrero mai – Let's talk

O le tele o sulu e maua ai figota – Through collaboration, the most difficult challenges can be overcome.

–Samoan proverb

Chapter Overview

The Samoan proverb above provides the rationale for this study. The proverb illustrates that much is gained by attending to challenges and tensions through collaborative talanoa and kōrero. Teu le va (making the space tidy) in research requires time and consideration of all parties, particularly when the va relational space blends three unique worldviews and knowledge systems. The current study aims to further understand and support the previous findings of Studies 1 and 2. This final qualitative component (Study 3) explores how youth mentoring underpinned by both Samoan-specific and Māori constructs relevant to positive youth development theories, is relevant to serve the needs of Māori and Pacific youth in a culturally responsive, sustaining and safe manner.

The current chapter reports on the analysis of postprogramme talanoa/kōrero with alternative education tutors and youth after taking part in the youth mentoring programme. Included in the analysis is one whānau member who kindly gave their time to talanoa/kōrero about their child's experience in the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand.

To remind the reader, each study explored key ingredients of youth mentoring practice to address the overarching research question "What are the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice in Aotearoa New Zealand?" and subquestions:

i.   What are the conditions present that determine culturally safe practice in youth mentoring?

ii.   What are the actions taken by mentors that support culturally safe practice in youth mentoring?

iii.   What features or indicators of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa are representative and beneficial for rangatahi or youth of Aotearoa?

As mentioned earlier (see Chapter 2), there has been a groundswell of interest in youth mentoring programmes as an intervention strategy targeting at-risk youth over the past 20 years (DuBois et al., 2002; DuBois et al., 2011) and more so over the last 10 years exploring the mechanisms of effective youth mentoring practice. However, there is limited research from a strengths-based Indigenous lens into the provision of youth mentoring practice that is culturally responsive, culturally sustaining, culturally safe and responds to the needs of heterogeneous young people.

Literature Review

In Aotearoa New Zealand, Māori and Pacific peoples are diverse, with a multiplicity of identities. Although Pacific peoples are the fourth largest group after other major ethnic groups (NZ/European, Māori and Asian), they are the fastest growing youth population in comparison with the total population. By 2026, the population of Pacific peoples will increase greatly against other ethnic groups compared to 2013 (Stats NZ, 2015). Similarly, Māori, the Indigenous population, are also a youthful group. Māori rangatahi (aged 12–24 years) make up over a third of the population under the age of 20. This chapter takes an antideficit approach and focusses on positive youth development approaches that focus on the potential of such young people as opposed to seeing them as problems to be fixed (Damon, 2004).

Given our fast-growing, diverse and youthful nation, and an increase in the numbers of youth not in education and employment, there is an increased demand for education and health services that meet youths' unique identity development, socioemotional development and cognitive developmental needs (Rhodes, 2005). Further, while much research on formal mentoring has focussed on fostering the mentor–mentee dyad relationship (Larose et al., 2015), there is sparse research focussed on the Aotearoa New Zealand context and whānau/group mentoring that draws on Indigenous values and constructs. Consequently, in the Aotearoa New Zealand context, there is a growing appetite for programmers to serve Māori and Pacific youth outside of mainstream education, necessitating an urgency for research that is self-determining, responsive and focussed on a positive developmental framework that considers culture in depth (Simmonds et al., 2014). Furthermore, there is little research in Aotearoa New Zealand from a positive youth development perspective, particularly literature that focuses on Māori rangatahi, and even less for Pasifika youth.

Purpose of the Present Study

The data for the current study were collected at the conclusion of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand which took place at a university based in Auckland, where all programme activities were held, either in a classroom on campus or at the university marae. This exploratory study privileged the voices and lived experiences of the youth in alternative education and their communities, in this case, their alternative education tutors. Although many parents/caregivers signalled their interest in participating during the graduation, due to the time of year (end of school year festive season) only one whānau member participated, offering their thoughts and experiences about the impact of the programme of their young person. Fortunately, this whānau member's young person participated in both Study 1 and 2.

The current and final study used the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand as a vehicle to better understand how programmes might be culturally responsive, sustaining and safe in youth mentoring practice. In addition to provide insight and consider the role of race, ethnicity and culture (Sánchez et al., 2014). In line with Simmonds et al. (2014), Study 3 sought to understand the positive outcomes, if any, for rangatahi and the routes by which Māori and Pacific youth develop positively. Importantly, this study was interested in how a Māori and Pacific youth development approach, underpinned by Indigenous theories, alongside values and principles of positive youth development, might provide insight and more in-depth consideration of culture within the context of youth programmes.

Method

Similar to Chapter 3 – Study 1, the current study took a pragmatic methodological approach. As a Pasifika researcher in a Māori, Pacific and Western context, I incorporated and enacted important principles of fa'aSamoa such as fa'aaloalo (respect) and teu le va (nurturing, caring for and maintaining the research relationship) with all participants regardless of racial–ethnic background. A key aim to the study was to gain in-depth understanding of the full extent of the experiences of participants who engaged with the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand, July 2017 initial intake.

Similar to Study 1, Study 3 also employed talanoa as a pan-Pacific tool underpinned by Pacific worldviews and knowledge systems (Suaalii-Sauni & Fulu-Aiolupotea, 2014; Vaioleti, 2006). To remind the reader, the study was conducted in the Aotearoa New Zealand context therefore the terms *kōrero* and *talanoa* were used synonymously as were *hui* and *fono*. The current study

prioritised an ethic of care where research relationships were approached as va tapuia (sacred spaces, see Amituanai-Toloa, 2006) similar to a Kaupapa Māori lens of enacting principles of whakawhanaungatanga (building relationships, see Simmonds et al., 2014). The current study utilised qualitative data from the postprogramme talanoa/kōrero of the 2017 iteration of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand to explore the voices of alternative education service providers' (from both AESP1 and AESP2) and the voices of youth themselves who participated in the 12-week programme.

Participants

As outlined in Chapter 3 – Methodology, the AEY participants in the current study are not all the same participants as in Study 1, with the exception of one student, AEY1. However, all participants in the current study did participate in the programme itself in July–November 2017. Focus group talanoa/kōrero were held with five alternative education tutors (male = 3, female= 2) from service providers AESP1 and AESP2.

Tutors from their service provider transported youth and accompanied their students to the mentoring programme over the 12-week period; four out of five (AET2–AET5) were present at the youth mentoring programme (one tutor attended at various points including the start, midway and end of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand). Each tutor participated at different times according to their preferred activities alongside youth such as the sports and kapa haka pro-social activities. All tutors (AET1–AET5) were present at the final mentoring programme day and graduation ceremony. Study 3 participant demographics are shown in Table 5. Both youth and tutors self-assigned their ethnicity during the talanoa/kōrero, including two youth who offered their iwi (i.e., tribal affiliations) at the time of their talanoa/kōrero.

Table 5

Participants' Post Programme One-to-One and Focus Group Talanoa/Kōrero

Group	*n.*	Average Age	Gender	Ethnicity
Tutors in alternative education	5	39	F (2) M (3)	Pākehā/Māori (2) Cook Island/Māori/Irish (1) Māori/Cook Island (1) Tongan/Māori (1)
Youth in alternative education	10	15.1	F (4) M (6)	Cook Island/Māori/Irish (1) Māori/Samoan (1) Māori/Australian (1) Māori/French (1) Māori/Ngāpuhi (2) NZ-European/Māori (2) NZ-European (1) Samoan/Niuean (1)
Whānau of youth in alternative education	1	Unknown	F (1)	Māori (1)

Procedure

The talanoa/kōrero with the five tutors occurred immediately after the last session in W12 of the programme which ran between July–November, 2017. Both tutors and youth participants were invited to participate in the evaluative component of research after a hui/fono was held at AESPI site before the initial July–November, 2017 intake, on a voluntary basis. Whānau members were invited personally by the researcher at the final W12 graduation. However, because of the time of year where the school calendar year was shutting down, parents were time poor and unavailable. The exception was one whānau member who generously gave her time over the telephone for a kōrero. For a more in-depth explanation of procedures, see Chapter 3 – Methodology. The talanoa/kōrero session was held at the university based in Auckland and was scheduled during the final mentoring session, whilst students/mentees were with their mentor whānau and coaches prior to their graduation, and lasted approximately 1 hour. For a detailed breakdown of participants in this study see Table 5, or Table 2 in Chapter 3 – Methodology.

The focus group talanoa/kōrero with youth from the two service providers (AESP1 and AESP2) occurred within a week of the 12-week programme graduation (male = 6, female = 4), at each location of the relevant service provider, and lasted approximately 20–30 minutes. The single

talanoa/kōrero over the telephone with one whānau/'aiga (AEW4) member of a male youth participant (AEY6) lasted approximately 40 minutes. Although AEY6 was a participant for Study 1 and Study 2, he did not participate in Study 3 (see Chapter 3 – Methodology for Table 2).

Analysis

Similar to Study 1, each talanoa/kōrero was transcribed within 24–48 hours. To ensure confidentiality, participants were assigned codes relevant to their group, for example, AEY1 and AET1 were a youth and tutor in alternative education who participated in the youth mentoring programme. Data analysis considered all researcher's notes, and initial reflexive notes taken immediately after interviews, in addition to the transcriptions. The inductive process of analysis was undertaken using reflexive thematic analysis procedures outlined by Braun and Clarke's (2006) process, utilising the key cultural constructs identified in the literature review. For example, talanoa/kōrero that included constructs such as fa'aaloalo (respect) or manaakitanga (ethic of care, hospitality) were grouped under the codes "culturally safe space" and "culturally safe relationships." They were then merged to "culturally transformative relationships." In the results, quotations were recorded verbatim to express the participants' lived realities of the programme. Full details of the analysis, procedure and methodological approach can be found in Chapter 3 – Methodology.

Results

The results of Study 3 present two interrelated themes as key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice in youth mentoring practice in Aotearoa New Zealand: (i) culturally transformative relationships, and (ii) sacred space. Narratives of alternative education tutors (*n*=5 from AESP1 and AESP2) are followed by the voices of youth participants (*n*=10) and one whānau participant (*n=1)*. Analysis of the talanoa/kōrero highlighted key actions by the programmers and mentors that supported culturally safe practice and key features of the programme that responded to and met the needs of youth.

Qualitative results in the current study provided additional insight into the culturally responsive, sustaining and safe processes occurring at both dyad and programme level from the perspective of youth themselves. All participants described their overall experience with the programme as mostly positive during the talanoa/kōrero. Analysis of the talanoa/kōrero highlighted key actions by the programmers and mentors that supported culturally safe practice and key features of the programme that responded to and met the needs of youth.

Culturally Transformative Relationships

Close mentoring relationships between mentors and mentee dyads are vital. The influence of close, caring and meaningful relationships with older nonparental adults or older peers is a vital component upon which the effectiveness of youth mentoring programmes rest (see DuBois et al., 2011). The powerful influence of the youth mentor–mentee relationship shows that it is the nucleus of the mentoring-relationship lifecycle alongside core elements of effective youth mentoring practice. Research in the US calls for caution on evaluations the effectiveness of youth mentoring programmes because large-scale evaluations of mentoring programmes rarely show the kinds of transformative effects on young people, which have been cited as a rationale for investment in mentoring (Rhodes & DuBois, 2006). Moreover, little is known about what transformative practice might look like within the youth mentoring context.

Culturally transformative relationships in this study are underpinned by the idea that youth mentors play an important role in supporting youth in their goals and to enjoy success as Māori and Pacific. The term *transformative* in this study refers to the idea that culturally transformative youth mentoring relationships affirm and acknowledge the cultural backgrounds of youth and draw on the cultural capital that youth bring (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Mila-Schaaf, 2011). Further, culturally transformative mentors honour and sustain the cultural heritage of young people and their communities (Paris, 2015; Paris & Alim, 2017). Drawing on ideas of culturally responsive and relevant practice from Gay (2010) in the context of youth mentoring, mentors in culturally transformative relationships help to develop success and simultaneously raise critical consciousness of mentees by igniting youths' aspirations beyond their current self-concept.

In the talanoa/kōrero (focus groups) with tutors, youth, and one whānau member, all participants indicated they had enjoyable experiences, and in some instances elaborated on positive outcomes observed and gained by all. The tutors' feedback immediately after the programme illustrated their initial thoughts about what stood out most, their aspirations for youth being met and linked to outcomes of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand experience, and the service providers' own individual learning plan goals constructed alongside youth. Alternative education tutors from AESP2 expressed their aspirations and explained that one of the goals they hoped for their youth attending the programme was "To build a relationship with their mentor" (AET3). His colleague agreed, with a similar expression of hope that strong bonds would be forged with their students and the mentors:

For our kids their ILP [individual learning plan] goals were to make the connection, the relationship with their mentor … building the connection… I think I need to go from there. For themselves yeah to build that relationship with their mentor because they didn't know them and then you know did they want to continue? But, they totally enjoyed it. They look forward to every Wednesday. (AET2)

AET3 explained that positive outcomes were visible for him not just for their students but for the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand mentors themselves in terms of being able to engage in positive relationship building.

For the mentors themselves … She [mentor] had two of them [mentees] ... they're quite full-on boys and she's managed them really well, so not only have our students got a positive outcome but I think the mentor as well in establishing that relationship and keeping them contained under her rules or whatever, programme of the day, they have actually listened to her which is cool. (AET3)

Tutors from AESP1 shared how mentors displayed actions and characteristics that showed promising practice which honoured their mentees' dignity by showing patience in challenging circumstance. He stated:

Yeah, they work well together, even like just hearing snippets of their conversations, they are quite insightful. I notice it. It might be a cheesy one, but I am really impressed with AEY1 and his mentor. I think she has responded sometimes in different situations better than I would as a tutor … Instead of like directly telling AEY1 off or putting him back in his place she would kind of come underneath and say a few words that will help encourage him and pull him back into the group. Naturally I would just take charge. We were building a bridge with those Lego pieces and anyway AEY1 was mucking around and I was like oh I'll just do it, but she [his mentor] came along and she pulled him back and got him to build the bridge himself, with words. She just used words. I thought that was great. She's probably got similar people in her family or a kid like that. I'm not sure. Or she's just good at what she does. (AET4)

Another participant also noticed promising practice, that restored his faith in youth workers who, in his observation, have often let young people down. He explained:

For me personally I have learnt from the mentors as well, just how they approach the students. Some of them are real different to how I would do it, I'm not saying they're wrong or right, but it's really ... I've learned a bit like how to approach different situations and how they are not necessarily less strict, but the approach still gets the

136

student engaged and it's not as over the top, like how I probably normally am ... I think even just I was feeling this morning, like we work with a lot of social workers and like being here with these students, being here with these up and coming social workers have kind of restored the relationship that has kind of been broken by some of the social workers that we work with. Most of them I would say are great but there is a portion out there that, like I love that every Wednesday these guys are passionate about it and you know the students walk in the door and their arms are wide open and they are getting them in. And it almost seems like it comes from an intrinsic motivation instead of external. The social workers that come and pick some of our students up, some of them don't even call us to say they are coming anymore, and we end up getting whatever is left over. I think that this ... has kind of restored the relationships between students and social workers and hopefully when social workers do come into their lives the great experience they have had here would been enabling them to be more open to working with social workers, because some of them are like oh I don't want a social worker, that means I am different, you know, a negative view.

The tutor's comment above offers insight into how he perceived the impact mentors of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand had on young people. The tutor's positive view of mentor–mentee interactions serve as an example of negative relationships "restored" between mentees and their social workers prior to the programme. The powerful work exhibited by mentors suggests that the tutor, in cultural humility, engaged in self-critique and reflected on his own practice and perhaps power imbalances that might exist (Tervalon & Murray-García, 1998). Similar to the work of Weiston-Serdan (2017), this may also suggest mentors, who are training to be social workers and/or youth workers in the field, were operating in ways that were "transformative," that is, the mentors centred youth through more dynamic way of mentoring relationships.

Further, the data offer insight into how transformative relationships were characterised, such as mentors going the extra mile with a depth of patience and honouring the young person's mana. A strengths-based approach to respectful relationships where high expectations are maintained and the dignity of young people is honoured is fundamental to respectful relationships (Jansen et al., 2010). A. Macfarlane et al. (2007) assert the criticality of respecting each young person's mana by not trampling on their honour/pride by shaming, deriding or being aggressive. Although the term mana may have slightly different meanings for Māori or

137

Pacific peoples, the data suggest relationships that are culturally transformative take into consideration the cultural context of rangatahi, and how their mana is safely kept intact.

The data suggest alternative education tutors felt the programme mentors were cognisant of their mentees' cultural and social contexts. In other words, mentors in the programme responded in ways that recognised the possible power imbalance between mentor and mentee, a key tenet of cultural safety (Curtis et al., 2019). The tutors recognised the impact of alternative strategies and particular practices mentors enacted, to show fa'aaloalo (respect) and similarly manaakitanga (care), key culturally grounded strengths they displayed. Tutors referred to a collective context, one of a whānau environment because whānau and whanaungatanga "indicate both a sense of belonging to and a sense of relating to others, within a context of collective identity and responsibility" (A. Macfarlane et al., 2008, p. 107). The programme provided such an environment: "I think why our kids love it is because it's a loving environment, like it really is. Right from the get-go when they get here they feel like they…" (AET4). AET2 finished his sentence, saying "They are wanted, part of a whānau" and AET4 replied "[the youth mentoring programme] want them to be here."

Youth participants' initial impressions of the programme were congruent with the tutors' talanoa/kōrero. Their experiences of the programme were positive, for example, AEY13 stated "I thought it was fun!" and AEY15 found his time at the campus was fun and an opportunity of a lifetime. One youth, AEY1, talked about how his new goals were "to work towards a future." AEY7 thought "It was cool." Other initial impressions from youth were more specific to their relationships, such as AEY11 who talked about his mentor: "It was nice having [MT9] because she's from [abroad] and she had only been in the country for 6 months she said, 8 months or something like that … Yeah it was buzzy aye like the way she talks it was out of it as!" Other youth participants were quick to offer their memories of the nourishing food on offer every Wednesday at the programme. One stated "Because they had the mean feeds, yo!" (AEY12). The various comments made by youth suggest that the programme environment, activities and mentoring relationships imbued them with a sense of joy and nourishment both physically and relationally where youth felt settled, with a sense of belonging and connectedness (Stuart & Jose, 2014).

The one whānau member who participated in the current study talked about how her experience of her son being a part of the course was mixed. She enjoyed the graduation and the positive outcomes over the 12 weeks where she felt he was more focussed. However, the effect was

short lived as her son fell into trouble shortly after. She described his transition from the youth mentoring programme to his normal routine attending alternative education as "changing over a course. It was a bit of a let-down" but then explained immediately:

> Don't worry about that you've done a lot for my son which has actually put a lot of the positive vibes into him during that programme although I didn't really take interest in it until he asked me to go to the graduation and then I sort of felt actually it turned out quite good for him. (AEW4)

The parent's comments suggest the positive vibes were a result of the mentoring relationship that her son experienced. The data suggest that there was an element of transformative powerful change during the programme; however, post programme, after the supportive relationship ended, he required ongoing support of the same nature the programme provided.

"Yeah, the graduation was awesome. It was not something I would have expected from him because he's such a disturbance to a class, but he changed during those 12 weeks." She expressed the outcomes she saw as generally positive, stating:

> I see him every day and it's one day he's good, the next day he's not. It's just back and forth so what I said ... in schoolwork I think he's picked up a little bit more from Term 1 and 2 in the sense of his schoolwork. His attitude slightly changed, not a lot but slightly. He's keeping out of trouble except for the other day. (AEW4)

The talanoa/kōrero shows the factor of time might have been a limitation for building on these relationships as there were indications that the 12 weeks was too short a period to start to really see the culturally nuanced transformative relationships.

One tutor, AET1 from AESP1, expressed her thoughts about elements of mentees' cultural and linguistic backgrounds being met across the whole programme.

> AET1: Yeah, so what I am hearing and what I have observed in the beginning, is that there is no doubt that these young mentors have great social intelligence. They are providing a safe environment. Our kids are happy which is definitely a measure of success. But I guess what I wonder if you unpack it is how much more value would be added if they put the cultural yeah, epistemologies in there.
>
> Interviewer: Do you want to talk about that a little bit more? Break it down, like we did last time.
>
> AET1: I guess the first thing that was done really well, because I was present at that meeting and I don't know if it was similar for you guys, it's the buddying of our students

with the mentors. So, it was great. There was considerable thought invested in that. And from the next tier up they had an idea of what that cultural responsiveness looked like, but I am not sure to what degree the mentors were up with it basically. So, adding into the programme, the learning programme, how to use students' cultural capital to make them shine, you know, yeah to give that extra boost etc. I don't know if that happened … One on one is great but we are whānau so there was lots of microteaching, but the activities I saw, for the best part, they were engaged, there is no doubt, but they looked very staid and nothing kind of outside the box, so very Eurocentric basically.

AET1's talanoa/kōrero showed she had reservations about the programme being culturally responsive in ways that were transformative. Her comments suggest that the programme was mainly positive and the programme had good intentions to match mentors appropriately with mentees, either as cross-cultural pairs or culturally matched pairs where in-depth discussion about culturally responsive practice strategies or plans to engage in responsive ways were discussed. However, this only went as far as drawing on assets of spirituality through karakia.

The tutor's aspirations and/or expectations to see youth were given learning opportunities to positively develop their diverse identities in culturally grounded ways were not quite met. Given she was part of the matching process, this study offers programmers insight into the importance of enacting practice that enhances the mana of young people by recruiting and engaging mentors who might have the potential or skillset to draw on the existing cultural capital of mentors or community members who identify as ethnically minoritised individuals.

The data suggest her observations of the programme also indicate there was a lack of ethnocultural empathy (Peifer et al., 2016) in planning for activities that matched mentees' contexts. The data suggest there is potential to go further than karakia in te reo and to build on this first iteration going forward; programmers should seek to reference the myriad of identities that youth bring, in order to have a sense of belonging in a culturally grounded space. Consistent with Mila-Schaaf and Robinson (2010), this means the tutor acknowledged youth have their own agency through Indigenous knowledge systems. Polycultural capital is an inherent asset for rangatahi who are able to exercise a sense of agency and ability to efficiently reference more than one knowledge tradition, to choose selectively and respond effectively dependent on context and purpose.

It is important to note that this particular tutor was present at the programme less than the other four tutors due to attending to other alternative youth members unable to participate on the

140

programme from the beginning of the 12-week programme. Despite the difference in time spent at the programme, it was still vital to note the valuable insight she had in expressing what might be responsive to sustaining mentees' diverse needs whilst ensuring safe practice.

Tutors also expressed that the sports activities were not as effective given they, as a service provider, are a sports-activity-based provider. AET4 described the potential of accessing key strengths and skills of mentors from the wider university:

> I think that like its key for them. Our kids have an idea of some sort of standard when it comes to sports obviously because we do a lot of that within our programmes, even on Mondays, together. So, when the ones that are facilitating the sport actually have no idea of touch rules and things like that ... it's hard for the kids because now they start complaining, who's reffing, they are all joking and laughing it off but really like yeah you're right, they should know how to ref a game of touch. And I don't think it was strength based like for the mentors who were facilitating the sports. You don't have to do touch because they like touch. What is your strength? What can you teach and deliver that the kids are going to benefit from? It doesn't have to be like basketball. Some of it was really like quite whack like I was like oh what is this, like yeah there is going to be a standard to keep and make sure that you are going to deliver something with excellence and if it's not your thing don't do it. (AET4)

Another tutor added to this talanoa/kōrero by stating that it could again be related to the timing of the programme and the ability to see some empowerment and transformation through the activities provided alongside their mentors. A strong theme from tutors was the first iteration of the pro-social activities might not have reached their expectations and potentially hindered the transformative power of mentee–mentor relationships. AET2 stated:

> And that could be the timeframe that we're talking about was too short. So, you may have found our mentors and the programme may have, made up a programme, but because it was in a short timeframe you have just put whoever in there, oh yeah, I'll do that, and I'll do that. So, if you get 6 months you maybe be able to spend the first 2 weeks with our students, gather what they want and then develop your programme so that it tailors to all the kids and then you would be able to have more time to have a specialised delivery that will keep them engaged and empowered so that they are not coming in thinking eh we're doing touch, we know touch and you are not doing it or something like that. Art, like a mural, a lot of our students are on art. I didn't hear any negative feedback about it from any of ours. (AET2)

Another tutor described the positive outcomes they observed as a result of having the right people in the right spaces operating to their strengths as mentors, which meant meeting the needs of their youth more effectively. Transformative relationships are built when students feel the autonomy to choose an activity with their mentor that interests them, and gives them a sense of mastery, competence and confidence (Deci & Ryan, 2000). As part of the programme model, youth choice in activities was an important component. The tutor's response about the importance of purposeful activities and the delivery of each was evident in his expression:

> Dance is the same. I think dance you could tell that the person had some dance experience. It went real well. Even the students that we thought wouldn't do it. But I think that's the difference with having somebody experienced. You get students that are on the fringes to get involved. As for sports, it's close to us because we are a sport course and our students are very competitive, so when it comes to … you get a white guy that doesn't work out, you know to lead something, our students end up not engaged. But like our spoken word, you've got somebody specialised in spoken word for that. Everything else was pretty good. But we pick on sports because that is our area and that is our strengths as well. (AET4)

The kōrero/talanoa from tutors indicates that they themselves, as well as their youth (from a tutor's lens) had high expectations of the activities and environment the programme offered. Tutors appeared to want an environment that was loving and open, which they found the programme delivered on overall. Consistent with Deci and Ryan (2008), tutors also expressed their hope for activities that not only fed into their students' interests but also gave them a sense of belonging, autonomy, mastery and empowerment. The data showed the tutors' desire for the youth mentoring relationships and programme to go further and reflect the world of their young people so that they felt connection, had a sense of relatedness and belonging, that they were able and competent within activities that challenged them.

One tutor (AET2) gave her overall expression whilst I was on-site for the youth talanoa/kōrero focus groups and also emailed her thoughts to describe the graduation as positive, stating:

> There was not one whānau that left yesterday without their faces and smiles beaming feeling proud of their child after graduation. Initially some whānau felt uneasy and apprehensive about being in the university space and were unsure. They might have lacked a full understanding of why their child was there. It wasn't until they saw for themselves the impact of the programme that they could see what they had gone through with their mentors. The fact they could sit down and enjoy a lovely hāngī meal and take

some away home was a bonus. That was something special for them. There was one young person who was very shy and sensitive and by the end of the programme she was very open to having a kōrero with most people now, including today.

This tutor's observations of whānau in the university space suggests it was an unfamiliar context for whānau/'aiga. The university was a social and cultural space that was inherently different for the parent and caused apprehension prior to attending graduation; however, with the inclusion of karakia, cultural food (hāngī) and other important cultural practices such as waiata and mihimihi, the programmers created an environment of comfort or safe space. The data align with Muriwai et al. (2015) whose findings posited Māori who have a high level of cultural efficacy have higher psychological resilience or predicted lower levels of psychological distress. Drawing on the Muriwai et al.'s (2015) culture-as-cure perspective, the data suggest the importance of youth mentoring programmes developing a cultural environment that enables rangatahi to increase cultural efficacy "whether that be through exploring a number of different ways to 'be Māori' or 'do Māori cultural things'" (p. 20) which may act as a buffering function to safeguard against potential psychological distress.

The data from the kōrero/talanoa with AET1 are also consistent with Mila-Schaaf and Robinson (2010) where she indicates the need for youth to access Pacific forms of capital in addition to the capital they were perhaps exposed to in the dominant space of a tertiary institution. The potential for youth mentoring programmes to ensure mentees are being exposed to Polycultural capital (as discussed in Chapter 2) might give students the cumulative advantage of having the best of both worlds. The quote below from AET1 suggests the potential of carefully planned activities that support cultural identity development in the next iteration. She stated:

Just the course of the days that I saw, yeah pretty much yeah. So, we talked about that in the beginning, cultural elements because a lot of our kids, either they are hungry and when you have a place to stand that's everything, so I don't know if the mentors were able to provide that or not. All that kind of stuff. I'm not saying a hundy [a concerted effort] but just elements of that, and then you would have different forms of measurement basically.

The talanoa/kōrero does show, however, that tutors were keen for Māori and Pacific students to gain so much more from the programme in terms of outcomes whilst developing transformative relationships. AET1 and AET2, alongside AET4, described the potential of building on assets both within the university and outside. Consistent with ideas from Paris and

Alim (2017), tutors suggested the opportunity for mentors to tap into the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of their young people by showcasing the access they have to support mechanisms in the university space. They were explicit about the ideas of raising the critical consciousness of their young people about leveraging and transforming their futures whilst being educationally successful. The data below suggest tutors could see the potential of the programme to bring more opportunities cognitive development (Rhodes, 2005). They commented:

AET1: How much the physical environment was utilised as a resource, our kids going to uni [university], I don't know if they had a really in-depth look around to grow their worlds bigger again. We are on-site yes, but ... how practical that was.

AET2: The Pasifika students support, tap into our Māori student support that is here, tap into the library and all the resources so that they actually know if they want to take on uni, this is the bigger picture. You have all these support systems around you, you are not going to fail. And if you feel you are failing this is where you can go and gather help and maybe tap into more of what's available here and maybe not only just this university, a little glimpse at where they want to go so that if the mentor really builds that relationship with that student, what do you want to do. Okay, I want to do engineering. Where? Which universities around the country will tailor your wish? Physiotherapy, I know that's only done over the Shore, so I think our students think wow this university must cater for every subject that I want to do. Yeah, probably utilise what is here, and they have got computers. Kids are always looking at that I suppose, the gym, the pool, everything, everything that was available here and that this is only a small university compared to everything that a country has to offer, if not Auckland alone, how many campuses are in Auckland? We must have the most in our region. We've got Massey. We've got here. There's Unitec. Whereas Hamilton has got just Waikato I suppose and then you've got all the other little wānangas.

The data suggest tutors could see the opportunity for powerful culturally transformative relationships between youth mentors and mentees. They also saw a lost opportunity in how the programme itself could potentially arm their young people with access to resources through intentional planned activities. For example, AET3 stated "Even if there had been an open day or something like that where their mentors could take them to all these different areas and be looking at the industry." The feedback from tutors offers insight to the funds of knowledge (Gonzalez et al., 2005) tutors hold, that is, the developed knowledge and skills they have

accumulated historically and culturally in their own contexts of Māori and Pacific communities. Making connections between home and the programme reinforces the potential power of culturally transformative relationships, in this case, through harnessing tutors' feedback to support youths' educational dreams and aspirations by fully utilising the resources and facilities on-site.

A key finding from the tutors was the importance of linking the programme closer to a whānau/environment that reflected the worlds of their youth. The feedback about working in whānau groups was positive. They did offer ways in which whānau groups could work well from a cultural lens by offering a simple suggestion to the whānau groups:

> AET4: It's good the way it is but if you want to improve it, like an idea was about bringing different cultural aspects. You could probably call them tribes, when they initially start the way to build relationships you kind of come up with the name for your group. Like it could be a tradition or like Māori.

> AET3: Or a meaning behind it.

> AET5: Something that represents you as a group.

> AET4: And a coat or arms maybe, they have to make arms or a flag. Yeah, something like your village.

> AET2: A moko, but one that embraces all the ethnicities that are in your whānau group, you could do something like that.

Consistent with research in Aotearoa New Zealand, there is a clear link to the importance of youth being able to see themselves actively participating in culturally transformative ways. Research in education by Bishop et al. (2003) almost 20 years ago, concerning Māori secondary students, pointed to the importance of Māori cultural constructs that prioritise strengths-based views and antideficit theorising. The data above show clearly the ideas of creating an environment that engenders youth agency. Youth are seen as active participants in self-determining the names they give themselves as a counter-narrative to historically being labelled in deficit ways (Bishop et al., 2009).

Culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring programmes have the potential to engage in meaningful ways that make space for Indigenous youth and their communities. Programmers have the opportunity to utilise rich ideas from the communities of youth that are not limited to tutors but also their whānau/'aiga and Kaumātua to support even more powerful

culturally transformative relationships between mentors and mentees. Consistent with Benson et al. (2003), this goes beyond the village rhetoric to create healthy communities for children and adolescents. It is a win–win situation for programme and community working collaboratively, drawing on the cultural assets of youth. The data from tutors above show the potential and are consistent with indicators of positive development such as collective responsibility, successfully navigation of Māori and Pākehā worlds, cultural efficacy by being able to walk in and out of multiple worlds, and the health and personal strengths as theorised by Simmonds et al. (2014).

Sacred Space

Sacred space/s refers to the sacredness of the mentoring relationship and the importance of treating mentees with care and without judgement within the mentoring va. Additionally, sacred space in this study refers to consideration of the spirituality of young people in the mentoring relationship. Space made sacred or va tapuia from a Samoan lens places emphasis on sustaining and nourishing mentees, and respecting diversity of spirituality through deep meaningful relationships. Sacred space is characterised by a whānau/'aiga or family-like environment of love and connectedness where young people experience a sense of joy, grace and transformation (Schoone, 2015, 2017). The concept of sacred space/va tapuia from a Samoan-specific lens refers to an environment in which one feels a sense of alofa and fa'aaloalo (Amituanai-Toloa, 2006) or similarly from a Māori lens, aroha and manaakitanga. However, it is important to note that distinctive to Māori spirituality is wairuatanga as noted in Chapter 2.

In the current study, an important aspect of sacred space is spiritual wellbeing. This includes the ability of mentees to express their spiritual self through karakia, or prayer from multiple lenses, such as a Pacific lens of tatalo or loto. Notably, this is only one outward expression among other aspects of cultural practices from a Māori and Pacific lens as sacred and vital to holistic health and wellbeing (Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pere, 1991; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001). In the talanoa/kōrero focus group with tutors, discussion about the inclusion of tikanga and karakia highlighted the importance of spiritual health and wellbeing. There was agreement about the importance of karakia in particular; however, one tutor was unsure of whether tikanga and karakia were practised throughout the programme. AET1 commented on the importance of mentees' diversity and visibility of this throughout the programme. She commented:

> I asked the kids this morning and one of them said that there was, other than karakia which was always in Māori, which is all good, but we've got a diverse mix and I don't know if the children ever got to say their own, so little things like that, elements of.

The data suggests the importance of sacred space when enacting spirituality regarding karakia are conducted, whether it be ad hoc or thoughtfully and intentionally. The tutors' response, questioning the inclusion of other languages throughout the programme, highlights the importance of affirming spirituality practices for all Pacific cultures (Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pere, 1991; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001). Ensuring sacred space for karakia is a vital component for culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice. The comment below by AET4 offered tips of how the programme might improve activities giving emphasis on the importance of karakia in different languages stating:

> You can get them to like, if you have Samoan there, you could say hey what's a prayer in Samoan we can do next week. If you have a Tongan there, Indian and European. You could just roll with that. It gets the kids thinking that they are building something as well as just receiving. They begin to get used to just being the recipients of the blessing.

The data offer youth mentoring programmers insight when working alongside an Indigenous population with diverse and important sacred rituals. In this case, tutors were highlighting the importance of spirituality and sacred space for Pacific and Māori youth within youth mentoring programmes. The importance of spirituality expressed in different ways such as the wairuatanga and va tapuia of the mentoring relationship shown in this study is consistent with well-established Indigenous health and wellbeing models, that is, spirituality is an integral part of Māori and Pacific youth flourishing holistically in a whānau/'aiga approach (Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pere, 1991; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001) .

The narratives of the tutors evaluating the programme were also consistent with recent work of Schoone (2017). Schoone's study showed alternative education tutors themselves were social pedagogues who related more authentically with students and valued pastoral care alongside academic guidance both within and beyond school for youth in alternative education. The data in the current study suggest that youth mentoring programmes in the tertiary space, targeting Māori and Pacific youth, might consider ways in which pastoral care is approached within the context of sacred space. AET5 responded:

> It's real authentic. Real sincere … like I said when students walk in the mentors, not physically, but you know metaphorically it seems like their arms are open to these kids, almost like not getting biblical, but the prodigal son coming back home. It really is a loving environment and a loving space.

A va relational approach in youth mentoring emphasises the acknowledgement of expression of spirituality as an integral part of the holistic development of rangatahi. The biblical reference

made by this tutor indicates that the tutor has an understanding of the holistic wellbeing and development of rangatahi. Just as Durie (1994) and other theorists in Aotearoa, mentioned in Chapter 2, noted the importance of spiritual wellbeing; this study highlights the multiple views of spirituality across heterogeneous youth. Thus, critical thought must be taken to proceed with activities and tikanga that enhance mentee spirituality.

Tikanga practices such as karakia, waiata and pōwhiri, were discussed in ways that suggest how specific activities might be treated within the context of sacred space within a te ao Māori context, given they provide a foundation for culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice. The pro-social activity kapa haka and presence of two staff from the Māori school at the university were discussed. Tutors' responses below show the talanoa/kōrero between tutors to clarify whether they felt tikanga and kawa was present.

> AET3: I come from a kapa haka background. My kids do all that. So, it just seems normal to me so just accept it for what it is, and I enjoyed it. That's about it for me.

> AET5: I like at the start the pōwhiri, because some of these kids have never been to a marae before. Some have never been through a pōwhiri and through the whole custom. I reckon it's useful.

> AET2: Tapped into a whole lot of untapped knowledge.

> AET5: Like our kids led the waiata you know. Some of them it was the first waiata that they had learnt.

> AET2: And some of them were the first time getting up and starting the waiata like for [AEY13], I was really proud that she got up with Whaea and did it in front of her class. I think having our little kohanga reo level there made our students feel well if the younger ones are doing it hard out and that they weren't just Māori, they were actually Māori, Pākehā, whatever, empowered them too. Wow, these kids are all just doing it so this is the norm for them. They are in a kohanga and their parents know they are going into a Māori kaupapa and they have accepted that, may have drawn on our students, oh well we are going to accept this is part of the process and I don't know, I mean it tapped into [AET5, of both Māori and Tongan descent]. We didn't know he could kōrero Māori. Next thing he gets up and makes us proud.

The discussion went on further about the importance about kawa and also about being surprised about one another's strengths in being able to tautoko (support) youth and the programme at different times, with formalities. What is notable is that although there was jest and laughter in

148

the focus group between tutors, there was a sense of importance between all tutors that kawa and tikanga are vital throughout. This is evidenced when AET1 stated "Day 1 was awesome, it was good. The kawa of Day 1 ...Yeah, was awesome, but was that maintained throughout or was it a Day 1 [one-off event]?"

The data suggest that kapa haka was a key pro-social activity as part of a culturally translated approach. In addition the tutor discussed a bigger picture context noting the importance of mentees seeing the kohanga reo next door with the pre-schoolers from diverse backgrounds normalise a kura even as non-Māori. The data shows excitement from Māori alternative tutors of the prospect of rangatahi linking into the urban Mārae of the university site and to make those links with the kohanga as being a package of Māori cultural pride.

Feedback of the mentoring programme processes from tutors suggest perhaps more consideration and time should be committed to making explicit links to te Ao Māori during the programme in collaboration with Māori staff in future iterations as opposed to a one off kapa haka session. The tutor's response indicates her knowledge and understanding of the importance of kapa haka as one part of te ao Māori and that perhaps she would like to have seen more depth or opportunity for rangatahi to engage in kapa haka. Consistent with Whitinui (2014), the tutor could see the transformative power of Indigenous-based inclusive pedagogy where space at the university and potential activities for rangatahi would enable them access to explore their Māori selves.

The response below by AET2 describes the importance of cultural rituals and practices in the context of sacred space, and importantly how rangatahi felt at ease, eventually volunteering to say karakia.

> When they did karakia timatanga [prayer to start the day] and karanga whakamutunga [prayer to close the day or meeting] at the beginning and at the end all the kids knew, and I think it was good that they had it up there for the kids to recite, everyone to follow. It was put out there, who would like to do it and like [AEY member], the first time I saw [AEY member] from [AESP1], he had a hoodie on, didn't want to interact with anyone. And then the next week he was empowered to get up and do the ... and he just put his hand up. I was like wow from a kid who came in with his hoodie on, didn't want to talk to a kid who is now standing in front of everyone doing the karakia, not 1 week, he did it a couple of weeks and then he must have thought I need to give someone else a turn. But I was quite happy to hear him every week. I was really empowered and

proud of him. Proud of him to do that. And straight away I made a connection with him. After that I just walked up to him every day saying "hey [AEY member]" because I was proud that he came into my realm, my area. That's my culture. And he took that on. I was really proud of him. I still am today. I just shake his hand. That is going to be a lifelong friendship whenever I see [AEY member]. Kia ora [AEY member] and he will always give me his hand.

Sacred space and the practices within those were vital components of the programme. The data suggest that the environment afforded to young people provided a space or va to enact their spiritual selves. Given that spiritual health and wellbeing are closely linked (Manuela & Anae, 2017), the data suggest that practising such elements also gives a positive sense of Māori identity and cultural efficacy which are critical resilience factors for rangatahi (Webber, 2015). The current study suggests the process of facilitating and developing a positive sense of Māori identity and cultural efficacy may also have a positive effect on others in the programme, including mentors, programme staff and stakeholders. In this case, the tutor expressed her sense of pride when her own cultural identity was affirmed through others and a youth participant from her out-group (non-Māori) who engaged in karakia. This supports the idea that, given the opportunity, youth can rise to the occasion and gain a sense of mastery and confidence.

Sacred space is also important to support increased confidence for positive youth development. One mentee showed courage and took risks without feeling judged. This was noticed by his tutors and no doubt by his peers of Māori descent. The mentee had agency and showed the potential for his peers, both Māori and non-Māori, to also feel comfortable and take risks. Professor Russell Bishop stated "What's good for Māori is good for all" (Te Kotahitanga, 2020) and this is one example of the programme presenting opportunities for all participants to explore each other's multiplicity of identities. Additionally, this is one way both Māori and Pacific youth may exercise agency in culturally grounded spaces to comfortably navigate multiple worlds, gaining cumulative capital (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010).

The talanoa/kōrero indicates that the programme environment was designed in a way that tried to take on the feedback in Chapter 4 – Study 1, that is, the tutors could see a concerted effort from the programmers to create an environment or space that was sacred, that included pōwhiri, karakia and was respectful to the tikanga of the local urban university marae as well as providing activities where youth had access to one session of kapa haka.

AET2's use of the term *tapped* alongside *knowledge* shows the potential of youth and mentoring programmes in Aotearoa New Zealand. A key consideration raised by one participant, and at other times from some tutors, is whether the programme considered the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of youth in meaningful ways through the environment and the activities. The data above suggest that the cultural identities of Māori mentees were considered; however, less so for mentees who were either of Pacific or Pākehā descent.

Similarly, the whānau member who generously offered her time to kōrero over the phone described her son's experience as the programme putting positive vibes in him. Her kōrero below suggests that the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa space had an impact on him. She described his positive time within the course compared to immediately after the course:

> It was a bit of a let-down … but don't worry … you've done a lot for my son which has actually put a lot of the positive vibes into him during that programme although I didn't really take interest in it until he asked me to go to the graduation and then I sort of felt actually it turned out quite good for him. (AEW4)

She also commented that she and her son enjoyed graduation and the positive impact it had on him stating "Yeah the graduation was awesome. It was not something I would have expected from him…. but he changed during those 12 weeks" (AEW4).

The data suggest that in that 12 weeks, her son experienced a space provided by the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand that was somewhat significant for him to realise his potential academically. From the perspective of his mother, the space he entered outside of his home environment was positive. In line with Mila-Schaaf (2011), this young man was able to access and accumulate both cultural and academic advantages in what this study suggests is a sacred space where he experienced joy, positivity and showed an improved attitude and which perhaps influenced him spiritually. The va tapuia (sacred space) between her son and his mentor, was space that was active. A space where he and his peers all faced their mentors, engaging in activities building close bonds, embedded within the youth mentoring programme and its participants as negotiated space, that provided an environment that met his needs at that point of time.

Strategies for future iterations would be to take on the ideas of alternative education tutors, noted previously, that mentees could themselves collaboratively name their whānau groups, representing their rich ethnic identities. Within the context of sacred space in the youth mentoring relationships, youth might feel more confident to explore and tap into their spiritual

selves if supported actively in the programme to do so. Engaging in activities beyond karakia and kapa haka, or alternatively having more activities offered that prioritise the exploration of spirituality in a sacred and safe space would support Māori and Pacific youths' holistic development (Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pere, 1991; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001).

Another example of the manifestation of sacred space where alofa and fa'aloalo were evident in the mentor-mentee relationship was when a tutor was asked to explain further about what he meant "to come under" his colleague, AET4 responded:

> So, like really it is some people they have a style or an approach where they come on top of people by force, getting them to do what you want, but when you come underneath you are empowering someone, you can't push them up unless you stoop down to their level and give them a hand up you know what I mean and I think that's what I mean by that. They kind of ... like if a student is at this level and the mentor is here, that's how we kind of view society and the world, like you go by ranks or upper class or whatever, for a mentor to come underneath a student you are kind of coming down to their level and you are relating on their level. You have to have a lot of humility to do that … Yeah well to come down you've got to humble yourself. Not much people will want to come down to their level and relate to them in that way.

It was clear from this part of the talanoa/kōrero that tutors had a positive view of how mentors in the programme conducted themselves, which is consistent with cultural humility, which refers to considering another's culture from their perspective (Tervalon & Murray-García, 1998). Moreover, tutors noted how mentors exhibited key elements of the tuakana–teina relationships which have been posited as "culturally safe ways to reinforce the development of spaces that are whānau centred, and that support the reciprocity and enhancement of tuākana and tēina as well as (whaka) whanaungatanga" (Gillon, 2020, p. 83). This study showed that it is within sacred space that tuakana–teina and similarly feagaiga relational elements can be useful in understanding ancestral ways of relationality, reciprocity and balanced, harmonious relationships.

Additionally, the data suggest that mentors at the programme enacted practice that exhibited ongoing self-reflection and self-awareness. In line with Curtis et al. (2019), the data suggest mentors understood the power imbalance in their relationships and engaged in providing culturally safe practice, as defined by their community. This may have been as a result of their training about the importance of culture, the role of whānau and positive identities and

importantly knowing one's mentee on a relational level, and understanding the va between mentor and mentee.

As mentioned above, sacred space, the va tapuia in youth mentoring relationships, includes being sensitive to a mentee's readiness. Youth in the current study were not ready for check-ins, also known as scheduled counselling sessions. Consistent with the results of Study 1, youth felt the need for their space to be safe and willingly engage in therapeutic, in-the-moment therapy. Youth shared their discomfort and unwillingness to engage. In a focus group with AESP2 mentees AEY11 stated

> I always moan when they always want me to do check-ins… I don't know, I've done a couple but it's weird you're just one on one with that … oh what's that lady's name … No, the first one I just went but then I didn't want to do another one. But they were just asking… she was like you wanna go check-in – I'm like nah I'm fine. Nah I'm all good.

When asked whether check-ins made a difference for AEY12, he stated "Nah it didn't make any difference." AEY12's response to being asked whether check-in had had an impact in was "No because I didn't feel like I need one." AEY12 also stated he had one session on his 12-week programme but didn't understand what the check-in was for. Although neither boy was keen on the counselling component or therapy in the moment, they still had very positive feedback about the course, particularly the poetry and supporting school success, where they talked about their goals and aspirations as did other mentees. However, in the context of sacred space, and Māori and Pacific youth developing positively in culturally responsive, sustaining and safe ways, rangatahi mostly felt unsafe and uncomfortable. On the other hand, they all had positive experiences through the generous helpings of food where they felt nourished, and they generally enjoyed the activities provided. In relation to the check-ins and culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice from a cultural lens, another focus group with AESPI students who participated in the programme had similar reactions, with AEY14 stating "I didn't even need check-in" although he also felt he did not have a choice. He stated "Yeah it wasn't a yes or no question, it was just a oh yeah, check-in." Equally important in sacred space is trusting relationships being built and a respect of boundaries. In his talanoa/kōrero focus group, a youth member shared his reluctance to engage with a counsellor during the programme, in this case referred to as a "check-in" within the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand

AEY15 felt that it took time away from the pro-social activities he wanted to engage in, whereas AEY13, a female mentee, felt that the questions were too personal. In contrast, AEY1, who was the only mentee who participated in all three research studies, commented that he

enjoyed the check-ins and took every opportunity weekly to attend. He stated "I liked the check-in because I always went to check-in and [she] asked if I want to check-in after walk and talk and I was like yeah." This particular mentee was the youngest of the whole cohort and was the only mentee who did not feel negatively about the check-ins.

Mentees from AESP2 stated they did not really appreciate the check-ins as they felt they did not need them either. AEY10 "It's like helpful for other people but I don't really need a counsellor." This reaction maybe a result of her experience where she felt uncomfortable. "They put me in such an uncomfortable position when they like asked me a question and I don't know whether to tell them or to sit back because it's awkward as." In a similar response, AEY9 explained her discomfort about probing and perhaps not waiting till she was ready. When making reference to counsellors, she stated she would prefer "Pretty much asking us like not personal things. Not pushing it like the boundaries and everything when you ask us questions"

Given the mainly positive responses of tutors, youth and a whānau member about the programme, this study provided new insights into key ingredients that were impactful in culturally responsive, sustaining and safe ways. The youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand showed the potential for powerful transformative practice in youth mentoring when taking into consideration the role of culture, race, and ethnicity that draws on the role of Indigenous constructs and values.

Chapter Summary

Study 3 provided insights from the lenses of alternative education tutors and their youth who were all participants of the programme. The tutors in particular were overall positive and proud of the growth that they witnessed for particular youth. Importantly, tutors also provided constructive feedback on what could be improved which was also echoed by youth themselves. Unfortunately, because whānau members were time poor only one participant offered her views which still gave insight into the effectiveness of the programme. The next chapter offers a discussion by triangulating all three studies and describes the implications for programmers and policy makers. Key to the chapter is an analysis of all findings utilising the broader conceptualisation of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice.

Chapter 7 – Discussion

Chapter Overview

This chapter presents an overall discussion of the findings outlined in Study 1, Study 2 and Study 3, respectively. This chapter presents an examination of each study's contribution to the wider literature base of race, culture and ethnicity in youth mentoring (Farruggia et al., 2010; Sánchez et al., 2014; Simpkins et al., 2017). Importantly, the chapter discusses the contributions of this research from a va relational approach both theoretically to the field of culturally responsive, culturally sustaining and culturally safe practice in the context of youth mentoring practice and methodologically to the scholarship of culturally responsive multimethods. To remind the reader, a va relational approach to in this thesis refers to engagement with Indigenous knowledge systems and frames of reference.

This thesis offers a va relational approach, that is, inclusive of both Pasifika and Māori research literature and approaches drawing on critical theory from a localised lens, "grounded in the specific meanings, traditions, customs, and community relations that operate in each indigenous setting" (Denzin et al, 2008, p. 6). The current study privileged Indigenous knowledge systems that included constructs relevant to youth mentoring, informed by theories of culturally responsive practice, culturally sustaining practice and culturally safe practice in disciplines of education and health in both Aotearoa New Zealand and internationally.

Following is a discussion about the research contributions this project makes to the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand, the vehicle utilised to explore key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice. I then discuss the insights and limitations of using a multimethod research approach to advance culturally responsive methods in youth mentoring contexts. The final part of this chapter discusses the implications for future research and my concluding thoughts that include reflections on the navigational malaga (journey) to explore the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice from a distinctive va relational approach.

The Role of Race, Culture and Ethnicity in Youth Mentoring

Before discussing the research contributions to race, culture and ethnicity in youth mentoring, it is important to remind the reader that a va relational approach was taken in this thesis. A va relational approach is a central organising construct to theorise both Pasifika and Māori knowledge systems in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand (Suaalii-Sauni, 2017). The

rationale for using a va approach was to privilege both epistemological and ontological ways of being and knowing for Pacific peoples in the diaspora of Aotearoa (also known as tāngata o le Moana) and their ancestral relatives or whanaunga, tāngata whenua Māori, the original habitants of this land. Using a relational approach meant that this doctoral project unapologetically prioritised Māori and Pacific worldviews, perspectives, and cultural ways. It also meant that participants' beliefs and experiences concerning race, culture and ethnicity were highlighted and considered critical to the success of the overall programme as well as other programmes in Aotearoa that support the needs of Māori and Pacific youth.

The current research included three studies, iterative in nature, that were conducted to explore the broader research question "What are the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice in Aotearoa New Zealand?" In line with the research literature, the three studies collectively provided deeper insight into the importance of considering culture, race and ethnicity (Sánchez et al., 2014), in addition to the call for research in youth mentoring that is culturally responsive (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon,et al., 2011; Simpkins et al., 2017). As noted in Chapter 2, the terms race, culture and ethnicity are often used interchangeably with little understanding of them as social constructs and their subsequent impact in youth mentoring programmes.

The data shows that consistent with the existing literature, the problematic nature of deficit references, negative stereotyping and, at times, incorrect assumptions Māori, and other Indigenous youth populations are ruinous (Webber et al., 2016). The findings of the current research revealed that youth, their whānau/'aiga/families and their communities are embedded and operate in culturally distinctive ways that support their development holistically. They do not perceive of themselves as deficit, vulnerable or less than others. Within collective cultures such as Māori and Pasifika communities, youth enter programmes with inherent assets of culture, whānau/'aiga/familial values, alagaupu/whakataukī that support positive identities and wellbeing.

Deficit orientations in the literature often describe Māori and Pasifika youth in Aotearoa as being disproportionately represented in inequitable health and education outcomes as a result of ongoing impacts of colonisation (Curtis, 2016; Samu, 2006). However, other scholarship about culturally responsive practice (Bishop et al., 2009), positive racial–ethnic identity development within education (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010; Webber, 2012; Webber et al., 2013) and health and wellbeing (Fa'alili-Fidow et al., 2016) have proposed that antideficit and

strengths-based approaches are more useful for youth who are alienated from mainstream education. This is particularly true for Indigenous youth who have been historically underserved in education and health. These authors posit that we need to better understand the youth mentoring programme environmental conditions, mentor practices and programme features that best meet the needs of underserved youth. The next sections of this chapter will show the contribution of each study to the conceptualisation of culturally responsive, culturally sustaining and culturally safe practice in youth mentoring.

Insights into Culturally Responsive, Sustaining and Safe Practice

Culturally Responsive Practice

The Study 1 themes of 1) culturally safe space, 2) positive social identities and 3) covenant relationships suggest that culture matters and plays a vital role in creating environmental conditions conducive to Māori and Pasifika youth who are often racialised groups that face negative stereotypes in education (Turner et al., 2015; Webber, 2012). Culturally responsive practice, as articulated by all five groups of youth, their whānau/'aiga/family, alternative education tutors, youth experts in the field, and community Elder participants in this study, is enacted when culturally safe spaces are established that enable rangatahi and youth to develop positive social identities in the context of covenant relationships. Importantly, the findings were consistent with the literature, highlighting the importance of a holistic approach underpinned by current health and wellbeing models (Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pere, 1991; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001;) and the familial collective cultural contexts important to youth (Farruggia Bullen, Davidson, et al., 2011; Schwartz & Rhodes, 2016).

Covenant agreements that were important components to establishing culturally safe spaces included: immediate and extended whānau/family involvement in the programme planning, implementation and postprogramme kōrero/talanoa (Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pere, 1991; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001); the further integration of tikanga into programme procedures; the affirmation of cultural identity; the explicit learning of whakapapa/ancestry as part of the curriculum; and the endorsement of collective as opposed to individual wellbeing (Farruggia, Bullen, Davidson et al., 2011). Culturally space spaces for Māori and Pasifika youth are characterised by having Elders present as one way of engaging whānau/'aiga/families where possible to ensure the integrity of cultural practices to support holistic development of rangatahi Māori and Pasifika youth. In collectivist cultures such as Māori and Pasifika, families' Elders play a significant role in the Indigenous ecosystem of development which is evident in the alagaupu (Samoan proverb) prefacing Study 1. Importantly, Study 1 findings suggest that in

response to the overarching question: What are the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice in Aotearoa New Zealand? and subquestion (i) What are the environmental conditions present that determine culturally safe practice in youth mentoring? that engaging with Elders, or Kaumātua in this case, supports culturally safe spaces where rangatahi Māori and Pasifika youth in youth mentoring programmes are supported in developing positive social identities as Māori and Pasifika youth.

In relation to Pasifika youth specifically, the findings were also consistent with Mila-Schaaf (2011) and Manuela and Anae (2017), in affirming that a strong cultural identity and the ability to efficiently reference and draw on more than one knowledge tradition to achieve optimum wellbeing were important. Indeed, Elders' involvement may support youth to develop in such a way so they can grow in their cultural capability, tapping into their inherent assets to build their Polycultural capital (Mila-Schaaf, 2011; Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010). This is particularly important in youth mentoring contexts with vulnerable youth as they require the wrap-around support through opportunities to access space where they can be fully Māori and Pasifika without the feeling of being judged, as constructed by Kaumātua in Study 1. Rather, youth might experience manaaki, care, and nurturing in a whānau-like environment, supporting youth development and their aspirations as Māori (Muriwai et al., 2015) similar to that of their own communities. Consistent with Quince (2017), the vital role Kaumātua play not only strengthens cultural identity and self-identity through assisting rangatahi to learn their pepeha and whakapapa, but also supports upholding Te Tiriti o Waitangi principle of tino rangatiratanga. Self-determination or having meaningful control over one's life and cultural wellbeing, as posited by Pihama et al. (2002), supports a holistic approach to wellbeing. Given Māori and Pasifika youth are racialised subjects, the findings of this study offer insight into how youth mentoring programmers can make efforts to fully include whānau and community (Farruggia, Bullen, Davidson et al., 2011) as expert advisors.

The findings across the three studies collectively highlight the multifaceted nature of culture, and the diverse and responsive ways mentors and programmers must engage. A key ingredient, as articulated by the participants in Study 1, is the importance of being responsive to the multilayered identities of youth whilst simultaneously being cognisant that care must be taken for those rangatahi or youth who are disconnected from their iwi, hapū or village. A critical theory lens highlights the need for programmers to consider race, ethnicity and culture in programmes by reaching out to the strengths already existent in communities, for example identifying and recruiting caring adults from within their community (Spencer et al., 2016).

This supports culturally safe space vital to ensuring a positive social identity can be developed in the context of unique cultural constructs, such as tuakana–teina reciprocal teaching and learning approaches, and feagaiga covenant relationships. These important constructs are embedded in Indigenous knowledge systems, and relevant to Māori and Pasifika youth mentoring because they reflect the organisation of familial structures and practices in te ao Māori and fa'aSamoa respectively and consequently support developing a young person's identity and connection to their culture.

Drawing on Indigenous knowledge systems, Study 1 offered insights that highlight a nuanced understanding of the youth mentoring dyad as conceptualised in the current literature (Rhodes, 2005, 2008). Given that Māori and Pacific health and wellbeing are underpinned by their specific epistemologies, ontologies and axiologies, the current study is unique because it prioritised an Indigenous lens in contrast to the interventionist youth mentoring model approach. New insights were gained by applying an Indigenous-specific lens to an established model, enhancing our understandings about culturally responsive and sustaining processes and mechanisms within the youth mentoring dyad. The current study drew on existing localised positive youth development literature and privileged Māori and Pasifika knowledge systems to understand Māori and Pasifika youth development. While a specifically diasporic Samoan-specific lens was utilised, the insights taken may also be translated to other minoritised ethnic and Indigenous communities. Culture, race and ethnicity have a vital role in youth mentoring; however, greater insight is gained when applying relevant cultural constructs to the youth being served by the programme.

There is a need to mitigate possible cultural mistrust when culturally translating a youth mentoring programme originally developed in the US to the Aotearoa context with Indigenous youth in a large University in Auckland. In line with the sacred nature of feagaiga/covenant relationships, respect, compassion, honouring and unconditional positive regard (Spencer, 2012) are critical. The current study provided important insights in that whilst group mentoring might have been planned as part of the cultural translation model for the youth mentoring programme, there was support for more focussed one to one mentoring. As demonstrated by a tutor participant, going above and beyond for mentees was a priority and a deep genuine concern was vital. The current study offers insights into covenant relationships in youth mentoring, that is, a nuanced lens of what it means to build a truly close, enduring relationship from a Pasifika and Māori lens. Similarly, the aroha way, as constructed by cultural experts in Study 1, offers insight for programmers that there are culturally distinct ways of supporting the

development of rangatahi. Both cultural and youth experts in Study 1 provided key insights into the importance of race, culture and ethnicity (Sánchez et al., 2014) and ensuring youth centrism, that is, including youth voices and ensuring the Indigenous values of their communities are at the forefront where power might be shared equally (Weiston-Serdan, 2017).

The concept of va tapuia (sacred space) is also important within the youth mentoring context; however, spirituality requires appropriate wisdom bearers to facilitate this component of a programme. This may mean going beyond addressing symptoms by using karakia or whakataukī and tikanga without the necessary depth of understanding. Indeed, there is potential for programmers with good intentions to misinterpret meaning and/or decentre the very communities they seek to serve. According to Curtis et al. (2019), a key element of cultural safety is recognition of power imbalances and therefore the opportunity is missed if programmers who are non-Māori or non-Pasifika forge ahead without cultural guidance and support to engage. Youth mentoring programmers should explore the ways in which the va (relational space) and va tapuia (sacred space) can be facilitated through the inclusion of Elders, whānau/'aiga/caregivers, and members of the community into programming to enable authentic partnerships. A partnership model based on Te Tiriti o Waitangi principle of participation, power and protection is an important reference point for programmers to find ways to engage with communities at different levels to support community co-design

Whilst the theoretical model of youth mentoring conceptualised by Rhodes (2005, 2008) provides a framework to understand processes and mechanisms of effective youth mentoring to achieve positive outcomes, there is a lack of attention to Indigenous-specific constructs that bring a clarity of cultural understanding in Aotearoa New Zealand and other Indigenous contexts. However, recently Schwartz and Rhodes (2016) proposed an expansion of mentoring interventions to promote connectedness through strengthening of both environmental and individual assets by recognising the need to empower youth to draw on their connections within their community. Indeed Study 1 findings highlight the consistent message aligned with Schwartz and Rhodes and youth themselves alongside their communities. As demonstrated by the participants themselves, they recognise the inherent strengths they hold as Pasifika and Māori communities and recommend to programmers that they reach into students' homes and communities to harness the power of culture, whānau/'aiga, and their unique ways of being to support youth building a positive social identity. To be culturally responsive, programmers must acknowledge and affirm the cultural and linguistic identities of youth, their

whānau/'aiga/families and the communities they hail from by including them at multiple levels and truly honouring them as equal partners in developing youth.

Youth development for rangatahi Māori and Pasifika, that is, specifically in the context of youth mentoring programmes targeting those particularly vulnerable, such as alternative education youth, demands culturally responsive practice that respects and honours the youth they serve and centre by explicitly creating space to ensure their worlds are visible. Informed by a multidisciplinary lens across education, health and youth justice, this project suggests that programmers should consider the multiplicity and fluidity of cultural practices.

Culturally Sustaining Practice

Evident across all three studies were salient cultural constructs important to youth mentoring and how rangatahi and young people in Aotearoa New Zealand develop positive identities. The Study 2 findings showed two important ingredients that offer insight regarding the ways programmes can go beyond cultural responsiveness to instead celebrate and integrate the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of youth. Study 2 findings contribute to the conceptualisation of culturally sustaining practice in youth mentoring, emphasising the importance of programmers ensuring that their environment and pro-social activities at programme, mentor-whānau and dyad level are conducive to creating a culture of self-determination and a culture of honour. The key ingredient of self-determination requires programmes to provide opportunities for youth to gain a sense of mastery in activities, to feel competent and efficacious, to feel a sense of relatedness, and to have some sense of autonomy in the structured programme (Deci & Ryan, 2000). In the Aotearoa context, programmers indeed have an obligation under Te Tiriti o Waitangi to ensure youth have a sense of meaning and control over their life. Pihama et al. (2002) referred to this as tino rangatiratanga, that is, absolute chieftainship or leadership over one's life and cultural wellbeing. The current study provides insights for youth programmers to understand how racialised youth, that is, Māori and Pasifika who often face negative stereotypes (Webber, 2012), need activities that support positive identity development by building a culture of self-determination and a culture of honour at programme, mentor-whānau level and dyad level. The findings in Study 1 informed the participant observational study in Study 2. A critical theory and critical mentoring lens highlighted the need for programmers to embed critical consciousness of power imbalances at all levels to ensure cultural safety for youth. Activities need to enable youth to be self-determining, and to support mentors to ensure they are drawing on mentees' Polycultural capital (Mila-Schaaf, 2011). Programmers should then able to ensure mentors are supported by

making sessions meaningful around mentee identity to contribute to building positive identities as Māori and Pasifika. Youth are truly student centric (Weiston-Serdan, 2017) and able to exercise agency by negotiating challenging environments (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010) drawing on multiple knowledge references. Further, mentees are able to negotiate and repel negative stereotyping by building their self-efficacy in academic achievement and other mastery tasks supporting their Māori identity (Webber, 2012).

Across the programme, whānau group and dyad levels there were elements of the overall programme environment and activities that attempted to cultivate a sense of rangatahi Māori having access to culturally grounded spaces. There was authentic engagement with Māori staff at the university and respectful adherence to tikanga whilst accessing the marae space as part of the programme. In addition, youth had access to one kapa haka session; however, Pasifika youth were not afforded a similar option at the time. Consistent with recent literature by Weiston-Serdan (2017) on critical mentoring, the findings across multiple domains showed that ensuring self-determination for all youth participants can be tricky. However, it is necessary to remain youth-centric, by exploring and including activities relevant to diverse youth at all times possible – particularly when thinking about activities and mentor actions to support a sense of tino rangatiratanga. Given youth in alternative education are likely to feel that they are treated unfairly (Clark, Smith, Raphael., et al., 2010), having a space to feel a sense of cultural pride, affirmation, and love is important. Youth involvement in mana-enhancing activities and practice contributes to developing a culture of honour.

Programmes that develop a culture of honour include activities and practices that support and sustain the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of youth. As described in Study 2, the act of honouring Pasifika youth through ula-lole at graduation was one example that was simple and highly appropriate as diasporic Pasifika peoples, particularly in Aotearoa, relish such rituals which are part and parcel of graduations for primary, secondary and tertiary students. Consistent with the research of Mo'a (2015), this study has found that a culture of care is vital to the positive development of Pasifika youth. This aligns with Māori concepts like manaakitanga and whanaungatanga honours the rich cultural identities of youth as well as their communities.

Culturally Safe Practice

Finally, the themes in Study 3 aligned well with aspects of cultural safety as discussed by Curtis et al. (2019). Going beyond competence, to responsiveness and sustaining activities includes

recognition of one's own biases and power imbalances with youth and their whānau/'aiga. Certainly, reflexive praxis in youth mentoring requires ensuring cultural safety which entails a degree of cultural humility (Tervalon & Murray-García, 1998). Study 3 findings posit that culturally safe practice can be achieved through establishing culturally transformative relationships and sacred space. The term *transformative* suggests that culturally transformative youth mentoring relationships affirm and acknowledge the cultural backgrounds of youth and draw on the cultural capital that youth bring (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Mila-Schaaf, 2011). Similar to research literature centred on the powerful influence of youth mentor–mentee relationships (DuBois et al., 2011), Study 3 showed that mentors who are culturally transformative not only respond to, but also sustain and honour, the cultural heritage of young people and their communities (Paris, 2015; Paris & Alim, 2017) in culturally safe ways (Tervalon & Murray-García, 1998). Consistent with ideas of culturally responsive and relevant practice from Gay (2010), in the context of youth mentoring, mentors in Study 3, within their dyad or whānau group, helped youth to experience success whilst raising their critical consciousness. This ignited their aspirations beyond their current self-concept. In essence, they were role models who approached their mentees with a strengths-based lens and respected young people's mana, honour and pride.

Significance of Findings

The findings outlined across each of the three studies collectively answer the broad question of "What are the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice in Aotearoa New Zealand?" Additionally, the studies contribute new knowledge about how youth mentoring programmers might think about providing an environment that is conducive to Indigenous and minoritised youth developing positive social identities, and feeling proud about who they are as Māori and Pasifika. The findings aligned with existing positive youth development theories arguing that youth have inherent assets as well as important collective whānau identities that align with their cultural group membership.

It is important for youth mentoring programmes to engender positive social identities so youth feel a sense of belonging and pride about being Māori and Pacific (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010; Tupuola, 2004; Webber, 2012). This particularly important for youth who have been exited from mainstream schooling to begin to build their sense of belonging and connectedness and in some cases to restore their dignity through achieving mastery in a self-determined way (Tajfel, 1981; Webber et al., 2016),

An important component of one's positive social identity is spirituality. This is an important consideration for youth programmers and mentors assisting Māori and Pacific youth who are exploring who they are and their place in the world. It is important to highlight the well-established health and wellbeing models of youth in Aotearoa specific to Māori and Pacific youth, such as Whare Tapa Wha (Durie, 1994), Fonofale (Pulotu-Endemann, 2001) and Te Vaka Atafaga (Kupa, 2009); all emphasise the importance of spirituality as a core pillar of wellbeing alongside physical, mental and emotional health and wellbeing. These findings show that the current international youth mentoring and positive youth development scholarship lacks the richness or nuanced understandings of how both Māori and Pasifika youth develop from a holistic lens that considers relationality from an Indigenous lens. The studies conducted show that answers to the solutions for Māori and Pasifika youth lie within their knowledge systems and within themselves with the support of programmes that include and prioritise youth developing a positive social identity vital to wellbeing (Manuela & Anae, 2017). Further, that it is critical for youth to feel safe and free to explore multiple facets of their heritage and faith systems with well-experienced culturally competent mentors to facilitate and journey with young people.

This thesis contributes to the wider landscape of youth mentoring research imported from overseas, underpinned by a lens that is predicated on an interventionist approach for youth at-risk, can be culturally adapted if done carefully. There is a need to ensure respectful relationships and build community ownership with the help of willing communities (Jansen et al., 2010). A culturally safe space has been shown to be an important ingredient of culturally sustaining and safe spaces. A genuinely intercultural approach involves co-labouring, where tensions are addressed to ensure the safety of the youth and all other participants. Consistent with Sánchez et al. (2014), this study offers further understanding about the role of race, culture and ethnicity The current study argues the strengths and assets of youth development lie within youth themselves, their culture, their Elders, 'aiga/whānau and the wider metaphorical village. Further, the current study argues that the critical theory and critical mentoring approach to youth mentoring research, drawing on Indigenous knowledge systems, empowers youth to become their own agents of transformation.

Consistent with Muriwai et al. (2015), this study asserts that "Māori cultural experts, clinicians, educators, academics, Kaumātua and whānau need to work together holistically" (p. 20). Both kin and non-kin support by a wider whānau-like collective is important to ensure identity development through structured activities that are overseen by appropriate community people

164

who can ensure youth feel supported. The inclusion of Elders to oversee and support the va feagaiga (covenant relationship) or tuakana–teina relationships possible in youth mentoring contexts is an important consideration for programmers going forward. Further, transmitting intergenerational cultural knowledge is a large component of a tuakana–teina approach that supports Māori youth development (Ware & Walsh-Tapiata, 2010), given positive youth development aims to nurture a variety of positive outcomes for adolescents and assist youth in negotiating and navigating their way through adolescence in a healthy way (Roth & Brooks-Gunn, 2003). This involves tapping into the internal assets, for example self-esteem, in a culturally nuanced way through learning about their Māori and Pacific worlds via external assets such as supportive family networks (Lerner et al. 2005). As a strategy of positive youth development, youth mentoring programmes seeking to respond to targeted groups through structured wrap-around approaches should engage influential people from the targeted communities.

Consistent with Ware (2013) the findings in this study showed a collective community desire to have people from youths' own communities reflected in governance or oversight of youth mentoring programmes in the form of Elders/Kāumatua in Western spaces. One aspect of culturally safe practice is the key ingredient of having culturally safe space which includes the presence of Elders in ways that they can support the healthy development of rangatahi Māori and Pasifika youth. The current study showed that the integration of key Indigenous Māori and Pasifika concepts may provide research insights necessary for the cultural translation of the youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand In addition, by employing culturally responsive methods through a multimethod approach, the current study offered important talanoa/kōrero to support nuanced views of the role culture, race and ethnicity plays in youth mentoring, contributing new understandings in youth mentoring.

The narratives by participants add new knowledge to the youth mentoring landscape from a distinctly Pasifika and Māori lens, in this case, a va relational approach. New insights may support pro-social activities operating within a family context, in this case, through whānau groups in a structured programme where youth might develop in a responsive, sustaining and safe way in the next iteration of the structured youth mentoring programme (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon et al., 2011; Schwartz & Rhodes, 2016). As mentioned earlier a key next step from a critical theoretical lens is to go beyond supporting engagement throughout for all. As part of a bicultural approach the prioritisation of addressing systemic and structural levels of unequal power relations will support unpacking elements of race, ethnicity and culture in deeper and

more meaningful way. Thus a partnership underpinned by the knowledge systems and aspirations of indigenous ecological systems that youth hail from, that is, their home context, places programmes in a strategic position. This study offers a unique lens on process to better include collaboration with whānau and community members towards effective culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice.

Advancing Culturally Responsive Methodological Approaches Using Multimethods

The research was designed in response to the call for youth mentoring research that drew on culturally relevant and responsive methodologies to better understand the role of race, ethnicity and culture in youth mentoring programmes (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon et al., 2011; Sánchez et al., 2014). Central to the research design was the deployment of culturally responsive multimethods to explore the lived realities of participants involved in the cultural adaptation of youth mentoring programme in Aotearoa New Zealand. In this case, a culturally responsive multimethod approach was taken utilising talanoa/kōrero and participant observation across three studies. The research was centred on the cultural translation of the youth mentoring programme. The results across three studies in this thesis suggest seven key ingredients as a framework for considering the role of race, culture and ethnicity. In essence, each study successively offered distinct yet interrelated key ingredients as a framework for culturally responsive, sustaining, and safe youth mentoring practice in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The current study fills a notable gap in methodological approaches in youth mentoring. Firstly, as noted, there is scant scholarship that seeks to understand how youth mentoring programmes could be responsive and safe for youth and their whānau/'aiga. Secondly, the current research adds new insights for youth mentoring programmers and practitioners seeking to understand the processes and mechanisms of the important mentor–mentee dyad, group and programme level from a culturally nuanced lens. Thirdly, underpinning the research design with Indigenous epistemologies, ontologies and axiologies, that is ways of being, knowing and values relevant to Māori and Pasifika communities, provides an authentic lens, again to provide insight for programmers, evaluators, analysts and the like to further understand key ingredients and how further research might proceed with other Indigenous communities.

Programmers interested in culturally responsive, sustaining, and safe youth mentoring for Māori and Pasifika youth must go beyond cultural competency to cultural humility. The concept of cultural humility supports the idea that both Pacific and non-Pacific and/or Māori

166

and non-Māori practitioners must authentically engage with youth and their communities by including them at every possible level. A partnership model of programmers and community to collaboratively co-design youth mentoring programmes provides a segue for robust discussion on key issues of race, culture and ethnicity, for example, unpacking unconscious bias, stereotype threat and creating positive identity development utilising Pasifika and Māori models.

The current research approach supports credibility through triangulating multiple sources of data. Triangulation has been posited as a strategy of validation (Denzin, 2012). In research, triangulation refers to the examination of different data sources that may have been collected at different times, from different places or persons (Flick, 2018). Further, triangulation has been characterised as a strategy that involves complex processes of playing methods or tools off one another to increase the validity of a research project (Denzin, 2012). Despite the theoretical and methodological arguments for triangulation and the relevance to validity, the current research project that culminated in collecting data using multimethods, that is, two qualitative tools was both intentional and pragmatic.

Additionally, an important critique of triangulation is that it does not necessarily reduce bias nor does it methodologically increase validity (Fielding & Fielding, 1986). Fielding and Fielding (1986) asserted that there is indeed a case for triangulation but were critical of Denzin's case of validity. This research study aligned well with Fielding and Fielding's (1986) call for researchers to take careful consideration and plan purposefully with an intention to add depth and breadth to analyses as opposed to pursuing objective truth. Indeed, the triangulation of methods in the analyses fosters clarity and understanding of what makes programmes responsive, sustaining and safe. The triangulation of the three studies findings' offers a broader picture through the emergence of the seven key ingredients that support youth mentoring practice that is culturally responsive, culturally sustaining and culturally safe.

Limitations

A possible limitation to this study was the missed opportunity to utilise an observational protocol in Study 2. However, key to the rationale for excluding the protocol was the need to maintain the congruency of methodological approaches in this thesis. This does not mean however that culturally responsive methods cannot lean towards a positivist lens and measure effectiveness or culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice via a tool. Given that culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice is largely underpinned by critical theory

approaches, the decision to align methods and tools of analysis was important. With this in mind the strength of the study was that as a researcher I responded and adapted my research to ensure it was culturally responsive, appropriate and participant-centric.

A limitation is that this body of work was based on a single programme where cross comparisons could not be made. Further, the programme was being delivered for the first time and therefore sample sizes were small particularly in regards to youth and whānau, in particular the whānau participant numbers were low. With these factors in mind a key strength was the multimethod approach taken, the inclusion of a broad range of stakeholders, for example in study 1; Kaumātua/Elders, Youth Experts, Alternative Education Tutors, Alternative Education students and their whānau/caregivers. In study 2: there were mentors and mentees and study 3 included Alternative Education Tutors, Alternative Education students and one whānau member.

Another limitation of this study was not having the benefit of being immersed in the programme (Study 2) for the full 12 weeks. Although I was there for over two-thirds of the programme, there may have been missed opportunities to capture activities or interactions that offered insight to the wider research questions. Given that some youths' assent forms and caregivers' consent forms were not returned at the very beginning of the programme I was unable to include fuller observations at dyad level or whānau group level.

Implications for Programmers and Policy Makers – A Va Relational Approach

A va relational framework underpinned by both Pacific and Māori constructs in youth mentoring contributes to our understanding of the role of race, culture and ethnicity in youth mentoring programmes (Sánchez et al., 2014). The results of this thesis offer youth practitioners, as well as policy makers, a deeper understanding of what's important to youth themselves as culturally located individuals within the collective of their whānau/'aiga. Collectively, the findings across the three studies of this thesis demonstrate the importance of the va (relational space) to not only weave together Pasifika and Māori knowledge systems but to also consider the sometimes competing third stream of knowledge, that is, the context of a Western institution in which the youth mentoring programme was located.

The findings were consistent with the limited existing positive youth development and youth mentoring literature from a local lens. The importance of Māori constructs of positive youth development, as well as holistic models of wellbeing and key values explicit in Kaupapa Māori theory, were critical to this study. Collectively, all three studies add to our understanding of

what it means to be responsive to diverse youth; what it means to sustain their cultural heritages and honour their languages and what it means to be safe in the youth mentoring context, mentoring Pasifika and Māori youth. All three studies were consistent with the literature related to prime environmental conditions, mentor actions and programme features that would support culturally sustaining and culturally safe youth mentoring practice.

Certainly, participants valued their cultural heritage and noted that having conditions where they could feel culturally safe to engage in karakia or engage in kapa haka-related activities was important. Also consistent with the literature was the importance of culture (Bishop et al., 2009; Brayboy et al., 2007; Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2007; Santamaria, 2009; Siope, 2013). The findings of the research also aligned with the importance of whānau, 'aiga and/or family to support building positive social identities as Māori and Pasifika youth, although One surprising finding was that one tutor participant expressed her reservations at being observed by a member of the community, likening it to her experience of classroom observations, whereas other tutors were open. An important finding to emerge in this study is that youth mentoring programmes that seek to target historically underserved youth, under a strengths-based approach, must include the very strengths that already exist within youth themselves and their communities. Guarded participants, that is, youth who might experience cultural mistrust need to feel safe. The findings in this thesis highlighted themes that drew on Indigenous ways of being and knowing, for example, Samoan proverbs in the analysis.

The study adds to the body of knowledge about culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice by showing that cultural safety is negotiated and driven by communities themselves. This research explored key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice also drawing from a critical mentoring framework. The findings suggest future research and programmes, programmers and policy makers must consider the importance of culturally safe spaces where Elders or whānau members are able to support rangatahi to develop cultural connections and positive social identities (Ware, 2013). This supports the recommendation of Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon et al. (2011) to include whānau/'aiga/caregivers. Key Māori and Pasifika community leaders such as Elders must oversee, guide and provide the cultural expertise in youth mentoring programmes that serve Māori and Pasifika youth. Similarly, Pryce and Aschenbrener (2019) have asserted that programmes can capitalise on the values of Indigenous communities, including family and community members, to serve as supportive role models and advisors for youth. Furthermore, programmes can utilise them to support mentors who are from outside of their communities.

Additionally, programmers and policymakers must consider mentor-mentee relationships in the context of Indigenous knowledge systems and concepts when seeking to serve diverse and minoritised youth such as Māori and Pacific young people. are explored. The findings of this study showed mentor-mentee relationships can be seen through a cultural lens. As an organising construct, the va (Suaalii-Sauni, 2017) can enable the utility of Indigenous bodies of knowledge, drawing on Pacific and Māori constructs, to coexist as a localised theoretical approach to youth mentoring practice and positive youth development in the Aotearoa New Zealand context. Consistent with the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, the key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice were developed through an interpretative and critical approach, through a relational lens unique to a Pacific Moana approach that brought both Pacific and Māori understandings of va (relational space) together (Sualii-Sauni, 2017). A va relational approach drawing on cultural constructs specific to fa'aSamoa and Kaupapa Māori theory afforded a nuanced lens through which to view youth mentoring in this study.

The current study suggested seven key ingredients identified in the research:

- culturally safe space
- positive social identities
- covenant relationships
- culture of self-determination
- culture of honour
- culturally transformative relationships
- sacred space

These seven key ingredients could enable programmers and policy makers to direct funding initiatives that include and support the development of youth mentoring practice that is not only responsive to but also sustains the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of rangatahi, which is integral to positive youth development. The culmination of findings across the three studies provides support of the importance of an equity-based approach that focusses on the importance of cultural constructs relevant to Pacific and Māori rangatahi/youth who are underserved at both a systemic and structural level in education and health. However, these findings should not discount the importance of positive outcomes associated with youth mentoring programmes in already established scholarship, but rather add an additional layer of knowledge to what might and may not work in terms of environmental conditions present that determine culturally safe practice in youth mentoring. Furthermore, insight into the actions taken by mentors that support culturally safe practice in youth mentoring and key features or indicators of youth

mentoring programmes that are representative and beneficial for rangatahi or youth of Aotearoa.

Recommendations and Concluding Thoughts

The review of literature showed research has consistently indicated that Māori and Pacific youth and their communities face worse educational, health and youth justice outcomes compared to other New Zealand youth. Despite the proliferation of research on the effectiveness of youth mentoring programmes over the past 30 years much of it excluded Indigenous knowledge systems and theories that centre holistic and relational approaches supported by Indigenous wellbeing models and theories. Up until now there has been no known research from a localised lens that considered both Pasifika and Māori Indigenous knowledge systems using a non-Eurocentric lens. This thesis contributes important insights utilising a culturally responsive multimethod approach to answer the overarching and sub-research questions that will inform cultural safety and opportunity to inform the effectiveness of programmes serving Indigenous and minoritised youth who are often targeted populations.

In relation to the research questions of this thesis, insights from this study highlight the importance of ensuring the (i) environmental conditions promoted safety through cultural humility beyond cultural competence. Drawing on the work of Cutis et al., (2019) a recommendation for this research is for programmes and policy makers to prioritise cultural humility that goes beyond the acquisition of cultural knowledge that is often an individualistic approach. Rather, mentoring programmers and funders might consider an organisational and systemic approach where processes are put in place to conduct reflective self-assessment of power, privilege and bias to achieve transformative cultural safety. In this case, the data showed the importance of Elders governance and oversight in youth mentoring programmes (Ware, 2013) at all levels of planning, implementation and follow up to ensure the needs of rangatahi Māori and Pasifika youth are met. In addition they are able to help support, guide and collectively work with youth mentoring programmes who wish to hold space, to build capacity and Polycultural capital (Mila-Schaaf, 2011) of participants and keep the aspirations of youth and the communities they hail from at the forefront. One way to support this kaupapa is to invite the local community from where youth are from in their local community to ensure an advisory board supports programmes with greater representation from both Pasifika and Māori communities where they can support positive socio-emotional and identity development (Mila-Schaaf & Robinson, 2010; Tupuola, 2004; Webber, 2012).

Another insight from this study was the need for va relationships underpinned by key Indigenous cultural constructs to support (ii) key actions taken by mentors and/or youth programmers that might support culturally safe practice. For example, the data in this study showed that cultural mistrust as a result of historical colonisation and harm influenced youth not being open or as forthcoming to utilise the therapeutic counselling services offered at the time of the first delivery when this research was conducted. A recommendation is to incorporate and create sufficient time for mentors and programme staff to explore Indigenous constructs based on familial structure. For example, spending time and energy on focussed training to unpack feagaiga – covenant relationships and what this looks like in the youth mentoring relationship, in addition to tuakana-teina and running workshops for youth and mentors to build on cultural values of alofa and tautua (Mo'a, 2015) or aroha, manaakitanga, teu le va (Anae, 2010; 2016) and other constructs outlined in the studies.

The data showed that mentors from diverse backgrounds showed promising actions towards their mentees where they were honoured and the mentees mana was upheld. Counselling practice informed by Indigenous counselling models and frameworks is one way to complement culturally safe youth mentoring practice. A key recommendation of this study is for programmers to go beyond incorporating language differences and underpin well established Indigenous health and wellbeing models aligned to daily practice and activities (Durie, 1994; Kupa, 2009; Pulotu-Endemann, 2001). A positive social identity as Māori in particular is aligned with activities that are mana enhancing and which draw on cultural constructs such as tikanga (values), whanaungatanga (relationship building), mana (collective integrity and responsibility) and manaakitanga (collective wellbeing). Activities should foster important characteristics for youth to develop maia (confidence), manawanui (resilience), ihumanea (innovation) and māhaki (humility) (Ware & Walsh-Tapiata, 2010).

Key insights of the (iii) features or indicators of the youth mentoring programme that were representative and beneficial for rangatahi or youth of Aotearoa include the carefully planned activities that affirmed youth identity, for example daily karakia, waiata, and kapa haka. However, the study also highlighted learnings where it was a challenge to manage the diversity of interests, beliefs and spirituality of all, exasperated by a lack of Māori and Pasifika mentors to glean from and better understand the worldviews of diverse youth. One of the challenges for policy makers and programme funders would be to consider the evaluation of programmes alongside the very communities they serve. To ensure key Indigenous psychological constructs of positive youth development, for example tautua in relation to tuakana-teina, feagaiga as key

familial organising structures aligned to feed into programme features and to ensure tino rangatiratanga (absolute chieftainship) (Pihama et al., 2002; Toki, 2017).

A va relational approach, that is, a culturally nuanced strengths-based lens underpinned by Indigenous frames of reference, drew on both Pasifika/Pacific [1]and Kaupapa Māori research constructs and theories of wellbeing and positive identity development explore key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe youth mentoring practice. Taking a multidisciplinary approach, this thesis was informed by the research landscape of culturally responsive, relevant, sustaining and safe practice across education and health both locally and internationally. Importantly, this thesis considered the call from previous scholars (Sánchez et al., 2014; 2019; Weiston-Serdan, 2017) to consider the important role culture, ethnicity and race plays in youth mentoring drawing on critical mentoring and critical theory. Given one size does not fit all, the va relational approach taken, utilising Samoan specific constructs to analyse and explore key ingredients of culturally responsive, sustaining and safe practice.

In conclusion, this study has demonstrated that youth from Indigenous communities, including those from ethnicities that have been minoritised, have existing assets within their own communities that are important. The findings showed the crucial role culture, ethnicity and race play for programmers who develop programmes that target at-risk youth. Although it was a big undertaking, with multiple worldviews to navigate and work alongside, the research participants included in each study were incredibly forthcoming and self-determining through each phase. A key area of concern for programmers in future research is to ensure that when engaging research alongside communities, the va (relational space) is key in relational ethics (Anae, 2016) with Indigenous communities. Importantly, future research work must consider self-determination or tino rangatiratanga for Māori by Māori and for Pasifika communities consider strategies to connect with youths' communities to build connections to support youth. Lastly, programmers and policy advisors must consider how co-design might be negotiated keeping in mind cultural safety (Curtis et al, 2019) alongside Indigenous communities' throughout planning, implementation of the programme duration (Ware, 2013).

As noted, although much of the research literature in youth mentoring has previously been from predominantly Eurocentric lens, the findings in the current study contribute new understandings for mentors, programmers and policy makers of the importance of relationality and Indigenous knowledge systems, in this case, a va relational approach drawing on both Pasifika and Māori knowledge systems through a culturally responsive multimethodological

approach. The findings in this study showed that rangatahi Māori and Pasifika youth are incredibly resourceful and hold a wealth of inherent assets through their ancestral knowledge within themselves and alongside their whānau/'aiga and communities. The current study also showed that understanding youth development for diverse youth requires engaging with themselves within the wider context of their community honouring their diverse ways of seeing the world.

Appendices

Appendix A – Study 1 Approval Letter UAHPEC

Office of the Vice-Chancellor
Finance, Ehtics and Compliance

THE UNIVERSITY OF
AUCKLAND
NEW ZEALAND

The University of Auckland
Private Bag 92019
Auckland, New Zealand

Level 10, 49 Symonds Street
Telephone: 64 9 373 7599
Extension: 87030 / 83761
Facsimile: 64 9 373 7432

UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE (UAHPEC)

31-Oct-2016

MEMORANDUM TO:

Dr Melinda Webber
Education Faculty Admin

Re: Application for Ethics Approval (Our Ref. 018107): Approved with comment

The Committee considered your application for ethics approval for your project entitled **Youth Mentoring in Aotearoa: Towards a Culturally Responsive Framework** .

Ethics approval was given for a period of three years with the following comment(s):

1. The committee would like to thank the applicants for a well written application.

The expiry date for this approval is 31-Oct-2019.

If the project changes significantly you are required to resubmit a new application to UAHPEC for further consideration.

In order that an up-to-date record can be maintained, you are requested to notify UAHPEC once your project is completed.

The Chair and the members of UAHPEC would be happy to discuss general matters relating to ethics approvals if you wish to do so. Contact should be made through the UAHPEC Ethics Administrators at ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz in the first instance.

All communication with the UAHPEC regarding this application should include this reference number: **018107**.

(This is a computer generated letter. No signature required.)

Secretary
University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee

│ **FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WORK**

SCHOOL OF LEARNING, DEVELOPMENT AND
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE
Epsom Campus
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Ave
Auckland, 1023, New Zealand
T +64 9 373 7999
W www.education.auckland.ac.nz

PARTICIPANT ASSENT FORM – Young People 16 and Over
THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A MINIMUM PERIOD OF 6 YEARS

PROJECT TITLE: Youth Mentoring in Aotearoa: Towards a Culturally Responsive Framework

Name of researchers: Dr Melinda Webber, Mrs Yvonne Ualesi, Dr Pat Bullen, Dr Kelsey Deane and other not yet identified researchers

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, and I understand what the research is about. I have been able to ask questions and my questions have been answered.

- I understand that by signing this consent form I agree to take part in the study; but signing this form is up to me.
- In addition, [name of organisation] has given their assurance that your decision to participate OR not to participate in this research will in no way affect your relationship with [name of organisation].
- I understand that I will take part in a 60—90 minute focus group with other young people from AE, and that the focus group will be recorded.
- I understand that the focus group will take place at a time and place convenient to me, and in a culturally respectful way.
- I understand that I can refuse to answer any questions and leave the room any time without needing to give a reason.
- I understand that once the focus group is finished I cannot withdraw from the study.
- I understand that I will keep private what other people in the focus group say.
- I understand that the researchers will do their best to protect my privacy. However, due to the small nature of AE in Aotearoa NZ, my privacy cannot be guaranteed.
- I understand that the data will be kept for a minimum of six years, after which time, it will be destroyed appropriately.
- I understand that the information provided will be used in the development of a new youth mentoring programme, a doctoral thesis and other written published documents.
- I understand that when the information I provide is reported/published, this will be done in a way that does not identify me.
- I understand that I can ask to be sent a summary of findings if I want to by providing an email address.

Name: _____ .

Signature: _____ Date: _____ .

Yes I would like to receive a summary of findings (email or mail address):

_____.

CONTACT DETAILS AND APPROVAL

For any questions or queries regarding the research and your or your possible participation please feel free to contact the researcher or my supervisor via the following contact details:

Researchers:

Dr. Melinda Webber, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48456, m.webber@auckland.ac.nz

Yvonne Ualesi, Doctoral Candidate, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, y.ualesi@auckland.ac.nz

Dr. Pat Bullen, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48535, p.bullen@auckland.ac.nz

Dr. Kelsey Deane, School of Counselling Human Services and Social Work, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48685, k.deane@auckland.ac.nz

Head of Department

Dr. Richard Hamilton, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 85619, rj.hamilton@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, (09) 373 7599 ext. 83711, ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz

Approved by the University Of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 31/10/2016 for three years. Reference Number 018107.

│ **FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WORK**
SCHOOL OF LEARNING, DEVELOPMENT AND
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE
Epsom Campus
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Ave
Auckland, 1023, New Zealand
T +64 9 373 7999
W www.education.auckland.ac.nz

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM – Whānau/Caregivers
THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A MINIMUM PERIOD OF 6 YEARS

PROJECT TITLE: Youth Mentoring in Aotearoa: Towards a Culturally Responsive Framework

Name of researchers: Dr Melinda Webber, Mrs Yvonne Ualesi, Dr Pat Bullen, Dr Kelsey Deane and other not yet identified researchers

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, and I what the research is about. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered.

- I agree to take part in this research and consent to my child taking part; and understand that my and my child's participation is voluntary.
- I understand that participating in this research is voluntary and that my child/ward's participation OR non-participation will not affect his/her relationship with [name of organisation]
- I understand that I will take part in a 30 minute interview, and that the interview will be recorded and transcribed.
- I understand that my child will be invited to take part in a 60-90 minute focus group with other AE students, and that the focus group will be recorded.
- I understand that the interview and focus group will take place at a time and place convenient to me and my child, and in a culturally respectful manner.
- I understand that I and my child can refuse to answer any questions without needing to give a reason.
- I understand that I will be given the opportunity to review my transcript and provide feedback within one week of receiving this.
- I understand that I will be able to withdraw my participation within two weeks of the interview.
- I understand that once the focus group is finished I cannot withdraw my child or the information he/she has given from the study.
- I understand that the researchers will do their best to protect my and my child's privacy. However, due to the small nature of AE in Aotearoa NZ, my or my child's privacy cannot be guaranteed.
- I understand that the data will be kept for a minimum of six years, after which time, it will be destroyed appropriately.
- I understand that the information provided will be used in the development of a new youth mentoring programme, a doctoral thesis and other written published documents or presentations.
- I understand that when the information I and my child provide is reported/published, this will be done in a way that does not identify me or my child.
- I understand that I can ask to be sent a summary of findings if I want to by providing an email or mail address.

178

PLEASE TICK THE BOXES THAT APPLY

☐ **I consent to participate in this study**

☐ **I consent for my child to participate in this study**

Name: _____ .

Signature: _____ Date: _____ .

Yes I would like to receive a summary of findings (email or mail address):

_____.

CONTACT DETAILS AND APPROVAL

For any questions or queries regarding the research and your or your possible participation please feel free to contact the researcher or my supervisor via the following contact details:

Researchers:

Dr. Melinda Webber, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48456, m.webber@auckland.ac.nz

Yvonne Ualesi, Doctoral Candidate, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, y.ualesi@auckland.ac.nz

Dr. Pat Bullen, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48535, p.bullen@auckland.ac.nz

Dr. Kelsey Deane, School of Counselling Human Services and Social Work, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48685, k.deane@auckland.ac.nz

Head of Department

Dr. Richard Hamilton, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 85619, rj.hamilton@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, (09) 373 7599 ext. 83711, ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz

Approved by the University Of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 31/10/2016 for three years. Reference Number 018107.

| FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND SOCIAL WORK
SCHOOL OF LEARNING, DEVELOPMENT AND
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE
Epsom Campus
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Ave
Auckland, 1023, New Zealand
T +64 9 373 7999
W www.education.auckland.ac.nz

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET
AE Tutors

PROJECT TITLE: Youth Mentoring in Aotearoa: Towards a Culturally Responsive Framework

Name of researchers: Dr Melinda Webber, Mrs Yvonne Ualesi, Dr Pat Bullen, Dr Kelsey Deane, and other research assistants not yet confirmed

Tēnā koe.

We are the lead researchers on a project that will consider the "key ingredients" for a new culturally responsive Aotearoa NZ-based youth mentoring programme from the perspective of experts in the field, young people in alternative education (AE), their whānau, and tutors. The primary objective of the research is to develop effective practice in mentoring Māori and Pasifika youth in alternative education in a culturally responsive and safe manner. A youth mentoring programme titled "Campus Connections Aotearoa" will be implemented in Auckland in 2017 and is based on a model developed in the United States. The purpose of this research is to identify the key ingredients of successful programmes for indigenous Māori and Pasifika youth. In addition, we would like to establish how this US-based programme can be effectively adapted for the Aotearoa context.

I would like to invite you to be a part of this research project. Your participation is voluntary and you may decline this invitation to participate without question. In addition, [name of organisation] has given their assurance that your decision to participate OR not to participate in this research will in no way affect your relationship with [name of organisation]. Your participation and the information that you provide will provide insight and understanding of culturally effective youth programmes. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to sign a consent form. You will be asked to participate in a semi-structured focus group/korero/talanoa with other AE tutors lasting approximately 60-90 minutes.

The focus group will be digitally audio-recorded and transcribed by the researchers themselves. You have the right not to answer any question(s) in the focus group or leave the room without needing to provide a reason. Because the audio-recording will contain data from other participants, once the focus group is completed you will not be able to withdraw any data I have contributed. The focus group korero/talanoa will be conducted at a time and place that is convenient for you with respect to your working hours, and in a manner that it culturally

sensitive. As a koha/reimbursement for your time and effort you will receive a $20 Warehouse voucher.

The preservation of confidentiality is paramount. The information you share will remain confidential to the researchers. We also request that you keep the information shared by other focus group participants confidential. Your identity will remain confidential through the use of pseudonyms on all written information and in the written report, and the name of your organisation will not be mentioned, neither will any references that might enable the identification of you or your organisation. If the information you provide is published, this will be done in a way that does not identify you as its source. *Due to the small nature of AE in New Zealand confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, as someone may be able to guess who the group is.*

Data will be stored securely on a password protected University of Auckland computer, backed up by a server. The device will be securely stored with the researchers. Data will be kept, separate from the consent forms and any identifying materials, for a minimum of 6 years. After the minimum storage time has elapsed, the data will be destroyed using appropriate digital data erasure procedures, and hard-copy documentation will be shredded and disposed of.

There are limited direct benefits to participants, however, the information and developed understanding generated through this research could prove to benefit the youth programming and AE communities more broadly. We have identified limited risk of physical, psychological or emotional harm to you associated with this research. However, should you experience discomfort or distress at any time during the interviews or research activities you have the right not to answer and all of your decisions will be respected. Further information about who to contact regarding any concerns you have about this research project are included at the conclusion of this Participant Information Sheet.

The purpose of the data collection is to inform the development of a new youth mentoring programme for Māori and Pasifika youth, to be used as data for a doctoral thesis and other academic publications and presentations. You can indicate your preference to be sent an electronic copy of the study's findings in the Consent Form by writing your email address next to the statement "I wish to receive a summary of findings, which can be emailed to me at this email address".

CONTACT DETAILS AND APPROVAL
For any questions or queries regarding the research and your possible participation please feel free to contact the researcher or my supervisor via the following contact details:

Researchers:

Dr. Melinda Webber, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48456, m.webber@auckland.ac.nz

Yvonne Ualesi, Doctoral Candidate, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, y.ualesi@auckland.ac.nz

Dr. Pat Bullen, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48535, p.bullen@auckland.ac.nz

Dr. Kelsey Deane, School of Counselling Human Services and Social Work, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48685, k.deane@auckland.ac.nz

Head of Department
Dr. Richard Hamilton, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 85619, rj.hamilton@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, (09) 373 7599 ext. 83711, ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz

Approved by the University Of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 31/10/2016 for three years. Reference Number 018107

Appendix B – Study 2 & Study 3 Information Sheet Organisation UAHPEC

INFORMATION SHEET

ORGANISATION

PROJECT TITLE: An Evaluation of Campus Connections Aotearoa – Youth & Mentor Experiences and Outcomes

Name of researchers: Dr Kelsey Deane, Dr Pat Bullen, Associate Professor Melinda Webber, Mrs Yvonne Ualesi, Ms Kiri Wilder and other research assistants not yet confirmed.

Tēnā koe

The Research

Campus Connections is a powerful, evidence-based, multi-level mentoring programme delivered as a university service-learning course: disadvantaged youth are paired in one-to-one mentoring relationships with trained university students for intensive weekly mentoring over one university semester. A cultural adaptation of the US-based Campus Connections youth mentoring programme will be delivered in Auckland for the first time in 2017 – Campus Connections Aotearoa. We are the lead researchers who will be evaluating the experiences and outcomes of young people involved as mentees and tertiary students involved as mentors in the Campus Connections Aotearoa programme. We are also interested in gaining a deeper understanding of the perspectives and experiences of young people, their whānau, and Alternative Education (AE) tutors' who participated in the initial 12 week Campus Connections Aotearoa programme in 2017 from a cultural perspective. Therefore, the purpose of this research is two-fold: (1) to evaluate youth mentees' and student mentors' experiences within the programme and how their programme experiences relate to changes in their wellbeing from baseline to end of program, six months post-programme and one year-post-programme, and (2) to assesses in what ways the programme was delivered in a culturally responsive way from the perspectives of mentees, their whānau, and AE tutors. To do this we would like to invite all young people, their whānau/caregivers, Alternative Education (AE) tutors and mentors who participated in Campus Connections Aotearoa to be part of this research.

Participant Involvement

With caregiver consent, young people who are part of the Campus Connections Aotearoa programme will be invited to complete surveys at five different time points (intake, week 5, week 9, week 11, 6 month post-programme, and one year post programme), and take part in a post-programme focus group. We estimate, depending on the literacy of the young person, over an 18-month period participation time for the young people will be between 2 to 5 hours. Whānau/caregivers will be invited to take part in a 30 to 60 minute post-programme interview. AE tutors will be invited to take part in a 60 to 90 minute focus group. All interviews/focus groups will be conducted in a culturally respectful manner and will be audio recorded and transcribed. During the programme, Yvonne Ualesi (PhD student) will also be observing interactions between young people, their mentors and AE tutors at three time points (week 1, 5, and 9). The observation process will not require additional participant time as the observations will occur during normal programme time. All young people, their mentors and AE tutors will be advised in advance of when the observations will take place and no observations will be recorded about any participant who does not consent to being observed.

Young people will be offered Warehouse gift vouchers: $20 at intake, $10 at three time points (1 at the end of the programme, 1 at 6-months post-programme and 1 at one year post-programme), and $20 for the post-programme focus group. All whānau/caregivers who take part in interviews and all AE tutors who partial in the focus group will also be offered a $20 Warehouse voucher as a koha/reimbursement for their time.

Organisational Involvement

We are seeking your support in facilitating connections with potential participants and informing them about the research. We ask that you brief the young people and their whānau/caregivers about the programme and the associated research when you discuss the opportunity to participate in Campus Connections Aotearoa. During this briefing, we ask that you stress that young people may still participate in the programme if they or their whānau/caregivers do not want to participate in the research. Their decision to participate or not to participate will have no effect on their relationships with the AE provider, Achieving @ Waitakere or Campus Connections Aotearoa and their respective staff members. We then ask that you provide contact details of all young people and their whānau/caregivers who are interested in participating in the programme. All interested parties will be contacted by the Campus Connections Aotearoa Case Manager who will arrange a time to conduct an intake interview. During the intake interview, young people and their whānau/caregivers will be fully

briefed about the research, explaining the difference between participation in the programme and participation in the research. For the AE tutors, we ask that you distribute PIS informing tutors about the opportunity to participate in the research. With your consent, a member of the research team will then visit the AE provider, explain the research, answer any questions, and distribute consent forms. Tutors who are interested in participating will provide contact details and a mutually agreeable time and location to conduct the focus group will be arranged at the end of the programme. Similarly, AE tutors decision to participate or not to participate in the research will have no effect on their relationships with the AE provider, Achieving @ Waitakere or Campus Connections Aotearoa and their respective staff members.

Consent

Your involvement in this research process is completely voluntary. Similarly, participants will again be informed by the Case Manager that participation in this research is completely voluntary and that their consent/assent to participate in the research or not will have no impact on their eligibility to participate in the Campus Connections Aotearoa Programme nor will it have any impact on their relationship with programme staff. Participants will be informed that they have the right to withdraw from the research and/or withdraw their data at any time up to one month following programme completion (and up to one month following the 6 and 12-month post-programme data collection) without penalty or compromise to any relationship. However, youth and AE tutors who take part in focus groups will not be able to withdraw their focus group data once the focus group is completed. As some of the participants may be current employees, students of the organisation or known to the organisation, we ask that you give your assurance that the decision any individual makes to participate or not to participate in the research will not affect his/her relationship with the organisation. For the young people we also ask that you give your assurance that that their decision to participate OR not to participate in the research will have no impact on their participation, learning, achievement, or standing at their education provider.

Risks & Conflicts of Interests

To protect the privacy and information of participants, the researchers will not be able to provide specific details regarding any participants. We can, however, provide electronic copies of journal articles, reports, or other publications which arise from this research. We believe there is minimal risk associated with taking part in this research. Although no individuals or AE providers will be named in any research outputs, due to the small nature of AE in New

Zealand someone may be able to guess who the group is, thus a potential risk of identifiability does exist.

We acknowledge that there are conflicts of interests that exist between some of the researchers and the research participants. For instance, all researchers other than Yvonne Ualesi (PhD student) are involved in the delivery of the Campus Connections Aotearoa programme and, as teachers for the course the student mentors are enrolled in as part of Campus Connections Aotearoa, Drs Deane and Bullen will be involved in grading the student mentors' academic work. To mitigate these conflicts of interest, an external evaluator will be contracted to review all Campus Connections Aotearoa evaluation processes to ensure internal evaluation bias is minimised and Drs Deane and Bullen will not be aware of which individuals have and have not agreed to participate in the research. They will only have access to research data once it has been de-identified.

Benefits of Participation & Dissemination

The purpose of the data collection is to evaluate the Campus Connections Aotearoa programme. Although there will be little direct benefit to participants for participating in the research other than receiving koha for their contributions, the findings will be invaluable with respect to informing further programme developments to ensure that Campus Connections Aotearoa is responsive and effective for future programme recipients (mentors and mentees) and their whānau. The information and developed understanding generated through this research could also prove to benefit the youth programming and AE communities more broadly. Data collected will be reported in a doctoral dissertation and potentially in other postgraduate research projects. It will also be reported in other written published documents, presentations and reports to stakeholders. You can indicate your preference to be sent an electronic copy of the study's findings in the Consent Form by writing your email address next to the statement "I wish to receive a summary of findings, which can be emailed to me at this email address."

CONTACT DETAILS AND APPROVAL

For any questions or queries regarding the research and your possible participation please feel free to contact the researcher or my supervisor via the following contact details:

Researchers:

Dr Kelsey Deane, School of Counselling Human Services and Social Work, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48685, k.deane@auckland.ac.nz

Dr Pat Bullen, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48535, p.bullen@auckland.ac.nz

Associate Professor, Melinda Webber, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48456, m.webber@auckland.ac.nz

Yvonne Ualesi, Doctoral Candidate, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, y.ualesi@auckland.ac.nz

Kiri Wilder, Campus Connections Case Manager, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48833, k.wilder@auckland.ac.nz

Head of Department
Dr Allen Bartley, School of Counselling Human Services and Social Work, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48140, a.bartley@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, (09) 373 7599 ext. 83711, ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz

Approved by the University Of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 12/06/2017 for three years. Reference Number 019325.

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET
Mentors

PROJECT TITLE: An Evaluation of Campus Connections Aotearoa – Youth & Mentor Experiences and Outcomes

Name of researchers: Dr Kelsey Deane, Dr Pat Bullen, Associate Professor Melinda Webber, Mrs Yvonne Ualesi, Ms Kiri Wilder and other research assistants not yet confirmed.

Tēnā koe.

The Research Project
Campus Connections is a powerful, evidence-based, multi-level mentoring programme delivered as a university service-learning course: disadvantaged youth are paired in one-to-one mentoring relationships with trained university students for intensive weekly mentoring over one university semester. A cultural adaptation of the US-based Campus Connections youth mentoring programme will be delivered in Auckland for the first time in 2017 – Campus Connections Aoteaora. We are the lead researchers who will be evaluating the experiences and outcomes of young people involved as mentees and tertiary students involved as mentors in the Campus Connections Aotearoa programme. We are also interested in gaining a deeper understanding of the perspectives and experiences of young people, their whanau and Alternative Education (AE) tutors' who participated in the initial 12 week Campus Connections Aotearoa programme in 2017 from a cultural perspective. Therefore, the purpose of this research is two-fold: (1) to evaluate youth mentees' and student mentors' experiences within the programme and how their programme experiences relate to changes in their wellbeing from baseline to end of program, six months post-programme and one year-post-programme, and (2) to assesses in what ways the programme was delivered in a culturally responsive way from the perspectives of mentees, their whānau, and AE tutors. To do this we would like to invite all young, their whānau/caregivers, mentors and all Alternative Education tutors who participated in Campus to be part of this research.

How you were selected
You have been selected because of your participation in the Campus Connections Aotearoa service learning course. All mentors involved in the course and programme are invited to participate in the research.

Participation is your choice

Your involvement in this research is completely voluntary. Your consent to participate in the research or not will have no impact on your ability to participate in the Campus Connections Aotearoa programme. The Dean of the Faculty, the Head of School of Counselling, Human Services and Social Work, Drs Deane and Bullen and other members of the research team guarantee that your decision to participate or not to participate in the research will have no effect on your relationship with the Faculty, the staff and students involved in the programme, or your course marks.

What the research will involve

If you decide to participate, you will be invited to complete four online questionnaires about yourself and your programme experiences over the next year. You will be sent a link to the questionnaires via email and will be invited to complete the questionnaire outside of class time at time convenient to you. Each questionnaire will take no more than 15 minutes to complete, one hour total participation time. In addition to the online questionnaires, during the programme, one of the researchers (Yvonne Ualesi), will be observing interactions between young people, their mentors and AE tutors at three time points. The observation process will not require any of your time as the observations will occur during normal programme hours. All young people, their mentors and AE tutors will be advised in advance of when the observations will take place and no observations will be recorded about any participant who does not consent to being observed.

It is your choice whether you agree to participation in all aspects of the research, or only in some, or none at all. You can indicate your choices on the Consent Form we will give you. You do not need to answer any questions you are not comfortable answering and you can also decide to stop participation in the project at any time without penalty and no questions will be asked. You have the right to withdraw your data at any time up to one month following programme completion without penalty or compromise to any relationship.

Risks associated with participating and how these will be managed

We do not believe there are risks to participating in this research project but if you get upset for any reason while participating, the Campus Connections Aotearoa Case Manager will be able to support you.

To protect your privacy, none of the information you provide will ever be associated with your name or the name of your mentee. All of your information will be linked to an ID number instead of your name and only a few people will know which number is linked to your name and they will not share this information with anyone. All information you provide will be kept private and securely stored on password-protected computers or in locked cabinets. Any information about you that is written down on paper will be locked separately from any documents

with your name on it and will later be entered into password-protected computer files. The hard copy information, including your consent and assent forms, will be destroyed after six years using a secure process. Any computer files that include your names will also be deleted after six years. The information on the computer files that does not include your names will be kept indefinitely so it can be used for research by our team in the future.

The findings from the research will be included in postgraduate research reports, reports to others interested in the Campus Connections programme, research articles and in presentations. We will never name you in any research reports, presentations or publications but. If the information you provide is published, this will be done in a way that does not identify you as its source. However, due to the small nature of AE in New Zealand confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, as someone may be able to guess who the group is.

We acknowledge that there are conflicts of interests that exist between some of the researchers and the research participants. For instance, all researchers other than Yvonne Ualesi (PhD student) are involved in the delivery of the Campus Connections Aotearoa programme and, as teachers for the course you are enrolled in, Drs Deane and Bullen will be involved in grading your academic work. To mitigate these conflicts of interest, an external evaluator will be contracted to review all Campus Connections Aotearoa evaluation processes to ensure internal evaluation bias is minimised. Drs Deane and Bullen will not be aware of which individuals have and have not agreed to participate in the research, and will only have access to research data once it has been de-identified.

Benefits of participating

Participating in the research won't benefit you directly, but the findings will be really important for making Campus Connections Aotearoa a better programme for young people in Aotearoa New Zealand and the findings may help others involved in creating youth programmes and working in AE centres. We can also share the findings with you if you let us know on your consent form that you would like a copy by writing your email address next to the statement "I wish to receive a summary of findings, which can be emailed to me at this email address".

CONTACT DETAILS AND APPROVAL
For any questions or queries regarding the research and your possible participation please feel free to contact the researchers or the Head of Department of the Principal Investigator (Dr Kelsey Deane) using the following contact details:

Researchers:
Dr Kelsey Deane, School of Counselling Human Services and Social Work, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48685, k.deane@auckland.ac.nz

Dr Pat Bullen, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48535, p.bullen@auckland.ac.nz

Associate Professor, Melinda Webber, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48456, m.webber@auckland.ac.nz

Yvonne Ualesi, Doctoral Candidate, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, y.ualesi@auckland.ac.nz

Kiri Wilder, Campus Connections Case Manager, School of Learning, Development and Professional Practice, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48833, k.wilder@auckland.ac.nz **Head of Department**
Dr Allen Bartley, School of Counselling Human Services and Social Work, Faculty of Education and Social Work, The University of Auckland, (09) 373 7999 ext. 48140, a.bartley@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, (09) 373 7599 ext. 83711, ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz

Approved by the University Of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 12/06/2017 for three years. Reference Number 019325.

Appendix C – Study 2 & Study 3 Consent Form Organisation UAHPEC

CONSENT FORM

ORGANISATION

THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A MINIMUM PERIOD OF 6 YEARS

PROJECT TITLE: An Evaluation of Campus Connections Aotearoa – Youth & Mentor Experiences and Outcomes

Name of researchers: Dr Kelsey Deane, Dr Pat Bullen, Associate Professor Melinda Webber, Mrs Yvonne Ualesi, Ms Kiri Wilder and other research assistants not yet confirmed.

I have read the Organisational Information Sheet, and I understand what the research is about. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered.

- I agree that our organisation will support this research project by facilitating connections with potential participants and informing potential participants about the researchers.

- I understand that young people will be invited to complete questionnaires and take part in a focus group and that this will take between 2–5 hours over 18 months. Their whānau/caregivers will be invited to take part in an interview that will take between 30–60 minutes. AE tutors will be invited to take part in a focus group that will take between 60–90 minutes.

- I understand that the interviews and focus groups will take place after the programme has finished, will be conducted in a culturally respectful manner and at a mutually agreed time and place.

- I understand that my organisation's involvement in this research process is completely voluntary, and that participants' (i.e., young people, their whānau/caregivers, and AE tutors) involvement in this research is completely voluntary.

- I understand that participants' decision to participate or not participate in the research will have no impact on their ability to participate in the programme and will have no impact on their relationship with programme staff.

- I understand that consent also includes an assurance that young peoples' and their whānau member'(s') decision to participate or not participate in the study will have no impact on their participation, learning, achievement, or standing at their education provider nor their relationship with my organisation.

- I understand that consent also includes an assurance that whānau/caregivers and AE tutors decision to participate or not participate in the study will have no impact on their relationship with my organisation

- I understand that the researchers will do their best to protect the participants' privacy. However, due to the small nature of AE in Aotearoa NZ, privacy cannot be guaranteed.

- I understand that our organisation will not receive any details regarding any individual participant.

- I understand that the information provided will be used to evaluate a new youth mentoring programme, and the results of this research will be included in a doctoral dissertation and other written published documents, reports or presentations.

- I understand that our organisation will be provided with any related reports or publications arising from the research if we indicate our interest below.

I _____ [full name] hereby give consent on behalf of

_____ organisation name to support this research.

Signature: _____ Date: _____.

☐ Yes I would like to receive a copy of the report and any other associated publications.

Email address: _____

Approved by the University Of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 12/06/2017 for three years. Reference Number 019325.

Appendix D – Study 2 & Study 3 Approval Letter UAHPEC

Office of the Vice-Chancellor
Finance, Ehtics and Compliance

THE UNIVERSITY OF
AUCKLAND
NEW ZEALAND

The University of Auckland
Private Bag 92019
Auckland, New Zealand

Level 10, 49 Symonds Street
Telephone: 64 9 373 7599
Extension: 87030 / 83761
Facsimile: 64 9 373 7432

UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE (UAHPEC)

31-Mar-2017

MEMORANDUM TO:

Dr Patricia Bullen
Learning,Development&ProfPrac

Re: Application for Ethics Approval (Our Ref. 018683): Approved with comment

The Committee considered your application for ethics approval for your project entitled **Youth Mentoring in Aotearoa: Towards a Culturally Responsive Framework for Young People and their whanau** .

Ethics approval was given for a period of three years with the following comment(s):

1. Please remove the Chair statement and contact details from the consent form documentation. This is only used for the PIS.

The expiry date for this approval is 31-Mar-2020.

If the project changes significantly you are required to resubmit a new application to UAHPEC for further consideration.

In order that an up-to-date record can be maintained, you are requested to notify UAHPEC once your project is completed.

The Chair and the members of UAHPEC would be happy to discuss general matters relating to ethics approvals if you wish to do so. Contact should be made through the UAHPEC Ethics Administrators at ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz in the first instance.

All communication with the UAHPEC regarding this application should include this reference number: **018683.**

(This is a computer generated letter. No signature required.)

Secretary

Appendix E – Study 2 & Study 3 Approval Letter UAHPEC

Office of the Vice-Chancellor
Finance, Ethics and Compliance
The University of Auckland
Private Bag 92019
Auckland, New Zealand
Level 10, 49 Symonds Street
Telephone: 64 9 373 7599
Extension: 87830 / 83761
Facsimile: 64 9 373 7432

UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE (UAHPEC)

12-Jun-2017

MEMORANDUM TO:

Dr Kelsey Deane

Counselling, HumServ & SocWrk

Re: Application for Ethics Approval (Our Ref. 019325): Approved

The Committee considered your application for ethics approval for your project entitled **An Evaluation of Campus Connections Aotearoa – Youth & Mentor Experiences and Outcomes**.

We are pleased to inform you that ethics approval is granted for a period of three years.

The expiry date for this approval is 12-Jun-2020.

If the project changes significantly, you are required to submit a new application to UAHPEC for further consideration.

If you have obtained funding other than from UniServices, send a copy of this approval letter to the Research Office, at ro-awards@auckland.ac.nz. For UniServices contracts, send a copy of the approval letter to the Contract Manager, UniServices.

In order that an up-to-date record can be maintained, you are requested to notify UAHPEC once your project is completed.

The Chair and the members of UAHPEC would be happy to discuss general matters relating to ethics approvals.

If you wish to do so, please contact the UAHPEC Ethics Administrators at ro-ethics@auckland.ac.nz in the first instance.

Please quote reference number: **019325** on all communication with the UAHPEC regarding this application.

(This is a computer generated letter. No signature required.)

UAHPEC Administrators
University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee
c.c. Head of Department / School, Counselling, HumServ & SocWrk

      Dr Patricia Bullen

      Dr Melinda Webber

      Mrs Yvonne Ualesi

      Ms Kiri Wilder

Additional information:

1. Do not forget to fill in the 'approval wording' on the Participant Information Sheets and Consent Forms, giving the dates of approval and the reference number, before you send them out to your participants.

2. Should you need to make any changes to the project, please complete the online proposed changes and include any revised documentation.

3. At the end of three years, or if the project is completed before the expiry, please advise UAHPEC of its completion.

4. Should you require an extension, please complete the online Amendment Request form associated with this approval number giving full details along with revised documentation. An extension can be granted for up to three years, after which a new application must be submitted.

5. Please note that UAHPEC may from time to time conduct audits of approved projects to ensure that the research has been carried out according to the approval that was given.

Appendix F – Study 2 & Study 3 Consent Form Mentors UAHPEC

CONSENT FORM

Mentors

THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A MINIMUM PERIOD OF 6 YEARS

PROJECT TITLE: An Evaluation of Campus Connections Aotearoa – Youth & Mentor Experiences and Outcomes

Name of researchers: Dr Kelsey Deane, Dr Pat Bullen, Associate Professor Melinda Webber, Mrs Yvonne Ualesi, Ms Kiri Wilder and other research assistants not yet confirmed.

I have read the Participant Information Sheet, and I have understood the nature of the research. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered.

- I understand that I will be invited to complete four online questionnaires about me and my programme experiences in Campus Connections Aotearoa and that this will take no more than one hour of my time in total.

- I understand that I will be send a link to the questionnaires via email and will be asked to complete these outside of class time, at a time and place convenient to me.

- I understand that I do not have to answer any questions if I do not want to without giving any reason, and have the right to withdraw my questionnaire data up to one month after the programme has finished.

- I understand that one of the researchers will be observing me, the young people and the AE tutors at three different times during the programme.

- I understand that I will be advised when the observations take place and my consent to being observed is completely voluntary and that I have the right to withdraw from the observation at any time and withdraw my observation data.

- I understand that my decision to participate or not participate in the research will have no impact on my ability to participate in the programme.

- I understand that the Dean of the Faculty of Education and Social Work, the Head of School of Counselling, Human Services and Social Work and my lecturers and other programme staff have given their assurance that my decision to participate or not participate in the research have no impact on my relationship with the Faculty, the programme or grades within the course.
- I understand my lecturers will not whether or not I have agreed to participate in the research and will only have access to research data once it has been de-identified.
- I understand that the researchers will do their best to protect my privacy. However, due to the small nature of the programme, my privacy cannot be guaranteed
- I understand that any forms that identify me will be kept separate from my data.
- I understand that all forms and hard copy data will be kept for a minimum of six years, after which time, they will be destroyed appropriately.
- I understand that all electronic de-identified data will be kept indefinitely.
- I understand that the information provided will be used to evaluate a new youth mentoring programme, and the results of this research will be included in a doctoral dissertation and other written published documents, reports or presentations.
- I understand that when the information I provide is reported/published, this will be done in a way that does not identify me or my organisation as its source.
- I understand that I can opt to be sent a summary of findings if I wish by providing an email address below.
- I understand that I can agree to participate in all, some or none of the research by ticking the appropriate boxes below.

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**   I agree to take part in the questionnaire study

☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**   I agree to be part of the observational research

Name: _____.

Signature: _____ Date: _____.

☐ Yes I would like to receive a copy of the report and any other associated publications.

Email address: _____

Approved by the University Of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee on 12/06/2017 for three years. Reference Number 019325.

Appendix G Observation Protocol

OBSERVATION PROTOCOL| M ID#_____ MT ID#_____		
Date & time: Event: W_, Pre-Prog Debrief|Mentee Arrival|SSS|Kai|ProSocA1|ProSocA2|Post-Prog **Who:** M&MT (Dyad) Whānau Grp (Smaller Grp) YM Programme Aotearoa New Zealand (Broader Lvl)		
Cultural Lens: Values and/or Concepts	**TALLY Mentor**	**Description**
Positive ID/Sense of Belonging M is attuned to MT fa'asinomaga & mana (wellbeing) sustained. Self-determination: choice in activities? MT Sense of belonging:		
Culture/Tikanga M Elements of cultural ritual present: Prayer/Karakia, Circular fono/hui, welcome/pōwhiri, proverb/value focus/whakatau, intro/Mihimihi/Pepeha, food/sustenance/Kai		
Family/Aiga/Whānau/ M makes reference to or involvement of family/group/whānau/wider/kin Individual located as central/connected to whānau		
Relationships: Va/Wa/Space Feagaiga: M values/considers covenant & ethic of care with MT Tapuia: M values/considers MT spirituality – sacredness of space between, in and through Fa'aaloalo: M approaches MT with respect enhancing mana. Tautua: M engaged = in deliberate acts of service/serving MT- Reciprocity		

References

Afeaki-Mafile'o, E. (2007). 2. Affirming Works A Collective Model of Pasifika Mentoring. In Penina Uliuli (pp. 16-25). University of Hawaii Press

Aiono, F. (1997) O le fa'asinomaga: le tagata ma lona fa'asinomaga. Alafua, Samoa: Lamepa Press.

Allen, J., Mohatt, G. V., Markstrom, C. A., Byers, L., & Novins, D. K. (2012). "Oh no, we are just getting to know you": The relationship in research with children and youth in Indigenous communities. *Child Development Perspectives*, *6*(1), 55–60.

Amituanai-Toloa, M. (2006). Tapuia (space made sacred) in bridging research and relationships: Brown culture and commonsensical ethics. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *3*(1), 200–219. https://doi.org/10.1177/117718010600300111

Anae, M. (2010). Teu le va: Toward a native anthropology. *Pacific Studies, 33*(2), 222–240.

Anae, M. (2016). Teu le va: Samoan relational ethics. *Knowledge Cultures*, *4*(3), 117–117.

Anae, M., Moewaka Barnes, H., McCreanor, T., & Watson, P. (2002). Towards promoting youth mental health in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Holistic 'houses' of health. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion, 4*(2), 5–14.

Apatov, E. (2019). The drivers behind the higher NEET rate for Maori and Pacific youth: insights from administrative data. Ministry of Business, Innovation, and Employment. https://www.mbie.govt.nz/dmsdocument/10355-the-drivers-behind-the-higher-neet-rate-for-maori-and-pacific-youth-main-report

Autagavaia, M. (2001). Social work with Pacific Island communities. New Zealand social work: Contexts and practice, 72-84.

Baba, T., Mahina, O., Williams, N., & Nabobo-Baba, U. (2004). *Researching Pacific and Indigenous peoples: Issues and perspectives. Centre for Pacific Studies*.

Bhabha, H. (1994). The location of culture. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203820551

Battiste, M. (2008). The struggle and renaissance of Indigenous knowledge in Eurocentric education. Indigenous knowledge and education: Sites of struggle, strength, and survivance, 85-91.

Brendtro, L. K., Brokenleg, M., & Van Bockern, S. (2014). Environments where children thrive: The circle of courage model. Reclaiming Children and Youth, 23(3), 10.

Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Hamilton, S. F., & Sesma, A. (2006). *Positive youth development: Theory, research, and applications*. John Wiley & Sons.

Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., & Mannes, M. (2003). Developmental strengths and their sources: Implications for the study and practice of community building. In R. m. Lerner, F. Jacobs, & D. Wertlieb (Eds.), *Handbook of applied developmental science: Historical and theoretical foundations. Volume 1* (pp. 369–406). Sage.

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

Betancourt, H., & López, S. R. (1993). The study of culture, ethnicity, and race in American psychology. *American Psychologist*, *48*(6), 629.

Biermann, S., & Townsend-Cross, M. (2008). Indigenous pedagogy as a force for change. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, *37*(S1), 146–154.

Bishop R. (2008). Te Kotahitanga: Kaupapa Māori in mainstream classrooms. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. T. Smith (Eds.) Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies (pp. 439–458). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

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

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2009). Te kotahitanga: Addressing educational disparities facing Māori students in New Zealand. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *25*(5), 734–742.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S., & Richardson, C. (2003). *Te Kōtahitanga: The experiences of Year 9 and 10 Māori students in mainstream classroom*. Report. Ministry of Education.

Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (2003). *Culture counts: Changing power relations in education*. Zed Books.

Blakeslee, J. E., & Keller, T. E. (2012). Building the youth mentoring knowledge base: Publishing trends and coauthorship networks. Journal of Community Psychology, 40(7), 845-859.

Borell, B. (2005). Living in the city ain't so bad: Cultural identity for young Māori in South Auckland. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa, (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 191–206). VUP.

Borell, B. A., Gregory, A. S., McCreanor, T. N., Jensen, V. G., & Barnes, H. E. (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 Contexts*, *3*(1), 29–50.

Borofsky, R., Barth, F., Shweder, R. A., Rodseth, L., & Stolzenberg, N. M. (2001). When: A conversation about culture. *American Anthropologist*, *103*(2), 432–446.

Bozarth, J. (2007). Unconditional positive regard. *The handbook of person-centred psychotherapy and counselling,* 182-193.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. Sage.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 11*(4), 589–597.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2020). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238

Brayboy, B. M., 2005. Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review 37*(5).425–46. DOI: 10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y.

Brayboy, B. M., Castagno, A. E., & Maughan, E. (2007). Equality and justice for all? Examining race in education scholarship. *Review of Research in Education*, *31*(1), 159–194.

Brayboy, B. M., Faircloth, S. C., Lee, T. S., Maaka, M. J., & Richardson, T. (2015). Indigenous education in the 21st century. Special issue. *Journal of American Indian Education*, *54*(1), 1–9.

Britner, P. A., & Kraimer-Rickaby, L. I. (2005). Abused and neglected youth. In D. L. DuBois & M. J. Karcher (Eds.) *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 482–492). Sage Publications

Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). Ecological systems theory (1992). In U. Bronfenbrenner (Ed.), Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development (pp. 106-173). Sage.

Brooks-Gunn, J., & Roth, J. (2014). Invited commentary: Promotion and prevention in youth development: two sides of the same coin?. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *43*(6), 1004–1007.

Brown Pulu, T. J. (2002). Turangawaewae/Tu'ungava'e: Echoes of a place to stand and belong. *He Puna Kōrero: Journal of Māori and Pacific Development, 3*(2), 14.

Bullen, P., Deane, K. L., Meissel, K., & Bhatnagar, S. (2020). What constitutes globalised evidence? Cultural tensions and critical reflections of the evidence-based movement in New Zealand. *International Journal of Psychology*, *55*, 16-25.

Bullen, P., Deane, K. L., Wilder, K., & Zoutenbier, S. (2020). Looking upstream to improve the wellbeing of youth who are alienated from mainstream education in Aotearoa New Zealand. In Safe, Supportive, and Inclusive Learning Environments for Young People in Crisis and Trauma (pp. 200-210). Routledge.

Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous youth: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*(4), 941–993.

Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies*. SAGE.

Clark, T., Fleming, T., Bullen, P., Denny, S., Crengle, S., Dyson, B., ... & Rossen, F. (2013). *Youth'12 Overview: The health and wellbeing of New Zealand secondary school students in 2012*. The University of Auckland.

Clark, T., Smith, J., Raphael, D., Jackson, C., Denny, S., Fleming, T., Ameratunga, S., & Crengle, S. (2010). 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. C., Smith, J. M., Raphael, D., Jackson, C., Fleming, T., Denny, S., Ameratunga, S., & Robinson, E. (2010). *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*. The University of Auckland.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). Research methods in education (7th ed.). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Sage Publications.

Curtis, E. (2016). Indigenous positioning in health research: the importance of Kaupapa Māori theory-informed practice. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 12*(4), 396-410.

Curtis, E., Jones, R., Tipene-Leach, D., Walker, C., Loring, B., Paine, S.-J., & Reid, P. (2019). Why cultural safety rather than cultural competency is required to achieve health equity: A literature review and recommended definition. *Int J Equity Health, 18*, 174. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-019-1082

Damon, W. (2004). What is positive youth development? *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 591*(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716203260092

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Key reading in social psychology. Motivational science: Social and personality perspectives* (pp. 128–145). Psychology Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologies Canadienne, 49*(1), 14–23. https://doi.org/10.1037/0708-5591.49.1.14

Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of mixed methods research, 6*(2), 80-88.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. Sage.

Denzin, N., Lincoln, Y., & Smith, L. T. (2008). *Critical and Indigenous methodologies. Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*. Sage Publications.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research. Fifth Edition

Deutsch, N. L., & Spencer, R. (2009). Capturing the magic: Assessing the quality of youth mentoring relationships. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *121*, 47–70.

DuBois, D. L., Holloway, B., Valentine, J. C., & Cooper, H. (2002). Effectiveness of mentoring programs for youth: A meta-analytic review. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *30*, 157–197.

DuBois, D. L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J. E., Silverthorn, N., & Valentine, J. C. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 12*(2), 57–91. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1529100611414806

DuBois, D. L., & Silverthorn, N. (2005). Natural mentoring relationships and adolescent health: Evidence from a national study. *American Journal of Public Health*, *95*(3), 518–524. http://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2003.031476

Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora: Māori health development*. Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. H. (1998). Te Mana, Te Kāwanatanga: the politics of self determination. Auckland, Oxford University Press.

Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. Child development, 82(1), 405-432.

Dutton, H. (2015). Getting to the heart of it: Exploring relationship quality in a New Zealand youth mentoring programme (Doctoral dissertation, ResearchSpace@ Auckland).Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & DuBois, D. (2008). Does Mentoring Matter? A Multidisciplinary Meta-Analysis Comparing Mentored and Non-Mentored

Individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *72*(2), 254–267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2007.04.005

Dutton, H., Deane, K. L., & Bullen, P. (2018). Distal and experiential perspectives of relationship quality from mentors, mentees, and program staff in a school-based youth mentoring program. Children and Youth Services Review, 85, 53-62.

Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Hoffman, B. J., Baranik, L. E., Sauer, J. B., Baldwin, S., Morrison, M. A., Kinkade, K. M., Maher, C. P., Curtis, S., & Evans, S. C. (2013). An interdisciplinary meta-analysis of the potential antecedents, correlates, and consequences of protégé perceptions of mentoring. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*(2), 441–476. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029279

Eccles, J. S., & Templeton, J. (2002). Extracurricular and other after-school activities for youth. *Review of Research in Education*, *26*, 113–180.

Education Counts. (2013). *Stand-downs, suspensions, exclusions and expulsions from school* [Fact sheet]. http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/147764/SSEE-Indicator-Report-2015-Data.pdf

Edwards, S., McCreanor, T., & Moewaka-Barnes, H. (2007). Māori family culture: a context of youth development in Counties/Manukau. *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, *2*(1), 1–15.

Efi , T. T. (2009). Tupualegase: The eternal riddle. In T. Suaali'i, I. Tuagalu, T. Alai, & N. Fuamatau (Eds.), *Su'esu'e manogi, in search of fragrance: Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Ta'isi and the Samoan Indigenous reference* (pp. 207–213). The Centre for Samoan Studies, National University of Samoa.

Efi , T. T., (2018). *Su'esu'e Manogi: In search of fragrance: Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Ta'isi and the Samoan Indigenous reference*. Huia Publishers

Ethnicity, and Culture in Mentoring Relationships. In D.L. Dubois, & M. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 145–158). Sage.

Evans, I. M., & Ave, K. T. (2000). Mentoring children and youth: Principles, issues, and policy implications for community programmes in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, *29*(1), 41.

Fa'alili-Fidow, J., Moselen, E., Denny, S., Dixon, R., Teevale, T., Ikihele, A., & Clark, T. C. (2016). *Youth'12 The Health and Wellbeing of Secondary School Students in New Zealand: Results for Pacific young people.* The University of Auckland.

Fa'avae, D., Jones, A., & Manu'atu, L. (2016). Talanoa'i 'A e Talanoa—Talking about Talanoa: Some dilemmas of a novice researcher. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples, 12*(2), 138–150.

Farruggia, S. P., & Bullen, P. (2010). Positive youth development in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In J. Low & P. Jose (Eds.), *Lifespan development: New Zealand perspectives* (2nd ed., pp. 144–154). Pearson.

Farruggia, S. P., Bullen, P., Davidson, J., Dunphy, A., Solomon, F., & Collins, E. (2011). The effectiveness of youth mentoring programmes in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, *40*(3), 52–70.

Farruggia, S., Bullen, P., Solomon, F., Collins, E., & Dunphy, A. (2011). Examining the Cultural Context of Youth Mentoring: A Systematic Review. *The Journal of Primary Prevention, 32*(5), 237–251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-011-0258-4

Fepuleai, M. (2016). *Feagaiga: the sacred brother-sister covenant – past, present and future.* [Master's dissertation, Te Wananga O Aotearoa, Mangakōtukutuku, Waikato, New Zealand]. Commons.

Fielding, N. G. & Fielding, J. L. (1986). Conclusion. In Linking data (pp. 83-91). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781412984775

Flick, U. (2018). Triangulation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research Fifth Edition*, (pp. 444-46).

Fredricks, J. A., & Simpkins, S. D. (2012). Promoting Positive Youth Development through organized after-school activities: Taking a closer look at participation of ethnic minority youth. *Child Development Perspectives*, *6*(3), 280–287.

Freire, P. (2000). Pedagogy of the oppressed (30th anniversary ed.). New York: Continuum.

Futch Ehrlich, V. A., Deutsch, N. L., Fox, C. V., Johnson, H. E., & Varga, S. M. (2016). Leveraging relational assets for adolescent development: A qualitative investigation of youth–adult "connection" in positive youth development. *Qualitative Psychology, 3*(1), 59.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice*. Teachers College Press.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106–116.

Gay, G. (2010). Classroom practices for teaching diversity: an example from Washington State (United States). In OECD (Ed.), *Educating teachers for diversity: Meeting the challenge* (pp. 258–275). OECD Publishing. https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264079731-en

Gillon, A. (2020). Growing the fleet; views of the Moana. A Māori re-search-teina's perspective on Māori and Pasifika re-search relationality. *MAI Journal*, *9*(1), 81–91. https://doi.org/10.20507/MAIJournal.2020.9.1.9

Giroux, H. A. (1984). Ideology, culture, and the process of schooling. Temple University Press.

Gonzalez, N., Moll, L.C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grant, A. (2016). Vulnerable children act 2014. *Te Mata Koi: Auckland University Law Review*, *22*, 401.

Greckhamer, T., & Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2005). The erosion of a method: Examples from grounded theory. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 18(6), 729-750.

Grossman, J. B., & Rhodes, J. E. (2002). The test of time: Predictors and effects of duration in youth mentoring relationships. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *30*(2), 199–219.

Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. Ectj, 29(2), 75-91.https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02766777

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191–215). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE

Halapua, S. (2000). Talanoa process: The case of Fiji. Honolulu, HI: East-West Centre. http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan022610.pdf

Hauʻofa, E. (2008). We are the ocean. University of Hawaii Press.

Heaton, S. (2011). The co-opting of "hauora" into curricula. *Curriculum Matters, 7*, 99–117.

Herrera, C., DuBois, D. L., & Grossman, J. B. (2013). The role of risk: Mentoring experiences and outcomes for youth with varying risk profiles. MDRC.

Hollis, H., Deane, K., Moore, J., & Harré, N. (2011). Young Māori perceptions of a youth development programme. *Kotuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*, *6*(1–2), 50–61.

Houkamau, C. A., & Sibley, C. G. (2011). Māori cultural efficacy and subjective wellbeing: A psychological model and research agenda. *Social Indicators Research*, *103*(3), 379–398.

Hudson, M., Milne, M., Reynolds, P., Russell, K., & Smith, B. (2010). *Te ara tika: Guidelines for Māori research ethics: A framework for researchers and ethics committee members.* Health Research Council of New Zealand.

Ioane, J., Lambie, I., & Percival, T. (2014). A comparison of Pacific, Māori, and European violent youth offenders in New Zealand. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 0306624X14560725.

Isaacson, M. (2014). Clarifying concepts: Cultural humility or competency. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, *30*(3), 251–258.

Jahnke, H., & Taipa, J. (1999). Māori research. In C. Davidson & M. Tolich (Eds.), *Social science research in New Zealand* (pp. 39–50). Pearson Education.

Jansen, C., Bruce, J., Williams, A., Campbell, J., Pawson, P., Harrington, J., Major, D. (2010) Positive Youth Development in Aotearoa. Wayne *Francis Charitable Trust* http://hdl.handle.net/10092/6132

Jennings, L. B., Parra-Medina, D. M., Hilfinger-Messias, D. K., & McLoughlin, K. (2006). Toward a critical social theory of youth empowerment. *Journal of Community Practice*, *14*(1–2), 31–55.

Kaili, T. O. (2005). Tauhi va: Nurturing Tongan Sociospatial Ties in Maui and Beyond. *The Contemporary Pacific, 17*, 83–114. https://doi.org/10.1353/cp.2005.0017

Karcher, M. J., Kuperminc, G. P., Portwood, S. G., Sipe, C. L., & Taylor, A. S. (2006). Mentoring programs: A framework to inform program development, research, and evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *34*(6), 709–725.

Keelan, J. (2014). *Ngā Reanga youth development Māori styles*. Unitec ePress.

Keelan, T. J. (2001). *E tipu e rea: the examination of the process used to design a Taiohi Māori development framework*. (Doctoral dissertation, ResearchSpace@Auckland).

Kincheloe, J. L., McLaren, P., Steinberg, S. R., & Monzó, L. D. (2018). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*, *5*, 235-260.

Koro-Ljungberg, M., Yendol-Hoppey, D., Smith, J. J., & Hayes, S. B. (2009). (E) epistemological awareness, instantiation of methods, and uninformed methodological ambiguity in qualitative research projects. *Educational Researcher, 38(*9), 687-699

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. University of Toronto Press.

Koya-Vaka'uta, C. F. (2017). Rethinking research as relational space in the Pacific: Pedagogy and praxis. *Relational hermeneutics: Decolonising the mindset and the Pacific Itulagi*, 65-84.

Kupa, K. (2009). Te Vaka Atafaga: A Tokelau assessment model for supporting holistic mental health practice with Tokelau people in Aotearoa, New Zealand. *Pacific Health Dialog, 15*(1), 156–163.

Kuperminc, G., & Thomason, J. (2014). Group mentoring. In D. L. DuBois & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 273–290). Sage

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms.* Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2007). Pushing past the achievement gap: An essay on the language of deficit. *The Journal of Negro Education*, *76*(3) 316-323.

Ladson-Billings, G. & Donnor, J. (2008). Waiting for the call: the moral activist role of critical race theory scholarship. *In Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 61-84). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781483385686

Larose, S., Savoie, J., De Wit, D. J., Lipman, E., & DuBois, D. (2015). The role of relational, recreational, and tutoring activities in the perceptions of received support and quality of mentoring relationship during a community-based mentoring relationship. *Journal of Community Psychology, 43*, 527–544. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.21700

Larson, R. W. (2000). Toward a psychology of positive youth development. *American psychologist, 55*(1), 170.

Larson, R. W., & Ngo, B. (2016). *Forthcoming Special Issue.* htpps://doi.org/10.1177/0743558416643605

Larson, R. W., & Tran, S. P. (2014). Invited commentary: Positive youth development and human complexity.

Lerner, R. M. (2004). Liberty: Thriving and civic engagement among America's youth. Sage.

Lerner, R. M., Fisher, C. B., & Weinberg, R. A. (2000). Toward a science for and of the people: Promoting civil society through the application of developmental science. *Child development*, *71*(1), 11–20.

Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J., Theokas, C., Phelps, E., Gestsdottir, S., & von Eye, A. (2005). Positive youth development, participation in community youth development programs, and community contributions of fifth grade adolescents: Findings from the first wave of the 4-H study of positive youth development. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 25, 17–71. doi:10.1177/0272431604272461

Lerner, R. M., & Tolan, P. H. (2016). On the qualitative transformation of developmental science: The contributions of qualitative methods. *Qualitative Psychology, 3*(1), 120.

Lester, A. M., Goodloe, C. L., Johnson, H. E., & Deutsch, N. L. (2019). Understanding mutuality: Unpacking relational processes in youth mentoring relationships. *Journal of community psychology, 47*(1), 147-162.

Li, J., & Julian, M. M. (2012). Developmental relationships as the active ingredient: A unifying working hypothesis of "what works" across intervention settings. *American journal of orthopsychiatry, 82*(2), 157.

Liang, B., & Grossman, J. M. (2007). Diversity and youth mentoring relationships. In T. D. Allen & L. T. Eby (Eds.), *The Blackwell handbook of mentoring: A multiple perspectives approach* (pp. 239–258). Blackwell.

Liang, B., Spencer, R., West, J., & Rappaport, N. (2013). Expanding the reach of youth mentoring: Partnering with youth for personal growth and social change. *Journal of Adolescence*, *36*(2), 257–267.

Macfarlane, A., Glynn, T., Cavanagh, T., & Bateman, S. (2007). Creating culturally-safe schools for Māori Students. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 36*(1), 65–76. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1326011100004439

Macfarlane, A., Glynn, T., Grace, W., Penetito, W., & Bateman, S. (2008). Indigenous epistemology in a national curriculum framework? *Ethnicities, 8*(1), 102–126. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1468796807087021

Macfarlane, A., & Macfarlane, S. (2015). Education, Psychology And Culture: Towards Synergetic Practices. *Knowledge Cultures, 3*(2)

Macfarlane, S., Macfarlane, A., & Gillon, G. (2015). Sharing the food baskets of knowledge: Creating space for a blending of streams. In A. Macfarlane, S. Macfarlane, & M. Webber (Eds.), *Sociocultural realities: Exploring new horizons* (pp. 52–67). Canterbury University Press;

Macfarlane, A., & Macfarlane, S. (2019). Listen to culture: Māori scholars' plea to researchers. *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, *49* (Sup1), 48-57. https://doi.org/10.1080/03036758.2019.1661855

Manuela, S., & Anae, M. (2017). Pacific youth, acculturation and identity: The relationship between ethnic identity and well-being-new directions for research. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Research, 1*(1), 129–147. http://pacificdynamics.nz/

Matapo, J. (2018). Traversing Pasifika Education Research in a Post-Truth Era. *Waikato Journal of Education, 23*(1), 139-146.

McIntosh, T. (2005). Māori identities: Fixed, fluid, forced. In J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations* (pp. 38–51). Victoria University Press.

Meo-Sewabu, L. (2014). Cultural discernment as an ethics framework: An Indigenous Fijian approach. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, *55*(3), 345-354.

Metge, J. (1995). *New Growth from Old, The whānau in the modern world*. Victoria University Press.

Māhina, O. (2002). 'Atamai, fakakaukau and vale:'mind','thinking'and'mental illness' in Tonga. *Pacific health dialog*, 9(2), 303-308.

Mila-Schaaf, K. (2011). *Polycultural capital and the Pasifika second generation: Negotiating identities*. Integration of Immigrants Programme.

Mila-Schaaf, K., & Robinson, E. (2010). 'Polycultural' capital and educational achievement among NZ-born Pacific peoples. *Mai Review, 1*, 1–18.

Minister of Health. (2016). *New Zealand health strategy: Future direction*. Ministry of Health.

Ministry of Education. (2019). *Alternative education guidance.* https://alternativeeducation.tki.org.nz/Alternative-education

Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs. (2016). Pacific people in New Zealand. http://www.mpp.govt.nz/pacific-people-in-nz

Ministry of Social Development. (2013). *Code of ethics for youth work in Aotearoa New Zealand* [Report]. http://www.arataiohi.org.nz/images/uploads/general/CoE2.pdf

Mo'a, V. (2015, November 25). *Culture as a foundation for care*. Paper presented at the Aniva Pacific Health Workforce fono, Pacific perspectives, Wellington.

Morse, J. M., & Richards, L. (2002). *Readme first for a user's guide to qualitative methods*. Sage.

Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 13–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690200100202

Muaiava, S. (2015). The Samoan parsonage family: The concepts of feagaiga and tagata'ese. *Journal of New Zealand & Pacific Studies, 3*(1), 73–83, https://doi.org/10.1386/nzps.3.1.73_1

Muaiava, S. P. (2017). The feagaiga and faife'au 'kids'(FKs): An examination of the experiences of parsonage children of the Samoan Congregational denomination in New Zealand. *Journal of Pastoral Care & Counseling, 71*(1), 27–40.

Muriwai, E., Houkamau, C. A., & Sibley, C. G. (2015). Culture as cure? The protective function of Māori cultural efficacy on psychological distress. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 44*(2), 14–24.

Naepi, S. (2015). Navigating the currents of kaupapa Māori and Pan-Pacific research methodologies in Aotearoa New Zealand. Mai Journal, 4(1), 71-84.Nakata, M. (2003). Some thoughts on literacy issues in Indigenous contexts. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, *31*, 7–16.

Napan, K., Connor, H., & Toki, L. (2019). Cultural pedagogy and transformative learning: Reflections on teaching in a Māori environment in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Journal of Transformative Education*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1541344619858978

Noel, H., Denny, S., Farrant, B., Rossen, F., Teevale, T., Clark, T., Fleming, T., Bullen, P., Sheridan, J. and Fortune, S. (2013)Clustering of adolescent health concerns: a latent class analysis of school students in New Zealand. *Journal of Paediatrics and Child Health*, *49*(11), 935–941.

Noonan, K., Bullen, P., & Farruggia, S. P. (2012). School-based mentoring: Examining the cultural and economic variations in engagement and effectiveness. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, *47*(1), 47.

Nota, L., Ferrari, L., Soresi, S., & Wehmeyer, M. (2007). Self-determination, social abilities and the quality of life of people with intellectual disability. *J Intellect Disabil Res*. *51*(11), 850–865. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2006.00939.x.PMID:17910537

O'Toole, V. O., Martin, R., Fickel, L., & Britt, E. (2019). Emotional wellbeing as perceived and understood through the lenses of SEL and PYD: A qualitative commentary and suggestions for future research in Aotearoa New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology* (Online), *48*(2), 91-102.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy, a needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, *41*(3), 93–97.

Paris, D. (2015). The right to culturally sustaining language education for the new American mainstream: An introduction. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*(4), 221–226. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2015.1092849

Paris, D., & Alim, S. (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies. Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world.* Teachers College Press.

Peifer, J. S., Lawrence, E. C., Williams, J. L., & Leyton-Armakan, J. (2016). The culture of mentoring: Ethnocultural empathy and ethnic identity in mentoring for minority girls. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 22*(3), 440–446. https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000078

Pere, R. (1991). *Te wheke: A celebration of infinite wisdom*. Ao Ake Global Learning.

Pihama, L., Cram, F., & Walker, S. (2002). Creating methodological space: A literature review of Kaupapa Māori research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education, 26*(1), 30–43.

Pryce, J., & Aschenbrener, C. (2019). *Mentoring for American Indian/Alaska native youth population. National Mentoring Resource Centre*. Loyola eCommons, Social Work: School of Social Work Faculty Publications and Other Works

Pryce, J., Deane, K. L., Barry, J. E., & Keller, T. E. (2020). Understanding youth mentoring relationships: Advancing the field with direct observational methods. *Adolescent Research Review*, online first. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-019-00131-z

Pulotu-Endemann, K. (2001). *Fonofale model of health.* http://www.hauora.co.nz/resources/Fonofalemodelexplanation.pdf

Punch, K. F. (2005). The analysis of qualitative data. Introduction to social research, quantitative and qualitative approaches (2nd ed.). Sage.

Quince, K. (2017). Rangatahi courts. In A. Deckert, & R. Sarre (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of Australian and New Zealand criminology, crime and justice* (pp. 711–723). Springer International Publishing.

Raposa, E. B., Rhodes, J. E., & Herrera, C. (2016). The impact of youth risk on mentoring relationship quality: Do mentor characteristics matter? *American Journal of Community Psychology*. *57*(304), 320-329

Refiti, A. (2013). A "psychedelic method": Spatial exposition, perspectivism and bricklaying. In T. Engels-Schwarzpaul & M. Peters (Eds.), *Of other thoughts: Non-traditional approaches to the doctorate* (pp. 27–34). Sense publishers.

Reynolds, M. (2016). Relating to va. AlterNative: *An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *12*(2), 190–202. doi:10.20507/AlterNative.2016.12.2.7

Raposa, E. B., Rhodes, J., Stams, G. J. J., Card, N., Burton, S., Schwartz, S., Yoviene Sykes, L. A., Kanchewa, S., Kupersmidt, J., & Hussain, S. (2019). The effects of youth mentoring programs: a meta-analysis of outcome studies. *Journal of youth and adolescence, 48*(3), 423-443.

Rhodes, J. E. (2002). *Stand by me: The risks and rewards of mentoring today's youth*. Harvard University Press.

Rhodes, J. E. (2005). A model of youth mentoring. In D. L. DuBois & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 30–43). Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412976664.n3

Rhodes, J. E., & DuBois, D. L. (2006). Understanding and facilitating the youth mentoring movement. *Social Policy Report, 20*, 3–19. http://www.srcd.org/

Rhodes, J. E., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Mentoring relationships and programs for youth. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *17*(4), 254–258.

Ritchie, J., (2015). Counter-colonial Research Methodologies Drawing upon Postcolonial Critique and Indigenous Onto-Epistemologies. In Cannella, G. S., Pérez, M. S., & Pasque, P. A. (Eds.). *Critical qualitative inquiry: Foundations and futures*. Routledge.

Robinson, T. L., & Howard-Hamilton, M. F. (2000). *The intersections of race, ethnicity, and gender: Multiple identities in counseling*. Merrill Prentice Hall.

Roth, J. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2003). What exactly is a youth development program? Answers from research and practice. *Applied developmental science*, *7*(2), 94–111.

Salzman, M. (2000). Promoting multicultural competence: A cross-cultural mentorship project. *Journal of multicultural counseling and development*, *28*(2), 119.

Samu, T. W. (2006). The 'Pasifika Umbrella' and quality teaching: Understanding and responding to the diverse realities within. *Waikato Journal of Education*, *12*(6), 35-49.

Sánchez, B., & Colón, Y. (2005). Race, ethnicity, and culture in mentoring relationships. In D. L. DuBois & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (pp. 191–204). Sage. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412976664.n13

Sánchez, B., Colón-Torres, Y., Feuer, R., Roundfield, K., & Berardi, L. (2014). Race, ethnicity, and culture in mentoring relationships. In D. L. DuBois & M. J. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (2nd ed., pp. 145–158). SAGE Publications. https://www.doi.org/10.4135/9781412996907.n1

Sánchez, B., Pryce, J., Silverthorn, N., Deane, K. L., & DuBois, D. L. (2019). Do mentor support for ethnic–racial identity and mentee cultural mistrust matter for girls of color? A preliminary investigation. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 25*(4), 505–514. https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000213

Santamaria, L. J. (2009). Culturally responsive differentiated instruction: Narrowing gaps between best pedagogical practices benefiting all learners. *Teachers College Record*, *111*(1), 214–247.

Scales, P. C. (1997). The role of family support programs in building developmental assets among young adolescents: A national survey of services and staff training needs. Child welfare, 76(5), 611.

Schoeffel, P. (1995). Cultural and institutional issues in the appraisal of projects in developing countries: South Pacific water resources. *Project Appraisal, 10*(3), 155–161.

Schoone, A. (2015). *Constellations of alternative education tutor essences: A phenomenological poetic inquiry* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Auckland. https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/handle/2292/27374

Schoone, A. (2017). Joy, grace and transformation: The pedagogy of tutors in New Zealand's alternative education centres. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 21*(8), 808–821. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2017.1326179

Schwartz, S. E., & Rhodes, J. E. (2016). From treatment to empowerment: New approaches to youth mentoring. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *58*(1–2), 150–157.

Schwartz, S. E., Rhodes, J. E., Spencer, R., & Grossman, J. B. (2013). Youth initiated mentoring: Investigating a new approach to working with vulnerable adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *52*(1–2), 155–169.

Seiuli, B.M.M. (2013). Counselling psychology from a Samoan perspective. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 2*(33), 50-58.

Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2014). Positive psychology: An introduction. In Flow and the foundations of positive psychology (pp. 279-298). *Springer*, Dordrecht.Sercombe, H. (2010). Youth workers as professionals: Managing dual relationships and maintaining boundaries. In S. Banks (Ed.), *Ethical issues in youth work* (2nd ed., pp. 77–91). Routledge.

Simmonds, H., Harré, N., & Crengle, S. (2014). Te kete whanaketanga-rangatahi. *MAI Journal*, *3*(3), 16.

Simpkins, S. D., Riggs, N. R., Ngo, B., Vest Ettekal, A., & Okamoto, D. (2017). Designing culturally responsive organized after-school activities. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *32*(1), 11–36.

Siope, A. (2013). 'A culturally responsive pedagogy of relations': Coming to understand. *Waikato Journal of Education*, *18*(2).

Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. D. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real: Anthropological and historical perspectives on the social construction of race. *American Psychologist*, *60*(1), 16.

Smith, G. (1997). *Kaupapa Māori as transformative praxis* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Auckland.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Zed Books.

Smith, L. T. (2012). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples (2nd ed.). London, UK: Zed Books.

Spencer, R. (2012). A working model of mentors' contributions to youth mentoring relationship quality: Insights from research on psychotherapy. *LEARNing Landscapes, 5*(2), 295–312.

Spencer, R., Tugenberg, T., Ocean, M., Schwartz, S. E., & Rhodes, J. E. (2018). "Somebody who was on my side" A qualitative examination of youth-initiated mentoring. *Youth & Society*, *48*(3), 402–424.

Stake, R. (1995). The art of case study research. Thousand Oaks, California, USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stats NZ. (2014). 2013 *Census QuickStats about culture and identity*. www.stats.govt.nz

Stats NZ. (2015). *National ethnic population projections*. http://www.stats.govt .nz/browse_for_stats/population/estimates_and_projections/ NationalEthnicPopulationProjections_HOTP2013-38.aspx

Stats NZ. (2016). *Estimates and projections*. http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats /population/estimates_and_projections.aspx

Stats NZ. (2018). New Zealand's population reflects growing diversity. https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/new-zealands-population-reflects-growing-diversity

Stats NZ and Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs. (2011). *Health and Pacific peoples in New Zealand.* Stats NZ and Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs.

Stewart, C., & Openshaw, L. (2014). Youth mentoring: what is it and what do we know? *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*, *11*(4), 328–336.

Stuart, J., & Jose, P. E. (2014). The protective influence of family connectedness, ethnic identity, and ethnic engagement for New Zealand Māori adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, *50*(6), 1817.

Suaalii-Sauni, T. M. (2017). The va and Kaupapa Māori. In T. K. Hoskins & A. T. Somerville (Eds.), *Critical conversations in Kaupapa Māori* (pp. 161–178). Huia.

Suaalii-Sauni, T., & Fulu-Aiolupotea, S. (2014). Decolonising Pacific research: Building Pacific research communities and developing Pacific research tools: The case of the talanoa and the fa'afaletui in Samoa. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint, 55*(3), 331–344.

Swadener, B. B., & Mutua, K. (2008). Deconstructing the global postcolonial. *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies* (pp. 31–43).

Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge University Press.

Tamasese, K., Peteru, C., Waldegrave, C., & Bush, A. (2005). Ole Taeao Afua, the new morning: A qualitative investigation into Samoan perspectives on mental health and culturally appropriate services. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, *39*(4), 300–309.

Tualaulelei, E., & McFall-McCaffery, J. (2019). The Pacific research paradigm: Opportunities and challenges

Te Kotahitanga. (2020, January 27). *Russell Bishop – What's good for Māori* [Video]. https://tekotahitanga.tki.org.nz/Videos/Interviews/What-s-good-for-Māori

Terruhn, J. (2019). Settler Colonialism and Biculturalism in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The Palgrave Handbook of Ethnicity, 1-17.Terry, G., Hayfield, N., Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. In W.Stainton Rogers, & C. Willig (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research in psychology*, (2nd ed, pp. 17–37). Sage.

Tervalon, M., & Murray-García, J. (1998). Cultural humility versus cultural competence: A critical distinction in defining physician training outcomes in multicultural education. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved, 9*(2), 117–125. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpu.2010.0233

Thaman, K. H. (2003). Decolonizing Pacific studies: Indigenous perspectives, knowledge, and wisdom in higher education. *The Contemporary Pacific*, *15*(1), 1–17.

Tiatia, J. (2012). Commentary on 'cultural diversity across the Pacific': Samoan cultural constructs of emotion, New Zealand-born Samoan youth suicidal behaviours, and culturally competent human services. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, *6*(02), 75–79.

Toki, V. (2017). Māori seeking self-determination or Tino Rangatiratanga? A note. *Journal of Māori and Indigenous Issues, 5*, 134–144.

Tolan, P., Henry, D., Schoeny, M., & Bass, A. (2008). *Mentoring interventions to affect juvenile delinquency and associated problems.* The University of Illinois at Chicago, Institute for Juvenile Research.

Tolan, P. H., Henry, D. B., Schoeny, M. S., Lovegrove, P., & Nichols, E. (2014). Mentoring programs to affect delinquency and associated outcomes of youth at risk: A comprehensive meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *10*(2), 179–206.

Tolan, P., Ross, K., Arkin, N., Godine, N., & Clark, E. (2016). Toward an integrated approach to positive development: Implications for intervention. *Applied Developmental Science*, 1–23.

Tolich, M., & Davidson, C. (2011). *An introduction to research methods: Getting started.* Pearson.

Torepe, T., Macfarlane, A. H., Macfarlane, S., Fletcher, J., & Manning, R. (2018). Leading schooling in Aotearoa New Zealand: Understanding and supporting the weight of culture for Maori teachers. *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*, *33*(2), 48.

Tsuruda, S., & Shepherd, M. (2016). Reflective practice: Building a culturally responsive pedagogical framework to facilitate safe bicultural learning. *Advances in Social Work and Welfare Education*, *18*(1), 23.

Tuagalu, I. (2008). Heuristics of the va. *AlterNATIVE An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* (Special issue), 108–126. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280941728_Heuristics_of_the_Va

Turner, H., Rubie-Davies, C. M., & Webber, M. (2015). Teacher expectations, ethnicity and the achievement gap. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 50(1), 55-69.

Tu'itahi, S. (2005). *Langa Fonua: In search of success* (Unpublished master's dissertation). Massey University.

Tupuola, A. M. (2004). Pasifika edgewalkers: Complicating the achieved identity status in youth research. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, *25*(1), 87–100.

Ungar, M. (2018). Systemic resilience. *Ecology and Society*, 23(4).

Vaai, U., & Nabobo-Baba, U. (2017). *The relational self: Decolonising personhood in the Pacific.* University of the South Pacific Press.

Vaioleti, T. M. (2006). Talanoa research methodology: A developing position on Pacific research. *Waikato Journal of Education, 12*, 21–34.

Vaioleti, T. (2013). Talanoa: Differentiating the Talanoa research methodology from phenomenology, narrative, Kaupapa Māori and feminist methodologies. *Te Reo*, *56*, 191.

Vaioleti, T. M. (2006). Talanoa research methodology: A developing position on Pacific research.

Ware, F., & Walsh-Tapiata, W. (2010). Youth development: Māori styles. *Youth Studies Australia*, *29*(4), 18.

Ware, V. (2013). Mentoring programs for indigenous youth at-risk (Vol. 22). *Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.*

Webber, M. (2008). *Walking the space between: Identity and Māori/Pākehā*. NZCER Press.

Webber, M. (2012). Identity matters: racial- ethnic identity and Māori students (Report). *Set: Research Information for Teachers (Wellington), 2*, 20.

Webber, M. (2015). Diversity and the secondary years: Ngā pūmanawa e waru: Identifying the characteristics of successful intelligence from a Māori perspective. In A. H. Macfarlane, S. Macfarlane, & M. J. Webber (Eds.), *Sociocultural realities: Exploring new horizons* (pp. 135–154). Canterbury University Press. https://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/docs/uoa-docs/rights.htm

Webber, M., McKinley, E., & Hattie, J. (2013). The importance of race and ethnicity: An exploration of New Zealand Pākehā, Māori, Samoan and Chinese adolescent identity. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 42*(2), 17–28.

Webber, M., McKinley, E., & Rubie-Davis, C. (2016). Making it personal: Academic counseling with Māori students and their families. *Contemporary Educational Psychology Journal*, *47*. https://doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2016.03.001

Webber, M., & O'Connor, K. (2019). A fire in the belly of Hineāmaru: Using whakapapa as a pedagogical tool in Education. *Genealogy Journal, 3*(41), 1–15. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/genealogy3030041

Weiler, L., Haddock, S., Zimmerman, T. S., Krafchick, J., Henry, K., & Rudisill, S. (2013). Benefits derived by college students from mentoring at-risk youth in a service-learning course. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 52*(3–4). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-013-9589z

Weiston-Serdan, T. (2017). *Critical mentoring. A practical guide*. Stylish Publishing.

Wendt, A. (1996). Tatauing the post-colonial body. *Span*, *42–43,* 15–29. www.nzepc.auckland.ac.nz/authors/wendt/tatauing.asp

Wexler, L. (2009). The importance of identity, history, and culture in the wellbeing of Indigenous youth. *The Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth*, *2*(2), 267–276.

Whitinui, P. (2014). Indigenous autoethnography: Exploring, engaging, and experiencing "self" as a native method of inquiry. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, *43*(4), 456–487. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891241613508148

Williams, J. L., & Deutsch, N. L. (2016). Beyond between-group differences: Considering race, ethnicity, and culture in research on positive youth development programs. *Applied Developmental Science*, *20*(3), 203–213.

Wilson, C. (2001). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*, 214–218.

Wolfgramm-Foliaki, E., & Smith, H. (2020). He vaka Moana: Navigating Māori and Pasifika student success through a collaborative research fellowship. *MAI Journal: A New Zealand Journal of Indigenous Scholarship, 9*(1), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.20507/MAIJournal.2020.9.1.2