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Abstract

When we look at a new page in a child’s colouring book we tend to think of it as ‘blank’ with spaces to be coloured in. We don’t often consider the fact that it is already coloured in – with white. White is the ‘invisible’ colour, because it’s just ‘there’ as the whole background. Also already on the page are lines – boundaries that tell you where you are allowed to put, and confine, any colours you choose to add. My study suggests that schools are “white spaces” – part of wider society’s white spaces. The white is just ‘there’ as the background set of rules that dictate whose knowledge is important, what success looks like, what achievement matters, how the space is organised and who has the power. That’s racism.

When we talk about schools being ‘multicultural’ or ‘diverse’ what we are really talking about is the colour of the students’ faces – the background colour stays white. Often we see ‘diversity’ as a problem or a challenge we have to come to terms with, so we address the issue from a deficit perspective. We all know of schools where all the children are brown, but the school’s colour is still the same – invisible white. That’s hegemony. We might as well put our colour around the edges of the page – because they make no difference to the way the school operates. That’s marginalisation.

As the education professionals and the grownups in this equation, we can’t ignore the fact that we don’t think much about the colour of our schools’ ‘page,’ and therefore we are complicit in perpetuating the status quo through what happens to our Maori and Pasifika youth in our schools and classrooms every day.

Dr Stuart Middleton, drawing on his research as one of 36 international educators in the 2007-2008 Fulbright New Century Scholars Programme identifies 18 features we share with the other four English-speaking education systems – the United Kingdom, USA, Canada, and Australia. These features include:

- changing demographics, where the white population will be in the minority
- education systems based on monocultural world views that are resistant to change
- education systems failing indigenous and minority children
- changing economies, where there will no longer be a place for unskilled workers

He states:

The proportion of students coming from backgrounds that lead to high achievement is shrinking while the number of students coming from backgrounds classed as low-decile continues to grow. If New Zealand does not address the achievement of those at the bottom of the pile, its international standing will not survive at a high level. ... New Zealand won’t have a successful education system until it is successful for Maori & Pasifika learners.

This research looks specifically at the conditions that need to exist in schools for young people to retain their identity and to have their cultural norms validated and valued throughout their school day. The sub-topic that comes out of this research is what sort of school leadership is required to foster those conditions? What personal and professional journeys effectively equip educators to understand how a whole system can advantage some students and disadvantage others, and to personally reflect on their own part in this process? No matter how many new curriculum documents, strategies or testing regimes we introduce, schooling will not become more equitable until paradigm shifts happen in the way we think about and define ‘achievement’. As school leaders how can we change our current approach to ensure equitable outcomes for Maori & Pasifika learners? This research hopes to plant some seeds that lead us to consider alternative approaches to the managerial, technical, and limited academic focus now rampant in our schools.
Background

As the Pakeha principal of two schools in Otara, where there is rarely more than two or three Pakeha students in either school, the issue of Maori and Pasifika learning is absolutely crucial in my daily work. This is a longstanding research interest and is the topic of my doctoral thesis. However, this is not purely a professional interest. As Gloria Ladson-Billings (2000, p.272) so powerfully describes, all of my ‘selves’ are invested in this work — the professional self that is an educator, a researcher, a school principal and member of the Clover Park/Te Whanau o Tupuranga community, as well as the personal self that is a mother and grandmother of Maori children, whose own school experiences have led to my personal stake in the education of indigenous and ethnic minority students. Sadly, access to high quality Maori-centred education options in their local schools is no more accessible to my eleven grandchildren than it was to my children over 25 years ago.

The issue of Maori and Pasifika “achievement” continues to challenge our schools. The government’s Maori Education Strategy, Ka Hikitia, (Ministry of Education, 2008a) aims to, “enable Maori students to enjoy education success as Maori.” In launching this strategy the Minister of Education made clear that realising Māori potential, “is the core business of the whole education system. …All schools, all principals, all teachers, all communities must step up.” Lessons learned from Ka Hikitia will be relevant to Pasifika students as well, allowing them to enjoy education success as who they are — without shedding their identity at the school gates.

If the effectiveness of a national education system is measured by who emerges at the end of their compulsory years of schooling, we cannot sit back and blame secondary schools for what happens to children after they leave their primary school years. As a primary trained teacher, an intermediate and middle school principal, and now the principal of two schools, one classified as primary, (Years 7-10) and one secondary (Years 7-13), and both including Year 7 and 8 students, I am now in the lucky position of being able to see both sides of this issue. The reality is that as teachers, as school leaders, or as education policy makers and officials, we are all part of each child’s learning journey. If some children are failed by our education system we are all complicit in that systemic failure and we all need to take responsibility for changing it.

Naming the ‘White Spaces’

The title of this report is taken from the title of my PhD thesis (Milne, in process), “Colouring in the White Spaces: Developing Cultural Identity in Mainstream Schools.” Naming these white spaces is important in progressing understanding of the realities for non-white students in school. Fitzsimmons and Smith (2000) explain the importance of naming:

Since naming the world is an exercise in power relations, interpretation by Maori is an exercise of power. For Maori ... partnership in terms of the Treaty of Waitangi implies power sharing and involvement at all levels of policy development, application and evaluation (that is, to also reserve the right to determine what counts as success). The control of the evaluation and assessment factors to evaluate services for Maori is critical; it is a means for Maori to name their world. Naming is employed in the sense of using language to control conditions of existence through cultural definitions of the world (p.39).
David Gilborn (2005, p.485) uses this quote from bell hooks (1989) to illustrate his gradual realisation of the role of education policy in the active structuring of racial inequity:

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

Gillborn (p.488) points out that a critique of whiteness is “not an assault on white people per se,” rather it is an assault on the socially constructed power of white interests and the constant reinforcement of these. He believes that, “it is possible for white people to take a real and active role in deconstructing whiteness but such ‘race traitors’ are relatively uncommon.” However, while agreeing that “race treason” is a definite choice for many white people, Zeus Leonardo, (2005, p.37) explains that, without accompanying structural changes even those whites who do reject and work against white privilege still benefit from that privilege. He uses the analogy of Scheurich (1998) that “being white is akin to walking down the street with money being put in your pant pocket without your knowledge.”

This is a difficult concept for those who have grown up without ever needing to question their own whiteness, to grasp, as Peggy McIntosh, (1988) explains in her list of 50 ways in which “I enjoy unearned skin privilege and have been conditioned into oblivion about its existence, unable to see that it put me ‘ahead’ in any way, or put my people ahead.” McIntosh describes white privilege as an “invisible weightless knapsack of special provisions, maps, passports, codebooks, visas, clothes, tools, and blank checks.” She deliberately chose to list those conditions that “somewhat more to skin-color privilege than to class, religion, ethnic status, or geographic location, though of course all these other factors are intricately intertwined.” Some of the conditions in her list of the daily effects of white privilege include:

1. If I should need to move, I can be pretty sure of renting or purchasing housing in an area which I can afford and in which I would want to live.
2. Whether I use checks, credit cards or cash, I can count on my skin color not to work against the appearance of financial reliability.
3. I can arrange to protect my children most of the time from people who might not like them.
4. I do not have to educate my children to be aware of systemic racism for their own daily physical protection.
5. I can be pretty sure that my children’s teachers and employers will tolerate them if they fit school and workplace norms; my chief worries about them do not concern others’ attitudes toward their race.
6. I am never asked to speak for all the people of my racial group.
7. I can be pretty sure that if I ask to talk to the "person in charge", I will be facing a person of my race.
8. I can be pretty sure that if I argue for the promotion of a person of another race, or a program centering on race, this is not likely to cost me heavily within my present setting, even if my colleagues disagree with me.
9. I can swear, or dress in second hand clothes, or not answer letters, without having people attribute these choices to the bad morals, the poverty or the illiteracy of my race.
10. I can be late to a meeting without having the lateness reflect on my race.
11. If I have low credibility as a leader I can be sure that my race is not the problem.
12. I can choose blemish cover or bandages in "flesh" color and have them more or less match my skin.
13. I have no difficulty finding neighborhoods where people approve of our household.
14. My children are given texts and classes which implicitly support our kind of family unit and do not turn them against my choice of domestic partnership.
15. I will feel welcomed and "normal" in the usual walks of public life, institutional and social.

McIntosh believes that to “redesign social systems we need first to acknowledge their colossal unseen dimensions.” Antwi Akom (2006, p.89) observes that many of the leading theories of social capital are silent on the issue of race, and ignore the contribution by young people in poor communities to rich social networks. He calls for a new model of social capital that pays careful attention to race, racism, and the processes of racialisation, identity-based frameworks; context dependency; and the issues of power:

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

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

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

Setting the Scene: Literature and Contexts

The National Context: “Gaps” and the “Tail”

One of the four key focus areas of Ka Hikitia, is “Young People Engaged in Learning (particularly years 9 and 10).” To see the stark reason for this focus, and the distance we still have to travel, we can create a snapshot of 100 Maori students who would have started secondary school in New Zealand in 2004, and use 2008 data (Ministry of Education, 2008b) to plot their educational pathway or the pipeline from school through to higher academic qualifications (Figure 1).
Of these 100 students, 60 (59.6%) have dropped out of school by the age of 17.5 years and 34 (34.2%) of these have left before 16.5 years. A further eight have been removed legally through early exemptions granted by the Ministry of Education at age 15 (7.3% or 73 per 1,000 students), exclusion if they were under 16 years (.05% or 5 per 1,000 students), and expulsion if they were over 16 years (.35% or 3.5 per 1,000 students). Of the 32 students who remain in school, we can predict their pathway based on 2005 tertiary education entry and completion data (Ministry of Education, 2007a). Ten students will embark on further Level 1 to Level 3 courses to try to complete their school requirements to ‘bridge’ their entry into tertiary study. Three students will enter tertiary education to begin Level 4 Certificate (6.4%) and Level 5 (3.6%), Diploma study. Two of these students will achieve these one and two year qualifications. Of the 32 students who remained in school, 18 (18.3%) achieved university entrance qualifications in 2007. Some of these 18 may choose Certificate and Diploma level study and be counted in previous figures, and six (9.5%) enter university to commence a bachelor level degree. Two (35.6%) complete this degree. If these two students go on to further postgraduate study we can predict that one (41%) will complete a Masters level degree and less than one (.4%) will achieve a Doctorate.¹

¹ These numbers are a prediction based on 2008 school leavers and participation data and 2005-2007 tertiary entry data from the Ministry of Education. These are the most recent data sets available at the time of writing.
The ‘pipeline’ from school to higher academic learning for Pasifika learners (Figure 2) has a different profile in that more Pasifika students (70%) remain in school for longer, however there is a dramatic drop off at university entrance qualifications level, with only 13% achieving this qualification in 2008. From this point the numbers entering and completing tertiary qualifications become very similar to, or even fewer than, those for Maori. The data in Figures 1 and 2 are the national Maori and Pasifika totals. If we break these statistics down into socio-economic areas by school decile, the picture is significantly worse.

Figure 2: Student Alienation and University Entrance eligibility 2008, by ethnicity. (Ministry of Education, 2008b)

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

Entering tertiary education directly from school is obviously only one of the options available to learners. Certainly in recent years there has been growth in the numbers of Maori who enrol in Maori tertiary institutions in ‘second-chance’ learning. Mason Durie (2009) attributes this growth to “the indigenisation of higher education in New Zealand.” This includes the establishment of three wananga, “which account for some 60% of all Maori tertiary students and have been largely responsible for the transformational increase in Maori participation in tertiary education since 2000” (p.5). Compared to other student profiles, Maori students tend to be older than 25 years when they first enrol and are more often studying on a part-time basis (Ministry of Education 2007a; Durie, 2009). The crucial question for secondary schools however, is why are the ‘first chance’ learning opportunities they offer working so ineffectively for their Maori and Pasifika students that they leave them without the option of a direct pathway to tertiary study?

This does not absolve primary schools from a shared responsibility for the pipeline. If the answer was as simple as raising literacy and numeracy scores for Maori and Pasifika children – which seems to be the primary focus of our current solutions and interventions – we would expect that our emphasis in recent years on this strategy would have made a difference by now. In fact, Ministry of Education data presented to South Auckland principals in 2008 showed that Maori children
achieving above national norms in literacy still featured in dropout statistics by Year 10. The answer is obviously more complex than a single-minded focus on technical academic achievement. At a purely anecdotal level, many of the students we enrol in Clover Park Middle School and Te Whanau o Tupuranga, who have been suspended from their previous schools, are extremely capable academically. Yet school has obviously not worked for them, and the problems began long before their entry into secondary school. The issue therefore, as Ka Hikitia points out, is the responsibility of the whole schooling community.

In the introduction to the Ministry of Education’s original *Pasifika Education Plan 2008-2012*, subtitled, “From good to great: Stepping up for Pasifika education” the opening statement says:

New Zealand’s education system is world-class. Every young New Zealander can be, and deserves to be, part of its success. The Pasifika Education Plan 2008–2012 sets out what needs to be done so the education system ‘steps up’ for Pasifika students (Ministry of Education 2008c).

One of the four key themes in the plan is building “strong learning foundations ensuring Pasifika students participate, engage and achieve at each stage of their education, and make good transitions from one stage to the next.” However, Pasifika students and families have every right to question the implication that the status of Pasifika education was “good” in the first place, given the data shown above, and to challenge the statement that our education system is “world class.”

**The International Context: Comparison with International Data**

The *Programme for International Student Assessment* (PISA) is an international study that assesses how well 15-year-old students are prepared to meet the challenges of today’s society. In 2006 PISA assessed three key areas of knowledge and skills: reading literacy, mathematical literacy and scientific literacy. In scientific literacy, of the 57 countries participating in PISA 2006, only two countries performed better than New Zealand. However when this result is analysed by ethnicity (Figure 3) it can be seen that Pakeha and Asian students performed well above the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) mean, while Maori outcomes were well below this level, and Pasifika results were lower still. The same pattern was repeated in both reading and mathematical literacy results, with New Zealand ranked fourth and sixth respectively in 2006 (Telford & Caygill, 2007).

These data show that our reputation for a “world class” education system is certainly not equitable, with Maori and Pasifika learners featuring at the lowest end of the range of achievement, in what has become known euphemistically as our long ‘tail’ of disparity (Hattie, 2003; Airini, McNaughton, Langley & Sauni, 2007).

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

---

2 The original *Pasifika Education Plan 2008-2012* was revised at the request of the National Government, and re-launched in 2009 “to concentrate on those areas which will make the greatest difference for students and to ...“incorporate key Government initiatives such as National Standards in literacy and numeracy, which will help raise achievement in reading, writing and maths” (Minister of Education AnneTolley, Press Release, 27 November, 2009).
School Reform: Norms and Benchmarking – the real pandemic in schools

In order to discuss school reform and schooling improvement initiatives for Maori and Pasifika students that have been implemented in mainstream New Zealand schools it is important to state that the context that initiates, supports, and determines the shape of these initiatives is still a white space. As Huia Tomlins-Jahnke (2007) explains, “what counts as school knowledge, the way school knowledge is organised, resourced, taught and evaluated, the underlying codes that structure such knowledge, access to and legitimation of school knowledge is determined by the dominant culture.” The same can be said of research, what counts as research, and who owns and designs research into mainstream schooling systems.

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

Often this requirement to measure success in terms of these national norms goes hand in hand with the expectations of the source of funding, usually the Ministry of Education, to have the outcomes defined, researched, and evaluated on their terms. Not only is the focus of these reforms generally to improve or ‘fix’ the children’s deficits, some also expand their focus to ‘fix’ the deficits in families, so we have initiatives like family literacy programmes, to teach parents how to better support their children’s reading, and projects that provide incentives to help families create ‘quiet’ spaces for homework and reading. We thus imply to parents and whanau that the natural, noisy, busy, environment of a large extended family is not conducive to learning, and to parents that they lack the skills to support their children’s learning. In a just and reciprocal partnership, schools would go to equal trouble to learn about Maori and Pasifika norms and incorporate these into ‘schooling improvement’ initiatives. This is rarely the case. Not only does this practice reinforce to Maori and Pasifika families that the problem is of their own making, it robs children of exposure to their own cultural norms in their daily lives at school. Corson (1995) describes the impact of this thinking:
When people in majority culture education systems ignore minority culture discourse norms, for that moment the cycle of cultural reproduction reinforced by those norms is disrupted. More than just miscommunication results. Over time, culturally different children are deprived of the everyday reinforcers of values that are central to their culture’s world view; and children deprived in this way of a developing and shared world view have less understanding of who they are, where they are going, and where in the world they might have a value as individuals and as group members (p.195).

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

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

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

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

Maori Perspectives

This gulf between the mainstream perspective and Maori aspirations was highlighted in Te Whanau o Tupuranga in 2008 when we hosted a visit from two USA critical educators, Dr. Jeffrey Duncan-Andrade and Dr. K. Wayne Yang. Just before their visit they advised me they wanted to bring a gift with them, in the form of a scholarship, to donate to two graduating students in Te Whanau o Tupuranga. The scholarship was designed to recognise that, “for indigenous youth, the pursuit of education under oppression is a revolutionary undertaking” and to acknowledge two “young revolutionaries who embody the historical struggle of oppressed peoples to liberate their minds and their communities.”³ They asked staff to name the award so it reflected the values of our school.

³ Personal email
I put that question to our Maori staff, who named the award, *Te Poho o Kia Aroha*, with the subtitle, *Ka whawhai tonu matou mo ake tonu atu*. *Kia Aroha* is the name of our school marae. In their written explanation of why the marae was central to the name of the award, Maori staff described the role of the marae where a child is:

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

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

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

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

In their discussion of “managing self” Macfarlane et al (p.118) contrast the western context of individualism and individual achievement with the Maori constructs of whanaungatanga and rangatiratanga which require individuals to fulfil their responsibilities to work for the well-being of the group.

**Pasifika Perspectives**

An alternative paradigm is also recognised in the literature review commissioned by the Curriculum, Teaching and Learning Group of the Ministry of Education (Gorinski & Fraser, 2006). It is backgrounded by the *Pacific Islands School-Parent-Community Liaison (PISCLP) Project* which was launched by the Ministry in 1996, to support the more effective engagement of schools and Pasifika parents and communities in education in order to raise the achievement of Pasifika students in mainstream New Zealand schools. The review explores both the conceptual and research based literatures on home-school relationships. It highlights the need for a fundamental change of thinking and practice in schools, from a monocultural to a multicultural lens, in order to promote effective parent community – school engagement in Pasifika contexts.
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4 *Te Poho* means literally ‘the bosom.’ Te Poho was also the name of a taniwha of the local, Ngai Tai, people who nurtured and fed the people. *Kia Aroha* means through love although aroha is a much wider concept than the English translation. *Ka whawhai tonu matou mo ake tonu atu* means, we will continue to fight forever.
The review provides a three-pronged thematic overview of the international, as well as Pasifika-referenced literature related to home-school relationships. These themes include the monocultural paradigm, highlighted by the dominance of a Pakeha education system which works to disadvantage families from cultures with differing values, beliefs and first languages to the dominant culture (Harker & McConnochie 1985; Nakhid, 2003). The review also shows that:

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

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

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

**Academic Achievement**

The acknowledgement of alternative perspectives however, does not mean that academic success is not an important goal, or that Maori and Pasifika learners should have some alternative achievement goals. Durie (2003, p.203) states that the three goals he proposes as relevant to Maori; enabling Maori to live as Maori, facilitating participation as citizens of the world, and contributing towards good health and a high standard of living, are “concurrent goals—a parcel of goals—all of which should be pursued together,” and he makes the point that “educational failure significantly reduces chances of success in any of the three areas.”

In Te Whanau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School it means that academic achievement alone, as defined by hegemonic mainstream norms, is not enough. Sir Ken Robinson is a world leader in the field of creativity in education and business. He was the keynote speaker at the International Confederation of Principals Conference in Auckland in 2007. Robinson (2007) thinks it is time we really examined the relevance of what we call academic achievement. He believes the problem we face in 21st Century schooling is to do with the whole idea of academic ability, which, involves particular, and limited, he says, types of verbal and mathematical reasoning, that may be essential, but there is much more to human intelligence, which is creative and diverse. “Education should develop the potential in our different ways of thinking.”

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

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

**Mainstream Contexts**

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

Beginning in 2001, *Te Kotahitanga* gathered narratives of classroom experience from a range of engaged and non-engaged Years 9 and 10 Maori students through a process of collaborative storying. The result from these narratives, together with input from parents, principals and teachers, was the development of an Effective Teaching Profile (p.140) which then formed the basis of a professional development intervention with 11 self-selecting teachers in four schools. One of the major findings of this first phase of the *Te Kotahitanga* project was that the major influence on Maori students’ educational achievement lies in the minds and actions of their teachers. In particular the research exposed, and addressed through professional development, a predominant discourse of deficit theorising by teachers about Maori students which resulted in low teacher expectations of Māori students, and created self-fulfilling prophesies of failure.

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

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

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

As well as *Te Kotahitanga*, there are other initiatives in the mainstream which seek to change the education experience of Maori and Pasifika learners. There is potential in the intent of *Ka Hikitia*. There is also potential in the intent of the newly revised *New Zealand Curriculum* and its partner document for Maori medium schools, *Te Marautanga o Aotearoa*.

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

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

Recognising this need for teacher professional development *Te Tere Auraki* is a work programme initiated by the Ministry of Education which encompasses four separate projects, including *Te Kotahitanga* and *Te Kauhua*. Over the last seven years *Te Kauhua* has engaged more than 30 schools and 350 teachers in action research to increase schools’ knowledge and understanding about how to link effectively with whānau in ways that contribute to enhanced outcomes for Māori students. *Te Kauhua* believes that for teacher change to be sustainable it must facilitate and enable teachers’ critical reflection on challenges in their beliefs about Māori culture and identity. The Ministry of Education research finds evidence of evidence of improved achievement results, increase in learner confidence and reduction in suspension and stand-down rates, as well as positive teaching and learning changes within classrooms and productive partnerships with whānau and the wider community (Unitec, 2008, cited in Ministry of Education 2009a).

The involvement of the Ministry of Education in initiating and contracting these developments however, also ensures they are designed with western academic achievement goals and lay few claims to outcomes that lead to cultural identity or competencies. There is little room for cultural achievement, other than increased proficiency in heritage languages, in our educational white space.

New Zealand’s self-governing, community-driven mainstream education system, by its very nature, encourages innovation and alternative, more relevant, models however, very few different solutions exist. Nationally for example, only 3.9% of Pasifika students are learning in Pasifika medium classrooms and only 15.5% of Maori students are involved in Maori medium education. This includes the 3.6% of Maori students who have moved outside mainstream education to enrol in Kura Kaupapa Maori (see Tables 1 and 2).
Table 1: Maori Learners involved in Maori Medium Education: July, 2008
(Ministry of Education, 2009b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level (percentage of time per week when Maori is medium of instruction)</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percentage of all Maori learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (81-100%) - includes 3.6% who attend Kura Kaupapa Maori</td>
<td>11,664</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (59-80%)</td>
<td>4,890</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 (31-50%)</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4a (up to 30%)</td>
<td>4,834</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Pasifika learners involved in Pasifika Medium Education: July 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level (percentage of time per week when a Pasifika language is medium of instruction)</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percentage of all Pasifika learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (81-100%)</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (59-80%)</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 (31-50%)</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4a (up to 30%)</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,726</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ka Hikitia: Lost in Translation**

Mainstream education’s goals for Maori learners for the next four to five years are espoused in the Ministry of Education’s Maori Education Strategy, *Ka Hikitia*. *Ka Hikitia* says all the words we would hope to see in a pathway towards Maori success and the intent of the strategy is difficult to fault. However, in the goal of *Ka Hikitia*, “Maori children enjoying education success, *as Maori,*” (my emphasis) the two key words, ‘*as Maori*’ are the most important words in the whole document, and will be the two words most ignored by schools who have no understanding of what “as Maori” might look like. “As Maori” is destined to become another white space, in that it will be reinvented and seen as no different to “as Pakeha.” (Milne, 2008). This is not necessarily a deliberate action on the part of principals and school leadership, but is indicative of the lack of understanding that is endemic in our system.

Dr Paul Goren, who spent six months in New Zealand in 2009, on an Ian Axford (New Zealand) Fellowship in Public Policy,⁶ chose *Ka Hikitia* as the focus of his research. His report echoes the concern about the difficulty in changing both the rhetoric and teacher practice and the danger of reducing the intent to a compliance checklist:

> The challenge with a policy framework like *Ka Hikitia* is to change attitudes, thinking, and behaviours in order to improve outcomes for all Maori learners. This means changing hearts and minds rather than solely instituting new compliance requirements. There have been attempts to change Ministry organisational processes to reflect key *Ka Hikitia* components in areas such as business planning and report writing. Yet, there is concern that *Ka Hikitia* will evolve into a compliance tick list rather than a broad commitment to improve education for and with Maori learners. The challenge in an organisation like the
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⁶ Ian Axford (New Zealand) Fellowships in Public Policy were named in honour of Sir Ian Axford, an eminent New Zealand astrophysicist and space scientist. The fellowships were established by the New Zealand government in 1995 to facilitate public policy dialogue between New Zealand and the United States of America.
Ministry is to engage in processes that change attitudes, thinking, and behaviours rather than forcing compliance, while adhering to timelines that meet urgent priorities (Goren, 2009, p.vi).

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

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

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

Goren cites an internal Ministry of Education Leadership Team memo in which Deputy Secretary Parata echoes these concerns:

I have become increasingly concerned about Ka Hikitia being “Lost in Translation” and the very general and generic approach that is being taken. The brand is being used but the thinking that sits behind and in it is not, and nor do we have a real focus on the outcomes sought at either a learner or system level. I am also worried about the paralysis that seems to take hold once this matter is brought to the attention of our respective staff members, the lack of ability to recognise that this is the case, the resentment that follows and the overall apathy towards resolving what presents (Parata, cited in Goren, 2009, p.41).

Without funding and real resourcing in terms of professional development, Ka Hikitia will languish in the “To Do” lists, file boxes, and bottom drawers in principals’ offices, and little change will happen in educators’ thinking.
Cultural Identity in Schools

Shape-Shifting: Changing Identity, Identity as Resistance

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

If we were to attempt to quantify my children’s ancestry, it is predominantly Pakeha, on both sides of the family. However, my four children identify first and foremost as Maori. If you ask them about their cultural identity they will tell you it is emphatically Maori. This is evident in their daily lives, socially and politically, and in their choices for their children. My 11 grandchildren are growing up educated in Maori immersion or bilingual settings and are all fluent speakers of Maori. How has this happened?

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

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

Thus, within two generations, the “whitening’ of our children could have been complete. Their commitment to resist, reject, and reverse this process through their strong identification as Maori is something I celebrate. The results of this resistance are evident in my mokopuna. This same counter-hegemonic conscientisation, resistance and transformative action can be seen in Maori families who seek education for their children in Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori. It would be completely wrong to assume it does not also exist in many of the over 90% of families who entrust the education of their children to mainstream schools.
Why cultural identity?

The New Zealand Government's annual report, *The Social Report 2008*, identifies ten discrete components of wellbeing which are referred to as “desired social outcomes” (p.4). One of the ten domains is cultural identity. The desired outcome for cultural identity is described as: “New Zealanders share a strong national identity, have a sense of belonging and value cultural diversity. Everybody is able to pass their cultural traditions on to future generations. Maori culture is valued and protected” (Ministry of Social Development, 2008, p.9).

There is little doubt, however, that far from being ‘valued and protected,’ the wellbeing of Maori youth in New Zealand schools is in crisis. Tomlins-Jahnke (2007) suggests that the pattern of consistent Maori underachievement over many decades seems to confirm a certain level of Government tolerance of the crisis in Maori education. In 2008, Maori students were 2.6 times more likely than Pakeha to be stood down from school; 3.3 times more likely to be suspended; 4.5 times more likely to be frequent truants; 2.7 times more likely to leave school with no qualifications, and 2.3 times less likely to attain a university entrance qualification (Ministry of Education, 2009b).

The Ministry of Education states explicitly that ensuring the success of Maori in education is a key priority. Less explicit is a definition of what that ‘success’ will look like. Our predominant indicators of success centre on improvement of literacy – in English – and of numeracy scores, national qualifications results and entrance to university. These might well be Maori and Pasifika aspirations, but Duncan-Andrade (2006) asks, what is the cost we are prepared to pay for these outcomes? Duncan-Andrade (2006) states that middle class white children tend to come to school with faith that the system will reproduce itself to their benefit, a sense of purpose in the larger society and a sense of hope that their purpose will be fulfilled. Non-white children tend to come to school with big questions in each of those areas.

Our definition of achievement and success might be the popular national measures, such as the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) credits, literacy, numeracy, university preparation or university enrolment, but there is little doubt that without the human measures such as a positive self identity, critical awareness, purpose and hope, young people will become disengaged and disillusioned with school, and find the national goals unattainable.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In Port Alberni on Vancouver Island, I was welcomed with ceremonial drums by the Nuuchahnuth Tribal Council and was afforded a wonderful meal of salmon caught in the river right outside the traditional House of Hupacasath where I had been invited to present a talk to community elders and district educators. Over lunch Huupachesaht First Nation elder, Ki-Ke-In, told me about the residential schools and the experiences of the 370 people he interviewed in his research for the book he wrote in 1996, “Indian Residential Schools: the Nuuchahnuth Experience.” People told him about the loss of family ties, culture, language, the physical and sexual abuse, and a mistrust in the present systems designed to support Nuuchahnuth children, families, and communities. His study shows how the schools failed to prepare the students for life outside of school, while stripping the children of their cultural knowledge and identity. He described the whole generation of First Nations people – those who had been in the schools, who didn’t know how to be parents, because they had been removed from their
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families and had no parents as role models. The youngest of a family of eight and the only one who wasn’t taken away to residential school he described his guilt, and the anger he suspected his siblings felt, that his experience had been better than theirs.

Edward ‘Tat’ Tatoosh, an elder from the Hupacasath First Nation told me of the loss of a language, the loss of respect from young people, the loss of traditional skills, and the loss of his Nation’s history. “It’s very hard.” he said, “It’s a constant battle to just survive. A lot of what happened is not even published.” There was a sense of Macedo’s “being present and yet not visible” in his words, “I got my linguistics degree at the University of Victoria in 1977, but I’m not really recognised as a linguist a lot of times.”

In primary and secondary schools in Vancouver and on Vancouver Island I saw well-intentioned teachers and principals genuinely trying to provide a culturally responsive environment for First Nations students. However, none came close to the Haahuupayak Independent School - situated within the traditional territory of the Tseshahat First Nation, and on the Tseshahat Reserve. The school’s building, the culturally rich classroom environments, the language spoken, the activities I saw the children engaged in, all strongly represented cultural identity and pride, which was also embedded in their mission statement (below). As is the case in New Zealand, schools that try to provide authentic, critical, culturally responsive learning for indigenous students, unfortunately, but inevitably, have to step outside the mainstream system.

Back in New Zealand I spoke with Dr. Bob Morgan, Conjoint Professor at Wollotuka, the School of Aboriginal Studies at the University of Newcastle in New South Wales in Australia, who was visiting our two schools. Bob Morgan chaired the 1993 World Indigenous Conference in Education (WIPCE) and following that conference, initiated the Task Force that drew up the now famous Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples Rights in Education, (1999). Dr Morgan spoke of the ‘Stolen Generation’ and of being lined up with all the other Aboriginal children at his primary school to be told by the ‘whitefella’ teacher (whose name ironically was Mr White), they would never be capable of learning. When he recounted this experience to his mother, “his greatest teacher,” she told him he could either live the teacher’s dream or he could live his own dream.

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

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

This international resistance and initiatives in education to centre learning and curriculum on indigenous knowledges and identities was a major part of my research study through this scholarship. Three specific programmes, visited during this research and on earlier occasions are described in detail later in this report.

**Defining Success: Whose success do we really mean?**

**Whiteness**

The hidden, unacknowledged nature of whiteness and power is a fundamental cause of our apparent inability to make change in our schools that will benefit non-white children. Omi and Winant (1994, cited in Apple, 2006, p.234) point out, it is only by noticing race that we can challenge it. Only by placing race at the centre of the debate can we begin to challenge structures and institutions, and our own individual positions to combat inequality and injustice, “inherited from the past and continually reproduced in the present” (Apple, 2006, p.234).

Those who belong to the dominant and powerful group in any society have choices about how they, as individual members of that group, behave. Beverly Tatum (2003, pp.11,12) likens these choices about racism to a moving walkway at an airport. Active, racist behaviour is the same as walking fast in the same direction as the conveyor belt. This person has identified with the ideology of white supremacy and is actively moving with it. Passive racist behaviour is the same as standing still. Through absolutely no deliberate effort of your own you are still moved along without resistance to the same destination as those who actively walk. Some might recognise racism and turn their backs, not prepared to go in the same direction as those supporting or passively accepting it and not wanting to end up in the same place – but unless you are prepared to actively walk in the opposite direction, at a pace faster than the conveyor belt – unless you are actively antiracist – you will still inevitably be carried along with the others.

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

One example of New Zealand’s reluctance to discuss whiteness as problematic in education is inherent in the *Quality Teaching for Diverse Students in Schooling: Best Evidence Synthesis* [BES], (Alton Lee, 2003). This report is one of a series of best evidence syntheses commissioned by the Ministry of Education, intended to inform education policy and practice in New Zealand. The term ‘diversity’ in this synthesis of evidence and best practice is defined as including, “ethnicity, socio-economic background, home language, gender, special needs, disability, and giftedness.” Also included in the definition is diversity within ethnic groups and, “the diversity within individual
students influenced by intersections of gender, cultural heritage(s), socio-economic background, and talent” (p.v). This homogeneous definition of diversity and the overall focus of the BES on quality teaching certainly does not put culture at the centre of best practice. Although there are many references to cultural identity and to research that make cultural norms explicit (Hohepa, Hingangaroa Smith, Smith & McNaughton, 1992; Durie, 2001) the Best Evidence Synthesis does little to specifically name the inherent Eurocentrism of our education system and does little to challenge Pakeha teachers to address power relations in their classrooms. Christine Sleeter (2008) comments on the issue of whiteness and teachers:

White people have a long history of, at best, getting in the way of the progress of people of color and, more generally, reinforcing and benefiting from everyday racism. In education, for example, there is ample evidence that White people enter the teaching profession bringing little or no understanding of race and racism, but well-armed with misinformation and stereotypes learned over the years....We assume we can teach anyone but at the same time routinely carry stereotypes into the classroom that support deficit thinking and depressed expectations for academic learning of students of color, particularly African-American students (p.82).

Privilege or Supremacy

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

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

Literacy as a White Space

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

---

8 The ‘1C’ programme segregated generations of language-minority students, in Arizona, forbidding the use of Spanish, aiming to ‘fix’ the linguistic and academic deficiencies of Mexican children, and relegating them to low level academic tracks.
Linda Smith (1999, p.33) directly implicates schools in the redefinition of indigenous worlds and discusses the dangers implicit in reading and writing. She cites Patricia Grace’s (1985) assertion that “books are dangerous” to indigenous readers when:

(1) they do not reinforce our values, actions, customs, culture and identity; (2) when they tell us only about others they are saying that we do not exist; (3) they may be writing about us but they are writing things that are untrue; and (4) they are writing about us but saying negative and insensitive things which tell us we are not good (Smith, p.35).

Grace is specifically referring to school texts and journals. Sue McLachlan’s (1996) analysis of 12,526 illustrations used in New Zealand state-produced beginning reader publications over a span of 89 years showed that, “Maori presence has been largely relegated to the past and with few exceptions unacknowledged in the present” (p.128). The tendency in later years was the use of colour as the single determining ethnic characteristic. This use of “dubious brown” (p.103) without any other distinguishing features failed to differentiate Maori from any other ethnic group, thus making Maori identity largely invisible in texts that were widely used in schools and sent home with young children.

Writing can be dangerous, according to Smith (1999, p.36), because “we reinforce and maintain a style of discourse that is never innocent.” She refers to the misappropriation of texts and the legitimisation of texts, in academic, journalistic and imaginative writing that reinforce ‘myths’ that are hostile to indigenous peoples.

Macedo (1995, p.77) also discusses this danger. He analyses the role of literacy in cultural reproduction and critiques the instrumentalist approach to literacy that reduces it to a “competency-based skills banking approach.” He asserts that this notion of literacy is a major and popular goal of the current back to basics drive in our education systems. In this model the rewards go to the “good student” who may be a functionally competent reader but who basically receives information, and is rarely taught the skills to critically analyse “the social and political order that generates the need for reading in the first place” (p.80). Students can be effectively literate but never taught to question the “racist and discriminatory practices that they face in school and the community at large.” He calls this a “pedagogy of big lies” and uses the following lyrics from the Tom Paxton song as an example of “a good student ... who wilfully and unreflectively accepts big lies”:

```
What did you learn in school today, dear little boy of mine?
What did you learn in school today, dear little boy of mine?
I learned that Washington never told a lie
I learned that Washington never told a lie
I learned that soldiers seldom die
I learned that everybody’s free
And that’s what the teacher said to me
And that’s what I learned in school today,
That’s what I learned in school.
I learned the policemen are my friends
```

```
I learned that justice never ends
I learned that murderers pay for their crimes
Even if we make a mistake sometimes
I learned our government must be strong
It’s always right and never wrong!
Our leaders are the finest men
And we elect them again and again
I learned that war is not so bad
I learned of the great ones we have had
We fought in Germany and in France
And some day I might get my chance.
```

---

*The beginning readers analysed included Part 1 School Journals and the original and revised Ready to Read series.*
Critical and New Media Literacies

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

The Curriculum as a White Space: The Politics of Knowledge

The most essential challenge however, if the implementation of The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007b) in mainstream schools is going to effectively support the development of Māori and Pasifika students’ cultural identity, is not about increasing English literacy levels or even the number of Māori and Pasifika language learning opportunities. It is how to support teachers, and school leaders not to just rethink their classroom practice in terms of curriculum delivery, but to fundamentally examine the white space ideology that drives the development of the curriculum and identify their own personal viewpoints within that paradigm (Helfand, 2009, Kincheloe & Hayes, 2007; Sleeter, 2001, Swartz, 1992). As Michael Apple (1993) explains, “One thing is perfectly clear. The national curriculum is a mechanism for the political control of knowledge” (p.234):

What counts as knowledge, the ways in which it is organized, who is empowered to teach it, what counts as an appropriate display of having learned it, and-just as critically-who is allowed to ask and answer all of these questions are part and parcel of how dominance and subordination are reproduced and altered in this society. There is, then, always a politics of official knowledge, a politics that embodies conflict over what some regard as simply neutral descriptions of the world and others regard as elite conceptions that empower some groups while disempowering others (p.222, emphasis in original).

He urges us to be aware of the origins and the history of the curriculum field and to understand that “the knowledge that got into schools in the past and gets into schools now is not random” (Apple, 2004, p.60). Rather, it is organised around a set of values and principles that represent particular views of normality and deviance and of what “good people act like.” If you ask the question, “What if existing social and economic arrangements require that some people are relatively poor and unskilled and others are not?” (p.60, emphasis in original) you can begin to understand how schools may help to maintain this set of arrangements. Schools preserve and distribute what is perceived to be ‘legitimate knowledge’ and confer ‘cultural legitimacy on the knowledge of specific groups’

---

10 New Zealand’s Ministry of Māori Development
This is an exercise in power. Apple believes that if we examine current curriculum, and what counts as knowledge now, through its historical context, the ideological and economic purpose schools have served in the past, we can comprehend why school reform now is often unsuccessful.

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

Determining success: Whose knowledge is of most worth?

Huia Tomlins-Jahnke (2008) states, “indigenous education outcomes are inevitably compared with, and measured against national and international norms, benchmarking tests and surveys embedded in western hegemonic values and ideals.”

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

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

It is technical knowledge however, that is the primary goal of our education system. The Ministry of Education’s Statement of Intent 2009-2014 (Ministry of Education, 2009b) specifies our strategic direction:

The New Zealand education system leads the world in many areas and performs well for most students. However, it does not fully meet the needs of some students, including a disproportionate number of Maori and Pasifika students, students from poorer communities and students with disabilities or special education needs. By lifting achievement for these students, the overall performance of the education system will improve.

The plan identifies the six primary outcomes expected:

---

11 In education, the Programme for International Student Achievement (PISA), an international survey of 15 and 16 year olds from 28 different countries, is an example.
1. The opportunity to participate in high quality early childhood education
2. Every child achieves literacy and numeracy levels that enable their success
3. Every young person has the skills and qualifications to contribute to their and New Zealand’s future
4. Relevant and efficient tertiary education provision that meets student and labour market needs
5. Maori enjoying education success as Maori
6. The Ministry is capable, efficient and responsive to achieve education priorities

The language of market forces and economic goals is clear. Having identified in the preamble, the disparity in our system, the plan to address this is to focus on participation, literacy and numeracy, retention to meet labour market needs, and the goals of Ka Hikitia, the limitations of which have been discussed earlier in this report. Further stipulated, in the indicators the Ministry will use to track the progress of the literacy and numeracy goal, is the implementation in 2010 of the government’s new National Standards in reading, writing and mathematics for primary and intermediate schools.

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

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

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

If schools are producing the outcomes they are in fact designed to do, and we continue to stratify and sort young people exclusively according to this high status technical knowledge, no matter how many school reform initiatives, strategic intent priorities, new curriculum documents, or National Standards we develop, or how much we euphemistically expect Maori students will achieve these same goals but, “as Maori,” the realities and outcomes for Maori and Pasifika students in New Zealand schools will not change. Duncan-Andrade and Morrell (2008, p.4) acknowledge this when they point out that if school achievement patterns had anything to do with intellect, we would expect them to “more closely mirror the random distribution of intellect genetic scientists report in human populations.” Instead the results for schools are quite predictable. They state, “We can cite a litany of research data and evidentiary claims to support the arguments that school is a rigged game, but what would be the point? How long must we argue over common sense? (2008, p.5).
Coloured-in Spaces

We, the Indigenous peoples of the world, assert our inherent right to self-determination in all matters. Self-determination is about making informed choices and decisions and creating appropriate structures for the transmission of culture, knowledge and wisdom for the benefit of each of our respective cultures. Education for our communities and each individual is central to the preservation of our cultures and for the development of the skills and expertise we need in order to be a vital part of the twenty-first century (The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights In Education, 1999).

Lessons Learned

The development of a secure cultural identity which allows young people to live and learn as who they are has been the central theme of this research and this report. Developing a strong cultural identity however, does not ignore the complex, multiple, shared, and fluid identities our young people navigate both in and beyond school. Knowing who they are in terms of their cultural identity is not to sentence young people to be forever trapped in a traditional cultural time warp. In fact, in order to effectively integrate all those other identities, the schools’ philosophy believes young people first have to have a strong sense of self, and cultural identity is seen as the thread that weaves through, and acts as their compass, in all of the other pathways our young people walk. A secure cultural identity in school connects students’ self and academic learning to the many worlds beyond school—including the international and future spaces.

This section describes social justice initiatives outside New Zealand. Although these exist in many countries, I will focus specifically on three programmes in the United States because these are communities and initiatives I personally visited and with whom our two schools have an ongoing association. The connection with these programmes show our youth that they are not alone in the struggle for social justice and educational sovereignty, and that injustice, colonisation, assimilation, racism and white spaces transcend borders to marginalise and pathologise young people the world over.

These initiatives add to the strategies outlined in the previous sections; to develop new ways to address the ‘white spaces’ that are not framed by, or limited to, Eurocentric norms that view Maori, Pasifika, indigenous and minoritised students’ education from a deficit viewpoint.

At the Hui Taumata Mātauranga12 in 2001, Mason Durie set three goals for Maori education policies; that they should aim to equip Maori children and rangatahi (youth) to be citizens of world, to live as Maori, and to enjoy a high standard of living. As noted earlier, Durie’s goals have been incorporated into the Maori Education Strategy, Ka Hikitia which identifies, as a broad student outcome that, “Maori learners gain the universal skills and knowledge needed to successfully participate in and contribute to Aotearoa New Zealand and the world” (Ministry of Education, 2008a, p.20). In the introduction to Ka Hikitia, Apryll Parata, Deputy Secretary—Maori Education, speaks of a future for Maori youth who are, “confident, capable and connected learners who are supported by their respective education communities, at home, in te Ao Maori, in Aotearoa New Zealand and in the global world” (p.9). However, Maori or Pasifika youth can’t learn how to become effective and participating global citizens if we are not connecting them to the rest of the world in ways that enable them to see how their experiences fit into the big picture.

12 The first Hui Taumata Matauranga: Maori Education Summit was convened in Turangi and Taupo 23-25 February 2001 at the invitation of Tuwharetoa paramount chief Tumu Te Heuheu.
Solidarity in the White Space

There have been three prolonged efforts by parents in the Clover Park, Otara, community, over a span of 20 years, to resist and reject alienating school environments in favour of a relevant, critical, culturally-located, bilingual, model of schooling. Two of these campaigns have been successful after many years of protest. The first saw the change from Clover Park Intermediate to Clover Park Middle School and the second, the establishment of Te Whanau o Tupuranga as a designated character, bilingual Maori secondary school. Both of these major changes were initiated by Maori parents. The outcome of the third, an application from Pasifika parents to enable their children to remain in their bilingual Samoan, Tongan and Cook Islands Maori learning environments through to Year 13, is as yet in process. Unfortunately, each initiative has been met with exactly the same opposition from our education authorities. These objections have very little to do with the education of this community’s youth and everything to do with maintaining the status quo in the ‘network’ of existing schools. In official minds the country’s “network” of state-funded schools already provide an education relevant to all students and they have too much invested in that concept to give it up easily.

The protest for educational equity and social justice may have different contexts, different ethnic communities, and different schooling systems and regulations to negotiate, but the following three examples from the United States resonate with the struggle and the solutions we have developed in Otara, New Zealand. Together they provide a powerful example of ‘audacious hope’ (Duncan-Andrade, 2009) and a model that challenges and resists the white spaces in our schools.

Resisting and Changing the White Spaces

1. ‘Doc Ur Block’: Stepping to College and Consciousness in East Oakland Community High School

I first encountered “The Definite Dozen” (Figure 4) on the wall in Dr. Jeff Duncan-Andrade’s and Dr. Wayne Yang’s classroom at East Oakland Community High School in 2007. Students in this class were not able to participate in the programme until they had committed The Definite Dozen to memory and their rendition had been approved by their classmates. Every lesson ended with the whole class saying The Definite Dozen in unison. At the end of our visit one of the gifts presented to us by the young people in the class was a framed copy of “The Definite Dozen” which I brought back to students in our two schools, which now is displayed in our school Wharenui, and which staff subsequently translated into Maori.

The Definite Dozen epitomises the spirit of the 11th Grade youth and the teachers I met that day. I sat in on their urban sociology class where they were studying the ancient Chinese philosophy of the I Ching. I rode the BART13 with them from East Oakland into San Francisco and attended their class at the university. A few days later met up with a group of these young people again in Chicago where they presented the results of their research to a large audience of eminent critical educators for social justice at the American Education Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting in a session entitled, Doc Your Block: Critical Pedagogy Through Youth Participatory Action Research. This was their 10th Grade (NZ Year 11) research.

---

13 Bay Area Rapid Transport monorail
This group of students was part of the “Step to College” (STC) programme, initiated by San Francisco State University’s (SFSU) College of Education “as a response to the disturbingly low levels of academic engagement, achievement, graduation, and college eligibility among poor and working class youth of color” (Hidalgo & Duncan-Andrade, 2009, p.2). The STC programme partnered a university professor with a local high school, allowing students to cross-enrol each semester in a high school class and a university seminar class. By exposing these young people to the rigor and culture of university courses the STC programme hoped to prepare them for college success (p.3). In the video greetings the East Oakland Community High School class made to introduce themselves to senior students in Te Whanau o Tupuranga, almost every student proudly stated they were a ‘junior’ at EOC and a ‘freshman’ at San Francisco State University.  

The urban sociology class was made up of 30 students—16 Latino and 14 African American. The overwhelming majority of the group would have been considered low achievers by conventional measures and approximately half of the class had been recruited due to their reputation as some of the school’s most challenging students. (Hidalgo and Duncan-Andrade, 2009, p.6; Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008, p.144). The class met, with Professor Duncan-Andrade as their teacher, for a ninety minute block, three times a week. Hidalgo and Duncan-Andrade argue that, “the results produced by STC must be understood as the outcomes of an intense commitment to the development of pedagogy and curriculum that create meaningful relationships between teachers and students, while

---

14 Grade 10 is the equivalent of New Zealand’s Year 11, when NZ students begin NCEA Level 1. In the USA grade levels are often referred to as follows: Grade 9 - Freshman Year, Grade 10 - Sophomore Year, Grade 11 - Junior Year, Grade 12 - Senior Year. When students begin college (university) these names are again used to describe each year, in the same sequence.
maintaining a high level of critical intellectual rigor” (p.6). The Doc Ur Block research was an example of this commitment.

The Doc Ur Block project took student sociologists through the five stages of critical praxis: 1) identify a problem; 2) analyze the problem; 3) develop a plan to address the problem; 4) implement the plan; and 5) evaluate the impact of the plan (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008). In the first stage students were introduced to three key sociological terms, hegemony, counter-hegemony and habitus, through readings, films and lectures. They then used those terms to analyse elements of popular youth culture, such as television shows, music, advertisements, video games, fashion and sports. Students then identified their own homes on a map of the community and were divided into groups of five, based on their own neighbourhoods. Each group chose a fourth guiding sociological term that they had investigated through their reading and discussion, to add to the original three. Each group presented their research, explaining the absence or presence of these four terms in the aspect of popular culture they had studied. This presentation, to members of the school community, included a literature review that forced them to explain the academic language they had encountered so it was understood by their audience.

In Stage 2 the research moved to the community. Groups developed an hypothesis about what they would find when they studied their respective neighbourhoods and then were trained in the basic use of the tools of ethnographic research; digital video, still photography, observational field notes, formal and informal interviews, basic surveys and artifact collection. They then spent three weeks, during lunch and after school, conducting field research in the community. The requirements of the final presentation of their findings, at a research conference again attended by key stakeholders in the school community were:

To prepare three main products for the conference: a twenty minute PowerPoint presentation, an eight-to-ten minute “Blocumentary” (documentary) film, and a twelve- to fifteen-page research report. The division of labor for these products was the decision of the research group. The minimum requirements for each of the assignments were as follows: 1) the PowerPoint presentation needed to have slides covering their literature review of social theoretical terms, research methods, hypothesis, findings, and reconstructed theory; 2) the research report needed to have sections covering the same topics as the PowerPoint; and 3) The “Blocumentary” film needed to have visual examples of the social theoretical terms, counter-instances, and reconstructed theory (Duncan-Andrade & Morrell, 2008, p.146).

Having seen both the ‘blocumentaries’ and the presentations of their research to “a standing-room only audience of more than 150 graduate students and professors” (p.148), who gave these young scholars a standing ovation at the AERA Conference in Chicago in 2007, I can attest to the raw honesty and academic rigour of this work. Duncan-Andrade (p.149) comments, “The real value of this project rests in the way it helped students re-envision their communities and their roles in creating and contributing to counter-narratives that promote hope and self-determination.” As Assata, told the AERA audience:

To be completely honest ... we didn’t think we were going to see any counter-hegemony in our community because we believed the hegemony just like everybody else. That’s why our key data, the stuff we just [presented], is so important because it proves us wrong about our own community (p.147).

In Grade 11, their Junior year, the research by this same group was to develop an East Oakland Youth SARC (School Accountability Report Card). California public schools annually provide
information about themselves for these reports to the community allowing the public to evaluate and compare schools for student achievement, environment, resources and demographics. The sociology class provided their own SARC based on their perceptions of their school and created a plan for school improvement. Again these young people presented their findings at the AERA Annual Meeting in New York in 2008. During their 12th-grade year they researched the presence and/or absence of human rights in classic literature and popular films, as well as within their schools and the Oakland community, analysing why these human rights are essential to a person’s quality of life and how to fight to gain access for those who are denied their basic rights (Hidalgo & Duncan-Andrade, 2009, p.22).

Beginning—and Ending

The East Oakland Community High School (EOC) opened in 2004, part of a wider community school reform movement, initiated by a group of mothers from the “flatlands” of Oakland who saw that their children, in large, overcrowded, poorly resourced schools were receiving a vastly different education from children in the affluent hills suburbs where schools were smaller. In May 2000 the Oakland Unified School Board unanimously adopted the New Small Autonomous Schools (NSAS) policy. BayCES (the Bay Area Collaborative for Equitable Schools) received a $15.7 million grant from the Gates Foundation to support the Oakland small schools work. From 2000 to 2005 BayCES led the incubation of 26 new small schools, one of which was East Oakland Community High School.

By 2007-2008 the Oakland Unified School District, under state control since its bankruptcy in 2003, had opened 49 new small schools and closed three “because of low enrolment and other problems” (Vasudeva, Darling-Hammond, Newton, & Montgomery, 2009, p.5). Unfortunately, one of those three was East Oakland Community High School. Maharaj (2007) reports, “Students, faculty and parents claim there are political motivations behind the shut down. School district officials point to hard numbers.” Wayne Yang, a co-founder of EOC, while agreeing there was room for improvement, asked for time to embed the changes already making a difference. The closure meant that the STC class, embarked on such a transformational trajectory to college, were ousted from their successful environment unable to complete their important senior year, and their junior year was disrupted by the threat of closure hanging over their heads:

We’ve finally created the conditions for which students are actually invested in school... They’re investing because they actually have hope. They have faith that these adults will not let them down,” Yang says. “I appreciate the challenge the district is throwing at us....Whether or not we believe in test scores, it’s still telling. We believe those test scores should go up. They’ll never be comparable to the population for which the tests were designed to measure, but our students will get into college and that’s the difference (Yang, quoted in Maharaj, 2007).

Marching for Justice

The decision to close EOC devastated students, staff and the community and they took action. On 28 February, 2007, the school closed at 2.00pm and an estimated 250 students, teachers, and community members rallied to march over eight miles to the Oakland Unified School District administrator/trustee meeting where the decision was to be made about the school’s closure. Yang (2009b) describes the march:

Their journey transgressed lines of representation, drawn by a state administration that had depicted the youth as disorderly, anti-school savages. It also transgressed colorlines
and hood-lines, very real social divides that structured ghetto space. On Macarthur Boulevard and 63rd Avenue, a group of DMBs (Dirty Mackin Boyz) locked arms to block the march as it crossed through their turf. The vice principal ran up to one young man, a former student. She said urgently, “They’re closing EOC. We’re marching for the school.” The youth motioned, his set dropped their arms, and the marchers passed. State turf also had its gang. Police were hired in extra numbers to protect the administration from the community. But sometime near midnight, the cops joined hands with the youth to pray and weep in the hallways of central office after the decision to close the school was finalized (Yang, 2009b).

8 Mile March 4 Education Poster

In spite of eloquent speeches from some 30 students, staff, parents and community members, they were unable to change the board’s decision, finally announced very late in the evening, that the school would officially close in June, 2007, the end of the school year. Maharaj (2007) quotes Jeff Duncan-Andrade’s words to the youth immediately after the decision:

“The people that made the decision are not from our community. They don’t live in this community. And they pass judgment on us?” Duncan-Andrade says. “I’m not surprised by the decision tonight. I’m reaffirmed.”

“I grew up as an athlete and I always wanted that final score. But freedom is not a final score. Freedom is a journey... Our freedom is in our decision to fight forever,” he says. “This march will be in the history book. Look in any history book for hundreds of students marching for freedom and education, and you’ll see that chapter is lacking. You have written it here today” (Maharaj, 2007).

Parents were then left with difficult decisions about their children’s education choices. Wayne Yang explains that, in what he calls “the EOC ghostlife” some parents chose to leave the district, enrolling their children in charter schools, and some chose not to send them to school at all. Some (specifically, the parents of students working in the STC programme) chose to enrol in a charter school and to send them each morning to class in a converted house in the westside ghetto. Yang (2009b) states:

It is difficult to express without understatement, the risk taken by these students and their parents, the trust they had to muster in the volunteer adults staffing the program, and their total distrust of the Oakland school district. The state administrator saw these
actions as irrational. Denouncing of colonial education, in both its aspects of dispossession and false generosity, appears completely irrational within the colonial epistemology.

This determination to continue with their programme in spite of the obstacles was not only an extreme risk, it required significant adjustment and commitment from the youth themselves to move out of their community where they knew the rules and the risks to a new community where they were unknown. Yang describes this process:

On school days, they crisscrossed from Oakland’s eastside ghetto to its westside one, over water to San Francisco State University, and through economic zones to a downtown charter school. They rode the Black Star Line, county buses, and the expensive commuter monorail train named BART. Eclectic transit was a necessity of living across fractured spaces. In between, they were not there, black bodies in white space. Students often spoke of a peculiar absence-presence, of feeling hypervisible yet invisible in modes of ‘public’ transportation not meant for them, in stores where they could not buy, in universities where they were curiosities – in moral geographies whose purity was predicated on their not-being-there. By skipping over or passing under white space, youth disappeared from one place, and reappeared somewhere else. Theirs was a black space travel akin to quantum tunneling, rather than a smooth commute on a contiguous freeway. This teleportation trick connected otherwise discontinuous space, and in the process defragmented the ghetto (2009b).

One measurable outcome of that commitment and the programme’s success is college entry. Of the 30 students in the original 10th grade cohort, 24 (80%) continued to 12th grade. Eighteen of the original 30 (60%) enrolled in 4-year universities after graduating from high school (with at least one additional student enrolling in a two-year community college). Twenty four of the 26 students (92%) in the STC senior class (which included 16 from the original cohort, plus four that joined in year 2 and six that joined in year 3) graduated from high school and continued to four-year universities. By comparison, in the 2007-2008 school year in the Oakland Unified School District, the rates for 12th Grade graduates completing all courses required for University of California and/or California State University entrance were Latino students 42.1% and African American students 30.9% (California Department of Education, 2009).

2. “Born out of Struggle”: Little Village Lawndale Social Justice High School, Chicago

Little Village in Chicago is the largest Mexican community in the U.S. Midwest. Since the late 1970s it has been steeped in community action and resistance, including a struggle to develop bilingual education in public schools. From as early as 1995 the community had put pressure on Chicago Public Schools (CPS) to build a neighbourhood, open enrolment, high school to address overcrowding in the only local public high school which had a roll of over 2,000 in a community where there were 4,000 school-aged youths (Cortez, 2008, p.20). This lobbying was eventually successful with $30 million allocated for the school in 1998.

Subsequently however, CPS overlooked parent requests and diverted the funding towards the creation of four selective-enrolment schools in other neighbourhoods in the city. Selective-
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15 Yang describes his use of ‘white’ and ‘black’ in this quote as “analytic categories not necessarily limited to phenotypically white and black people.”

16 Personal email from Nicole Hidalgo, 3 September, 2009.
enrolment schools require applicants to have a particular composite test score in order to gain entry and are mostly populated by white middle-income and affluent families (Stovall, 2007, p.683). With no sign of ground being broken by fall of 2000, and outraged at the decision to build the four other schools, Little Village residents attended a CPS central board meeting to be told that the funds originally allocated to their school had been spent and that CPS had made a final decision not to build the school at all (p.684).

**Starving for Justice**

On 13 May, 2001, Mother’s Day, four women and one man initiated a hunger strike to protest this decision. These five were joined over the following days by a further 12 residents, mostly mothers, and including one 71 year old grandmother (Cortez, 2008, p.17), one high school student and one college student, both under the age of 20. Rather than an act of desperation or outrage, Stovall (2007, p.684) describes the hunger strike as “an intensely planned strategy to alert CPS to the community’s power to resist and demand quality education.” Cortez (p.17) says, “Their act was a show of force by brave ordinary mothers who confronted a patronage political platform dominated by men in the name of community empowerment and democratic principles.”

The hunger strike took place on the corner of the vacant land set aside for the original school. The group called their camp site ‘Camp Cesar Chavez’ in honour of the famous Mexican-American civil rights leader. They had two demands; that construction begin on the school by the summer of 2001, and that there be community participation at all levels of planning, design, curriculum development and implementation. By 15 May, with the hunger strike gaining state and national media attention the strikers issued a public statement:

> [On] Mother’s day, a mother’s aspirations are focused on her family and especially her children ... the most important concern is the education and safety of her children.  
> How long will the children of Little Village be further punished with poor schools? What happened to the money budgeted for our school? Northside Preparatory and Walter Payton Academy are beautiful schools; what happened to ours? No other community has as many children. No other community has a greater need for day-care. No other community has a greater need for green recreational space. Mayor Daley, why is it that you won’t make this project a reality? [We believe] peaceful non-violent protests can overcome greed and arrogance. It is in this spirit that we raise the banner of the future of our children as a cause to be championed on this Mother’s Day. Long live the strike! We can do it!!! (Cortez, 2008, p.24)

The hunger strike lasted 19 days from 13 May to 1 June. Over 500 people attended the closing event held on 2 June. Strikers vowed to continue to fight. During the strike the strikers and media attention had forced a reluctant visit to the site by the chief executive of CPS who had originally stated “he did not want to come to Little Village to meet with a few women who are refusing to eat,” (Friedman, 2007). They negotiated a verbal agreement from him that the high school would be built. However, supporters and strikers knew they couldn’t stop the campaign until there was signed agreement from CPS. Over the ensuing weeks Camp Chavez continued to be a focal site, with ‘open-mic’ sessions and festivals for youth, rallies, church services, a town meeting and even a planned “Incomplete Graduation” ceremony which was abandoned when the Camp Chavez wooden stage was mysteriously burned down. Instead, organisers placed graduation gowns and caps on a nearby fence to demonstrate how many students could have graduated had the school been opened in 1999 as promised (Cortez, 2008, p.47). Cortez (p.54) comments that Camp Chavez, “truly was a special place that embodied a force of hope by a wide range of people.”
Finally, almost four years after the end of the hunger strike, the Little Village Lawndale High School Campus opened its doors to four hundred students in the fall of 2005. The campus is comprised of four independent, autonomous, small schools; Multicultural Arts High School, World Language High School, Social Justice High School, and Infinity: Math, Science, and Technology High School. Each school has its own principal and teaching staff. Each school houses approximately 385 to 400 students from the neighbourhoods of North Lawndale and Little Village. Currently the building is the most expensive high school built in the state of Illinois, with final construction costs of $63 million (Stovall, 2007, p.684). African-American residents in the neighbouring community of North Lawndale were included in the school formation process. To comply with the federal government’s desegregation mandate each high school is required to maintain a population that is at least 30% African-American and no more than 70% Latino/a (p.685).

Originally the activists of the hunger strike, continuing to advocate for control of the school model, went door to door asking parents what they considered would be the ideal situation for their children to learn in. Parents wanted a safe, small, and academically rigorous place for their children. They wanted the school to value bilingualism and biculturalism, to celebrate art, dance, and music as part of the curriculum, and to prepare students for the ever increasing jobs requiring strong math, science, and technological skills. These aspirations shaped three of the schools on the site. What surprised some educators and activists the most from the surveys was the concept of “keeping the values of peace and equity” that came out of the hunger strike alive. Parents wanted all the children who graduated from the new high school never to forget the physical, spiritual, and communal struggle it took to achieve justice. Out of this desire came the fourth school, the Social Justice High School. The core beliefs of the school are explained as:

**Truth and Transparency**
We will practice honesty and authenticity in our communication and relationships with students, our community, peers, and ourselves.

**Struggle and Sacrifice**
Our struggle is against systems of power that have been historically used to deny, regulate, and prohibit access to the most basic human rights that should be granted freely to members of society regardless of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, or religious belief. We accept the reality that such struggle will require sacrifice from all involved.

**Ownership and Agency**
We will take responsibility as agents and catalysts of change to expose the truth about the functions of power, work (unite) to interrupt their operations, and operate as producers of power to meet the needs of the Greater Lawndale community.

**Collective and Community Power**
Through collective community power, we commit to a conscious effort to overcome the intended historical obstacles that have been designed to disempower and divide our communities, and thereby meet the needs of all members of Greater Lawndale for continual betterment and progress.

David Stovall (2007, p.688), a member of the design team, and “one of the first persons outside the hunger strikers to be consulted on issues of curriculum” (Stovall, 2006, p.100) describes the curriculum of the Social Justice High School, which is organised around four sets of ‘knowledges’ critical to the concept of social justice; community, critical, classical and behavioural knowledge. Community knowledge recognises that the curriculum had to be relevant to the lived experiences of the students and their families. Critical knowledge seeks to enable students to analyse aspects of
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injustice that are meaningful and relevant to their lives so they are equipped to challenge and address these. Classical knowledge includes the information that students need to “pass gatekeeping exams and to access content-area knowledge often denied to poor students and students of color” (p.688). Behavioural knowledge, added later as staff were appointed, planned to develop knowledge of the behaviours that were conducive to learning. Stovall adds that this concept was the most difficult to communicate in the first year of the school’s operation.

Stovall (p.682) calls the process of creating a public high school centred in community accountability, “the politics of interruption” and aligns this ‘politically relevant pedagogy’ (Beauboeuf-Lafontant, 1999 p.705) which “recognizes political, social and economic factors as relevant to the political experiences of inequity and disenfranchisement,” with Ladson-Billings’s (1994) concept of culturally relevant pedagogy.

Symbols and Environment

In her book *The Power of Place*, Dolores Hayden (1995) writes, “Many cultures have...attempted to embed memory in narrative elements of buildings...Common urban places like union halls, schools, and residences have the power to evoke visual, social memory” (pp.46-47). Reminiscent of the process described in Chapter 4 to develop a relevant learning environment in Te Whanau o Tupuranga’s design, the Little Village Lawndale High School Campus has incorporated traditional signs and symbols that are reflective of both communities and are permanent reminders of the struggle to build the school.

The final design chosen is a numerological representation of the hunger strike and the Aztec story of the five worlds. The Aztec legend speaks of the elements of fire, air, water, and earth. In the school building design each element is represented by a colour shown in the bricks in each of the schools. The bricks in the multicultural arts school are green, representing the earth. The bricks in the School of Social Justice are red, representing the world of fire (also representing the colour of change). Bricks in the mathematics, science, and technology building are blue, representing water. The World Language school has purple bricks, representative of the air. David Stovall describes the feature in the centre of the four schools:

> The fifth world is represented in a 60-foot sundial structure in the middle of the building. To commemorate the hunger strike, points are marked in the interior of the cone. From 13 May to 1 June (the original 19 days of the strike) the sun (by way of a skylight) hits a dot marked on the interior of the cone on each of the 19 days. On 1 June, the dot reaches the center of the cone and is reflected as a beam of light on a compass on the floor of the dial.

The sundial is used as collective meeting space for all four schools. Schools use the space for project displays, art projects, student meetings, and community forum.
The main entrance to the four schools features bays between classrooms skewed at 19 degrees to represent the 19 days of the strike. Fourteen trees have been placed at the south end of the school to represent the 14 hunger-strikers who lasted the duration of the 19 days. A patch of tall grass rests on the north end of the campus, acknowledging the original site of Camp Cesar Chavez.

Visiting Little Village Lawndale Social Justice High School, standing beneath the sundial, and hearing the story of the hunger strike was a powerful experience. As well as the architectural design features, the environment is rich with student murals, mosaics, and the central space windows when we visited hosted a display of silhouettes of civil rights leaders and images for social justice.

3. “Tú eres mi otro yo / You are my other me”: Raza Studies, Tucson Unified School District

In 2009 I spent a week in Tucson, Arizona, hosted by Dr Augustine Romero, Director of Student Equity for the Tucson Unified School District (TUSD). I was specifically interested in the work of the Raza Studies Department and their “Critically Compassionate Intellectualism Model of Transformative Education” (CCI), (Cammarota & Romero, 2006, p.22; Romero, Arce & Cammarota, 2009), developed through research within the Social Justice Education Project (SJEP) at the University of Arizona. I was able to meet and speak with many youths, teachers, Raza Studies and Ethnic Studies departmental staff, parents. I visited high schools, a middle school, two elementary (primary) schools and a parent education class. I also spent time with graduates from different
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18 Photographs in this section were taken personally during my visit in 2007
19 La Raza is a Spanish phrase that may be translated as “the race” or “the people.” In the United States, “La Raza” is sometimes used to denote people of Chicano (i.e. Mexican American) and Mexican descent.
cohorts of the Social Justice Project, now undergraduates at the University of Arizona and working as student-workers and mentors in the programme’s schools. The experience made a lasting positive impression.

Unlike the previous two examples, the Raza Studies programme is not based in one specific school, rather it is a district programme that operates across several school sites using itinerating Raza Studies tutors who partner with and resource the classroom teachers. Another difference from the previous examples is that this programme is not limited to high school students, but now involves younger middle and elementary students as well. However, the focus on Chicano culture and identity through critical pedagogy and critical race theory counter-storytelling closely aligns this programme with the goals and the practice of Te Whanau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School.

The Social Justice Education Project began in 2003 in a class at Cholla High School in Tucson with a group of 16 students who had largely been disengaged from school and on the verge of dropping out.

The premise was straightforward: teach students research skills and allow them to use their research to address inequities that students of color experience in public schools. The results astounded everyone. [The students] all graduated from high school, and 12 of them went on to college. They gave presentations at academic conferences to standing ovations (University of Arizona, 2007).

At Cholla High School at that time, Professor Julio Cammarota, from the University of Arizona and Augustine Romero, with another teacher at the high school, teamed up to develop the programme. They expanded the curriculum of a history course to include Chicano studies and qualitative social science methods. Again, as with the other groups in all of the programmes described here, students were taught the techniques they needed to engage in ethnographic research—a mix of new and traditional, media and academic, critical literacies. Again, the students chose the issues they wanted to study, initially media representation of students of colour, stereotypes, critical thinking vs passivity in education and loss of culture. Again, they produced written reports and videos and presented their findings to their school, community, school board, and city and state officials, and again, students’ engagement in their education was completely turned around.

Research topics in the programme’s schools have included the racial hierarchy and “patterns of unevenness and injustice” (Cammarota, 2008, p.52), the conditions in the special education programme, the over-representation of white students in advanced placement classes, timetabling (scheduling) that acted as a barrier to academic progress, and the physical conditions of their schools. I watched one student presentation during my visit that had documented a 2009 school environment that certainly pulled no punches and was stark evidence of inequality within the school. From 16 students in 2003, the programme grew to include 125 students at three high
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schools; Cholla, Tucson High and Rincon by 2007. In 2009, I visited high school, middle school and elementary school classes in the Raza Studies programme.

Julio Cammarota (Romero, Cammarota, et al., 2008, p.136) explains that in many respects the SJEP draws from the “Funds of Knowledge” approach (González & Moll, 2002). This approach holds that, “instruction must be linked to students’ lives and that the details of effective pedagogy should be linked to local histories and community contexts” (González & Moll, 2002 p.623) and that students’ learning is bound up within larger contextual historical, political, and ideological frameworks that impact their lives. That simple underlying premise of the Funds of Knowledge concept is that people are competent and have knowledge that comes from their life experiences. However, knowledge is not neutral and particular types of knowledge are academically validated in school, while the social and cultural capital of students with different funds of knowledge is negated in this process. The goals of the Social Justice Education Project are to provide students with; “a truly equitable education, academic rigor, the opportunity to develop a critical consciousness, the social and academic scaffolds necessary to dramatically increase the level of student success, assistance to enter the world independently, and preparation to provide leadership to their world.”

The Ethnic Studies Department in the Tucson Unified School District has, since 2004, brought together the Raza Studies, Pan-Asian Studies, African-American Studies and Native-American Studies programmes under one umbrella. Although I met some staff from the other three programmes my specific interest, and the focus of the information in this section is the Raza Studies programme, which was developed out of the Social Justice Education Project. The approach developed by the Raza Studies programme combines the essential characteristics of critical pedagogy, compassionate student/teacher relationships, and social justice content (see Figure 5). This model, co-constructed and defined by the students from the SJEP’s first cohort, is called, “critically compassionate intellectualism” (CCI) (Romero, Arce, & Cammarota, 2009).

Romero, et al., (2009) state that the primary intent of the SJEP was not to foster academic proficiency or an academic identity, but, rather, to help students develop their critical consciousness and, through this process, to help the students develop a strong sense of organic intellectualism:

Very seldom, if ever, did we dialogue about doing better in this class, much less other classes. The same is true about the notion of academic identity; the dialogue regarding identity is that of the social, cultural and historic self. In essence we discussed who the students are, where they come from, and what this means in the present day context, as well as how this understanding could transform their lives and help them engage their epistemology today and transform the ontology they will carry into tomorrow (p.231).
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20 Raza Studies Department, Tucson Unified School District website: 
http://instech.tusd.k12.az.us/Raza/justice.asp
Cammarota (2008 p.48) cites Freire (1998), who contends that marginalized communities must act to change their lived social context, and it is through conscious, organized actions that they produce or create new cultural forms. The SJEP and CCI are two forms that have evolved in this programme. Through ongoing interaction with their students and from the students’ own feedback came a need to explain more explicitly the essence of critically compassionate intellectualism, and how this was experienced by the students. Romero, et al (2009, p.219) call this the “Third Dimension” of the programme. The six elements of CCI’s Third Dimension are:

1. The nurturing of blossoming intellectualism (*Xinachtli*) through authentic caring.
2. Pedagogy de los barrios.
3. Students as creators of knowledge.
4. Focus on collective and individual agency.
5. Organic intellectualism.
6. Academic and personal transformation.

The most powerful demonstration of the Third Dimension came from a 12th Grade class of students at Tucson High School when I questioned them about the value of the Raza Studies programme. After several responses around the class one young man, without any prompting from the teacher, suggested they should say “*In Lak’ech*” for me and, just as the East Oakland class had delivered “The Definite Dozen,” the Tucson class recited the following in unison:
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**Figure 5: Critically Compassionate Intellectualism Model of Transformative Education.**
(Romero, Arce, & Cammarota, 2009, p.222)
There are many parallels between this indigenous philosophy and a Maori worldview. The Maori pepeha (traditional saying), ‘Ko au ko koe, ko koe ko au’ – I am you and you are me’ (Macfarlane et al, 2008, p.119) is a direct example. So too is Te Whanau o Tupuranga’s whakatauaki (proverb) which refers to planting the seeds in the young so they will grow to bear fruit to provide nourishment for future generations.

The first element of the Tezkatlipokas, Xinachtli (Chee-nacht-lee) is a Chicano indigenous concept meaning a process of nurturing the semillas (seeds) of knowledge. This element deals with authentic caring and love—again similar to Maori concepts of whanau. Students commented their teachers were like tios (uncles) and one said, “There was that love, there was that cariño, there was that touch; you guys could relate to us, it was a relief. Finally, somebody that understood where we were coming from” (Romero et al., 2009, p.221).

The second element in CCI’s Third Dimension is Pedagogy de los barrios or “barrio pedagogy,” a term defined by Jeff Duncan-Andrade in his work with the Raza Studies department in Tucson. This pedagogy changes community and school and converges both in a ‘third space’ that challenges and changes the ‘white spaces’:

Within this pedagogy are the Freirean elements of problematization, true words, and tri-dimensionallization (Freire 1994). It is also crucial that we define these critical intellectual engagements as taking place both in the barrio and in the school. Moreover, the third space that is created in our classrooms is a convergence of the barrio and the institution. This third space challenges the status quo and the stereotypes that exist
within our educational institutions. This is a newly created pedagogical space that is driven by the need to challenge the epistemological and ontological understandings of our students and in many cases their parents (Romero et al., 2009, p.227).

The role of students as creators of knowledge is an important element and a theme that is consistent across the three examples in this chapter and in our two Otara schools. The fourth element, a focus on collective and individual agency, is again a common theme; the concept that acting upon and countering injustice benefits the individual but also benefits the community, the whanau, and future generations. This concept, framed within a Chicano indigenous framework or within Maori or Pasifika epistemology, is the idea of the collective, of whanaungatanga, where the continuity of past, present, and future is a strong influence. This in turn creates the development of a critical consciousness.

The final element of the Third Dimension of CCI is the academic and personal transformation that again, each of the schools described here can attest to. Romero, in an interview for the Latino Perspectives magazine (March 2008) described the three basic stages in this process; “One, we hope to develop a sense of identity in our students. Two, we hope to develop a sense of purpose. Those two things together then allow them to develop a stronger sense of hope.” Olivia, an SJEP student, describes her transformation this way:

Your class got me really interested in learning and like education because, like before, I probably wouldn’t have graduated on time because I was already really behind... I had a lot of family problems and I ended up not going to school for a whole year. After I became involved with the project, I had a lot of motivation to get finished, and, like the class, really made an impression on me that without education, without a high school diploma and going on to college, you really wouldn’t be successful in life. I did better in all my classes; I think I knew that if I could do all the college assignments in our class, I could do the other BS stuff in my other class. I realized that I wanted an education. (Romero 2008, p.186, cited in Romero et al, 2009, p.231).

In 2008 the students in the SJEP who experienced the CCI passed Arizona’s high stakes exit exam at a higher rate than all other similarly situated non-SJEP/CCI students at the four high school sites which are involved in the SJEP and use the CCI. Also, over the last four years’ graduating classes the SJEP/CCI students graduated at a higher rate than similarly situated non SJEP/CCI Anglo students in the four schools (Romero, Arce, & Cammarota, 2009, p.219).

Youth Voices

However, for me, an even more important evaluation was observing the work being done listening to the young people involved in the programme. In all of the schools I saw culturally, politically and critically rich environments. Students’ work, slogans, posters and Chicano philosophy and cultural artefacts were present in every room. I visited two elementary school classes, two middle school classes, who combined for our visit, and four different classes in two high schools. In each one I asked questions about what they were learning and why, and about the impact the Raza Studies class or classes on their other learning. In the elementary schools children told me about learning, reading and writing in Spanish, and about learning stories from their ancestors. They explained traditional stories and I watched a class rehearsing a traditional story as a play and learning traditional dance. In the middle school, I was invited to present a lesson to the students so this dialogue was more about their questions, than mine. They asked about culture and identity and working as a family and drew comparisons with their programme.
At one elementary school we visited a Family Centre and sat in on a class for mothers, who were learning about their culture from the TUSD Raza Studies staff. In a conversation that had to be translated from English to Spanish and vice versa, mothers, some with tears in their eyes, told me they were learning and now understanding how their culture had been lost. One mother said:

_They are teaching us about our true history, how it is that when Europeans came over the colonisation templates that they placed here made our ancestors look like savages, unintelligent and uncivilised—so it’s looking at our history from our perspective as indigenous people._

In the high schools I saw students studying a 17-year-old legal battle over how Arizona treats students who are still learning English, which had been argued the week before the U.S. Supreme Court. I watched students studying a Martin Luther King speech about war and identifying elements of pathos and ethos in the text. I sat in a class where, in the middle of the Arizona desert, the school was holding a theme ‘Beach Day’ and students were wearing water wings and carrying inflatable beach toys, and also preparing for the end of their final school year and their senior prom just a few days away. I saw this same class however, present serious documentaries about inequalities in their school. Students spoke of how the two year (11th and 12th Grade, junior and senior years) programme had changed lives. Some of their comments speak to their achievement and learning far better than any test score could, and they exemplify all of the elements of the critically compassionate intellectualism that is the project’s goal:

_These classes really opened my eyes to a lot of things. They taught me humanisation and that’s a really big part now of how I try to live my life. I want to become a teacher so I want to keep this going._

_My theory is that although some people classify these classes as racist, that’s the opposite of what we do in this space._

_I think these classes help us connect with other people and other cultures. Because we have respect for our culture now we should show respect for other cultures, so it helps us to interact more._

_In these classes we learn concepts that our ancestors used to use in their lives (points to posters on wall). One of the main ones we’ve learned is ‘In La’kech’ which is about treating everybody the way you like to be treated. That helps us a lot in life and that connects us to people and that’s how we became like a big family._

_This class has built up my level of confidence to where I feel like I can do anything, because this class is much more challenging than other ones. It presents information to you, but it’s your choice to go out and get more of it. In other classes, it’s given to you whether you want it or not._

_It’s a very effective programme. It helps open up students’ minds and helps them see clearly. You’re not fed information here, you’ve got to go out and search for it._
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21 Italicised quotes in this section represent spoken comments transcribed from video footage filmed during personal visits and meetings.

22 These comments are all transcribed from personal video footage filmed during my visit.
It develops your critical thinking skills and instead of just taking what you’ve learned and not even applying it to life, with classes like this you can take different tools, learning methods, research—it just broadens your intellectual side of you—like it brings out the best of you.

It’s very empowering. You learn a lot about your culture that regular text books don’t even mention, or they say it in one paragraph and that’s usually negative.

What I think is different is that in here we can actually express our true feelings and we won’t get into trouble for it. In other classes, like the class across the hall [there is laughter all around the room as everyone understands], if you say certain things you get put down.

What I get from this class is that I like that we get our own voice and that we don’t have to follow what everyone has just told us like, “It’s this way, this way.” No. You can work any way you want and you can learn anything. I like how our teachers work for us—so hard—they go out and look for our stories so we can feel at home.

I also spent a morning with graduates of the Raza Studies programme, now giving back to the programme as mentors and co-workers in the Social Justice Education Project while continuing with their own study. One young woman summed up the whole programme this way:

The mesquite tree is native to Tucson and it can’t grow without roots. I would say this gives a perfect explanation of the last two years in the project where you are just laying down the ground area and allowing us to grow roots in our culture and, once the students have roots in their culture and know who they are, they can grow. Before that, they can’t grow. They can’t grow academically or socially but when they learn to love themselves and they grow, they learn to love other people, and their culture, and their community, and they want to take care of it. All of that takes place in their two years and it’s like a transformation.

Running for Justice

You would expect that, with the academic achievement of the SJEP students, together with the strong committed support of families, the advocacy of eminent educators and universities, and the calibre of the passionate, articulate, confident, young people I met, and whose learning I witnessed, that this programme would receive the highest support and praise from education authorities. Unfortunately, as with all the other examples in this section, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the opposition to the SEJP and the Raza Studies programme has been sustained and vitriolic—vehemently supported, in fact spearheaded, by the Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tom Horne, and attacked in a string of negative media reports over several years.

On 11 June, 2007. Horne wrote an open letter to the citizens of Tucson (Horne, 2007) which started with the heading, “The TUSD Ethnic Studies Program Should be Terminated.” Labelling the programme as, ‘destructive ethnic chauvinism” Horne stated his belief that, “people are individuals, not exemplars of racial groups. What is important about people is what they know, what they can do, their ability to appreciate beauty, their character, and not what race into which they are born.” He urged the citizens of Tucson to bring pressure on the school board to close down Ethnic Studies, however his specific target, made clear in the letter, was Raza Studies.
The ensuing media attention included headlines like, “Raza Studies Defy American Values,”23 “Secretive Raza studies in Tucson district need close look,”24 “Horne takes to task Raza Studies teachers,”25 and “TUSD’s Raza Studies called divisive.”26 Commonly-used phrases in these articles called the programme “anti-American” and accused it of teaching young people to “hate whites.” In June 2009 the campaign to close the programme was again escalated by Horne, who was quoted in the Arizona Daily Star as saying, “I have tried for two years, using publicity and persuasion, to attempt to convince the Tucson Unified School District to put a stop to this dysfunctional program. They have refused. The next step is legislation (Scarpinato, 2009). His proposal was to amend a State Senate Bill (SB1069), with two additions which read:

15-110. Declaration of policy

The legislature finds and declares that public school pupils should be taught to treat and value each other as individuals and not based on ethnic background.

15-111. Prohibited courses and classes; enforcement

A school district or charter school in this state shall not include in the program of instruction any courses or classes that either:

1. are designed primarily for pupils of a particular ethnic group.

2. advocate ethnic solidarity instead of the treatment of PUPILS as individuals.

(Arizona State Legislature, 2009)

Sponsored by Senator Jonathon Paton, SB1069 proposed a 10% cut to the Tucson Unified School District’s overall funding if they persisted with the Ethnic Studies programmes. In an editorial in The State Press, Ben Berkley wrote:

“The job of the public schools is to develop the student’s identity as Americans and as strong individuals,” Horne said in a Friday news release supporting the passage of the bill.

“It’s not the job of the public schools to promote ethnic chauvinism,” he said.

And amazingly, just like that, Horne, showed in 30 words how we have remained among the nation’s worst in education rankings during his 7-year tenure (Berkley, 2009).

SB1069 was approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee, chaired by Senator Paton, with a 4-3 vote on 16 June, 2009, and needed final approval from both chambers of the Legislature and the Arizona State Governor to become law, but the community took action.

On 27 June, 2009, over 50 young people ran over 190 kilometres in heat of up to 45 degrees celsius, across the desert from Tucson to Phoenix. It took them two days and they were joined by hundreds of supporters from the barrios and communities of Tucson, Eloy, Casa Blanca, Guadalupe and Phoenix, both as the run progressed, and on arrival in Phoenix where they marched to the State Capitol Building. It also involved the spiritual support from the Native-American Yoeme and Akimel O’odham nations when runners passed through their territory.

23 CNN: 2 July, 2008
26 The Arizona Daily Star, 1 January, 2008
Faced with this opposition, Senator Paton had withdrawn the bill before the runners arrived in Phoenix. However, the following day, Horne said that he would try again to eliminate ethnic studies next year. Roberto Rodriguez described the run in Arizona Watch (7 July, 2009):

There is not enough room on this page to convey the actual story of this run. Everyone who participated came back with historias sagradas, profound truths. This run will one day rank as an event akin to Cesar Chavez’s fasts or the student walkouts of a generation ago: a monument of what people are capable of when they believe in something. As one of the young people noted, “We went to fight against an anti-ethnic studies bill, but what we really came for was to know ourselves (Rodriguez, 2009).

Augustine Romero explains that the run was about healing and it was linked to indigenous traditional practice:

The Run was used as a channel to carry out positive change in our communities, and in our State. The Run was not a march, a rally, or a race; but rather, an opportunity for our people to work united with all the rest of creation to bring about healing.

In addition, the Run was a reflection of a historical Indigenous tradition that brings about change through prayer. It is believed that the energy that is projected from the momentum of the run, its runners and their intentions and their constant connection to the earth will be reciprocated in the form of a healing and ultimately a blessing.27

“Sitting-In” for Justice

The Clover Park Middle School Board of Trustees was once accused, by a senior Ministry of Education official, that simply keeping a group of senior students on our campus awaiting a decision to change the school’s status, in spite of the Minister of Education’s specific instructions they should be enrolled in other schools, was tantamount to staging a “sit-in.” We agreed, and kept sitting.

By comparison with the protest action taken in East Oakland, Little Village and Tucson, sitting-in may seem relatively innocuous, however protest in the form of simply going ahead and carrying out the community’s wishes in the face of prolonged and bitter resistance from education authorities, has been sustained by the community of Clover Park Middle School and Te Whanau o Tupuranga over three separate struggles spread over almost 20 years.

Whatever the type of action taken, each of the communities described has refused to accept the status quo for their children and has gone to extraordinary lengths, in the face of extreme opposition, to achieve an educational model that is relevant to their values and beliefs about learning, achievement, culture and identity.

Challenged Spaces

Each of these contexts is different, across different ethnic groups, school systems, legislation and international borders however, there are remarkable similarities across the solutions each of these four communities has developed to challenge the system’s white space. These fall into seven broad categories (Figure 7);

27 Personal email from Dr. Augustine Romero, 1 September, 2009.
1. Each community has faced resistance and barriers over sustained time but has not allowed these to dictate or change their direction. The programmes are all intentionally counter-hegemonic.

2. Race, ethnicity and cultural identity are central to their curriculum and practice. Each school or programme works successfully across different ethnic groups on the same sites or in the same classes.

3. The programmes developed in each context have been strongly supported and driven by parents and community, who often become strong advocates for the initiatives due to the engagement they see in their children. Parents have been prepared to take risks and to trust the programmes. All programmes have been developed in underserved communities with
youth who have been minoritised by their respective societies. The community has been actively involved in the design of environments, the curriculum, and in discussing the historical significance of cultural leaders, artefacts, symbols and sites.

4. The programmes are based in authentic caring, love, whanau, cariño, or compassion. Across all sites the young people are not seen as “other people’s children” (Delpit 1999) and the building of relationships of trust and care is crucial and genuine. There is a clear continuum across cohorts and generations and an expectation of reciprocity. Young people see their connectivity to each other and to their past and future, and their responsibility to advocate for change that will better the collective.

5. All these programmes are informed by critical theory and the work of Paulo Freire. They are based in critical pedagogy and critical race theory which sees racism as a ‘given,’ and are driven by social justice goals for humanisation, conscientisation and transformation through critical praxis. The curriculum is based in the community and in the realities youth experience in education, and in society. Examples of this curriculum and delivery are the pedagogy of whanau in Te Whanau of Tupuranga, the barrio and Raza Studies pedagogies developed in Tucson.

6. Students are involved in the identification of issues and the production of knowledge through participatory action research. All four programmes draw heavily on other knowledges—traditional cultural knowledge and practices, youth knowledge and culture, and community knowledge, that are usually considered irrelevant or peripheral to core or national curricula. Contexts for study are youth-centred. Students are highly engaged with new media literacies through the use of information and communications technology and digital resources, as well as learning advanced traditional literacies. All four programmes have extremely high expectations for the achievement of academic standards and outcomes and the development of “warrior scholars.”

7. There is a high stakes ‘end result’ that gives students a purpose for their learning. Students present their research to well-informed and critical peers, to parents and families, to staff, administration, educators and academics outside the school, legislators, members of parliament, and city councils. They speak at highly-regarded conferences alongside adult academics and answer questions about their research.

These programmes provide the counter-narrative to the rhetoric of school reform and the intense focus on technical knowledge and high stakes testing and standards. They don’t try to change the children, they aim to change the white spaces so that children can flourish. Professor Julio Cammarota explains why this works:

My personal experience as an educator within the SJEP tells me that a social justice alternative is far more successful than the dominant strategy of high stakes testing and remedial education. The latter disconnects learning from social context, and the former links learning to the student’s lived experience so that he or she can realize how education can be a tool to transform one’s existence (Cammarota 2007 p.95).
Reflections and Implications for our Schools

My original application to the ASB/APPA Travelling Fellowship Trust Board explained:

This research looks specifically at the conditions that need to exist in schools for young people to retain their identity and to have their cultural norms validated and valued throughout their school day. The sub-topic that will come out of this research is what sort of school leadership is required to foster those conditions? What personal and professional journeys effectively equip educators to understand how a whole system can advantage some students and disadvantage others, and to personally reflect on their own part in this process? How do we prepare teachers in training for this process? No matter how many new curriculum documents or strategies we introduce, schooling will not become more equitable until paradigm shifts happen in the way we think about and define ‘achievement’. As school leaders how can we change our current approach to ensure equitable outcomes for Maori & Pasifika learners?

I asked the following questions:

1. What conditions could exist in schools to empower students to follow their cultural norms?
2. Can schools contribute to the development of this knowledge in any way or is this the role of the home?
3. How could schools ensure all students have strength in their own cultural identity?
4. How could schools know this is developing?
5. How does this confidence and cultural competence benefit students?
6. How is this relevant in New Zealand to the issue of Maori and Pasifika students’ engagement and success in education?

My research and experiences, both as the ASB/APPA Travelling Fellow, and my prior study over many years, have led me to some assumptions and conclusions and even further reflection. No one single definitive solution exists and nor does this research provide all the answers. It does attempt however, to sow some seeds to challenge our collective thinking and to ask our policy-makers, our school leaders and teachers to consider that a more effective response most probably lies outside our usual norms and comfort zones. The final question are answered in previous sections of this report which detail background and programmes that are working. The first five questions are revisited here as they speak to the role of school leaders and teachers in leading this change, and they lead to my recommendations:

What conditions could exist in schools to empower students to follow their cultural norms?

If tweaking school environments to better reflect our ‘diverse’ student population, with one-off cultural meals or weeks, bilingual/multilingual signage, bilingual programmes, a kapa haka group, and the like, really made a difference for Maori and Pasifika learners, we would already have different results. If raising literacy and numeracy levels to or above national “norms” really was the solution to school engagement, we would already have different results. We don’t, and while none of these practices is the answer, they are certainly our primary, often our only focus in our attempts to make change. The introduction of National Standards in 2010 is yet another step in this relentless march. All of these interventions might briefly change a non-white student’s school experience momentarily but they don’t make lasting change. One of Te Whanau o Tupuranga’s Year 13 students, who studied discourse analysis, in order to critique the education system from a Maori perspective, said this eloquently:
If a school newsletter tells parents that they are having a Maori Language Week and a Pacific Languages Week, critical discourse analysis would make us realise that, if there are 38 weeks in the school year, what they are really saying is that they have 36 English Language Weeks. The newsletter makes us feel the school is focusing on Maori and Pacific languages. Critical discourse analysis helps us see that the school’s real focus is English. (Lolita Lio, 2007)

In order to understand the hidden messages and the covert curriculum non-white students and families suffer daily, schools have to have the courage to critically audit and analyse their environment to ask, “What is the real colour of our spaces?” In your environment, your charter, strategic planning, goals, teacher planning, contexts for study, assessment practices, teacher-student relationships, community interaction and relationships, who really has the power and whose knowledge really counts? These are very difficult questions to answer truthfully if we allow our own whiteness and the whiteness of our system to get in the way. If we are not prepared to be this honest we should at least acknowledge that assimilation is still our real goal – so our Maori, Pasifika and other non-white students can then understand the rules of the game and why they it’s not possible for them succeed in it “as Maori” or as who they are. Indigenous Hawaiian educators, identify this exact issue when they label the USA’s “No Child Left Behind” mandatory national standards regime, as “No Child Left Brown” (Maaka, M., Kukea-Shultz, P., & Krug, G. (2007). We are headed, hell-bent, in the same direction, unless we find the courage to take a stand.

Can schools contribute to the development of this knowledge in any way or is this the role of the home?

This was a very long debate at Clover Park Middle School and in Te Whanau o Tupuranga – and one that is still addressed with each influx of new teachers and with new families. Cultural knowledges and identities are lost through intentional policies and legislation imposed by a dominant culture that holds the power. The responsibility to right these wrongs is therefore societal. When we understand this it is no longer acceptable to require Maori and Pasifika students to leave their culture, regardless of its strength, at the school gates and assume another persona that better fits the white space. Schools have two choices I believe:

1. to intentionally and authentically contribute to the development of the strong secure cultural identity of their students, or
2. to deliberately choose not to contribute and so knowingly become complicit in perpetuating the status quo.

All of the schools and programmes described in this report were intentionally counter-hegemonic.

How could schools ensure all students have strength in their own cultural identity?

This is a school and community journey and there are no quick fixes. Because it is a partnership it is difficult to pluck a solution from elsewhere and hope it will fit a local setting. Some schools have many different ethnicities, some have very few. In all New Zealand communities the place of Maori as tangata whenua behaves all schools to listen and respond to their Maori communities, and to Maori as partners under the Treaty of Waitangi. The fact that this is a requirement already, yet we haven’t made a difference for Maori learners, is an indictment on our system and our listening processes.
The most consistent argument I hear as an excuse for doing very little is that parents wouldn’t agree to a more culturally responsive school. “Maori and Pasifika parents in my school,” I’m often told, “don’t want that culture stuff. They want their kids to achieve academically.” Of course they do – but we are asking the wrong question when we give parents an either/or choice. In nearly 40 years of teaching in predominantly Maori and Pasifika communities I’ve never met a Maori or Pasifika parent who, when assured the two are not mutually exclusive, didn’t want both! It’s also true that, that argument is weakening as Maori and Pasifika parents become aware of the damage caused by loss of language and culture and more families practise the resistance I described earlier from my family’s personal experience. It’s worth repeating that it is wrong of us to assume that by enrolling in their local mainstream school Maori and Pasifika parents are not conscientised, resistant, and seeking transformative school practice. However, most Maori and Pasifika families have generations of experience of schools not responding to their viewpoint. It is equally wrong of us to assume that silence means families agree with what we are delivering. More often than not silence is a sign of disapproval, or of the fact no one has listened in the past so why would that change now?

In order to develop culturally responsive programmes that develop strong secure cultural identities we have to do all of the following – and more:

- **Raise our own awareness of the effect of whiteness on our thinking and practice** – as individuals, as leaders, as a staff, as policy and decision-makers, as an education system and as a community.
- **Critically analyse our current practice and policy in our own schools.** A powerful exercise we once did at a staff meeting was to start from the footpath across the road from the school gate looking at the image we presented to our community, then walk through the school office, classrooms, playground and finally examine a range of school documents, newsletters, our prospectus, our Charter, etc. As a staff we were shocked at the not-so-hidden messages we were sending out to our Maori and Pasifika communities about what was “right” and about how they should meet our expectations.
- **Ask different questions in conversations with your community.** You are the educational leaders, so lead. Don’t wait for initiatives to be suggested by parents whose experience is that they don’t have a voice in education. Offer parents programmes that deliver BOTH academic achievement and cultural identity, languages, and knowledges, as of right. When you do develop these programmes don’t imply that you are doing the targeted children some special favour that the white majority of the school don’t have. They do.
- **Don’t overtly or covertly structure learning and achievement as some sort of hierarchy with high status for some learning (literacy and numeracy) and lower or peripheral ‘add-on’ status for other knowledge, particularly cultural knowledges and competencies.**
- **Ask!** The resources for designing culturally responsive learning that fits your community exist in the community right at your doorstep.
- **Listen!** Having asked different questions don’t then re-interpret what your community tells you into “school-speak”. An example of this practice is the way we ‘allow’ bilingual units to develop but then measure their success in terms of their English literacy levels.
- **Read!** There is a vast pool of research and literature in this field that all educators need to examine. This is rich material for staff discussion and professional development.
- **Audit!** Truthfully and name the colour of the spaces on our own school ‘page’ and genuinely work towards changing this so all children can see a place for them in your space.
How could schools know this is developing?
How does this confidence and cultural competence benefit students?

There is work being done in this area. In Alaska, Alaska Native educators have developed “cultural standards” based on the belief that a “firm grounding in the heritage language and culture indigenous to a particular place is a fundamental prerequisite for the development of culturally-healthy students and communities associated with that place” (Alaska Native Educators, 1998). Mason Durie’s (1998, p.58) and work from the Te Hoe Nuku Roa longitudinal research project at Massey University identify four key ‘markers’ for Maori cultural identity: identification as Maori, cultural knowledge and understanding, access to and participation in Maori society, and communication. Huiu Tomlins-Jahnke from Massey University is working with Ngati Kahungunu to develop cultural standards.

In Te Whanau o Tupuranga and Clover Park Middle School staff have spent several years in action research developing an assessment tool that now gives us rich data about the development of students’ identity, as Maori, Samoan, Tongan, Cook Islands Maori – or who they are. These data clearly show that in order for other learning to take place the foundation first has to be a strong cultural identity.

Before the development of this tool however, we knew we had made change. We saw it, parents saw it and children themselves showed it. Visitors to the schools inevitably comment that our children are different, but it’s a mistake to interpret this as some sort of warm, fuzzy, ‘self-esteem.’ This is in fact completely the wrong reason for developing initiatives to support cultural identity. It cannot be emphasised enough that this learning and achievement is valid, high status learning, in its own right. Although we understand all learning is related, and gains in identity and relationships results do in fact lead to related shifts in other learning, this is not the purpose of the development of cultural identity. The legitimation and validation of Maori and Pasifika knowledges and values should never be seen as peripheral, or less important learning. Secure self knowledge and identity might be a prerequisite for self esteem and self efficacy. Self efficacy might in turn lead to higher engagement in learning, which could well result in improved English literacy and numeracy outcomes. Learning about your cultural identity and language however, is a valid ‘end point’ in itself. This learning is intentionally counter-hegemonic. To see it as a stepping stone towards improved literacy and numeracy is to make a deliberate choice to perpetuate the western academic hegemony that relegates Maori and Pasifika learners to the margins in our education system. This should never be the intent of the development of cultural identity in our schools.

The difference we see in our children comes from critical pedagogy and a strong sense of social justice. Our young people do understand the ‘rules of the game’ of education. We see our role as not changing them to enable them to fit in and play it more effectively, but giving them the tools they need in order to change the rules. Jeff Duncan-Andrade calls these young people. “warrior scholars.” In Tucson they are referred to as “warrior intellectuals.”

Our role as school principals and teachers is firstly to become aware of our own personal positioning, then to facilitate this change to think differently about our schools. We may have to accept in this process that white is not always right. New Zealand doctor, poet and children's author, Glenn Colquhoun sums this situation up best when he writes:

The most difficult thing about majorities is not that they cannot see minorities, but that they cannot see themselves. There is no contrast, no dissonance, everything is white on white. To be Pakeha in this generation is sometimes to stand behind the goal line,
scratch our heads, waiting for the conversion, on the wrong end of one of the great comebacks in cultural history, our coach screaming possession, possession, possession.

What we do next will define us. Accepting a loss could be good. We may discover a way of being we had forgotten (Colquhoun, 2004, p.53-54).

**Recommendations**

1. That “mainstream” schools, or the national “network” of schools become culturally responsive to Maori and to children of other ethnicities so that this is not considered “alternative” to the norm.

2. That school principals and senior leaders develop an understanding of culturally responsive, critical, social justice pedagogy.

3. That pre-service education includes understanding of culturally responsive, critical and social justice pedagogies.

4. That *Ka Hikitia* be fully resourced so that schools can avail themselves of the professional development that should accompany this strategy.

5. That we ask different questions of our Maori and ethnic communities about their aspirations for their children, then don’t allow our own agendas to influence the answers, or reinterpret the answers to fit our preconceived ideas.

6. That we give Maori and Pasifika parents genuine choices. If mainstream schools are not providing authentic cultural learning environments, Section 156 of our Education Act should be supported to work in the way it was designed to do. The Ministry of Education should not put insurmountable barriers in the way of schools trying to implement the Act to provide an education that fits their community. The strength and bitterness of the opposition from education officials to any notion of self-determination or educational sovereignty in mainstream schools is consistent across countries and communities. Implementing this change should not be so hard.

7. That we seriously review our narrow blinkered focus of literacy, numeracy and technical academic achievement as our primary measures of “success.” This includes refusal by school leaders to implement National Standards in their present form.

8. That we acknowledge that this is a systemic issue, therefore apportioning sectoral blame is counter-productive to finding meaningful solutions. Alienation from school is not an intermediate/middle or secondary school phenomena. Disengagement and dislocation from their cultural identity begins when children enter our schools’ white spaces. Just because it takes some years for the impact of this dislocation to manifest itself does not absolve primary schools from their responsibility to respond differently.

9. That school leaders and teachers recognise that the systemic change required is unlikely to happen overnight, if at all. Our self-governing education system however, gives us an autonomy that the educators I visited could simply not believe. The greatest barrier to each one of us making this sort of change in our own school is our own thinking – which we do have the power to change.
The right to be Indigenous is the most fundamental and important of all Human Rights. Non-Indigenous peoples through the various levels of government and bureaucracy have an over-riding responsibility to accept and uphold the educational rights of Indigenous peoples and to know that these rights and freedoms are non-negotiable. (The Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights In Education, 1999).
Appendix 1: Travel in 2009

People

... who hosted me, showed me programmes, talked with me, introduced me to colleagues, teachers and school principals, and helped facilitate this research

- **Newin Orante**
  - Director of Extended Opportunity Programmes – Los Medanos Community College, San Francisco
- **Professor Jeff Duncan-Andrade**
  - Co-Director Cesar Chavez Institute Educational Equity Initiative, Raza Studies and Administration and Interdisciplinary Studies, San Francisco State University
- **Professor K. Wayne Yang**
  - Ethnic Studies, University of California – San Diego
- **Professor David Stovall**
  - Policy Studies in the College of Education at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC).
- **Dr Augustine Romero,**
  - Director of Student Equity and Co- Director of the Raza Studies Department for the Tucson Unified School District.
- **Gayle Bedard,**
  - District Principal, Aboriginal Education, Surrey School District 36, Vancouver
- **Cam Pinkerton,**
  - Superintendent of School District 70, Port Alberni, Vancouver Island
- **Professor Margie Maaka**
  - Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies, University of Hawaii at Manoa
- **Professor Kerry Laiana Wong**
  - Kawaihuelani Center for Hawaiian Language. Laiana completed the first doctoral dissertation in the Hawaiian language and is a leader in the movement to revive the Hawaiian language.

I also met and spent time with a large number of students, youth workers, teachers, parents, principals, and school district staff in San Diego, Tucson, Vancouver, Vancouver Island, and Honolulu

Heard

I attended the following sessions at the AERA Conference. Within each of these sessions 3-4 different papers and research relevant to this study were presented:

- “Languages, Fruits, and Vegetables: Expanding the Domains of Indigenous Languages and Cultures”
- “Indigenous Knowledge and Developments: Case Study of a School of Indigenous Graduate Studies”
- “Race, Culture, and Schooling: Implications of Theory and Research From Social Scientists Across Nations”
  - Professor David Gillborn, Institute of Education, London)
  - Professor Carol Lee (Northwestern University)
“Research That’s More Like Me and Less Like You: Socially Engaged Scholarship and the Development of Warrior-Scholars”
“Creating and Negotiating Cultural Identities in Educational Contexts”
“Untempered Tongues and Unconditional Love: Theoretical, Empirical, and Pragmatic Implications for Critical and Culturally Empowering Education”
“Teaching Like Our Lives Matter: A Critical Literacy Classroom Ethnography”
“Working Against the Grain: Urban Youth, Academic Success, and Community Connections”
“ Achieving Educational Excellence by Indigenous Peoples”
  o “A Place to Be Pacific: Wrestling With/In Public Education in the Republic of the Marshall Islands”
  o “Hookulaiwi: A Community, School, and University Partnership for the Vitalization of Public Education in a Native Hawaiian Community”
“The Pedagogy and Promise of ‘Truth Tellin’: Researching Transformative Teaching in Our Own Image”
  o “Seeing It for Themselves: Teaching the Truth to Urban Youth”
  o “Block Biz: Liberatory Education and Truth Tellin’ in Chicago”
  o “Don’t Be No Punk: What Is a Pedagogy of Hope and Love in Times Like These?”
“Studying Diversity in Teacher Education: Current Trends and Innovations”
“Dare to Struggle and Dare to Win: Lessons on Education and Organization for Self – Determination”
“Critical Education for Social Justice”
“New Horizons in Indigenous Research and Transformative Action: Perspectives From the Indigenous Peoples of the Americas, the Pacific, and Postcolonial Studies”

**Visited**

I visited the following schools and institutions:

**SCHOOLS**
- Tucson High Magnet School (3 visits) – Tucson
- Hollinger Elementary School - Tucson
- Davis Bilingual Elementary Magnet School - Tucson
- Cholla High Magnet School - Tucson
- Pistor Middle School - Tucson
- Kwantlen Park High School – Surrey, Vancouver
- Guildford Park High School – Surrey, Vancouver
- Eighth Avenue Elementary School – Port Alberni, Vancouver Island
- Ucluelet Elementary School – Ucluelet, Vancouver Island
- Wickanninish Community School – Tofino, Vancouver Island
- Haahuupayak Independent School - Category 1 BC situated on reserve within the traditional territory of the Tseshat First Nation – Vancouver Island
- Nanaikapono Elementary School, Waianae, Hawaii
UNIVERSITIES
- University of California at La Jolla, San Diego
- University of Hawaii at Manoa – sat in on Hawaiian immersion language student-teacher presentations summarising their theses research

SCHOOL DISTRICTS/OTHER
- Tucson Unified School District
- Tucson Unified School District
- Rose Family Resource And Wellness Centre – Parents’ Course
- School District 36: Surrey, British Columbia: largest district in B.C. and one of few growing districts in the province with 124 schools located in Surrey and White Rock
- School District 70: Port Alberni, Vancouver Island

Presented to:
I was invited to present guest lectures about the work we are doing at Clover Park Middle School and Te Whanau o Tupuranga to the following audiences:

UNIVERSITIES
- University of California at San Diego – guest lecture to PhD students and staff, including Professor Yen Le Espiritu, Chair of Ethnic Studies at UCSD

OTHER
- Tucson Unified School District – Student Equity staff
- Tucson Unified School District – general staff
- Tucson High School – spoke to several classes and was filmed for USTV documentary on the Raza Studies programme
- Pistor Middle School – presentation to two classes
- Staff of Aboriginal Education Department, School District 36, Surrey, Vancouver
- Nuu-chanalth Tribal Council and educators from across the school district at the House of Hupacasath, Port Alberni, Vancouver Island
- Combined staff at Ucluelet Elementary and Secondary Schools
- Vancouver Island Regional Circle (Aboriginal Education representatives from each Island school district) and the Ministry of Education in Nanaimo.

Highlights
- The amazing hospitality everywhere, the people who hosted me and their advocacy for the young people they are working in support of – I had experiences that were way off the tourist track – interaction in genuine and authentic settings which meant I saw truth.
- The opportunity to reconnect and exchange information with educators and communities within the network of critical, socially just, culturally responsive programmes internationally.
- The Raza Studies Programme and Social Justice Project in Tucson that are giving Mexican/American youth their culture and pride back.
- The strong message from the Raza Studies Programmes in schools that Mexican people were in Arizona first and they have lost their land, language and their culture.
- The young people in Tucson involved in the programme – articulate, confident, respectful, interested, determined to learn and make change.
• The parents’ programme running alongside the Raza Studies in schools – giving parents the same opportunities and learning as their children
• The First Nations people we met in Canada, their history, and the traditional welcome they gave me.
• The willingness of educators to share, to listen and to seek authentic meaningful change
• The renaissance of Hawaiian language and culture – still in its early stages we were told but a strong movement
• The ‘extras’– Mariachi music in Tucson, the revival of traditional Hawaiian music and the opportunity to see these, the different languages and foods

Lowlights

• The battle the Tucson Raza Studies programme has had with the public because they see the programme as ‘anti American’ – reminiscent of our own battles in NZ
• The closure of the East Oakland Community High School between my previous visit and this one.
• The generational impact and the anger from First Nations about the residential schools that took children away from families to breed out the race through assimilation.
• The truth that Indigenous people all over the world have these experiences in their education systems. If this is so crystal clear why has it still not changed? I have to agree with Jeff Duncan-Andrade’s rationale that it hasn’t changed because the system is doing what it is designed to do – keep certain races at the bottom to serve others.
• Homelessness – in major cities, but also in unexpected places. I saw indigenous Hawaiian ‘tent villages’ on the beach at Waianae which have been ‘home’ to two generations in some families
• First Nations Reserves – although some of these do provide wrap-around support for families and strong sense of community – as a concept they just made me sad
• Economic cuts – while I was in Tucson, 630 teachers in Arizona, in the first three years of their careers, received notice their jobs would end.
• Police with guns in school playgrounds and the necessity for over the top security
• The dearth of Native American programmes
• The relentless drive to meet standards – No Child Left Behind
• Shabby school building environments and lack of resourcing
• You forget, until you are there, that the USA is a country at war – there is a strong, mandatory, military recruiting presence in every high school, even stronger in poor communities
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