

# **International Journal for School-Based Family Counseling**

Volume IV, November 2012

## **Critical reflections on a New Zealand school from a School-Based Family Counseling perspective**

*Andrew Smith, Bethlehem Tertiary Institute, Tauranga, New Zealand*

**The school-based family counseling literature thus far is primarily drawn from the United States. This article reports on the counseling service of a New Zealand school which has intentionally developed an inclusive attitude towards the families of students. Staff members of the school were interviewed and parents surveyed. Findings reveal a service that applies its inclusive ethos in practice, that is flexible and responsive to changes, and that recognises the challenges inherent in aiming for its goals. These findings are discussed, with particular focus on how different stakeholder groups position themselves and how they are positioned in relation to each other.**

**Keywords: school counseling, school-based family counseling, New Zealand, inclusion, positioning**

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent to Andrew Smith, Bethlehem Tertiary Institute, Private Bag 12-015, Tauranga, New Zealand. (email: [a.smith@bti.ac.nz](mailto:a.smith@bti.ac.nz))

### **Introduction**

As a generalization, school counseling in New Zealand (NZ) has focussed almost exclusively on the student as client, and given little attention to the inclusion of the student's family in the counseling process. By contrast, school-based family counseling (SBFC) is a model which is developing internationally, and which intentionally takes a broad-based systems approach looking at the difficulties a student is experiencing "in the context of all his or her interpersonal networks" (Gerrard, 2008, p.1). Within a system's model, how different stakeholders are positioned in relation to others is clearly significant for the functioning of the system. This study reports on and critiques the counseling service provided within one New Zealand school which has intentionally sought to be inclusive of the families of students, and describes the experiences and perceptions of a sample of staff and parents.

### **Literature review**

In recent years much has been written on advocating collaboration between schools, families and community agencies (see for example: Milbourne, 2005; Vulliamy & Webb, 2003). One specific

model of collaboration is that of SBFC (Gerrard, 2008). A counselor working with a young person from this systemic approach will have a desire to involve all relevant parties in the therapeutic process (See, for example, Carter & Evans, 2008; Minke, 2010). However, alongside the rhetoric of collaboration is an awareness that within any system different individuals or groups will be positioned by each other, consciously and unconsciously. Davies has written on this theme of positioning within teacher-student relationships (Davies & Hunt, 1994; Davies, 2006). The concept is equally relevant to teacher-parent relationships. Such positioning creates power dynamics that contribute to the functioning (or dysfunction) of the system (Winslade, 2012). Often it seems, in academic discussions on positioning and power, that there is an assumption that power is intrinsically abusive, and an impression that power balances are static. Also, as Boyd (1996) points out, 'power' is not of itself negative or malevolent. While 'power over' may well be abusive, there is also the possibility of 'power-on-behalf-of' as a constructive force.

In relation to these dynamics, a number of writers have reflected on the significance of school ethos as the key determinant in how 'collaboration' is worked out in practice. Berkeley (1999) contends that individual school ethos does not always align with government policy, but is more significant than such policy in influencing day-to-day relating. Lloyd (2000) states "More inclusive schools tended...to be characterized by more flexible and open pupil-teacher and school-home relationships" (p. 267). In developing discussions of school practice, Berkeley (1999) cites the work of McManus (1995), who describes a continuum of school practice between what he described as 'mechanical solidarity' and 'organic solidarity'. Mechanical solidarity is characterized by rules and centralised authority, and views offences as being against a norm. Organic solidarity, conversely, has fewer rules, sees offences as against people, and has less hierarchy and greater staff discretion, with a more pragmatic approach to perceived misbehavior. Carter and Evans' (2008) description of SBFC seems to sit more comfortable within an organic solidarity approach.

Other authors have drawn attention to how school ethos is significant in how both students (Berkeley, 1999) and parents (Tett, 2001) are conceptualized, and hence related to. 'Family-inclusive' ways of working can still position parents as 'the problem'. Tett (2001) contrasts a view of 'parents as problems' with 'parents as people'. Reports of SBFC can tend to give an impression of the need to work 'on' parents rather than work 'with' them (Gerrard, 2008). Previous work on the exclusion of students and its impact on families, both in New Zealand (Smith, 2009) and overseas (e.g. McDonald & Thomas, 2003), has highlighted that, in disciplinary situations, parents often feel stigmatized and punished along with their teenagers as a result of the attitudes of school staff. Sometimes, as Smith's participants acknowledge (2009), parents' self-perceptions, largely derived from their own school experience, contribute to the negative positioning.

In contrast with deficit views of parents, Harrison (2004) makes a strong case that while educators sometimes see themselves as the experts on the students in their school, the majority of parents "generally know the child best, care the most, and have the strongest incentives to make decisions in their child's interest" (p. 66). Smith's (2009) participants wanted to be treated as partners with the school. As an example of partnership, Lau (2011) has reported the use of Narrative Therapy techniques that include parents, who themselves have received counseling, as

reflecting teams working with other families. These observations, drawn from the international literature, set the scene for this study which explores these issues within one NZ school.

In focussing specifically on the New Zealand context, guidance and counseling have been a significant part of NZ secondary schools since the 1960s. The original definition of school counseling, and the provision of support to school counselors by the Ministry of Education, was affected by political changes in the 1990s. At that time, the move to a policy titled ‘Tomorrow’s Schools’ gave rise to the introduction of Boards of Trustees who had greater autonomy in deciding general school policy, including the nature and form of counseling services (Crowe, 2006). While the Education Act (1989) requires schools to provide access to good guidance and counseling, there is no definition of what this would look like, and reports suggest that the provision of such services varies considerably. Hughes (1996) describes what he views as the gradual marginalization of counseling services, and an increasing sense of invisibility and isolation experienced by school counselors. Crowe (2006) has described issues of increasing workload, and challenges related to the increasing complexity of the issues brought by students to the school counselor.

As previously mentioned, school counseling in NZ has worked primarily with the student client in isolation from her or his wider network of relationships. In an article in the New Zealand Association of Counsellors’ Newsletter in 1996, Winslade discusses issues around the rights of children, and the rights of parents to have a say in the counseling provided for their children. While both legal and ethical aspects are addressed, the article clearly stresses the issue of parents’ views of the student receiving counseling, rather than the possibility of parents’ involvement in counseling. Crowe’s (2006) exploration of issues facing NZ school counseling and counselors makes no mention of parental involvement or parental views. This is despite Crowe’s acknowledgement that the research literature has identified positive connections, with parents as one of the key protective factors against adolescent at-risk behavior and mental health problems. The striking absence of reference to parental involvement stands in contrast with growing international interest in the development of increased partnership between schools, families and community agencies mentioned previously. In the light of this background, both domestic and international, a NZ school that is intentional in seeking to be family-inclusive is of significant interest in developing a critical analysis of SBFC perspectives.

### **The school**

The school in this study, which has elected to be anonymous for the purpose of this article, is 25 years old and currently designated in the NZ system as a “decile 10 school of special character” by the Ministry of Education. The decile rating refers to the socio-economic status of the community from which students in the school come, with 10 as the top rank – thus in a decile 10 school, families involved in the school are within the top 10% of the population socio-economically. The special character in this instance is specifically related to the faith-based nature (interdenominational Christian) of the school. In 2011, it had approximately 1200 students from years one to thirteen, in three groups – Primary, Middle and Senior schools. Up until 2004 there was no formal provision of counseling in the school. The growth of the school and the increasing pressure on senior staff, particularly the principal, to provide support in non-academic areas for students and their families led to the appointment of a part-time counselor. This appointment, rather than being modelled on the traditional school counselor, was focused on

pastoral care and utilised a teacher already on the staff who had counseling training, along with another pastorally-inclined teacher. The need to extend the counseling service to families became apparent as the principal experienced increasing pressure to address wider and more specialized needs. In 2006 a trained school counselor was appointed in a role specifically designated as a 'family care counselor'. As of 2011, the counseling team consists of three members of staff: two who are trained counselors/psychologists and who occupy one full-time equivalent position between them; and one trained teacher who is given the equivalent of five teaching periods for the purpose of pastoral care and counseling. This study explores perceptions of the counseling service of the school from different viewpoints. I am very grateful for the support of the principal and staff of the school in allowing me to undertake the study, and in the generous and open way they made time for the conversations that form the basis of the report.

### **The research process**

The goal of the study was to capture snapshots of how different stakeholders view the counseling service provided by the school. The key questions that the study seeks to address are:

- *How do different 'players' in the school perceive the counseling service, and particularly what is the rationale for, and experience of, being family-inclusive?*
- *How do the different groups involved see themselves and others in terms of positioning and power?*

In keeping with the focus on experience and perception, a qualitative approach was used (Cresswell, 2003), based on a phenomenological rationale. Phenomenology is concerned primarily with seeking to see as others see, and to understand the meaning that others make of their experience, rather than overlaying the interpretations of the researcher (Kvale, 1996). In their discussion of interpretation and representation of life history work, (one form of phenomenology) Cole and Knowles use the analogy of an art gallery and, "see the role of researcher in interpretation as similar to that of a curator" (Cole & Knowles, 2001, p. 115). Pursuing the analogy, the data collection phase of research parallels the act of creating an artistic representation of a scene. The curator of a gallery is responsible for taking a collection of works and presenting it in a way that makes an impact on viewers. The role is not passive: the ways in which works are grouped and the lighting, for example, both contribute to how the artist's work is seen. A researcher has a parallel challenge when confronted with the representation of data (Cole & Knowles, 2001). In most situations the researcher is acting as both co-artist and curator, offering creative opportunity, but also possessing significant responsibility. However skilful the artist and artful the curator, the impact of their work lies in the eyes of their viewers. Likewise, a researcher's desire to provoke, challenge or transform rests ultimately with the reader. This study aims to present participants' word pictures and to critically reflect on observations from those pictures, while also allowing readers to make observations and draw inferences not noted by the researcher. A research proposal was written and approval for the project was gained from both the school principal and the research ethics committee of the researcher's institution. The researcher is independent of the school.

### **Data collection and analysis**

The researcher made a two day visit to the school in May 2011, during which time face-to-face interviews were held. The interviews were with the principal, senior teaching staff (seven

people), and the counseling team of three. The interviews, based on discussion starters, were designed to draw out perceptions of:

- *the services that are provided, including goals, strengths and weaknesses,*
- *the involvement of family in the counseling service,*
- *any current challenges or possible future changes.*

With participants' permission, the interviews were audio recorded for later analysis.

An on-line survey was developed for use with parents. It was made up of questions designed to draw out experiences and perceptions of their encounter with the school counseling service (see appendix). An email was sent by the counseling team to parents who had had contact with the counseling service in the first four months of 2011. The email explained the project and provided a link to the online questionnaire. This process allowed anonymity for the parents in that the researcher was not aware of the identity of any parent, and school counseling staff were also not aware of which parents responded to the questionnaire (Latimer, 2003; Holloway & Wheeler, 2002). In total, six parents responded.

The researcher accessed written and on-line material – year book, annual report, website links, application forms – as a means of triangulating participant comments (Holloway & Wheeler, 2002). The collated data provides a qualitative perspective on experiences and perceptions of the school's counseling service. In keeping with the methodological stance, there is no attempt to quantify the data, or to generalise inappropriately from the specific information gathered from a limited number of respondents.

The data was analyzed by thorough and repeated listening to the recordings, reading and reflection, and identification of themes (Gadamer, 1979; Bogden & Bikle, 1992). No verbatim transcription of interviews was carried out. The themes provide a window into the counseling service, permitting critical reflection, connection with existing literature, and acting as a basis for questions for further consideration - both in terms of service delivery and of future research possibilities.

## **Findings**

In light of the specific intent of this study, the collated data was analyzed with a focus on how the participating staff and parents positioned themselves and in relation to each other. Four themes from the data are presented:

1. The linking of ethos to policy and practice.
2. The evolution of policy, derived practice, and its responsiveness to needs.
3. The challenges in developing the provision of counseling.
4. Thoughts on the transferability of principles and practice to other school settings.

These themes are presented in turn, with illustrative quotes from interviews and questionnaires.

The quotes are identified by one of the following abbreviations, indicating its source:

P = Principal; S = Member of teaching staff; C = Member of counseling team; Pt = Parent.

### ***Themes derived from the study data***

#### ***1. A clear linking of ethos to policy and practice***

The ethos of the school, as expressed in its mission and values statements, clearly reflects an inclusive view of students' families. In the data there is clear evidence that the stated values are

known by the staff who were interviewed, and are carried through into practice. This is evident in a number of areas:

a) A holistic view of students

The mission statement of the school states the intention, “to be a Christian community of learning that nurtures young people towards their full potential as servant leaders in the kingdom of God”. It is clear that school staff who were interviewed have a ‘big picture’ view of students which includes the student’s family.

P *The family is the most important part of the school – to disciple their kids is just a natural part of that.*

S *As educators we know we only play a small role in a child’s life – most of their life happens outside of school – therefore it is important to involve the family.*

C *Permanent change is more likely to occur in the context of a family system rather than just working with the child in isolation.*

Having practice rooted in ethos is particularly illustrated by the following statements from various staff:

S *Mixing pastoral care and discipline seems to be working? Yes, I think so – and it is rooted in scripture.*

S *We need to ensure we are consistent – transforming the culture bit by bit – “This is what we do – and why”.*

b) The centrality of relationship

Further developing the theme of practice rooted in ethos in the comments of participants, there is evidence of the importance of building relationship with students and their families.

P *We see relationship as key to everything we do.  
[In referring to students] They love the fact that people took the time to get to know them.*

S *With a family you are trying to put money in the bank in the sense that if you don’t build that relationship with the family, if you call them in and you have had a laugh, had relationship with them, then you have got a basis for a conversation.*

c) Partnerships with parents

The school’s foundation document states that the school promotes the development of servant leaders in part through the promotion of “recognizing that parents in partnership with the school need to be involved and are responsible for their child’s education”. As with the previous section, this facet of the ethos of the school was an explicit part of staff comments, exemplified in practice, and experienced by the parents who responded to the questionnaire.

P *The philosophy of the school - is parent partnerships.... what we believe God has charged parents with...when they are choosing to share that with us – we need to input more than just the teaching.*

S *It’s a very family oriented way of working compared to other schools – it’s part of the parent partnership that parents sign up to – first and foremost the parents are the educators...We tell the parents what we are doing – that creates the family feeling – it creates that parent partnership.*

*When we get to a stand-down situation we've always tried to be really proactive in involving the family – we've wanted the families on board right from Day One.*

C [talking about the primary and middle schools] *Unless there is a clear reason not to, we always talk to parents before seeing the child.*

This observation from one of the counselors was in contrast to her experience in a previous school.

C *Totally different to most schools – in my previous school it was very rare to contact parents – not part of the school culture. Students insisted that we didn't.*

In the parent responses, all six felt appropriately involved. Two of the responses stated:

Pt *...very much a part of the process – a sense of everyone working together – our view was carefully considered and respected.*

Pt *...always feel the counselor has a lot of time for us – I like the fact I can work together with the school.*

While much of the 'teacher talk' reflected seeing parents as partners, there were some comments that suggested a different stance.

S *We need to be educating parents to fulfil their role in the home.*

C *I think there is still opportunity to continue to work with the parent community to educate parents in a number of ways.*

## **2. Counseling provision is evolving, intentional, principle-driven and flexible.**

Staff talked about the ways in which the counseling service had developed in a manner that indicated responsiveness to the perceived needs of families. The principal talked about the original appointment of the family care counselor:

P *[We appointed] a family care counselor to enable us to better work with their children at school. It has morphed way beyond that.*

*Some families saw it as an easy route to any counseling – there was a need for boundaries, for parameters.*

*We are seeing increasing needs in families... Seeing the needs beyond the ability to work one to one...hence the introduction of programmes such as 'Seasons' ...constant state of change...it's all a journey.*

Teaching staff made similar observations:

S *The needs are growing – partly because the school is growing, partly because families are becoming more aware of what is available. Previously it was a bit ad hoc. Structures are clearer, referral structures have been sorted out.*

...as did the counseling team:

C *Initially there were no parameters...it was free counseling for families...it became unworkable and outside of the school structure. Now [it is] accessible to parents and part of the school structure.*

*We have become more specific about who works with whom. Previously parents and teachers were not sure who to talk to.*

Both teaching staff and the counseling team talked about the move over the last twelve months to introduce Restorative Justice practice into the school.

C *It fits more with our mission statement. Moving towards working this way is putting action to what we say – what does our mission statement look like when kids overstep the mark, or when it comes to resolving conflict? It's about seeing a situation as an opportunity rather than a problem.*

There was an intentional move in 2011 to involve deans of form classes in the pastoral care of students, not just in disciplinary matters. Staff saw this as another example of a willingness to make changes that both fit with the foundational values of the school and respond to pragmatic needs. Within this theme, there was an expressed awareness that the ideal and reality do not always match – that sometimes efforts do not always work – and an awareness that both families and school staff can be responsible for the 'not working'.

C *We do get parents who get very upset because we are not doing something for the child, we are not providing what they think we ought to be providing.*

S *We do 100% support our staff here but I think we also have to be humble enough to say we all make mistakes. We went through an incredible sticky situation at the end of last year where a student verbally abused a teacher in front of a lot of people – the teacher had to take responsibility for the student feeling the way they did.*

C *But it is easy for the sake of drawing a line in the sand to not see the impact on the individual. Sometimes parents feel our rules, our stand, have compounded the problem rather than solved it.*

However, the flexibility of structure and humility of attitude did not appear to reflect a *laissez faire* stance. It was evident in the interviews that staff have clearly communicated high expectations of both students and their families.

### **3. Challenges in developing the provision of counseling**

Participants talked about a number of challenges associated with the family-inclusive approach.

#### **a) Boundaries**

Mention has already been made of the historical need to put boundaries in place as some parents were tending to see the school counseling as a free service for any issue. Teaching staff identified other areas – specifically relational areas – where boundaries between roles could be a challenge.

S *The teacher – pastoral care role mix is sometimes challenging.*

The counseling team identified two areas of challenge in this regard:

C *[One of the challenges is] maintaining roles between counseling and discipline in stand-down situations.....Staff are often open to reflect, "How could this have been done better?" There's a lot more consultation than there used to be.*

C *Who is the client? Parents have needs – the child has needs – which may be different.*

b) Time

All staff commented on the challenges of meeting the needs within the limited time availability of the counseling staff. This challenge was exacerbated by the part-time nature of the counseling staff. The parent respondents talked about their awareness and experience of the challenges around availability:

Pt *...a bit inconsistent – but [we have] a recognition of busyness.*

Pt *...overstretched so not so good at following up unless pushed.*

c) Resourcing

Staff commented that extra resourcing would be helpful, although one member of staff could see an implication of increased resourcing:

S *More counselor time – releasing deans from some teaching time – but demand would match supply – make more time available and more need becomes apparent.*

d) Fee paying parents

I asked a question about whether staff saw the fact that parents pay fees created any issues. Teaching staff and the counseling team had differing views. Teaching staff did not see this as an issue currently, but one of the counselors felt, *“There is some pressure of expectation from parents because they pay fees”*.

**4. *The transferability of principles and practice to other school settings.***

Towards the end of each interview, I made the observation, “If I were a cynic, I would be saying “In terms of the families involved this is a relatively affluent school, with a relatively homogeneous group of staff and parents. You are not likely to have the issues that other schools face and your counseling provision is bound to work” – and invited comment. In a non-defensive way, the participants all reflected a balance of, on the one hand an awareness of the advantages of the school situation, and, on the other hand a belief that the issues faced by the school and its families are real, whatever the socioeconomic situation or faith perspective. There was also a clear perception on the part of the staff that the values and practices being worked out at the school could be transferred to any context.

P *The principles are transferable – there is no decile rating on family relationships.*

S *Issues may be different to other schools – but not less...as Christians we can be harder on each other.*

S *Our parents go through exactly the same issues, recession, etc...*

C *[There is] huge variation in perspective within the Christian community....the principles are transferable.*

It is not difficult to accept that a supposedly homogeneous group is more heterogeneous in reality than might appear on the surface. In defence of the belief in transferability of their way of working, the principal made reference to a newly acquired satellite school which is a decile one school – i.e., at the bottom end of the socio-economic spectrum. Pastoral care and counseling are

only embryonic in this new venture, but the intention is to use the parent-school principles in the new setting. The principal saw this as a good test of transferability of the principles.

## **Discussion**

The findings from the data-gathering give a picture of a school with clear values, of which an inclusive attitude towards parents is part. The principal saw this as an explicit part of the school practice: “*The philosophy of the school - is parent partnerships*”. These values are known to and worked out by staff, and experienced by the parents who responded. The staff did not communicate a sense of ‘parents as problems’ (Tett, 2001), even in situations where there were known to be challenges at home, or where parents were known to be antagonistic. Rather, there seemed to be a genuine attitude towards ‘parents as partners’ (Smith, 2009). Of particular note is the contrast with her previous experience in schools noted by one of the counseling team: “*Totally different to most schools*”.

Picking up on the characteristics of mechanical or organic solidarity (Berkeley, 1999) referred to previously, the school seems to sit midway along the spectrum, not in a wishy-washy way but rather exemplifying the positive aspects of both extremes. There are clear rules and high expectations without pathologizing students who transgress. There is an emphasis on relationships, and clear lines of authority while still allowing for flexibility and discretion in decision-making. This way of being is consistent with the faith-based nature of the school, embodying the hallmarks of grace, avoiding both legalism and licence.

The rhetoric of partnership with parents in the education of their children is clear within the interviews with staff, and reflected in the experience of the parents who responded. However, what is also apparent is a sense that it is the school side of the partnership that makes the decisions regarding counseling policy and practice. There was no evidence within the data collected of policy and practice being discussed at a planning stage with parents or negotiated with parents or parent representative groups. (I am fully aware that this may not be an accurate reflection of the reality of the situation.) In the context of this study, while it may be that the school makes decisions regarding counseling and pastoral care policy without reference to parental opinion, it may be that this is an example of ‘power for’, rather than ‘power over’ (Boyd, 1996). Further research would be needed to clarify the reality of the situation, its motivation and impact.

While the data was collected from three stakeholder groups there are others referred to by participants who are clearly key players within the context, notably students and school governance. In relation to this, it is worthy of note that a family-inclusive way of working can perceive ‘family’ as one entity, and fail to distinguish between the expectations, needs and experiences of young people and those of their parents. This distinction is recognised in the data in the “Who is the client?” question asked by one of the counseling team, and noted as a specific potential ethical dilemma within SBFC by Gerrard (2008). Clearly, as Winslade (1996) indicates, involvement of parents is a potential ethical minefield, and awareness and careful practice are needed. While Gerrard (2008) makes general reference to the ethical issues inherent in SBFC, there is need for more specific research regarding such challenges, that not only draws attention to the issues but which reports ways of working with the dilemmas.

Fee paying schools would seem to be at risk of parent power dictating policy and practice. When school governance is focussed on the business side of the institution, and aware of the need to 'keep the customer happy', there is always the risk that policy will be dictated by financial considerations, rather than a desire for educational best practice. The participants in this study reflect a diversity of perspective in this regard. While the teaching staff reported less 'demand' from parents, the counselors' experience was less positive. Within the growing SBFC literature, it seems that there is a general lack of discussion on issues of power and positioning. As illustrated by the participants' comments in this study, the relational dynamics of collaborative practice are complex. In relation to the latter, who holds the power is unlikely to be consistent, and will shift from situation to situation, and over time. Again, this is an area worthy of further exploration. Case studies that are specifically aimed at teasing out the ways in which the various stakeholders position themselves and are positioned would be worthy projects.

Finally, as was noted by the principal, it is possible for school governance and finance bodies to see counseling and pastoral care as a luxury and, in times of financial constraint, expendable. While reducing counseling provisions may seem an easy option when budget cuts are needed, Gerrard (2008) makes it clear that there are strong links between student emotional and relational well-being and academic achievement. Consequently, while cuts in counseling provisions may have short-term fiscal advantages, the long-term results may not be desirable.

### **Conclusion**

Within the broad scope of SBFC, reflection on the data gained from the varying sources gives a picture of a counseling service that is an example of 'best practice'. The link between school ethos and practice is clear. The flexibility of the service to develop in ways that respond to need, and yet remain rooted in principle is noteworthy. Similarly, the strong emphasis on being family-inclusive in all aspects of the counseling provision reflects the growing international awareness of the appropriateness and benefits of a stance of partnership building. Staff at the school did not set out to implement a model, but rather to structure a service that is value-based, and responsive to perceived needs. In doing so, they have achieved a result that sits very well within the SBFC framework. The data collected for this study gives the school cause for affirmation and celebration of development thus far.

### **References**

- Berkeley, R. (1999). *Not fitting in: Exclusions from school, a local study*. Paper presented at the British Educational Association Conference, Brighton, England, September 2-5.
- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boyd, S. (1996). Introduction. In S. Boyd, M. Longwood, & M. Muesse (Eds.). *Redeeming men: Religion and masculinities*. Louisville, KN: Westminster John Knox.
- Carter, M., & Evans, W. (2008). Implementing School-Based Family Counseling: Strategies, activities, and process considerations. Retrieved from <http://schoolbasedfamilycounseling.com/journal.html>.

- Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (Eds.). (2001). *Lives in context: The art of life history research*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches*. California: Sage.
- Crowe, A. (2006). Guidance and counselling in New Zealand schools: Exploring the issues. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling*, 26(3), 16-25.
- Davies, B. (2006). Subjectification: The relevance of Butler's analysis for education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(4), 425-438.
- Davies, B., & Hunt, R. (1994). Classroom competencies and marginal positionings. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 15(3) 389-408.
- Gadamer, H. (1979). The problems of historical consciousness. In P. Rainbow & W. Sullivan (Eds.). *Intrepretive social science: A reader*. Berkeley, CA.: University of California Press.
- Gerrard, B. (2008). School-based family counseling: Overview, trends, and recommendations for future research. Retrieved from [http://schoolbasedfamilycounseling.com/docs/Gerrard - school-based family counseling-The Journal.pdf](http://schoolbasedfamilycounseling.com/docs/Gerrard_-_school-based_family_counseling-The_Journal.pdf)
- Harrison, M. (2004). *Education matters: Government, markets and New Zealand schools*. Wellington: Education Forum.
- Holloway, I., & Wheeler, S. 2002. *Qualitative research in nursing*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hughes, C. (1996). The colonisation of the school counsellor's role. *Newsletter of the New Zealand Association of Counsellors*, 17(1), 40-41.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Latimer, J. (Ed.). *Advanced qualitative research for nursing*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lau, Y-K. (2011). *Multiple family group with school refusals and their parents*. Paper presented at the Oxford Symposium in School Based Family Counseling, Hong Kong (June).
- Lloyd, G. (2000). Gender and exclusion from school. In J. Salisbury & S. Riddell (Eds.), *Gender, policy and educational change: Shifting agendas in the UK and Europe* (pp. 257-273). London: Routledge.
- McDonald, T., & Thomas, G. (2003). Parents' reflections on their children being excluded. *Emotional and Behavioral Difficulties*, 8(2), 108-119.
- Milbourne, L. (2005). Children, families and inter-agency work: Experiences of partnership work in primary education settings. *British Educational Research Journal*, 31(6), 675-695.

Minke, K. (2010). Helping teachers develop productive working relationships with families: The CORE model of family-school collaboration. Retrieved from <http://schoolbasedfamilycounseling.com/journal.html>.

Smith, A. (2009). *Sent home: The impact on the family of a child's exclusion from school*. Wellington, NZ: New Zealand Families Commission.

Tett, L. (2001). Parents as problems or parents as people? Parental involvement programmes, schools and adult education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20(3), 188-198.

Vulliamy, G., & Webb, R. (2003). Supporting disaffected pupils: Perspectives from the pupils, their parents and their teachers. *Educational Research*, 45(3), 275-286.

Winslade, J. (1996). The school counsellor and parents. *Newsletter of the New Zealand Association of Counsellors*, 17(1), 32-34.

Winslade, J. (2012). Positioning along the lines of force in schooling: An issue for psychologists and counsellors in schools. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 29(2), 20-31.

## **Appendix**

Survey used online for parent participants.

- 1 *Prior to direct contact with the counselling team this year, please describe how much you knew about the counselling and pastoral care services at [the school], how you knew what you knew, and whether you feel what you knew was sufficient for your situation.*
- 2 *The traditional model of school counselling is focussed on the student and the counsellor, with the family on the edge of involvement or uninvolved in the process. How would you describe the placing of family in relation to the student and the counsellor at [the school]?*
- 3 *Please describe briefly your contact with the counselling and pastoral care team this year. Please do not include details of the specific issues involved or names of teachers, counsellors, students.*
- 4 *Please describe how you felt the counselling team related to you in the circumstances you have described in Q3.*
- 5 *How do you feel your involvement in the counselling process contributed to the outcomes of the process, and to your sense of your role as parents?*
- 6 *Please make any other general comments you would like to make about the counselling and pastoral care provided by the school.*