



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

**“IT’S BECOMING PART OF THEIR KNOWING”:
A STUDY OF BICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN AN
EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHER EDUCATION SETTING
IN AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND**

**A thesis submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy
at the
University of Waikato
by**

JENNY RUTH RITCHIE

**University of Waikato
2002**

Abstract

This study is an exploration of the implementation of bicultural development within a university-based early childhood teacher education programme in Aotearoa/New Zealand, which can be considered to be a bicultural country (Walker, 1987, p. 221). Bicultural development is a process in line with obligations contained within the Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi, which are reflected within the New Zealand Ministry of Education's Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices (Ministry of Education, 1996a) and the early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b). The study adopts a critical, transformative theoretical paradigm, and employed an eclectic and emergent qualitative methodological approach, that reflected aspects from ethnographic, narrative and grounded theory methodologies. Interviews with university lecturers, early childhood care and education teachers, and professional development facilitators within the early childhood field; observations within early childhood care and education centres; audiotaping of university class discussions; samples of university student assignments; and a written survey of graduates of the university teacher education programme provide the sources of data for the study. Central to the methodological process is a commitment to ethical care for participants, which involves attentive accountability to the interpretations that they place on the material that they contribute to the study and to the overall theorising of the significance of the findings.

Key research questions of the study were to define 'bicultural development' in the context of early childhood care and education in this country; to identify key components of the bicultural development implementation process employed within the university teacher early childhood education programme; to distinguish some useful 'indicators' of bicultural development within early childhood centres; and to consider the implications for the teacher education programme in terms of preparing

graduates to facilitate bicultural development within their future work in early childhood education.

A significant finding of the study was the identification of a range of strategies for implementing bicultural development in early childhood education teacher education and care and education settings. The key strategies include Tiriti-based partnership models of teaching whereby Māori and Pākehā work alongside each other, enabling the paralleling of Māori and Western perspectives within both university teacher education and early childhood care and education programmes. It was considered essential that universities employ Māori lecturers to enable Māori content within the teacher education programme to be adequately provisioned. Since there are few Māori educators employed in mainstream early childhood services, it was suggested that teachers might seek to employ a “whanaungatanga” approach. This involves the early childhood centre staff creating a climate and environment in which Māori families/whānau are comfortable to participate fully in programme planning, implementation, and evaluation, which will enable all children attending to access Māori perspectives alongside the Western curriculum content. This approach is consistent with Article Two of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, which guaranteed to Māori their tino rangatiratanga, or self-determination.

An implication for management and staff of early childhood teacher education programmes in Aotearoa/New Zealand is the need to equip graduates with the knowledge bases and commitment that will enable them to implement bicultural development, ideally through adopting a whanaungatanga approach. This involves facilitating teacher education students to move beyond the dysconscious racism (King, 1994) that is deeply embedded in mainstream Pākehā culture in this country, to the position where they are able to adopt a critical, transformative stance that is humble, respectful and responsive to cultural difference. This stance includes valuing the inclusion of te reo me ōna tikanga throughout early childhood programmes, in a partnership initiated by teachers, but one in

which whānau Māori are then able to take the lead in determining the nature and application of Māori content.

Acknowledgements

I want to express my sincere appreciation for the time and thoughts so generously contributed by all my research participants: university colleagues, graduates, students, professional development facilitators, and early childhood educators. Numerous conversations and exchanges over the years have informed and enhanced my understandings, and seeing so many others committed to this kaupapa was always inspirational.

I particularly need to thank my supervisors: Barbara Harrison, Margaret Carr, and Russell Bishop. Barbara, thank you for your enduring patience, wisdom, and careful scrutiny, and for always phrasing your criticisms and suggestions with such consummate diplomacy. Above all, thank you for having faith that I could and would complete this prolonged exercise, and for staying with me so dutifully even when there were months on end when I did not deliver anything concrete. Margaret Carr has been a mentor ever since I first contemplated becoming a kindergarten teacher, and her teaching and scholarship have been important models for me as a lecturer, whilst her editorial skills have contributed greatly to my present and previous writing. Thank you Margaret for your detailed feedback and valued suggestions.

I also want to acknowledge the supportive role of other colleagues and auxiliary staff at the university, especially my Head of Department, Margaret Nicholls. Thank you Margie for your understanding and patience, and the numerous conversations that have contributed to my emotional wellbeing.

Lastly I want to acknowledge and thank my family, especially my parents, Jane and James Ritchie, for their ongoing encouragement and guidance.

Thank you all, so very very much for your support which has enabled me to complete this project.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	v
Table of Contents.....	1
Thesis Statement.....	10
Part One: Research Context	17
Chapter One: Rationale and Theoretical Domains.....	18
1.0 Introduction to Chapter One	18
1.1 Te Tiriti o Waitangi	19
1.1.1 Te Tiriti o Waitangi as a Bicultural Framework	22
1.1.2 “Pākehā” or “Tauīwi” as Treaty Partners?.....	23
1.1.3 Tino Rangatiratanga as a Key Tiriti Commitment	25
1.2 Impact of Education Policy for Māori: Assimilation and Language Loss	27
1.2.1 Language, Culture and Identity	33
1.2.2 Revitalisation of Te Reo Māori	34
1.2.3 Tino Rangatiratanga and Te Reo Māori.....	37
1.2.4 Whanaungatanga and Te Reo	38
1.3 Aotearoa/New Zealand: a bicultural paradigm?	41
1.3.1 ‘Biculturalisms’	42
1.3.2 Bicultural Development	45
1.3.3 Tiriti-based Partnership.....	46
1.3.4 ‘Bicultural’ and/or ‘Multicultural’ Education as the Aspiration?	49
1.4 Early Childhood Education and Cultural Responsiveness	50
1.4.1 Early Childhood Education and Social Change	51
1.4.2 The Early Childhood Community’s Commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Bicultural Development.....	52
1.4.3 Socio-Cultural Issues within the Current Theoretical Paradigm for Early Childhood Education	53
1.4.3.1 Vygotskian Influences: from Individual to Social as the Unit of Analysis	53

1.4.3.2	Culture as Central to Education.....	54
1.4.3.3	Early childhood as a Crucial Site of Cultural and Linguistic Learning	55
1.5	Theoretical Domains	56
1.5.1	Social constructionism and socio-cultural theory.....	58
1.5.2	Critical Social Science	58
1.5.3	Critical Pedagogy.....	61
1.5.4	Cultural Studies	64
1.5.5	Critical Multiculturalism.....	66
1.5.6	Critical Early Childhood Studies	68
1.6	Overview of Chapter One.....	69
	Chapter Two: Teacher Education as a Site for Bicultural Development.....	71
2.0	Introduction to Chapter Two.....	71
2.1	Teacher Education as Pivotal in Creating Educational Change.....	72
2.1.1	Identifying Effective Pedagogies for Teacher Education	76
2.1.2	Anti-Racism Education as Pivotal	77
2.1.3	Facilitating ‘Reflective Practice’	80
2.1.4	‘Developmental’ Processes in Becoming a Teacher	82
2.1.5	Validating Emotions in Change Facilitation	84
2.2	Policy Contexts	85
2.2.1	International Obligations.....	85
2.2.2	Ministry of Education Requirements	86
2.2.2.1	Te Whāriki, Early Childhood Curriculum: Background.....	86
2.2.2.2	Te Whāriki as a Bicultural Document	89
2.2.2.3	Kaupapa Māori Content of Te Whāriki	92
2.2.2.4	Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices	97
2.2.3	University of Waikato Policy	98
2.2.4	School of Education Policy	99
2.3	Previous Research of Relevance to this Study.....	100

2.4	An Overview of the Primary Research Setting, the Early Childhood Teacher Education Programme.....	104
2.4.1	Department of Early Childhood Degree Programme.	104
2.4.2	Introductory Tiriti and Anti-racism Workshop	107
2.4.3	Specialist Courses as well as Integration	115
2.4.4	Pedagogical Strategies	120
2.4.5	1994 Departmental Review of ‘biculturalism’ integral theme	125
2.4.6	The Ki Taiao Programme.....	126
2.5	Positioning the Study.....	127
2.5.1	Delimitations: clarifying the parameters of the study.....	129
2.5.2	Research Questions.....	130
2.6	Overview of Teacher Education Context	131
	Part Two: Methodology	134
	Chapter Three: Methodological Paradigm	135
3.0	Introduction.....	135
3.1	‘Positionality’ of the Researcher.....	136
3.2	Critical Pedagogy as a Key Methodological Context	142
3.3	Qualitative Research.....	144
3.4	Ethnographic Research Approaches.....	145
3.5	Post-modernist Perspectives	148
3.6	Narrative Methodology	150
3.7	Issues of Accountability, Representation, and Ethics	152
3.8	A Reflexive and Emergent Methodology	155
3.9	Overview of methodological paradigm	156
	Chapter Four: Method	158
4.0	Introduction to Chapter Four	158
4.1	Overview of Data Collection and Codes Used	158
4.2	Preparing for the Interview Process	161
4.2.1	Individual interviews	161
4.2.2	Interview Strategies	163

4.2.3	Group Interviews	164
4.2.4	Group Interview Strategies	166
4.2.5	Question Preparation.....	169
4.3	Interview Questions.....	171
4.4	Selection of Participants	173
4.5	Summary of Research Method Utilised	174
Chapter Five: Emergent Insider- Researcher Methodology		175
5.0	Introduction to Chapter Five.....	175
5.1	Interviewing Experiences	175
5.1.1	Interviews as an Emergent Process.....	178
5.1.2	Emergent Data Analysis: Coding Data Using NuDist.....	181
5.2	Issues Pertaining to Interview Data.....	183
5.2.1	Conversations and Contestation of Meaning	184
5.2.2	Transcription Issues	186
5.2.3	Impositional Tendencies in Selectivity of Data	188
5.2.4	Accountability Processes	191
5.2.5	Representation of Māori Voices	193
5.2.6	Application of Narrative Research	195
5.2.7	Relationships and Ethics	197
5.3	Issues Pertaining to Stage Two Data.....	199
5.3.1	Justification of Types of Data, and Robustness Measures.....	199
5.3.2	Observations in Centres	202
5.3.3	Student Assignments.....	204
5.3.4	Class Discussions	205
5.3.5	Graduate Survey	207
5.4	Dilemmas of the Insider-Researcher	208
5.4.1	Journaling as a Tool to Support Researcher Reflection.....	209
5.4.2	Surprises for the Insider	212
5.5	Key Learnings from Data Gathering and Interpretation.....	217
Part Three: Discussion on Findings		220

Chapter Six: Bicultural Development In Early Childhood Care and Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand	223
6.0 Introduction to Chapter Six	223
6.1 “Tino Rangatiratanga for Me is About Māori Rights”: Explanations of Tino Rangatiratanga	223
6.2 “We still need to work in partnership”	227
6.3 Tiriti-based ‘Partnership’: a Pākehā and Taiwi Responsibility.....	228
6.4 “The Main Focus is our Tamariki”: Māori Aspirations for Bicultural Development.....	229
6.5 “An Inclusive Model”	231
6.6 Barriers to Implementation of Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Centres.....	233
6.7 Overview of Bicultural Development as a Project for Mainstream Early Childhood Settings	234
Chapter Seven: Bicultural Development within the Department of Early Childhood Studies at the University of Waikato:	235
7.0 Introduction to Chapter Seven	235
7.1 Lecturers’ Aspirations	235
7.1.1 “Creating Heart”: Generating a Commitment to Bicultural Development.....	235
7.1.2 Creating Culturally “Safe” Teachers	237
7.2 Pedagogical Approaches.....	238
7.2.1 Introductory Workshop: Te Tiriti and History of Colonisation, Cultural and Racism Awareness	238
7.2.2 Interactive Teaching and Praxis	241
7.2.3 Validating Emotions	243
7.3 Positioning Māori Knowledge as Central.....	245
7.3.1 “Making Māori Things Real”	245
7.3.2 Tino Rangatiratanga and Inclusion of Cultural Diversity	248
7.4 Exploring Cultural Values	249

7.4.1	Recognising One’s Own Cultural Paradigm	250
7.4.2	Appreciating Cultural Differences.....	252
7.5	Partnership Models.....	257
7.5.1	Pākehā Lecturers’ Responsibility	258
7.5.2	Recognising Pākehā Students’ Resistance	260
7.5.3	Demands Placed on Māori Lecturers	262
7.6	Some Indicators of Bicultural Development within the Department of Early Childhood Studies.....	263
7.7	Graduates’ Views of the Teacher Education Programme’s Processes	264
7.8	Overview of Bicultural Development within the Teacher Education Programme	267
Chapter Eight: Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Education Settings ..		269
8.0	Introduction to Chapter Eight	269
8.1	Te Whāriki: the Dilemma of a Non-prescriptive Curriculum.....	269
8.2	Environmental Symbols	273
8.3	Kanohi ki te Kanohi: Teachers Initiating Welcoming.....	275
8.4	Maximising Available Resources	277
8.5	Te Reo: Issues of Quality and Extent of Usage	278
8.6	Integrating Tikanga: the Whānau Can Weave Their Own	281
8.7	Policy Commitment, Management Leadership and Support	282
8.8	‘It’s Becoming Part of Their Knowing’: From Teachers to Children to Parents	283
8.9	Overview of Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Centres	285
Chapter Nine: Teacher Education and Bicultural Development.....		286
9.0	Introduction to Chapter Nine	286
9.1	Commitment, Confidence, and Competence	286
9.2	“Te Whāriki Makes the Māori Things You Do Real”	289
9.3	Initiates as Initiators	290
9.4	A Reflexive and Respectful Orientation.....	292
9.5	A Whanaungatanga Approach	294

9.6	Bicultural Development as an Ongoing Personal and Professional Commitment.....	299
9.7	Overview of Goals of Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Teacher Education.....	300
Chapter Ten: Dilemmas of Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Teacher Education.....		302
10.0	Introduction to Chapter Ten.....	302
10.1	“Empowering Pākehā to Let Go of Power”.....	302
10.2	Rhetoric is Not Enough	303
10.3	Partnership Demands: Delivering the Māori Content of Courses.....	305
10.4	Contestation of Content	306
10.5	“The Ultimate Bicultural Person”?: Pākehā Lecturers as Role Models	309
10.6	The Centrality of the Significance of Te Reo	312
10.7	Pākehā Fears as a Pākehā Problem	315
10.8	Issues Regarding Māori Students.....	316
10.8.1	Whānau: Support for Māori	316
10.8.2	Māori Students as Experts.....	318
10.8.3	Māori Students Are Already Bicultural	318
10.9	Respect for Māori Domains: “If You Are Going to Use it, You Use it Right”	319
10.10	Effectiveness of Integrated Models	324
10.11	Frameworks for Understanding, or Trapdoors to Essentialising?.....	325
10.12	Maintaining the Wellbeing of Māori Staff within a Pākehā Institution ..	327
10.13	Implications of these Dilemmas.....	328
Chapter Eleven: Summary of Findings.....		329
11.0	Introduction to Chapter Eleven	329
11.1	Bicultural Development, a Tiriti-based Social Change Process	330
11.2	Early Childhood Centres and Bicultural Development.....	331
11.3	Teacher Education Goals and Strategies	333

11.4	Whanaungatanga as the Key to Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Centres	334
11.5	Bicultural Development as an Ongoing Personal and Professional Commitment	336
11.6	Collaboration as an Overarching Theme	337
11.7	Overview of Key Findings of the Study	338
	Chapter Twelve: Reflection on the Study	340
12.0	Introduction to Chapter Twelve	340
12.1	Racism and Partnership	340
12.1.1	Different Positionings: “I Find it Quite Hard at Times”	340
12.1.2	Gender Matters	345
12.1.3	Institutional “Racism in Action”: “It’s the Controlling Still”	346
12.1.4	The Racist Impact of New Right Ideology	350
12.1.5	Transformative Processes.....	352
12.2	Weaving the Whāriki.....	355
12.3	Wider Implications	357
12.4	Areas for Further Exploration	362
12.5	Conclusion	364
	Appendices	369
	Appendix One: Details of Degree Programme and Course Content	369
	Appendix 1.1 Degree Structure	369
	Appendix 1.2 Cultural Studies Two 1058.113:.....	371
	Appendix Two: Details of Methodological Process	380
	Appendix 2.1 Chronology of Data Collection	380
	Appendix 2.2 Notes for co-theorising hui participants, May 18 th 2001.....	384
	Appendix 2.3 Preparation sheet for observation in early childhood centres, 1998	387
	Appendix 2.4 Coverage of Participants within text.....	389
	Appendix Three: Data Sections	395
	Appendix 3.1 Stage One Data: Initial Interviews.....	396

Appendix 3.1.1	Māori Colleagues	396
Appendix 3.1.2	Māori Graduates	411
Appendix 3.1.3	Pākehā Colleagues	419
Appendix 3.1.4	Pākehā Graduates.....	433
Appendix 3.1.5	Interviews with Professional Development Facilitators	446
Appendix 3.2	Stage Two Data: Further Sources	461
Appendix 3.2.1	Bicultural development in centres	461
Appendix 3.2.2	Class Discussions Data	469
Appendix 3.2.3	Students' Writing	484
Appendix 3.2.4	Graduate Review Questionnaire	505
Appendix 3.3	Co-theorising Hui with Māori Participants	514
	Glossary of Māori Terms	526
	References:	529

Thesis Statement

Aotearoa/New Zealand¹ is a nation of two key peoples. Māori, the indigenous people of New Zealand, are approximately 15% of the population (Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development, 2000, p. 13). The rest are mainly of European descent, although there is also a growing number of immigrants from the Pacific and Asia who form a small overall percentage of the population. The Treaty of Waitangi Act of 1975 was significant, in that 135 years after the original signing of the treaty between the indigenous Māori and the British Crown, the New Zealand Government at last gave legislative recognition to the Treaty of Waitangi/Te Tiriti o Waitangi² (Oliver, 1991, p. 95; Orange, 1987, p. 246). This treaty³ had enabled colonisation of Aotearoa/New Zealand to take place. Article Two of Te Tiriti of Waitangi, the Māori version of the treaty, guaranteed to Māori their self-determination, and maintenance of all things that were important to them, which includes their language and culture. The treaty had also guaranteed to Māori equal citizenship, and that their beliefs (ritenga) would have equal status alongside Western belief systems⁴. However, a policy level acknowledgement of the Treaty of Waitangi does not in itself ensure that this commitment will be implemented, and certainly does not provide the institution with guidance as to how the policy can be translated into action. Research is needed to identify models in which this translation from policy to practice has been effected.

An increasing recognition of Māori economic, cultural and linguistic rights has contributed to a social change process over the past three decades. This has impacted particularly on educational institutions that have acknowledged a responsibility to implement programmes, which will deliver Māori language and culture in appropriate ways. The early childhood education field has been responsive to Māori demands for

¹ Aotearoa is a Māori term for New Zealand.

² The Treaty of Waitangi is used here to refer to the English version of the treaty, and Te Tiriti o Waitangi refers to the Māori version.

³ “treaty” will be used as a general term to refer to both versions of the document, the Māori and English versions.

changes that focus on the revitalisation of te reo me ngā tikanga Māori⁵, and on equitable outcomes for Māori children. This has placed the onus on early childhood teacher educators to provide professional programmes that prepare early childhood teachers to be able to deliver biculturally responsive programmes for young children and their families.

The purpose of this study was to provide a narrative exploration of the ways in which an early childhood teacher education programme has endeavoured to implement a commitment to bicultural early childhood education within the context of a mainstream University in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The education sector and particularly, early childhood care and education settings, are primary sites for this cultural preservation, which has become more imperative as a result of the debilitating effects of over one hundred and sixty years of colonisation. This process of colonisation has created a situation whereby the colonisers have benefited at the expense of the colonised, whose language and cultural values have not been protected.

The majority of students within the teacher education program offered by the Department of Early Childhood Studies in the University of Waikato are Pākehā⁶ New Zealanders with minimal knowledge of the Māori language and culture. Since its instigation in 1989, the programme has had a commitment to ‘biculturalism’, which has been an integral theme within the Early Childhood Studies courses. The Ministry of Education’s Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices (DOPs) (Ministry of Education, 1996a) and the new New Zealand early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b), have a strong bilingual and bicultural focus. This means that bilingual/bicultural competence is now a necessary

⁴ This specific protection of ritenga Māori, alongside the prevailing Christian faiths, is contained within Article Four, which was read to the Māori chiefs prior to the Waitangi signing.

⁵ Te reo is the Māori language. Ngā tikanga Māori refers to Māori values and cultural practices, that is, that which is ‘tika’, or right, from a Māori perspective. Te reo me ngā tikanga Māori are therefore, Māori language, values, and cultural practices.

⁶ Pākehā is a term for New Zealanders with European ancestry.

facility for effecting the professional responsibilities of early childhood teachers within early childhood centres that are licensed by the Ministry of Education. The challenge for the Department of Early Childhood Studies has been to prepare students, within the framework of a three-year full-time qualification, to develop bicultural teaching competence as well as the commitment to implement a bicultural curriculum.

As lecturers within the Early Childhood Studies degree programme at the University of Waikato, my colleagues and I have been developing strategies, which will improve the way, we prepare students to deliver bicultural early childhood programmes. Although it is not possible, within three years, to provide enough opportunities for students to develop sufficient fluency in te reo Māori⁷, the approach of this programme has been to develop within students a commitment to issues of bicultural development. Fundamental to this has been to ensure that students become familiar with the implications of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the history of colonisation and race relations of this country, and to develop an awareness and deeper understanding of their own culture in relation to Māori, in particular, and other cultures. Intrinsic to this process is to understand that although there may be universals such as family structures, love of one's children, and language, there are very many ways that these are expressed as determined by different cultural paradigms. As students are provided with opportunities to explore their own cultural values and compare these to those of Māori, the intention is that they develop a respect for the different ways that these values are expressed.

The Tiriti-based⁸ bicultural paradigm used here is one that is inclusive of cultural diversity. On the Māori side of the treaty partnership this diversity is expressed

⁷ Te reo Māori is the Māori language.

⁸ Tiriti here refers to the Māori version of the treaty.

through tribal and hapū⁹ differences, while the Crown¹⁰ side of the partnership includes all those cultural groups that have immigrated to New Zealand since 1840. Whilst it would not be possible for students to gain an in-depth understanding of all the immigrant groups they may possibly encounter in their teaching career, obligations of Te Tiriti o Waitangi expressed through Te Whāriki, the early childhood curriculum, require early childhood teachers to be able to deliver te reo me ōna tikanga authentically, to children in their centres. It is the responsibility of our early childhood teacher education programme to equip our graduates to do this. This study explores the philosophical frameworks and pedagogical strategies that we have been developing to meet this challenge.

The theoretical domains for this study included early childhood studies, critical pedagogy, critical multiculturalism, social-constructionism, and socio-cultural theory. These perspectives provide an awareness of the socially constructed contestable nature of cultural meanings. Bicultural development is a proactive attempt to redress social and cultural inequities arising from the colonisation of this country.

There were two key stages in the research process. Initial data came from interviews with Māori and Pākehā colleagues in the early childhood field, some of whom were graduates of the University of Waikato teacher education programme. Observations were made in a range of early childhood centres. An emergent coding process, using a qualitative software analysis programme (NuDist), enabled key ideas to be discussed with Māori participants at a co-theorising hui¹¹. Participants at this hui had been sent their transcripts and the preliminary data write-ups of their interviews, with their contributions highlighted for quick access. I also prepared for the hui a summary of key ideas as a possible discussion framework (See Appendix 2.2). This

⁹ A hapū is a sub-tribe or clan.

¹⁰ “Crown” refers in its original sense, to the British Crown, and its role of governance. However, the 1852 New Zealand Constitution Act transferred this role of governance to the New Zealand Government (Walker, 1990, p. 110), which is also referred to as the “Crown”.

¹¹ A hui is a gathering, meeting, people coming together for some common purpose.

process is in accord with the distinction made by Strauss and Corbin between coding and theoretical coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1999, p. 166). It is also consistent with methodological approaches that highlight the need for participants to be involved in the theorising of the data that they have supplied. These processes of creating shared meanings (Aubrey, David, Godfrey, & Thompson, 2000, p. 127), of “making sense” through “a complex back-and-forth process of negotiation (Shotter, 1990, p. 164), have been variously termed “co-exploration” (Diller, 1993, cited in Noddings, 1995, p. 93), “whitiwhiti kōrero”¹² (Holmes in Bishop, 1996, p. 104), “collaborative storying” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 336), and “spiral discourse” (Bishop & Glynn, 1999). The data from this co-theorising hui with Māori participants generated the themes that are presented in chapters six, seven, eight, and nine.

Chapters one and two provide contextual background to the study, outlining the rationale, situational context and theoretical domains. Chapters three to five outline the methodological paradigm and processes. Chapter Six discusses the concepts of bicultural development and tino rangatiratanga in the context of early childhood care and education in this country. Chapter Seven describes some key components of the Department of Early Childhood Studies’ bicultural development implementation process. Chapter Eight considers what might be some indicators of progress early childhood centres might make in terms of bicultural development. In Chapter Nine I explore what we might aim for in preparing our graduates to facilitate bicultural development within their future work in early childhood education.

¹² Whitiwhiti is an exchange or crossing over, kōrero is discussion, talk, conversation.

Chapter Ten considers some dilemmas of bicultural development that arose from consideration of the data. Chapter Eleven provides a summary of key findings of the study, and Chapter Twelve reflects on the implications that are raised by these findings.

As the research proceeded, and as a result of the emergent coding and co-theorising processes, the original research questions (Ritchie, 1995) were refined into four key research focuses or tasks:

- defining ‘bicultural development’ in the context of early childhood care and education in this country
- identifying some key components of the Department of Early Childhood Studies’ bicultural development implementation process
- exploring possible ‘indicators’ of bicultural development within early childhood centres
- clarifying the aims of the teacher education programme in terms of preparing graduates to facilitate bicultural development within their future work in early childhood education.

The key findings of the study are that:

- a process of bicultural development, as an ethical and moral response to obligations of te Tiriti o Waitangi, has been identified within early childhood sites of teacher education and early childhood care and education
- the Department of Early Childhood Studies at the University of Waikato had implemented a number of strategies in line with Tiriti-based commitments which included partnership models of teaching by Māori and Pākehā colleagues, and the

paralleling of Māori perspectives within courses, with the overall aim of generating in students an ongoing commitment to bicultural development

- tangible processes are emerging as early childhood students and teachers attempt to implement bicultural development in early childhood centres, central to which is a “whanaungatanga”¹³ approach which involves educators creating an environment in which Māori whānau are comfortable to participate fully in programme planning, implementation, and evaluation, and children demonstrate that Māori perspectives are “becoming part of their knowing” [MPH3]¹⁴.

¹³ Whanaungatanga means relationships, based on validation of whānau, or Māori extended families.

¹⁴ MPH3 is a code identifying a research participant. These codes are explained more fully in section 4.1.

Part One: Research Context

Part One contextualises the research project historically and theoretically. It provides the background for the study in terms of historical, educational, and policy contexts in order to position the research study and identify the various “lenses” (Delpit, 1995, p. 151; Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 25) that have informed it.

Chapter One: Rationale and Theoretical Domains

1.0 Introduction to Chapter One

Research and researchers are culturally and historically situated (Graue & Walsh, 1995, p.144; Greene, 1986, p. 479). This chapter provides an overview of the “culturally and historically situated lenses” which frame this study (Graue & Walsh, 1995, p. 144). A primary rationale for the study lies in the 1840 treaty between Māori, the indigenous people of Aotearoa/New Zealand, and the British settlers, Te Tiriti o Waitangi¹⁵. Central to this treaty is the concept of tino rangatiratanga,¹⁶ and Māori explanations of this concept as involving Māori authority and self-determination indicate that it is a central organising and operating principle in any consideration of restoration of guarantees to Māori contained within Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

This chapter offers some background into the effects to iwi¹⁷ Māori of the past two centuries of colonisation. A key focus is that Crown education policies have had a negative impact on Māori language, culture and identity, raising the issue of language revitalisation and maintenance. Recent recognition of the extent of the breaches of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi has resulted in a “crisis of conscience” at the extent of the injustices that have been perpetrated by the Crown (Jackson, 1992c, p. 171). Tino rangatiratanga is viewed as a crucial element in the contemporary struggle for Māori language revitalisation. For Māori, the concept of whānau¹⁸ is a fundamental unit of social organisation intrinsic to any endeavours to protect and strengthen their language and culture.

¹⁵ The use of Te Tiriti o Waitangi signals a recognition that the Māori text of the document is primary (Nairn, 2000, p. 9)

¹⁶ Tino rangatiratanga means self-determination for Māori – see section 1.1.3 for discussion of this concept.

¹⁷ Iwi are tribes.

¹⁸ Whānau refers to the Māori extended family and principles and practices for operating within this collective. See for example Smith (1995) and Metge (1995).

The bicultural development paradigm adopted in this study is explored in sections 1.3.2 to 1.3.4, situating this as deriving from a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and organic to the context of Aotearoa/New Zealand, and therefore different to 'multicultural' perspectives evident in other countries.

A brief outline of current socio-cultural theory locates the early childhood care and education sector as a crucial site for Māori language revitalisation. In the final sections of this chapter, further theoretical domains that underpin this research are canvassed, which include: social constructivism; critical social science; critical pedagogy; cultural studies; critical multiculturalism; and critical early childhood studies.

1.1 Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Any understanding of the context of bicultural issues in Aotearoa/New Zealand must be grounded in recognition of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi of 1840. This document had enabled British settlement of this country, which had been previously acknowledged by the British Colonial Office to be under Māori dominion as stated by the Confederation of United Tribes in their Declaration of Independence of 1835 (Orange, 1987, p. 21). Te Tiriti o Waitangi/ The Treaty of Waitangi provides the foundation for a bicultural paradigm in this country (Grace, 2000, p. 24-5). There are two versions of the treaty, one in Māori (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) and one in English. There are several key differences between versions, which necessitates their parallel treatment. It should be noted also that the overwhelming majority (over 530) Māori chiefs signed the Māori version, with only one signing of 30 signatories occurring on the English version, which had been initially considered to be a 'translation' of the Māori language original (Orange, 1987, p. 260). The treaty was an agreement

between two parties, tangata whenua¹⁹ on the one hand, and the British Crown on the other, for the future political organisation of the nation.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi, like other British treaties of this era, served as “a statement of permission which allowed British government or commerce” to develop in the colony, having secured “some sense of international legality” for the settlement and colonisation process (Moon, 2002, p. 126). Those whose ancestors are not Māori, are included under the Crown side of the agreement; our legitimacy to be citizens here lies in the Crown’s immigration policies. The treaty has been described as a treaty of allowance, in which an alliance was formalised between Māori and the Crown (Grace, 2000, p. 24). Captain William Hobson, in administering his duties of obtaining Māori consent to the treaty, “explicitly and unambiguously presented the Treaty to Māori as an instrument of protection – a means of allowing the Crown to rule over the settler population in order to regulate European behaviour” (Moon, 2002, p. 131).

The preamble of Te Tiriti, the version that was signed by the Māori chiefs (Walker, 1990, p. 93), clearly states the intention of the Crown to preserve to Māori their tino rangatiratanga (absolute authority) and their land, in order that they might continue to live in peace and quiet. The preamble also introduces the Articles of Te Tiriti which follow it as “laws” that are an arrangement whereby settlers are invited to coexist in this country, under the Crown governance (Kawanatanga) ceded in Article One (Way, 2000, p. 19).

Article Two of the Māori version of the treaty guaranteed to Māori their tino rangatiratanga, which has been explained as “full authority, status, and prestige with regard to their (Māori) possessions and interests” (Waitangi Tribunal, cited in Brookfield, 1989, p. 5). This can also be interpreted as self-determination (Irwin, 1993; Smith, 1992a, 1997). This tino rangatiratanga included Māori control over

¹⁹ Tangata whenua are “people of the land”, that is, Māori, also used more specifically to refer to Māori of a particular tribal area.

lands, villages and homes, and everything else of value - “te tino rangatiratanga o o ratou wenua o ratou kainga me o ratou taonga katoa” – as stated in Article Two of the Māori version of the Tiriti (Kawharu, 1989, p. 317; Sharp, 2001, p. 38).

Article Three of the Tiriti reinforces the intention of the Crown to protect Māori interests and extends to them the same rights and privileges as British subjects (Sharp, 2001, p. 38), whilst retaining “their own sovereignty of indigenous citizenship” (Moon, 2002, p. 130). A fourth article, read out to the assembled chiefs at the Waitangi signing, affirmed that Māori beliefs and customs (ritenga) had equal standing with those of the Christian faiths represented by the missionaries present (Colenso, 1890, p. 32; Orange, 1987, p. 53; Project Waitangi, 1992).²⁰ .

The treaty can thus be seen to confirm the rights conferred on Māori by their indigeneity, their status as tangata whenua, people of this land. An ancestor of Moana Jackson said in 1886:

Ko te pūtake o o tatou tikanga, penei tonu ite rākau kauri. I whānau tatou i konei, i tipu ake tatou i konei, ko tatou te tangata whenua. E mātou ana tatou, kei te mōhiotia e te Tiriti o Waitangi, tenei kaupapa, hei kawenata mo aua tikanga.

The source of our rights is that, like the kauri, we are grounded here, we were nurtured here, we are the people of this land . . . and we know that the Treaty protected our rights, covenanted our place. (Jackson, 1992e, p. 9) (Translation in Jackson).

Māori understandings of the Tiriti o Waitangi were dismissed when, immediately it was signed, the Crown chose to adopt the English version of the document as confirmation of its assumption of sovereignty as ceded in Article One, and ignored the guarantees contained in subsequent articles of both the Māori and English versions. Moana Jackson, a lawyer and expert on Tiriti issues, believes that this

²⁰ It should be noted that treaty historian Claudia Orange considers that this “official recognition seemingly given to Māori custom” was an anomaly that arose from sectarian rivalry, in contradiction with prevailing attitudes toward Māori usages (Orange, 1987, p. 53).

dismissal is symbolic of the philosophical colonisation and military and economic oppression inflicted by the Crown and its agencies (Jackson, 1992e). It is only since 1975 that the New Zealand government has recognised the treaty, and some moves have been made, albeit overdue, to give effect to the guarantees made 135 years previously.

The fact that Te Tiriti o Waitangi was an agreement between two parties, Māori and the Crown, is the basis for a ‘bicultural’ paradigm. Maarire Goodall, former Chief Researcher for the Waitangi Tribunal, believes that the:

...powers of the Crown in New Zealand and of parliament are constrained by requirements of the Treaty of Waitangi. They are conditional upon certain requirements being properly observed, especially those detailed in Article Two -- the guarantee of tino rangatiratanga and full, undisturbed and exclusive possession of taonga²¹ (Goodall, 1995, p. 136).

Tiriti implementation, therefore, requires Crown agents to honour this guarantee of tino rangatiratanga and protect the taonga kātoa²².

1.1.1 Te Tiriti o Waitangi as a Bicultural Framework

The formalizing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi brought together two key parties, iwi Māori, the tangata whenua of Aotearoa, and the British Crown acting on behalf of present and future non-Maori settlers. Te Tiriti o Waitangi can be seen as “the shared touchstone and starting point of ‘official’ Māori/Pākehā interaction” (Jackson, 1992f, p. 40). The word “Pākehā” appears in the preamble of the Māori version of the treaty, to describe Europeans living in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Walker, 1990, p.290).

²¹ Taonga are anything highly prized, including both tangibles such as land, or intangibles such as te reo Māori.

²² Taonga kātoa, as used in Te Tiriti, refers to everything of value to Māori.

Moana Jackson has suggested that restoration of the mana²³ of Te Tiriti, obscured by the past 160 odd years of colonisation, provides both a symbolic and practical framework for positive intervention, which should be based on three key precepts that should be understood in their Māori conceptualisations. They are “the tangata whenua status of Māori people; the partnership which the Treaty imposes upon them and the Crown, and the idea of biculturalism which grows out of it” (Jackson, 1992f, p. 41). Jackson explains that:

To the Māori people the partnership of the Treaty developed from the tangata whenua status itself, and from the rangatiratanga or authority which that gave them to establish an equal relationship with Pākehā. The Treaty was the tangible recognition of that relationship, and its terms were the framework within which it was to develop (Jackson, 1992f, p. 41).

Biculturalism, then, arises from the partnership between the treaty signatories of Māori and the British Crown (Williams, 2000, p. 4), and by extension the descendants of the Crown, that is those of us who reside in this country because we, or our ancestors, entered under Crown immigration policies that legitimise our presence. According to sociologist Paul Spoonley (1988) the partnership suggested by biculturalism “relies upon resolving the grievances which have arisen since 1840” and “requires the negotiation of an equitable relationship between Māori and Pākehā” which will require the implementation of anti-racist strategies (Spoonley, 1988, p. 45).

1.1.2 “Pākehā” or “Tuiwi”²⁴ as Treaty Partners?

It has been suggested that the term ‘non-Māori’ is appropriate to describe those on the Crown side of the treaty, since it serves to “normalise Māori as being the centre of things rather than on the periphery” (Parata, 1995, p. 39). I consider, however, that being viewed as a ‘non’-person is unhelpful to anyone’s sense of identity, and that

²³ Mana means “authority, control... Influence, prestige, power... Psychic force... Effectual, binding, authoritative... Having influence or power ...Vested with effective authority... Be effectual, take effect... Be avenged...” (Williams, 1992, p172).

²⁴ Tuiwi is a term for a strange tribe or foreign peoples.

‘Pākehā’ is an appropriate term to describe New Zealand citizens of European ancestry. The fact that it is a Māori term is important in that it signifies a relationship with Māori, and a positioning alongside of Māori. It also differentiates Pākehā as being of Aotearoa/New Zealand, rather than of Europe, which is certainly more accurate for those of us who are the descendants of people who immigrated here many generations previously.

The use of the term ‘Tuiwi’ is sometimes used to refer to all non-Māori resident in Aotearoa/New Zealand, which includes alongside Pākehā the diversity of people who have immigrated to New Zealand under Crown policies. However, Michael King (1999; 2000) considers that Pākehā have been here long enough to now no longer be seen as an “outsider” culture to this country, which makes the term ‘Tuiwi’ with this outsider connotation, seem a little inappropriate when used to refer to Pākehā. In this document, I use ‘Tuiwi’ to refer to non-Māori other than Pākehā.

‘Māori’ is a construction of colonisation. Prior to contact with Europeans, ‘māori’ meant simply ‘ordinary’ and Māori individuals identified not as Māori, but with their hapū and iwi (Kawharu, 1992). It is ironic that as a result of colonisation, to be ‘ordinary’ or ‘normal’ in this country now means to be part of the dominant Pākehā mainstream (Mead, 1996).

The historian Claudia Orange (1988) has pointed out that since Pākehā have been the chief beneficiaries of the treaty and the subsequent actions of our settler forbears, it behoves us to find out about Māori perspectives on Te Tiriti (1988, p. 20). Reassessing the historic record of Crown breaches of the treaty and the consequences for Māori, she believes, “provides both a guide for understanding the present and a justification for changing it” (Orange, 1987, p. 254).

1.1.3 Tino Rangatiratanga as a Key Tiriti Commitment

Rangatiratanga can be defined as the right of political authority that enables Māori to exercise self-determination in relation to people and resources (Jackson, 1992c, p. 175). Rangatira were the chiefly class in traditional Māori society. Chiefly power, although inherited, could only be maintained or increased through wise judgement that benefited the people of that hapū/iwi (Walker, 1990, p. 65). Rangatiratanga has been defined by Sir James Henare (cited in Jackson, 1992e, p. 5) as authority over the Māori way of life. Rangatiratanga refers to the exercise of chieftainship, in order to sustain the wellbeing of all those individuals who formed part of the collective for whom the chief or chiefs were responsible. This wellbeing could only be provided for if the necessary resources were protected and available to sustain the hapū or iwi, and the mechanism of chiefly hierarchy provided the structure and authority to enable this sustenance to remain viable. Rangatiratanga is therefore about not only the management of resources, but also the right and responsibility to care for the people concerned (Jackson, 1997, p. 18).

Te Tiriti o Waitangi guaranteed Māori self-determination through its recognition of rangatiratanga (Article Two) and ritenga (Article Four) (Jackson, 1992a, p. 44). The phrase “te tino rangatiratanga” was used in Article Two of the Māori version of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, reassuring the chiefs who were potential signatories that their absolute (tino) authority would remain with them after they had acceded to the treaty. An explanation of tino rangatiratanga is that it means Māori “controlling their own resources and having complete control of protecting their own language and culture” (Goodall, 1995, p. 135). Mason Durie (1998), Professor of Māori Studies at Massey University, Palmerston North, has explained that many Māori utilise the term tino rangatiratanga to convey “the message of Māori autonomy and control” (1998, p. 219).

Contemporary constructions are often grounded in traditional understandings. In the 1880s, Te Ataria described rangatiratanga as the power to determine life or death

(cited in Jackson, 1992e, p. 5). Community organiser Mike Smith's understanding of tino rangatiratanga was sourced from his tribal wānanga²⁵. He considers that traditionally,

Tino rangatiratanga was authority based on mana and there were three different concepts of mana – mana atua, mana tangata, and mana whenua. Mana atua is about cosmic principles and spirituality, mana tangata is about politics and how people organise themselves, and mana whenua is about territorial control of the land and economic development. . . [Tino rangatiratanga] is a means to set priorities for society's values, to decide how people live up to those values and how resources are used to sustain those values. It offers a kaupapa²⁶ for living, and it is not an end in itself but a process. . . Those mana atua principles and values dictate for us our fundamental kaupapa (M. Smith, 1995, p. 101-102).

Tino rangatiratanga can be manifest in terms of territorial, political, or cultural sovereignty (Parata, 1995, p. 39). Hekia Parata, former General Manager, Policy, at Te Puni Kōkiri, the Ministry of Māori Development, describes cultural sovereignty as "ownership and control of those characteristics which reflect your culture and keep it alive - like language, value systems and institutions such as the marae²⁷ and the whānau" (Parata, 1995, p. 39).

Tino rangatiratanga operates at various levels. Traditionally it resided in the chiefs, or rangatira of individual iwi and hapū. More recently it has been featured at "a higher level of rangatiratanga where one has to consider the needs and rights of all tribes and all Māori" (Goodall, 1995, p. 134). Jenny Te Paa (1995, p. 173), Ahorangi (Dean) of Te Rau Kahikatea, the Māori Theological College at St John's Theological College in Auckland, considers that contemporary understandings of terms such as tino rangatiratanga are worthy of further exploration in their current contexts. For example, the recent Waitangi Tribunal²⁸ Napier Hospital and Health Services Report

²⁵ Wānanga refers to traditional tribal lore, and situations for learning this.

²⁶ A kaupapa is a philosophical paradigm.

²⁷ The marae is the courtyard in front of the whareniui, or main meeting house.

²⁸ The Waitangi Tribunal is a Government Commission which investigates Māori grievances stemming from breaches of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi.

considers “that the active protection of rangatiratanga over possessions implies that the ability of Māori leaders *to promote the wellbeing of their people*, including their care and welfare, will also be protected” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2001, p. xxvi). This indicates that the concept of rangatiratanga as the exercise of chiefly authority in order to ensure wellbeing of tribal members is one which has been consistent over time, and despite the obstructions generated by British colonisation and a settler government which disregarded its obligations to sustain tino rangatiratanga as guaranteed in Te Tiriti o Waitangi. As Moana Jackson has stated:

The exercise of the right of rangatiratanga over people, resources and things Māori depends upon the retention of the power or sovereignty to determine how that right will be exercised (Jackson, 1992a, p. 44).

Unfortunately, successive governments have continually promulgated legislation and policies that have comprehensively diminished this right, and in refusing to recognise Māori aspirations for self-determination, have assumed control over Māori to the detriment of their wellbeing (Jackson, 1992a). The negative status of te reo Māori, the history of poor Māori educational achievement, and other negative social statistics achieved throughout the past 162 years of Crown dominance, lend support to the view that:

A theory of tino rangatiratanga presumes that Māori collectivities and individuals will be better served by processes and structures which reflect Māori priorities as decided by Māori (A. Durie, 1994, p. 113).

In summary, tino rangatiratanga can be translated as self-determination by Māori over traditional resources and taonga such as te reo, applying also to contemporary policy making with regard to Māori rights and wellbeing (Durie, 1995).

1.2 Impact of Education Policy for Māori: Assimilation and Language Loss

Traditionally Māori children were respected and cherished, since the future wellbeing of the hapū/tribe depended on their being nurtured to a healthy competent adulthood. The whānau unit served as the primary socialising milieu. Often it was the

grandparental generation that took on the day-to-day role of caring for and educating the mokopuna²⁹ (Pere, 1982), and children were treated with affection and kindness (Belich, 1996, p. 105; Salmond, 1991, p. 422). Traditionally, according to Hine Potaka (1995):

For the Māori child there was always someone other than the mother to grow up with. They lived in the warmth of a family-oriented world. Children were to cuddle and carry on one's back, to play with and spend one's time with. They were the future generation and so the learning skills were initiated very early in life. The language and with it the tikanga, coupled with Māori childrearing practices were developed naturally in the bosom of the family. Grandparents especially had a spiritual devotion and a warmth of relationship with their grandchildren (Potaka, 1995, p. 6).

Since the early contact period, Māori have been wary of the supposed 'benefits' to be obtained by their children from the state education system. The system was convinced that the English language was one of those benefits. With the 1847 Education Ordinance Governor Grey had sought a resolution to the 'Māori problem' by removing Māori children from "the demoralising influences of their villages" and thus "speedily assimilating the Māori to the habits and usages of the European" (Walker, 1990, p. 146). This policy ignored Māori reluctance to have their children removed from their homes, and also took the power away from Māori to determine what education they considered appropriate for their own children. These 'habits and usages of the European' unfortunately included physical punishment of young children. Many Māori were initially repelled by the brutality of the Pākehā disciplinarians, and even took steps to remove their children from these schools (L. T. Smith, 1995, p. 9).

The 1880 Native Schools Code was drawn up by James Pope, Inspector of Native Schools, who described the Māori language as an anachronism. It was assumed that the Māori were "destined for extinction" (Belich, 2001, p. 191), and that consequently their language and culture would fade away. Te reo Māori could be

²⁹ Mokopuna are grandchildren.

used with new entrants as a transition measure, although Rule 11.3 of the code stated that “The aim of the teacher, ... should be to dispense with the use of Māori as soon as possible” (cited by Nairn, c1986, p. 3).

In 1900, over 90% of Māori new entrants spoke Māori as their first language. In 1905, the Inspector of Native Schools issued an instruction that resulted in the punishment of children for speaking Māori for the next fifty years. The salience of messages such as this is evident in that by 1960 only 26% of young Māori children were fluent in their own language (Walker, 1990, p. 147). The loss of their language had implications for Māori children’s ability to access discourses that afforded them a positive sense of identity, since “Te reo Māori serves as the medium through which symbolic and cultural components are properly united and Māoriness most appropriately expressed” (A. Durie, 1997, p. 152).

Until 1940, 90% of the Māori population was rurally based (Walker, 1990, p. 197). By 1966, this had reversed to the point that over 70% were now domiciled in urban settings (Smith, 1997, p.6), and by 1986 Māori urbanisation had reached 83%, a complete inversion over a half-century time-frame (Belich, 2001, p. 471-2). The urbanisation of the post-World War Two era led to depopulation of traditional tribal areas, as Māori were encouraged into industry, attracted by wages, and settled through the assimilative official ‘pepper-potting’ policy, where Māori families were placed alongside Pākehā homes within state housing blocks on the margins of the growing towns and cities (Walker, 1990, p. 198).

Urbanisation was traumatic for many Māori (Belich, 2001, p. 473). Graham Hingangaroa Smith has written that the “cultural shock” experienced by Māori families shifting into the cities was replicated in schools and other education settings (Smith, 1997, p. 434):

The high and disproportionate levels of underachievement being experienced by Māori reflected the wider social dysfunction in the urban environment; in poorer health, higher criminal offending, disproportionate welfare

dependency, and lower incomes . . . At school Māori educational underachievement was likely to be interpreted as the fault of the Māori child and the debilitating effect of their cultural baggage which translated into a number of key deficits when they were inevitable compared to the relatively more successful Pākehā children (Smith, 1997, p. 434).

Māori children faced the challenges of growing up in isolated nuclear families without the support of the extended whānau that they would have experienced in a rural marae-based setting, which would also have included greater exposure to Māori speaking models. Māori children were unwitting victims of the deliberate government policy of ‘assimilation’, nominally revised to ‘integration’ after the Hunn Report of 1961 and the disestablishment of Native Schools by 1969 (Belich, 2001, p. 477). Although undoubtedly assimilationist in intent, the Native Schools had also been a site of struggle and resistance by Māori, through which, in the most positive scenarios, aspects such as close relations between school and marae, innovative pedagogy, permeation of a whānau environment, and encouragement of Māori identity and arts, though not language, had provided some positive benefits for tamariki³⁰ (Belich, 2001, p. 203; Simon & Smith, 2001). Native Schools overall appear to have been better academically for Māori children than regular state schooling, and were a factor in sustaining Māori identity and ensuring cultural continuity although not the Māori language (Belich, 2001, p. 204).

In 1986 the Waitangi Tribunal reported its findings on a claim regarding the Māori language. In their report they rejected the colonial attitude that has been widely held within the State education system that “the natural abandonment of the native tongue involves no loss to the Māori” (Jackson, 1931 cited in Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 37). They pointed out that “The Crown has failed to protect the Māori language as required by Article II of the Treaty” (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 49). This failure was linked to the general failure of the State to deliver educational success to Māori:

The education system in New Zealand is operating unsuccessfully because too many Māori children are not reaching an acceptable standard of education. . .

³⁰ Tamariki are children.

Their language is not adequately protected and their scholastic achievements fall far short of what they should be. The promises in the Treaty of Waitangi of equality in education as in all other human rights are undeniable. Judged by the system's own standards Māori children are not being successfully taught, and for this reason alone, quite apart from a duty to protect the Māori language, the education system is being operated in breach of the Treaty (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 38).

The Waitangi Tribunal thus confirmed that the Māori language (te reo Māori) is unique to Aotearoa/New Zealand. It is a *taonga* that should have been protected by the government and its agencies, including the education system, under the guarantees stipulated in Article Two of Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 49).

Successive education policies imposing the English language, and the dislocation resulting from urbanisation, have resulted in several generations of Māori who are monolingual speakers of English. Despite recent, and largely token official status granted to te reo Māori, English is the predominate language in Aotearoa/New Zealand, and very few non-Māori speak Māori. In a major survey published in 1998 only 2.4% of adult Māori considered themselves to be very fluent in the Māori language (Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development, 1998b, p. 34). The 2001 national census painted a slightly more optimistic picture. In this census 9% of the population reported that they can speak Māori well or very well, and another 36% have some Māori language skills (Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Maori Development, 2001a). These indications of an upward trend in Māori usage are probably due to the impact of Kōhanga Reo, a recent language revitalisation movement which focuses on intergenerational transmission of the language. However, te reo Māori is still used in only a restricted range of domains, such as religious and educational settings. Te reo Māori continues to be under threat, due to the salience of English both nationally and globally (Crawford, 1992; Phillipson, 1986, 1988, 1992). The implications for the Māori culture are also grave, since the language is the main medium through which Māori culture is expressed (Waite, 1992, p. 18). As a result of colonialist educational

policies, “Māori faces a serious threat to its future as the distinctive vehicle of a distinctive culture” (Waite, 1992, p. 30).

With the assumption of sovereignty by the Crown came denial of tino rangatiratanga, and the right for Māori to define and deliver on their aspirations. Assimilationist education policies were derived from racist ideology and served to exclude Māori from decision-making power within structures such as the education system (Simon, 1989, p. 25). The Māori language was seen as inadequate since it did not include words for concepts outside of Māori cultural experience, although the same standard could have been applied to English, which did not contain words for Māori concepts such as tapu³¹, mana, or marae (Ballara, 1986, p. 94). As the Māori language came under threat, so did the cultural values that it defined. Māori epistemologies and cosmologies, encapsulated within the language, were devalued by the colonisation process (Bishop, 1996, p. 14). As Mason Durie has written, “Māori learners were subjected to newly constructed myths and legends of colonial presence which presumed European superiority and denigrated Māori” (A. Durie, 1997, p.153). The European colonisers confidently believed that their culture represented the highest level of achievement and that this justified the assimilation or destruction of ‘inferior’ ethnic groups such as Māori through the imposition of their social institutions (Ballara, 1986, p. 5, p. 17). As Angela Ballara has written:

The confrontation between two sets of values took place upon terms which became increasingly unequal as one culture’s economy obtained a stranglehold over the other through political control, military power and bureaucratic smothering (Ballara, 1986, p. 168).

Simultaneous with this economic domination and marginalisation of Māori by Pākehā was cultural and linguistic domination, and an ongoing denial of the racism that underlies this (Ballara, 1986, p. 168-9).

³¹ Tapu means “Under religious or superstitious restriction... Beyond one’s power, inaccessible... Sacred... Ceremonial restriction...” (Williams, 1992, p. 385).

1.2.1 Language, Culture and Identity

Language is intrinsic to culture (Crawford, 1992, p. 248). Language provides the means by which young children are enculturated into the meanings of their people.

As Rangimarie Rose Pere (1991) has written:

Language is the life line and sustenance of a culture. It provides the tentacles that can enable a child to link up with everything in his or her world. It is one of the most important forms of empowerment that a child can have. Language is not only a form of communication but it helps transmit the values and beliefs of a people.... [Language] enshrines the ethos, the life principle of a people. It helps give sustenance to the heart, mind, spirit, and psyche. It is paramount. (Pere, 1991, p. 9-10).

Early childhood educators play a significant role in young children's lives during the period of 'readiness' for the learning of languages. As Antonia Darder writes: "It is critical that educators realise the role language plays as one of the most powerful transmitters of culture; as such it is crucial to the survival of a cultural community" (Darder, 1991, p. 37). Kath Irwin (1993) has written that:

Educationists know that the relationship between language and culture lies at the very heart of humanity. We become human through the learning of our culture. Our culture is expressed through the many forms our languages take. This is a given in any society, or it is not a human society. And it is education that enables this knowledge to be passed from generation to generation, maintaining links with tradition and developing, continually changing to ensure relevance in any times. Plural societies like ours... have far more complex educational tasks to face if every child is to have an equal right to language and cultural maintenance. (Irwin, 1993, p. 146).

Language and culture are intimately connected to cultural identity (Siraj-Blatchford, 1995). The Māori language is the medium which enables Māori epistemology to be expressed (Tau, 2001, p. 67). Tamati Reedy has stated that "it is inconceivable that Māori people can retain any measure of [their] identity without the language" (cited in Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, p. 43).

1.2.2 Revitalisation of Te Reo Māori

Despite the impact of colonisation on te reo Māori, revitalisation of the language is a viable and worthwhile endeavour (Nicholson & Garland, 1991; Spolsky, 1989). Destruction of a language is destruction of identity, according to Joshua Fishman (1991, p. 4). A language should not be viewed as having value only to those who speak it, but can instead be viewed as a resource for all of humanity. According to Colin Baker (1995), in the same way that rain forests and whales have become the focus of environmental protection, endangered languages “should be protected and promoted to effect revival and reversal” (Baker, 1995, p. 1). Any language should be safeguarded for its unique contribution to language diversity, as a source “of adaptational ideas - ideas about transferring property..., or about curing illness, acquiring food, raising children, distributing power, settling disputes” (Bernard, 1991, p. 2, cited in Waite, 1992, p. 33).

Revitalisation of Māori can be seen as multi-advantageous in that it will result in: a stronger sense of identity for Māori people; the sustenance of Māori cultural practices; the enhancement of a language that is unique to Aotearoa/New Zealand and is reflected in the relationship Māori have with their land and landmarks; bilingualism and biculturalism leading to an improvement on the part of non-Māori in their understanding of Māori people and their culture; the cognitive, social, emotional and imaginative benefits of bilingualism; international recognition for te ao Māori, vocational and other personal satisfactions as benefits for bilingual individuals, and the fulfillment of Tiriti obligations (Hirsh & Scott, 1990, p. 54-56).

Although Māori see the revitalisation of their language as paramount (Waite, 1992, p. 30), it is a difficult step for most Māori, who are first-language English speakers, to transfer to speaking te reo Māori when they are already able to use English for most life-purposes (Fishman, 1991, p. 237). Loss of language and lands, has been accompanied by a decline in Māori custom and lifestyle, and a further related effect of colonisation which is:

an intergenerational discontinuity where knowledgeable elders have not always considered members of the next generation to have the necessary qualities to succeed them as repositories of knowledge of high value (A. Durie, 1997, p. 154).

Joshua Fishman has theorised what he terms “reversing language shift”, the processes whereby minority groups struggle to maintain their languages (Fishman, 1990, 1991).

For Fishman, reversing language shift

is a peculiarly and admirably human endeavour after all is said and done, an endeavour to build life, to attain an ideal of cultural democracy and justice, to meet felt responsibilities *vis-à-vis* one’s identity, to behaviourally implement the traditions to which one subscribes, [and] to safeguard and activate perceived cultural imperatives and sanctities...(Fishman, 1990, p. 32).

Fishman (Fishman, 1990, 1991) has identified eight stages in his “Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale for Threatened Languages”:

- Stage Eight, is when the language is seriously threatened due to the fact that there are few remaining speakers;
- Stage Seven is where the minority language is used only by elders particularly in traditional rituals;
- Stage Six is when the language is passed on through intergenerational continuity at the level of family, neighbourhood and community;
- Stage Five involves formal linguistic socialization focusing on literacy in the minority language;
- Stage Four involves formal compulsory education in the medium of the language;
- Stage Three involves extending the use of the language into the worksphere;
- Stage Two is the use of the language in lower government services and local mass media; and
- Stage One is when cultural autonomy is realised by extending use of the language into higher education, central government, and throughout national media (Fishman, 1990, p. 18-28).

Reversing language shift is not an easy task (Fishman, 1990). Fishman considers that it is important that language revitalisation efforts “must attempt to do a few crucial things well and early” (1990, p.32), and that persistence is a key feature of change processes to reverse language shift (p. 11). A key stage in Fishman’s scale is that of stage six, “the crucial, pivotal stage for the survival of the language, when it is used between grandparents, parents and children” (Baker, 1995, p. 3). Fishman (1991) considers that there is potential for utilising intergenerational ethnolinguistic continuity by maximising opportunities for the older generation of fluent speakers to pass on their language through “richly traditional Māori-language related daily rounds of life and ritual occasions” (1991, p. 236). Childrearing and the care and education of young children can be seen as a key site for this cultural transmission. Kōhanga Reo, a Māori language revitalisation movement focusing on the early childhood period, is one such forum, in that Māori language is the medium and goal of the programme, much like the early Hebrew “preparatories” which played a key role in Hebrew revitalisation (Nahir, 1988). Kōhanga Reo arose out of the realisation that state education policies had failed to protect the Māori language (Barrett-Douglas, 1989; Irwin, 1990; Ka’ai-Oldman, 1988).

Another particularly significant stage in his theory is that of stage five, which focuses on establishing literacy in the target language (Baker, 1995, p. 2). This occurs through “formal linguistic socialization” whereby young potential speakers of the target language are exposed to more formal varieties, of the language, beyond what may be available in the home (Fishman, 1990, p. 21). State funded education settings, including the early childhood sector, have a key role to play in ensuring the ongoing viability of te reo Māori (Baker, 1995; Nicholson & Garland, 1991; Waite, 1992), since “What is crucial is that early childhood and teenage socialization is enacted in the minority language and culture” (Baker, 1995, p. 3). Early childhood centres also have the potential to contribute to the neighbourhood and community building efforts, and intergenerational continuity also identified by Fishman as a crucial feature of reversing language shift (Fishman, 1990, p 28).

1.2.3 Tino Rangatiratanga and Te Reo Māori

The small pool of fluent speakers, and even smaller number of Māori speakers who are qualified teachers, indicates that institutional support is needed in the revitalisation efforts (Waite, 1992, p. 32, 39). Yet Māori are wary of initiatives which are not Māori-controlled (Waite, 1992, p. 34), since experience has taught them that it is only when they are able to exercise their tino rangatiratanga (self-determination), that their language will be validated and sustained.

Kōhanga Reo is an example of this principle - a movement initiated and run by Māori who identified their needs, and then endeavoured to maintain a degree of autonomy, whilst seeking government funding to support their aspirations. Beginning as a pilot project under the auspices of the Māori Affairs Department in 1981, by 1993, 49.2% of Māori early childhood enrolments were in Kōhanga Reo (Ministry of Education, 1994a, p. 24). In 1998 the movement supported 613 individual Kōhanga Reo centres (Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development, 1999, p. 7), and 40% of Māori children who were enrolled in early childhood centres attended Kōhanga Reo, although the 11,980 enrolments represented a drop of 10% from the previous year's figure of 13,353 (Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development, 2001b). Recent figures confirm that Kōhanga Reo attendance continues to drop, quite markedly. The current Minister of Education, Trevor Mallard recently reported that 35% of Māori pre-school children attended Kōhanga Reo in the year 2000, compared with 46.3% in 1996 (cited in Gifford, 2002, p. 3). This decline in Kōhanga Reo attendance has serious implications in terms of the percentage of Māori speaking children needed to sustain the language within that generation and into the future (Hohepa cited in Gifford, 2002, p. 3).

The threat to Māori language is not the only result of 155 years of assimilationist education policies. The Ministry of Education has confirmed that Māori continue to be disadvantaged by the mainstream education system (Ministry of Education, 1994a, p. 6). Despite the development of Māori medium early childhood education, 1993

statistics demonstrate that in fact a majority (50.7%) of Māori children who were enrolled in early childhood education programmes attended mainstream early childhood settings. This total percentage comes from adding the attendance in kindergartens (22.6%), Playcentres (6.2%), child-care centres (14.9%), home-based services (2.0%) and funded playgroups (4.5%) (Ministry of Education, 1994b, p. 14). In 1996, although 46.3% of Māori children who attended an early childhood service were participating in Kōhanga Reo, 21.6% were at kindergartens, and 19.3% were in childcare (Statistics New Zealand, 2002).

Surveys of Māori families have indicated that even those who send their children to mainstream early childhood centres and schools, rather than to Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa³², still want their children to learn their language and expect that their children will have opportunities for this within that educational setting (AGB/McNair, 1992; Durie, 2001; Else, 1997; Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development, 1998a, 1998b).

The fact that many whānau Māori³³ continue to take their tamariki to mainstream settings yet still feel strongly that their children should learn their language and culture, reinforces the need for all early childhood educators and the early childhood curriculum to deliver appropriate Māori content to these children - it cannot be left to Kōhanga Reo alone (Barrett-Douglas, 1989, p. 65).

1.2.4 Whanaungatanga and Te Reo

By the end of the 1930s, Māori had recognised the “subversive action of the education system on Māori language and culture” (Walker, 1982, p. 87). Judith Simon and Linda Tuhiwai Smith state that by 1969, Māori had sufficient experience in both Native and Public Schools to have come to expect that the education system

³² Kura Kaupapa are schools which are based on Kaupapa Māori, or Māori philosophy, and teach through the medium of te reo Māori, following a document called Te Aho Matua as their philosophical guide (Smith, 1997).

³³ Whānau Māori are Māori families.

should meet their needs, rather than continue to pursue an agenda of assimilation (Simon & Smith, 2001, P. 308). This experience eventually led them to “initiate transforming action that diverted education away from its avowed assimilationist purpose to the recognition of biculturalism” (Walker, 1982, p. 87). The Kōhanga Reo movement can be seen as a response by Māori to the failure of the State to adhere to the guarantees in the Tiriti of protection of taonga Māori, and in particular te reo Māori. The growth of the Kōhanga Reo movement reflects the commitment of Māori to tino rangatiratanga and to te reo me ōna tikanga. From the Kōhanga movement has emerged Kura Kaupapa Māori, the continuation of the commitment to a philosophically Māori learning environment, immersed in te reo me ngā tikanga Māori into the primary school years.

In his study of whakapapa³⁴-based whānau, Paul Hirini (1997) found that within his mainly Hawkes Bay-based sample of 12 informants:

All whānau used and promoted the learning of the Māori language and culture within their networks. Members actively learned the language either inside or outside the whānau structure. All had children attending te Kōhanga Reo, some also had children attending Kura Kaupapa or Māori boarding schools (Hirini, 1997, p. 48).

Kath Irwin and Lisa Davies have pointed out the huge investment by Māori families in kaupapa Māori³⁵ education:

The whānau of children in Kōhanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa Māori, immersion, and bilingual programmes are involved in hours and hours of work which is *aimed* at a fundamentally different level of involvement than is normally the case in other programmes of mainstream schooling or early childhood provision (Irwin & Davies, 1994, p. 80).

They point out that “Whānau strength, exercised through Māori processes and working collectively has been most effective” (Irwin & Davies, 1994, p.103). Māori have mobilised around the issue of preserving for their children the taonga of te reo

³⁴ Whakapapa is genealogy.

³⁵ Kaupapa Māori education refers to education based on Māori philosophy, and taught through the medium of te reo Māori.

me ōna tikanga. They write that “Whānau have been engaged in substantial educational functions, far more complex and comprehensive in the education of their members, than has hitherto been accounted for in theoretical explanations of the role of the family in education provision” (Irwin & Davies, 1994, p.105).

In his theorising of kaupapa Māori as a ‘philosophy of social transformation’ Graham Smith (G. H. Smith, 1995) has identified the concept of whānau as being pivotal to this process. Smith considers that:

Whānau as a key intervention element within Kaupapa Māori is able to make sense of and mediate the intricate and complex, (at times contradictory), discourses which envelop Māori people attempting to maintain the viability and the legitimacy of their traditional cultural foundations in the confusing societal context created by the unequal power relations between Pākehā and Māori (G. H. Smith, 1995, p. 22-23).

In the modern urban settings of many Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa, it is not just the traditionally based kinship structure of whānau that is significant. Māori “values, practices and customs involved at the social relations level of whānau practice” in the modern reconstructions of whānau include core values such as manaakitanga (sharing and caring), aroha (respect), whakaiti (humility), and supporting the relationships between tuakana and teina (older siblings and younger siblings) (G. H. Smith, 1995, p. 33).

The centrality of the role of the whānau within kaupapa Māori education is a key element in supporting the following positive aspects, as identified by Graham Hingangaroa Smith (1995):

- A holistic approach
- The confrontation of structural and cultural elements
- The affirmation of the validity and legitimacy of Māori language, knowledge and culture
- An assertion of self development as a positive initiative
- Increased Māori autonomy over key decision making

- The endorsement of a Māori preferred pedagogy
- An ability to mediate socio-economic impediments (G. H. Smith, 1995, p. 34).

Since within kaupapa Māori education, “Māori knowledge, oral histories, cultural forms and practices are validated and legitimated as part of the ordinary, everyday curriculum and pedagogy” (G. H. Smith, 1995, p. 34), this provides a closer match of “cultural capital” between the home and educational settings for Māori children (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 30).

Smith sees the involvement of Māori families in these kaupapa Māori education whānau structures as having “been very successful in undoing much of the deep-seated mistrust that many Māori parents themselves have had of the Pākehā education system” as the result of previous negative schooling experiences (G. H. Smith, 1995, p. 31). Smith considers that not only is this revitalisation of the whānau structure a promising intervention in reversing the educational underachievement of Māori, but that it is fundamentally linked to the survival of Māori language, knowledge, and culture.

1.3 Aotearoa/New Zealand: a bicultural paradigm?

This study is positioned in relation to the historical context of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the resultant colonisation process which involved a repositioning of Māori, who had been formerly dominant in their land, to one of marginalised subordination to the dominant mainstream ‘Pākehā’ culture. The two key treaty ‘partners’, Māori and the Crown, form the basis for the notion of a ‘bicultural’ focus for a transformative agenda which aims to generate positive outcomes for Māori aimed at redressing the imbalances caused through colonisation. The following sections (1.3.1 to 1.3.4) expand upon this focus of bicultural development as the paradigm for this study.

1.3.1 'Biculturalisms'

Biculturalism in Aotearoa/New Zealand is a recognition that there are two major cultures in this country, Māori and Pākehā (J. E. Ritchie, 1995, p. 1; Walker, 1987, p. 221). Biculturalism can also be seen to reflect the relationship between indigenous Māori and colonisers of European descent (Walker, 1987, p. 221). A bicultural paradigm reflects the partnership inherent in Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi. As Ranginui Walker has written, "From a Māori perspective, the Treaty of Waitangi can be interpreted as a charter for biculturalism" (Walker, c1987, p. 4). Biculturalism has been defined as the recognition of Māori as tangata whenua (indigenous people of Aotearoa) with the right, as enshrined in the Māori language version of the treaty, to their own language and cultural, political, and economic self-determination (Abbott & Durie, 1987; Sullivan, 1993). The notion of biculturalism is a challenge to Pākehā to acknowledge both the treaty and the concept of partnership inherent within it (Spoonley, 1990, p. 29). Enacting a bicultural future for Aotearoa/New Zealand, according to Walker, requires "transform[ing] monocultural institutions, which are inherently racist, to become bicultural", ensuring that Māori people are represented throughout all institutional structures and levels (Walker, c1987, p. 5).

Biculturalism became official government policy through the State Sector Act 1988, which resulted in guidelines being issued to all government departments instructing them on how to become bicultural (Kelsey, 1996, p. 185). The Act's "General Principles" in both sections 56 and 79 requires managers within Government Departments and the Education Service to be "good employers" (1988). This requires that they operate personnel policy which includes provisions requiring recognition of:

- (i) The aims and aspirations of the Māori people; and
- (ii) The employment aspirations of the Māori people; and
- (iii) The need for greater involvement of the Māori people in the Public and Education services (1988, sections 56 and 79)

There have been significant criticisms of 'biculturalism' as delivered through government policy. Jane Kelsey (1991) considered that biculturalism, as adopted by neo-colonial institutions, has been a "soft option which avoids addressing Māori self-determination" and instead has provided a "more culturally sensitive and saleable form of assimilation" (Kelsey, 1991, p. 44). This co-option of biculturalism ensures that ultimately, power remains in Pākehā hands, avoiding the implications of tino rangatiratanga, guaranteed in the Tiriti, and the structural change required to deliver this (Jackson, 1992e; Nairn, 1989). Moana Jackson has written that Pākehā politicians have redefined Māori political and philosophical aspirations, sourcing their authority through 'biculturalism', in a process he terms a 'bicultural rapprochement', which is still controlled by Pākehā. He believes that Pākehā are reluctant to relinquish this control, since the implications of acknowledging tino rangatiratanga in terms of major structural change are too threatening (Jackson, 1992b, 1992d).

Kelsey (1991) distinguished between this co-opted version of biculturalism, and what she terms "genuine biculturalism" (1991, p. 47). She pointed out that successive governments have demonstrated "their unwillingness and political inability to address the central issue, tino rangatiratanga or Māori independent authority over their resources and lives" (Kelsey, 1996, p. 198-199). The means for achieving the structural change that will deliver full expression of tino rangatiratanga continue to be problematic, since they require the mainstream to relinquish its tight control of the legislative power and economic resources of this country (Culpitt, 1994). Sullivan (1993) considered that 'biculturalism' also implies partnership between Māori and Pākehā, and a concern for redressing past injustices and the re-empowerment of Māori.

Bicultural policy at the institutional level, would, in an ideal sense, recognise that for every mainstream value or practice there is a Māori equivalent, that would be given

equal consideration and validation, and be visible and accessible at all times (J. E. Ritchie, 1995, p. 1). Biculturalism can also be seen as policy being translated into processes and practices that can be identified by markers such as: the presence of Māori staff; comprehensive use of te reo Māori; and, especially, Māori representation at decision-making level (J. E. Ritchie, 1995).

‘Biculturalism’ is also used to refer to individual cultural competency in two cultural domains at the personal level (J. E. Ritchie, 1995). Antonia Darder has described biculturalism as “a process wherein individuals learn to function in two distinct sociocultural environments” (Darder, 1991, p. 48). According to Brenda Tahi, “most people understand it has something to do with being able to understand and use, but not necessarily adopt, the concepts, customs and practices of a culture other than one’s own” (Tahi, 1995, p. 62). She explains that for Māori, becoming bicultural has been a matter of necessity in order to survive within a Pākehā-dominated society. Māori have fulfilled this aspiration to the point that the integrity of their own culture has been threatened by their ‘successful’ acculturation (Tahi, 1995, p. 62).

‘Biculturalism’, as an education curriculum policy, was criticised by Graham Hingangaroa Smith, for channeling limited resources away from Māori towards meeting Pākehā needs, and perpetuating the exclusion of Māori from decision-making power (Smith, 1986, 1990). Smith considered that a ‘bicultural’ agenda could result in a confusing fusion of Māori and Pākehā cultures, with a corresponding erosion of the cultural boundaries that protect the uniqueness of tikanga Māori. This may be precipitated when the delivery of this content is in the hands of teachers who lack the specialist knowledge and understandings that would allow them to do this with authenticity (Smith, 1986). Priority should instead be placed on “preserving the uniqueness of Māori culture, redressing the cultural loss of Māori people, [and] developing and promoting appropriate attitudes throughout society that accept cultural diversity” (Smith, 1990, p. 189). According to Smith, “Once the protection and assurance of cultural survival has been addressed, issues such as the educating of

the Pākehā dominant group will be better able to proceed and will be more likely to succeed” (Smith, 1990, p. 189).

This indicates that Pākehā should not have access to Māori knowledge, unless Māori determine that this is appropriate (Hindmarsh, 1993, p. 35). The needs of Māori to ensure protection of Māori language and knowledge should be prioritised, and only once these needs are being adequately serviced, the needs of Pākehā can be addressed. Māori should also determine which knowledge they release into the ‘public domain’ and which remains the preserve of Māori only. In terms of a bicultural kaupapa³⁶ within mainstream education settings, major issues arise. The simplistic notion of an amalgam of identifiable features from each of the two key cultures has central problems of demarcation and definition. Educators need to be concerned with not only “What comes from each culture?” but also “Who decides?” (Bishop, 1996, p. 137), and we do not seem to have a clear process of “How do we work these things out?”

1.3.2 Bicultural Development

The term ‘bicultural development’ may be a more useful term than ‘biculturalism’ to describe a bicultural agenda for educational settings. “Bicultural development” (Metge, 1990, p. 18) is a social change process generated from a commitment to social justice and Te Tiriti o Waitangi/ the Treaty of Waitangi. The implication of ‘development’ is one of an on-going process of change toward an equitable bicultural society (Metge, 1990). According to the Royal Commission on Social Policy:

Bicultural development has been proffered as an important element of any programme which has as its objective the advancement of the social and economic status of Māori people. It is an option which derives from the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1987, p.14).

³⁶ Kaupapa is used here as a term for programme or philosophical framework.

Bicultural pedagogy can therefore be seen as a political process (Akinyela, 1991). The objectives of this process might include the restoration of tino rangatiratanga and the survival of Māori culture and language.

Māori reassertion of tino rangatiratanga, expressed in terms of parallel development, as in te Kōhanga Reo, has been considered by some Māori to be the only viable option to secure the survival of Māori language, culture and identity, and ensure justice for Māori (Awatere, 1984; Jackson, 1992b, 1992d). To this understanding, it is important that Pākehā accept the viability of parallel Māori systems, and advocate to ensure that they are adequately resourced. The presence of these Māori models, which are consistent with Article Two guarantees does not mean that Pākehā no longer have to create change within the existing systems, an obligation which extends from Article Three obligations to ensure equity to Māori (Waitangi Tribunal, 2001, p. xxvii). However, the nature of changes to support Māori aspirations must be determined by Māori (Ramsden, 1994a).

A primary goal of a bicultural development process is to develop in Pākehā a commitment to supporting Māori aspirations for tino rangatiratanga. The first step in this process is to acknowledge and combat a heritage of racist ideology. It is only from this point of awareness and commitment that Pākehā should have access to Māori cultural knowledge, and then only on Māori terms. Since Pākehā currently dominate and control political and educational processes, it is essential that they accept responsibility for the bicultural development process (Culpitt, 1994), whilst maintaining accountability to Māori.

1.3.3 Tiriti-based Partnership

There are both historical and contemporary perspectives which frame Te Tiriti/The Treaty as a 'partnership'. From a historical perspective, Lyndsay Head (2001, p. 110) believes that Māori conceptualisations of relationships were genealogical, and that on this basis, the treaty unified Māori and Pākehā as 'friends':

The unity of a notional shared genealogy which Māori offered Pākehā implied a shared culture. The tie that bound them into political kinship was aroha, 'love' in the sense of the warmth and duty of care owed to family. 'Ka nui toku aroha ki a koe', 'great is my love for you' was the commonest opening salutation in letters, whether to officials or family members...(Head, 2001, p.111).

During the period following the treaty signing, Māori sought to demonstrate their commitment to honour their side of the partnership through tangible displays of aroha towards Pākehā. Maori believed that the aroha they showed through sale of lands to Pākehā would be reciprocated by commensurate aroha from the Governor in the form of policies which would protect Māori interests (Head, 2001, p. 115). This view of the treaty as formalisation of a reciprocal relationship is supported by the words of Bishop Manuhuia Bennett (1989), who considered the treaty to signify much more than a written contract:

So then to say that the Treaty is always speaking, in the context of faith, is also to say that the Treaty is not only a contract between two parties, or a compact between two partners, or a covenant of good faith. It is indeed a statement of faith in itself and is the sign of covenant between Māori and Pākehā (Bennett, 1989, p. 36).

The treaty is therefore the basis for the implicit notion of 'partnership' (Culpitt, 1994; Durie, 1991), which is considered by many to be a recognised principle of Te Tiriti/The Treaty (Bishop & Glynn, 1999, p. 196; M. Durie, 1994; Durie, 1998, p. 29; Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1987, p. 19) (Waitangi Tribunal, 2001). The Waitangi Tribunal states that "The principle of partnership arises from one of the Treaty's basic objectives, that of creating the framework for two peoples to live together in one country (Waitangi Tribunal, 2001, p. xxvi). The Tribunal believes that partnership means:

- enabling *the Māori voice* to be heard;
- allowing *Māori perspectives* to influence the type of health services delivered to Māori and the way in which they are delivered;
- empowering *Māori to design and provide health services* for Māori; and
- presenting a *coherent and accountable* face in order to sustain a high-quality relationship with its Treaty partner (Waitangi Tribunal, 2001, p. xxvi) (italics in original).

The references here to health, from the Napier Hospital Report, could apply equally to other Crown provision such as education services (Jahnke, 1997a). Mason Durie considers the notion of Tiriti partnership to be a viable model for the nation:

Although partnership is difficult to define or to arrange, it has generated enough positive experiences to warrant continuing enthusiasm and a commitment to the principle, not only in negotiating durable solutions within already determined frameworks, but also in crafting national philosophies and substrates for broad policies, and eventually for a New Zealand constitution (Durie, 1998, p. 213).

Huia Jahnke points out that in the education context, “Partnership between Māori and the state assumes that Māori would be fully involved in decision-making and would have a shared responsibility to provide quality education” (Jahnke, 1997a, p. 109). Partnership, therefore, implies dual responsibility, and bicultural development is a response to the challenge for the Crown side to address this responsibility with regard to the Tiriti obligations:

Pākehā too must wrestle with the significance of the bicultural debate, not from a defensive position of crafting a response to an increasingly articulate Māori protest, but as an essential part of developing a nation based upon the acceptance of the tino rangatiratanga clause of the Treaty (Culpitt, 1994, p. 48).

This view is consistent with that of Sullivan (1993), who observes that as Māori are exercising their tino rangatiratanga and creating their own solutions to inequity and marginalisation, “Tauīwi must build their side of the partnership and address the historical and philosophical context of Aotearoa/New Zealand as it stands poised for the twenty-first century” (Sullivan, 1993, p. .216).

This Tiriti-based responsibility for Pākehā and Tauīwi is seen by Jane Kelsey as primarily one of working with other Pākehā to expose and challenge the processes of oppression and help reduce resistance to change. She cautions that “we must also understand that the path to liberation lies in the hands of the oppressed. Any role we may play as catalysts must occur within that parameter and on their terms” (Kelsey,

1989, p. 18). She suggests that Pākehā reassess their resistance, and instead “see the prospect of tino rangatiratanga as offering a positive alternative future” (Kelsey, 1989, p.19).

1.3.4 ‘Bicultural’ and/or ‘Multicultural’ Education as the Aspiration?

The bicultural development stance being utilised in this study is one which seeks to be culturally inclusive and to recognise the plurality of cultures which co-exist in Aotearoa/New Zealand, whilst giving acknowledgement of the primacy of Māori as tangata whenua (Sullivan, 1993, p. 195; Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 138), as the first people of this land. Māori language and culture can only be sustained in Aotearoa, this is its homeland. Within te ao Māori³⁷ there exists a diversity of tribal and hapū sub-cultures and dialects, and this is also true for the other side of the Tiriti partnership, in that Crown immigration policies have enabled emigrants from many different countries to make this country their new home (Prasad, 1996, p. 6).

Although the situation of bicultural development here in Aotearoa/New Zealand is unique, there is much of value to be gained from studying the literature from overseas that frames discussion of linguistic and cultural issues within a discourse of ‘multiculturalism’ or ‘cultural diversity’. These issues of cultural diversity are subsumed within the discourse of bicultural development. It is important that this commitment to a culturally inclusive bicultural development paradigm be the focus for this country, rather than adopting a purely ‘multicultural’ stance which fails to recognise the unique status of Māori in this country, the historical and political context of the current demographics and economic positionings, and issues of cultural and linguistic survival for Māori. A ‘level-playing field’ multicultural attitude to issues of cultural rights could be used to subordinate issues pertaining to Māori Tiriti-based rights within a discourse in which Māori become just another ‘ethnic minority’

³⁷ Te ao Māori is the Māori world or worldview.

within their own country (Ramsden & Spoonley, 1993, p. 164; Sullivan, 1993, p. 196; Walker, 1987, p. 221; Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 138).

1.4 Early Childhood Education and Cultural Responsiveness

The early childhood care and education sector in Aotearoa/New Zealand is one that has developed largely outside of the compulsory state education provision. The various different services have arisen in response to needs identified by communities to create better support for families with young children and appropriate educational processes for these children. These community-based initiatives have been sustained because they continue to meet the needs of families for support in the care and education of their young children. They have often maintained a strong sense of autonomy, particularly in the case of Playcentre and Kōhanga Reo. These background factors may contribute to the sector's history of responsiveness to changes regarding issues pertaining to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the recognition of the importance of cultural consistency in the care and education of young children.

The current Ministry of Education Statement of Desirable Objectives and practices contains the requirement that early childhood management and educators implement policies, objectives and practices that are inclusive, equitable and culturally appropriate (Ministry of Education, 1996a). The concept of culturally appropriate early childhood education has resonance with other similar pedagogical conceptualisations such as: culturally relevant pedagogy (Bartolome, 1994; Bowman, 1991; Darder, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1995; O'Loughlin, 1995b; Troyna, 1993); culturally responsive pedagogy (Osborne, 1991); culturally sensitive approaches (Gonzalez-Mena, 1992; Mangione, Lally, & Singer, 1993); culturally consistent and inclusive programs (Booze, Greer, & Derman-Sparks, 1996); culturally congruent critical pedagogy (Hyun, 1998); and educationally effective cultural compatibility (Jordan, 1985; Jordan, 1995).

These variations of the concept of culturally relevant pedagogy do, at least in principle, reflect the need to position culture as central to learning (Carr, 1993). Implementation of programmes which reflect a commitment to cultural relevance draw upon anthropological and ethnographic paradigms, which place culture as central to learning, and responsibility on the part of educators to enable students to maintain cultural integrity in their learning processes (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 160). The following sections (1.4.1 to 1.4.3.3) provide background on the responsiveness of the field of early childhood education to issues regarding cultural difference.

1.4.1 Early Childhood Education and Social Change

The idea of education being a means to a better society has been evident in many forms over the centuries. Mary Wollstonecraft in her 1792 publication “A Vindication of the Rights of Woman” advocated a public education system for girls and boys of all classes as a means towards a better society (Rippa, 1988, p. 235). Later John Dewey (1859-1952) also advocated universal education as a means to achieving a more democratic and therefore better society (Rippa, 1988, p. 169). His philosophies underpinned a progressive wave within Western education which came to the field of early childhood in New Zealand in the 1930s through the efforts of the New Education Foundation (N.E.F.). The N.E.F. emphasised freedom in education, and a child-centred educational philosophy. According to Dr William Boyd, one of the international speakers at the N.E.F. conference held in New Zealand in 1937, “what the child learns must become the stuff of his own life so that the culture of the past is re-created in him up to the level of his capacities”, and “that the methods of learning in home and school should take account of the child’s individuality and lead to creative efforts in the process of learning” (Campbell, 1938, p. 489).

The progressive child-centred philosophies presented by Susan Isaacs and others at the 1937 N.E.F. conference profoundly influenced early childhood education in New Zealand (May, 1992). Helen May considers that “it was in the early childhood area that the progressive ideals were implemented most fully [since] the other echelons of

the education system were more cautious” (May, 1992, p. 101). Early childhood education in New Zealand is characterised by its diversity, and the grass-roots basis from which the various elements within the sector as a whole have developed, in response to the needs of women, families and children (Cook, 1985). Being outside of the compulsory state education sector, with its concomitant rules, regulations and restrictions, has enabled this responsiveness to diversity to be sustained, and also means that early childhood organisations can be more innovative and progressive in adopting new pedagogical approaches such as those required by a commitment to bicultural development in line with Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

1.4.2 The Early Childhood Community’s Commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Bicultural Development

Many sectors within the early childhood education community in Aotearoa/New Zealand, have made policy statements recognising the Treaty of Waitangi and biculturalism (Cooper & Tangaere, 1994; Cubey, 1992). The Kindergarten, Playcentre, and Childcare communities have all stated their commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi, and to the bicultural development that honouring the Treaty requires (Cooper & Tangaere, 1994; Cubey, 1992; Hawira, Mitchell, & Baxter, 1990; Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa/New Zealand Childcare Association, 1992; Working Party on Cultural Issues (Rōpū Hanga Tikanga), 1990). Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa (New Zealand Childcare Association) and the New Zealand Playcentre Federation have worked to develop partnership models in their decision-making structures and processes (Cubey, 1992). In 1990 the Playcentre organisation has published a report detailing how this commitment can be translated into Playcentre settings (Working Party on Cultural Issues (Rōpū Hanga Tikanga), 1990).

The report of the working party led by Anne Meade, “Education to Be More” (also known as the “Meade Report”) (Meade, 1988), which resulted in the government early childhood policy statement, “Before Five” (Ministry of Education, 1988), had recognised the significance of cultural and linguistic maintenance as an integral part

of the national early childhood education agenda (Cooper & Tangaere, 1994, p. 103). The Meade Report identified its agenda as being consistent with the Labour Government's ideology pertaining to its social policy reform programme, which involved implementing the Treaty of Waitangi, and included in its list of characteristics of "good quality" early childhood care and education the incorporation of Te Reo Maori and tikanga Māori (Meade, 1988). The report also put the onus on the Government "to ensure that under the Treaty of Waitangi, Maori people are provided with appropriate and adequately resourced ecce which fosters Te Reo Maori and tikanga Māori" (p. 21). This focus clearly set the scene for the bicultural focus that is a strong feature of Te Whāriki, the early childhood curriculum, that was subsequently promulgated.

1.4.3 Socio-Cultural Issues within the Current Theoretical Paradigm for Early Childhood Education

Recent approaches to early childhood pedagogy have seen a shift from a reliance on the individualistic cognitive developmentalist theory of Piaget wherein the child is portrayed as an explorer of the environment, constructing knowledge about the world, to an emphasis on socio-cultural contexts as theorised by Vygotsky (Smith, 1993).

1.4.3.1 Vygotskian Influences: from Individual to Social as the Unit of Analysis

In acknowledging the importance of the environment as the source of development Vygotsky focuses on the *social* environment as central:

The environment is the source of development of these specifically human traits and attributes [ie. speech], most importantly because these historically evolved traits of human personality, which are latent in every human being due to the organic makeup of heredity, exist in the environment, but the only way they can be found in each individual human being is on the strength of his being a member of a certain social group, and that he represents a certain historical unit living in certain historical circumstances (Vygotsky, in Van der Veer & Valsiner, 1994, p. 353).

Vygotsky emphasises that the child's language and learning develop through social interaction, through collective behaviour and cooperation with other (Vygotsky, in Van der Veer & Valsiner, 1994, p. 353). Instead of focusing on creating environments which will enable children to develop logical thinking through play (Somerset, 1976), there has been a shift towards the facilitatory role of the teacher in terms of scaffolding children's learning through appropriate social interactions (Smith, 1993, p. 56). The theories of Vygotsky also place importance on the role of culture in the development of young children, since "In the process of development the child not only masters the items of cultural experience but the habits and forms of cultural behaviour, the cultural methods of reasoning interactions" (Smith, 1993, p. 57).

1.4.3.2 Culture as Central to Education

Children's home discourses "are vital to their perception of self and sense of community connectedness" (Delpit, 1993, p. 293). Applying Renato Rosaldo's thinking to the sphere of education, it would seem that educators need to consider the complexities of children's social and cultural identity and reflect upon the nature of the life experiences that have shaped it, and the power relations backgrounding that child's socio-cultural positioning (Rosaldo, 1989, p. ix). Lisa Delpit has quoted a Native Alaskan educator, who said, "In order to teach you, I must know you" (1995, p. 182).

Māori people are concerned for the preservation of their cultural identity (Smith, 1986), which has been threatened by the effects of colonisation such as loss of language, and cultural and social dislocation. Tilly Reedy believes that the Māori response to this threat has been "To return to their language, their culture, their values and their practices for their identity - to return to their tribal roots to strengthen their mind and spirits" (Reedy, 1995, p. 29). She considers this return to be "the only hope for the survival of our young, the Māori child" (p. 29).

Self-knowledge, in terms of awareness of one's own cultural values, is linked to an appreciation of the perspectives of those from a different cultural milieu. Integral to this is also the ability to reflect on one's own values and the ways in which these may inadvertently intrude into our understandings of others. Having a critical and reflective orientation towards educational and child development theories may ameliorate the tendency to universally impose these Western theoretical understandings. As Holmes (1992) explains:

It cannot be assumed that so-called universal theories and the practices based upon them, eg. a Piagetian theory of cognitive development or an Eriksonian theory of social and emotional development, are appropriate, should be, or can be used to support a program or to attempt to understand indigenous children's development. Alternative processes of learning need to be acknowledged, respected and validated (Holmes, 1992, appendix 3).

Western researchers and theorists need to constantly guard against the overwhelming urge to search for universalisms, which is evident in the following discussion regarding "framework theories such as the theory of mind" :

While elements of a similar understanding of mind have been reported in several non-Western cultures...the nature of these understandings, the timing of their emergence, and their cultural relevance has yet to be explored in full. It may well be that this research identifies a number of universal elements that make up theories of mind, as well as a number of culturally-specific elements (Dockett, 1995, p. 67).

The pervasiveness of applications of Piagetian child development theory indicates that Western researchers have tended to demonstrate a proclivity for claiming the right to name the world, and in naming the world, they continue to create 'truths' which come to be applied as 'universal knowledge' (Ingleby, 1986).

1.4.3.3 Early childhood as a Crucial Site of Cultural and Linguistic Learning

Influenced by Vygotsky, sociocultural theorists have highlighted the significant role that families and early childhood settings serve as key sites for young children's early learning (Rogoff, 1990).

From birth, as narrative and discourse theorists note, children are part of ongoing cultural narratives and discourse practices that provide the norms by which they learn to conduct themselves in various social contexts. Thus, when children come to school they come as *storied* beings, living out their lives and interpreting their experiences through the narratives and discourses that have been part of their upbringing as members of families and communities. Rather than possessing a single identity or voice, students are constructing multiple perspectives on their emergent identities as a result of their social and cultural experiences as members of racial, ethnic, gender, social class, economic, and sundry other communities, each of which provides its own system of cultural apprenticeship into ways of being in the world...(O'Loughlin, 1995a, p. 8).

The cultural models that young children are exposed to, carry within them different values and perspectives, reflecting multiple interpretations of 'reality', and these may at times be in conflict (Gee, 1990). For children from middle-class families, there is often a close match between the cultural milieu or 'cultural capital' (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 30) of the home and of the educational setting. Lisa Delpit describes this dominant culture as "the culture of power" (Delpit, 1988, p. 282). In Aotearoa/New Zealand this culture of power is that of the Pākehā mainstream. The discourses of mainstream institutions such as teacher education providers reflect the culture of power, despite increasing awareness of the need for changes to reflect more equitable recognition of sociocultural dynamics (Gonzalez, 1998).

1.5 Theoretical Domains

I came to the position of 'researcher' from a very practical background of being firstly an early childhood teacher, and more recently, a lecturer in a pre-service early childhood teacher education programme. I have a longstanding commitment to cultural equity and social justice issues, and accompanying this commitment is an eclectic and critical orientation. The doctoral project needed to fit with an agenda of responsive social change within the early childhood context, with the intention of supporting mainstream early childhood centres to better respond to the aspirations of Māori children and families, and to support the revitalisation of te reo Māori.

My teaching within the early childhood programme has taken a socio-cultural and critical stance. Despite our best intentions, my colleagues and I, as lecturers in the teacher education programme, seldom find time to reflect as a team on our pedagogical approaches, let alone on a particular aspect of the programme such as my research focus of bicultural development. In line with the Freirean notion of praxis (Freire, 1972, p. 28), it was my intention that the research project would be an opportunity for colleagues within the Department of Early Childhood Studies to find time to reflect on the issue of the bicultural aspects of our early childhood teacher education programme, and would also be a catalyst for improvements to be made.

Henry Giroux has stated, “Within the next century, educators will not be able to ignore the hard questions that schools will have to face regarding issues of multiculturalism, race, identity, power, knowledge, ethics and work” (Giroux, 1994, p. 280). I therefore viewed this research as providing an opportunity to lead such a process of reflection. The outcomes described by Naidu, Neeraja, Ramani, Shivakumar, and Viswantha (1992, p. 261) seemed a viable prospect:

By naming what we do we have recovered our practice, which otherwise might have been lost irretrievably (a fate we believe that many teachers have suffered). Further, we can now identify for ourselves what aspects of our practice we are confident of and what we need to strengthen. We can also account for our more satisfying lessons in terms of our appropriate and timely use of some of these skills. What for us had been most valuable is the awareness-raising exercise that we collectively experienced by articulating our unacknowledged repertoire of skills as teachers (cited in Edge, 1996, p.18).

As a researcher it was important to me that I developed a methodological paradigm that fitted with my philosophical stance. I drew largely upon the field of critical pedagogy for a theoretical foundation, since I had discovered during my Masters’ studies that I was very much at home within the theorising of Paulo Freire and others such as Henry Giroux and Peter McLaren. I was determined that the research process would not only be empowering of participants, but also offer useful contributions to our pedagogical contexts, those of early childhood care and education and teacher

education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. An initial exploration of the interplay between critical pedagogy and early childhood education in Aotearoa (Ritchie, 1996b) had confirmed a philosophical nesting of key ideas from critical pedagogy with the pedagogical framework that is presented in Te Whāriki, the recent curriculum for early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 1996b).

As the study developed, the initial “home” theoretical foundation of critical pedagogy was supplemented with some further related and relevant domains which included social-constructionism and socio-cultural theory; critical social science; cultural studies; critical multiculturalism; and critical early childhood studies. Key considerations from each of the theoretical domains are outlined in the following sections, 1.5.1 to 1.5.6.

1.5.1 Social constructionism and socio-cultural theory

Social constructionism and socio-cultural theory recognise that what happens *between* people is of ultimate importance (Rogoff, 1998; Shotter, 1993). These theoretical stances move away from an individualistic positioning where the unit of study is ‘the child’ to one which recognises that individuals are embedded in a social and cultural milieu which informs and sustains them, and where understandings are negotiated through dialogue. Joint construction of meaning becomes an important framework for understanding social interactions and processes of cultural change.

1.5.2 Critical Social Science

Critical social science provides an over-arching theoretical umbrella for this study. According to Kincheloe (1991):

A critical social science is concerned with uncovering the ways ideology shapes social relations - relations, for example, in the workplace, in schools, between classes, races, and genders . . . Critical social science is also concerned with extending a human’s consciousness of himself or herself as a social being. An individual who had gained such a consciousness would understand how, why, his or her political opinions, religious beliefs, gender

role, or racial perspectives had been shaped by dominant perspectives (Kincheloe, 1991, p. 2).

Critical theory recognises the inequities of social systems, and the moral imperative to rectify social injustice through social transformation. This can be achieved through the enlightenment or conscientisation of the oppressed (Fay, 1987; Freire, 1972). Critical theory focuses on the agency of people and their potential to proactively create social change through praxis, the process of reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it (Darder, 1991, p. 82; Freire, 1972, p. 28; McLaren, 1991, p. 21).

Michel Foucault has suggested that we develop a “philosophy of difference” (Foucault, 1977, p. 111). Critical theorising focuses on enhancing awareness of the socially-constructed contestable nature of cultural meanings, which are shaped by the dominant discourses available and the power relations that underlie these. A discourse is a representation of a particular conceptualisation of reality, shaped by historical, ideological, cultural and socially constructed ways of making sense communicated through language and other signs, symbols, and practices (Gee, 1989). Post-structuralist views of discourse include examination of relationships between language, meaning, emotion, the body, social practices, the individual, and society (MacNaughton, 1995, p. 42). Particular individuals and groups of people are able to exercise power because certain discourses have become institutionalised as normal, right, and desirable, thus privileging these people and silencing and marginalising alternative discourses (MacNaughton, 1995, p. 43).

Foucault has used the phrase, “the politics of knowledge”, and describes a “process by which knowledge functions as a form of power and disseminates the effects of power” (Foucault, 1980, p. 69). Individuals are both the vehicles and products of power, which is a circulating relation of force exercised through repression, over “bodies, multiplicities, movements, desires, forces” (Foucault, 1980, p. 74). According to James Marshall:

Power/knowledge is located within the “deep” regimes of discourse/practice. It is knowledge that permits statements [about expectations and practices for children and programmes] to emerge and be legitimated as truth. It is produced by power and in turn produces power. (Marshall, 1995, p. 369).

Foucault has suggested that an analysis of power needs to begin historically at a basic level and then ascend, taking into account the ways in which the interconnected mechanisms of power are “invested, colonised, utilised, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended etc, by ever more general mechanisms and by forms of global domination” in order to demonstrate “the subtle fashion in which more general powers or economic interests are able to engage with these technologies that are at once both relatively autonomous of power and act as its infinitesimal elements” (Foucault, 1980, p. 99). He also considers that it is necessary to examine the underlying structure of prevalent discourses, utilising questions such as: “What are the modes of existence of this discourse?” and “Where does it come from; how is it circulated; who controls it?” to further the analysis (Foucault, 1977, p. 138). Discursive practices are contextually embedded. “They are embodied in technical processes, in institutions, in patterns for general behavior, in forms for transmission and diffusion, and in pedagogical forms which, at once, impose and maintain them” (Foucault, 1977, p. 200). Certain discourses may be subordinated by the power effects within the dominant infrastructure, according to Foucault, who writes that:

... there exists a system of power which blocks, prohibits, and invalidates this discourse and this knowledge [of the masses], a power not only found in the manifest authority of censorship, but one that profoundly and subtly penetrates an entire societal network (Foucault, 1977, p. 207).

Educators who are representatives of the dominant culture are likely to transmit knowledge in ways that perpetuate the hegemonic dominant discourse, unless they adopt a reflexive, critical stance. Instead of shying away from an instrumental analysis of power, Shotter (1993) considers that it is possible to develop an awareness of the role of power that is inclusive and collaborative. He suggests that:

...we must rethink the workings of ideology and power . . . as not exerted by individual agents in the control of cause and effect processes at the centre, but

as formative, to do with the shaping – in communication with genuinely different other people – of a collective, sharable form of life, so that all come to live in a ‘world’ of their own making. (Shotter, 1993, p. 38).

The domain of critical social science, with its recognition of the subtle but insidious effects of power within social relations nests comfortably with that of critical pedagogy, which applies similar analyses specifically within the realm of educational settings.

1.5.3 Critical Pedagogy

Critical pedagogy, heavily influenced by the work of Paulo Freire, applies critical theory to the context of education, and emphasises the inter-relationship of language, experience, power, and identity (McLaren, 1996). As Peter McLaren has written, “Critical educators have shown us that students do not step into the moving stream of history naked. They are always clothed in the dispositions of language and power” (McLaren, 1991, p. 11). The following is McLaren’s (1996) summary of presuppositions of critical pedagogy:

- All knowledge is fundamentally mediated by linguistic relations that are socially and historically constituted
- Language is central to the formation of subjectivity (conscious and unconscious awareness)
- Individuals are connected to the wider society through influences of family, friends, religion, schooling, popular culture, and so on
- Social facts are ideologically produced
- Capitalist production, consumption and social relations are linked and inform the available discourses
- Certain groups within society are unjustly privileged over others and hegemonic processes contribute to social acceptance of these oppressions
- Power and oppression are complex and multi-layered

- Mainstream research practices are generally and unwittingly implicated in reproduction of oppressive systems (McLaren, 1996, p. 125-126).

Despite the emphasis of seminal critical pedagogues such as Paulo Freire on creating meaningful social change through praxis, reflection and action aimed at social and political transformation (Freire, 1972, p. 28), there has been criticism that critical pedagogy has remained atrophied at an impotent level of analysis, constrained by wider institutionalised power imbalances:

theorists of critical pedagogy have failed to launch any meaningful analysis of or program for reformulating the institutionalized power imbalances between themselves and their students, or of the essentially paternalistic project of education itself. In the absence of such an analysis and program, their efforts are limited to trying to transform negative effects of power imbalances within the classroom into positive ones. Strategies such as student empowerment and dialogue give the illusion of equality while in fact leaving the authoritarian nature of the teacher/student relationship intact (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 306).

Others consider as central the role of a critical pedagogue in facilitating change processes through genuine empowerment of those with whom she/he is engaged. For the purposes of this study, the focus was on the work being done within the teacher education programme to develop critical awareness in mainstream students, which is aimed at them relinquishing the power and privilege that entails with their membership of the dominant social grouping. This is somewhat at variance with critical approaches that aim to conscientise “the oppressed” (Freire, 1972). Although the emancipatory outcome is different, similar processes of conscientisation apply. Antonia Darder (1991) explains that:

Critical educators perceive their function as emancipatory and their primary purpose as commitment to creating conditions for students to learn skills, knowledge, and modes of inquiry that will allow them to examine critically the role that society has played in their self-formation. More specifically, critical pedagogy is designed to give students the tools to examine how society has functioned to shape and constrain their aspirations and goals, and prevent them from even dreaming about a life outside the one they presently know (Darder, 1991, p. xvii)

Dialogue is a central process of critical pedagogy (Darder, 1991; Freire, 1972; hooks, 1989; Simon, 1987). Paulo Freire has written that, “Founding itself upon love, humility and faith, dialogue becomes a horizontal relationship of which mutual trust between the participants is the logical consequence” (Freire, 1972, p. 64). This respectful, reciprocal relationship between teachers and learners has resonance with Nel Noddings’ (1995) notion of an ethic of care:

When we care, we receive the other in an open and genuine way. . . . As dialogue unfolds, we participate in a mutual construction of the frame of reference, but this is always a sensitive task that involves total receptivity, reflection, invitation, assessment, revision, and further exploration (Noddings, 1995, p. 191).

The notion of humility as intrinsic to this respectful process of dialogue, is also characteristic of Māori roles within relationships (Mead, 1996, p. 12-13).

Paulo Freire considers that “it is an ethical duty for educators to intervene in challenging students to critically engage with their world so they can act upon it and on it” (Freire & Macedo, 1995, p. 391). He suggests that as people reflect on their presence in the world, we may come to see ourselves as spiritual and ethical beings (Freire & Macedo, 1995). Critical pedagogy has at its heart an optimism, a sense of faith in the human spirit that is founded in love, compassion, and solidarity (McLaren, 1996; Simon, 1992). It recognises the emotional dynamics that underpin how we feel and act (Simon, 1992)). Educational processes are seen as potentially transformative and based in a commitment to social justice with practical goals for social change such as, for example, countering racism (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1999, p. 127-8).

Critical pedagogy recognises that the study of history informs the present by revealing the previously obscured narratives of oppression that gave rise to existing patterns of marginalisation, poverty, dispossession, and cultural dislocation (Giroux & McLaren, 1996). James A. Banks (1996) has proposed a transformative educational approach which brings content about marginalised groups such as ethnic

minorities and women from the margin to the centre of the curriculum (Banks, 1996, p. 339).

The 'transformative pedagogy' described by bell hooks (hooks, 1994) (see in particular, chapter three, "Embracing Change. Teaching in a Multicultural World") is an applied critical pedagogy that goes beyond revision of curriculum content. hooks addresses the issue of "Whose 'voice' is heard?", by creating democratic classroom processes which focus on building a sense of community, shared commitment, and common good. A climate of acceptance and respect means that people can speak freely and move at their own pace. There is acknowledgement of the emotional component of education, an acceptance that tensions are a reality, and that change can be painful. Pedagogical strategies include a recognition by the lecturer of different "cultural codes" and ways of knowing (hooks, 1994, p. 41). hooks aims to make positions transparent, explain her philosophy, and integrate theory with practice, that is, ways of knowing with habits of being. Decentering of Western dominance is achieved through recognising cultural codes, accepting different ways of knowing, and interrogating 'whiteness', whilst avoiding reliance on 'native informants'.

1.5.4 Cultural Studies

The arena of Cultural Studies offers a particular focus on analysis of issues of culture and power, (Giroux, 1994), which are "inextricably intertwined" (Rosaldo, 1989, p. 167) requiring examination of the relative positionings of speakers and the power relations that shape, constrain, and privilege various discourses. A cultural studies perspective considers that:

...teacher education is fashioned not around a particular dogma, but through pedagogical practices that address changing contexts, creating the necessary conditions for students to be critically attentive to the historical and socially constructed nature of the locations they occupy within a shifting world of representations and values (Giroux, 1994, p. 303).

Teachers, in this view, are required to be alert to power effects surrounding the construction and legitimation of knowledge. The field of cultural studies seeks to

explore ways in which particular practices reproduce either structures of domination and subordination or representation of identity, difference, and inequality in order to understand the complexities of how such structures and representations work within what has been described as “the domain of cultural struggle” (Grossberg, 1994, p. 6). According to Giroux, the project of cultural studies is one of social transformation in which education plays a key role:

Educators need to assert a politics that makes the relationship among authority, ethics, and power central to a pedagogy that expands rather than closes down the possibilities of a radical democratic society (Giroux & McLaren, 1996, p. 303).

Cultural studies are an important component of a critical teacher education curriculum, “since they can provide student teachers with the critical categories necessary for examining school and classroom relations as social and political practices inextricably related to the construction and maintenance of specific relations of power” (Giroux & McLaren, 1996, p. 321).

Cultural meanings are recognised as being localised and hybrid, and at risk from translation by the discourse of the white supremacist dominant culture (McLaren, 1996, p. 135). As translators of cultural meanings, critical educators face the challenge of rethinking authoritative representations of the other in order to avoid repeating past patterns of cultural imperialism (McLaren, 1996). A key focus for mainstream critical educators is to interrogate the discourse of the dominant culture, including the way in which the hypervisibility of Western white culture actually hides its power effects in terms of dominance and oppression (McLaren, 1996, p. 138). This requires a decolonising of the Western white mind, through analysis of past and present discourses (McLaren, 1996, p.144).

Recognising whiteness as a “cultural terrain” (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 234) enables a critique of the ways in which “white cultural practice” is linked to dominance through the pervasiveness of white cultural practice throughout key institutions and the

positioning of the “Other” outside of decision-making sites. Analysing the construction of whiteness, its location of privilege and its culturally normative function are key components for reconceptualising anti-racist approaches (Frankenberg, 1993, p. 242). As Christine Sleeter has written, “White silence about white racism is a silence that roars, not only from white preservice students, but also from white people in general” (Sleeter, 1996, p. 147).

In moving beyond dichotomised positions of “white” and “other”, into a “third space” (Bhabha, 1994; Isaura Barrera cited in Gonzalez-Mena, 2002, p. 3; May, 1999; McLaren, 1995, p. 213; Meredith, 1998), it is important to consider issues of cultural essentialism and the question of “Who is defining whose culture and identity?” Peter McLaren asks, “Who has the power to exercise meaning, to create the grid from which Otherness is defined, to create the identifications that invite closures on meanings, on interpretations and traditions?” (McLaren, 1995, p. 213). As we tiptoe into complex cultural territories, negotiating cultural terrains, not just our own but other people’s, our motivation needs to be ethically guided and constrained:

As educators we need to be exceedingly cautious about our attempts to speak for others, questioning how our discourses . . . position us as authoritative and empowered speakers in ways that unwittingly constitute a reinscription of the discourse of colonization, of patriarchy, of racism, of conquest. . . (McLaren, 1995, p. 224).

The potential for this ‘unwitting’ appropriation is clearly an issue not only for critical educators but also for a critical researcher.

1.5.5 Critical Multiculturalism

Critical multiculturalism introduces the concept of cultural responsiveness (May, 1999, p. 31-32). The focus is not just at the interpersonal level, but at the level of institutional change. Christine Sleeter considers that educational institutions need to be restructured holistically focusing on components which include curriculum, grouping patterns, assessment, instructional strategies, relationships with community, language policies and programmes, and the ethnic and gender composition of staff

(Sleeter, 1992, p. 39). A critical multiculturalist paradigm also focuses on racism and cultural identity (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997, p. 29-30), recognising that the pervasiveness of white supremacy within Western cultures has influenced outcomes for non-white children through ideologies such as deficit theories (Bartolome, 1994; Sleeter, 1992; Smith, 1999).

Stephen May considers that a critical multiculturalism situates cultural differences “within the wider nexus of power relations of which they form a part” (May, 1999), p. 32). This enables critique of the dominant group’s reproductive processes that result in inequitable educational outcomes. For May, a key consideration is that “the normalization and universalisation of the cultural knowledge of the majority ethnic group, and its juxtaposition with other (usually non-western) knowledge and practices, should be critically interrogated” (May, 1999, p. 32). Attention should be paid to misrecognition, and subjugation of alternative cultural knowledges. A critical multiculturalism needs both to recognize and incorporate the differing cultural knowledges that children bring with them, and address and contest the differentials created by hegemonic power relations. Mohanty (1994) believes that the goal should be a process of praxis involving challenging traditional hierarchies of knowledge and power, and seeking to decolonise both education settings and the wider society:

...decolonizing educational practices requires transformations at a number of levels, both within and outside the academy. Curricula and pedagogical transformation has to be accompanied by a broad-based transformation of the culture of the academy, as well as by radical shifts in the relation of the academy to other state and civil institutions (Mohanty, 1994, p.152).

A critical multicultural paradigm, requires activism and commitment to social change based in a well-informed analysis of the history of colonisation that underpins current socio-political relations:

The struggle to transform our institutional practices fundamentally also involves the grounding of the analysis of exploitation and oppression in accurate history and theory, seeing ourselves as activists in the academy - drawing links between movements for social justice and our pedagogical and scholarly endeavors and expecting and demanding action from ourselves, our

colleagues, and our students at numerous levels. This requires working hard to understand and to theorize questions of knowledge, power, and experience in the academy so that one effects pedagogical empowerment as well as transformation (Mohanty, 1994, p. 162).

Issues regarding ways in which educators engage, negotiate and represent differences are a central consideration (Giroux, 1995a, p. xi). Dialogue provides the means to explore ways in which values, ethics, and social responsibility can be reworked in order to reconsider “the related notions of belonging, social justice, and democratic community” (Giroux, 1995a, p. xi).

1.5.6 Critical Early Childhood Studies

The phrase, ‘critical early childhood studies’ implies an intersection between critical pedagogy and early childhood education studies. The field of early childhood education is an applied field which draws upon a range of disciplines, including education, psychology, and sociology (Aubrey et al., 2000). Recent work by ‘reconceptualisers’ of the early childhood field have brought critical, post-modern and post-structuralising theorising to illuminate our thinking regarding cultural and other issues (see for example Canella, 1997; Grieshaber, Cannella, & Leavitt, 2001; MacNaughton, 1998; Mallory & New, 1994). Critique is made of universalist paradigms and the Western tendency to over-generalise these across cultures. The positivist focus on the individual, Western, self-contained child is replaced by a view of children in their social and cultural contexts (Hatch, 1995). Constructions such as the importance of mothers to ‘development’, ‘development’ itself (Jenks, 1996; O’Loughlin, 1992a; O’Loughlin, 1995b), and personal responsibility are seen as culturally-based assumptions, no longer to be taken for granted.

Critical early childhood studies approaches suggest the possibility of new conceptualisations of the roles of educators as reflective practitioners and researchers who are able to draw upon newer forms of interpretation drawn from cultural and post-modernist perspectives (New & Mallory, 1994, p. 10). Central to the research and theorising of critical early childhood studies is the recognition that

understandings of children be located in the children's specific cultural and historical contexts (Graue & Walsh, 1995, p. 150). Localised descriptions can provide a rich narrative offering insight into the socially constructed positionings which serve as contexts for children's interactions, relationships, and learning (Graue & Walsh, 1995, p. 151). Theorising is based in a deep knowledge of the local socio-cultural situation, grounded in understanding of the political and historical background. Critical early childhood studies does not shy away from troubling tensions or issues, but is prepared to consider the "disturbing, unaskable questions [that] hover at the edge of our intellectual consciousness" (Tobin, 1995, p. 224) such as those pertaining to emotions, sensuality, pleasure, power and control arising from our work with young children (Johnson, 1999; Leavitt, 1994; Leavitt & Power, 1997).

Critical early childhood studies does not maintain the traditional focus on a quest for universal grand narratives or 'truths' in order to provide guidelines for early childhood educators, or pan-cultural solutions to issues and dilemmas they may face (Alloway, 1997), but recognises that each individual piece of critical, interpretative scholarship plays its part in contributing towards a "growing mosaic of understanding" which can instead inform our early childhood research and practice (Graue & Walsh, 1995, p. 151).

1.6 Overview of Chapter One

This chapter has positioned the research within a range of contexts, both historical and disciplinary (Eisenhart & Howe, 1992). Tino rangatiratanga, as guaranteed in Article Two of the Māori version of the treaty, Te Tiriti o Waitangi, was identified as being a key Crown responsibility, and therefore also a key focus of a Tiriti-based bicultural development process. Māori aspirations for te reo me ōna tikanga go hand in hand with tino rangatiratanga exercised through whānau support structures (Smith, 1997, p. 448). Early childhood education has a history of responsiveness to community needs and aspirations, and is placed at a critical site for positive intervention in young children's linguistic and other learning and for the sustenance

of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. Recognition of the need for Māori whānau involvement and leadership in terms of the delivery of culturally responsive programmes is a current challenge for mainstream early childhood education settings. Bicultural development is identified as a process based in Te Tiriti o Waitangi, which aims to deliver social justice outcomes to Māori which will restore the imbalances that have been created through the previous two centuries of colonisation. Bicultural development is the term that will be used as a reference point in this thesis.

The final sections of chapter one outlined a range of theoretical domains that support the research paradigm. These focus, for example, on aspects such as the positioning of relationships and interactions between people as central in the negotiated construction of understandings and meanings (social constructionism); a recognition that awareness of the role of power effects in the determination of truths and knowledges is necessary in order to pursue a journey of transformative social justice (critical social science); consideration of some of the key components of critical pedagogy such as processes of conscientisation facilitated through reflective dialogue grounded in respectful relationships; reflection upon issues pertaining to power effects and mainstream dominance within domains of cultural struggle (cultural studies), and racism and subjugation of knowledges and cultural identities (critical multiculturalism). Final mention was made of the relatively new field of critical early childhood education studies which has been led by a number of theorists loosely known as ‘reconceptualisers’ who are endeavouring to apply some of the theoretical challenges offered by critical and postmodern perspectives to the arena of early childhood care and education.

Chapter Two: Teacher Education as a Site for Bicultural Development

2.0 Introduction to Chapter Two

The primary site for this research study was a university-based teacher education programme, preparing teachers to work in early childhood settings in Aotearoa/New Zealand. These settings include primarily: kindergartens, which in this country take children from around three-four years until they start school, usually on their fifth birthday or shortly afterwards; and childcare centres, which may cater for very young infants through to five year olds. During the majority of the time frame of this study, the University of Waikato, where this research was based, offered two versions of the early childhood programme. One was a specialist kaupapa Māori early childhood programme that aimed to prepare students to work in Māori immersion early childhood settings. This research focused on the other programme, which was preparing students for mainstream settings.

This chapter gives consideration to implications for teacher education programmes that have a commitment to fostering social justice issues. Teacher education settings are an important site for generating educational and social change such as implementation of bicultural development. Some key pedagogical aspects relevant to this project are the centrality of anti-racism education and attention to emotional components of learning processes that aim to facilitate critical reflection and praxis.

International, national, and localised obligations and requirements provide a significant background context to this study, in that they stipulate the need for bicultural development in terms of linguistic and cultural equity for Māori. Previous research indicates that despite these policy statements, attention is required to the arena of bicultural development in early childhood care and education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, since practice is falling short of the policy-level requirements (Cubey, 1992).

According to Elizabeth Graue and Daniel Walsh (1995) “rich descriptions that are the hallmark of good interpretative research must be connected to those contexts in which they are embedded” (p. 152). Accordingly, this chapter provides some background description of the three year (mainstream) early childhood teacher education programme offered by the University of Waikato in order to set the scene which will give meaning to the discussion provided later in the document, with a particular focus on aspects of the programme that are salient in terms of bicultural development processes.

Clarification of the “delimitations” (Wolcott, 1997, p.1) of this study is offered in an attempt to clarify what it was not about. The study is positioned as one committed to positive social justice outcomes which may benefit tamariki Māori and contribute to the sustenance of te reo, although bounded by its localised and particularised setting and methodology. The research questions are outlined at the end of the chapter.

2.1 Teacher Education as Pivotal in Creating Educational Change

Māori children currently form one quarter of the total of children in this country. Over the next 50 years this proportion is expected to increase to the point whereby Māori children will comprise one third of the total (Māori Education Commission, 1999). The disparity in the participation rates in early childhood services between Māori and non-Māori children is actually increasing (Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development, 1998c). In 1997 proportionately fewer Māori four year olds were attending an early childhood service than in 1991, whilst for non-Māori the participation rate has increased. Although the Ministry of Education is unable to provide recent statistics on the ethnicity or fluency in te reo Māori of early childhood teachers, a 1992 Education Sector Census showed that only 4.5% of kindergarten teachers were Māori (O’Rourke, 1992). Fewer Māori work in kindergartens than in any other area of the education sector (Jahnke, 1997a). Māori children in mainstream

education are being taught largely by Pākehā, 99.9% of whom are “not Māori speaking or even Māori-literate” (Kawharu, 1992, p. 23).

A research report prepared for the Ministry of Education by Walter Hirsh in 1990 provided some important recommendations aimed at enhancing Māori educational achievement (Hirsh & Scott, 1990, p. 11-15). These included a recommendation for teacher education providers that future teachers be prepared with an understanding “of the meaning and relevance of the Treaty of Waitangi” (underlining in original), to educational settings, in order to “enable teacher to understand and take ownership of the history of this nation from its earliest settlement some 1000 years ago” (Hirsh & Scott, 1990, p. 13). Hirsh also recommended that “more work be done urgently to eliminate all forms of racism from the education system” (p. 15) (underlining in original).

It is acknowledged that teacher attitudes are a crucial factor in creating educational change: “Educational change depends on what teachers do and think - it’s as simple as that” (Fullan, 1991, p. 117). Pre-service early childhood education programmes may not necessarily be effective in creating positive attitude change in the students participating in them (Jacka, 1990). Teacher educators work within institutional structures that impact on the potential to achieve the required changes in student attitudes. It is suggested that institutional development is required in order to achieve educational change (Fullan, 1991, p. 349). Fullan points out that institutions cannot be developed without developing the people in them (Fullan, 1991, p. 349). This means, firstly, that lecturers running the programmes should have a clearly articulated philosophy of their educational goals for students. It is useful if this can be applied across all content areas, not only courses focusing on political and cultural issues, in order to reinforce the kaupapa of preparing students to implement a commitment to bicultural development within early childhood education.

Students beginning a teacher education programme bring with them strongly held personal beliefs and theories (Carr & May, 1993, p. 7). Achieving changes in these beliefs is not necessarily an easy process (Prawat cited in Carr & May, 1993, p. 7). Teacher education programmes can facilitate prospective teachers to deconstruct not only the assumptions that they bring with them regarding teaching and education, but also to develop a reflexive approach to their understandings of cultural issues and their pedagogical implications (Cockrell, Placier, Cockrell, & Middleton, 1999). Post-modernist perspectives call for teacher preparation to move beyond reliance on universalist theories of human development and instead engage students “to think critically and to interrogate the assumptions that underlie any and all knowledge claims, in particular regarding their usefulness in the creation of a more equitable society” (Lubeck, 1996, p.149).

In the U.S.A., a “Multicultural Preservice Teacher Education Project” (Zeichner, Grant, Gay, Gillette, & Villegas, 1998) identified key principles of good practice in multicultural teacher education. These institutional and programmatic principles were that:

1. The mission, policies, and procedures of the institution reflect the values of diversity and multicultural education
2. The institution is committed to multicultural teacher education
3. The teacher education programme is a living example of multicultural education
4. Admissions requirements to teacher education programmes include multicultural as well as academic criteria
5. Faculty, staff, and supervisors are committed to and competent in multicultural teacher education
6. Multicultural perspectives permeate the entire teacher education curriculum, including general education courses and those in academic subject areas

7. The programme fosters the understanding that teaching and learning occur in socio-political contexts that are not neutral but are based on relations of power and privilege
8. The programme is based on the assumption that all students bring knowledge, skills, and experiences that should be used as resources in teaching and learning, and that high expectations for learning are held for all students
9. The programme teaches prospective teachers how to learn about students, families, and communities, and how to use knowledge of culturally diverse students' backgrounds in planning, delivering, and evaluating educational programmes
10. The programme helps prospective teachers reexamine their own and others' multiple and interrelated identities
11. The programme provides carefully planned and varied field experiences that explore sociocultural diversity in schools and communities
12. The programme helps prospective teachers develop the commitment to be change agents who work to promote greater equity and social justice in schooling and society
13. The programme teaches prospective teachers how to change power and privilege in multicultural classrooms
14. The programme draws upon and validates multiple types and sources of knowledge (Zeichner et al., 1998, p.163-169).

This summary of findings from a North American multicultural education project has bearing on a study concerned with bicultural development in early childhood teacher education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, in that a number of points are salient. Firstly, these findings point to a need for a high level of commitment to the bicultural development kaupapa within the teacher education provider institution. Secondly, it is suggested that the teacher education programme provides in its own operations a model of effective bicultural development, which would entail staff competently integrating te reo Māori and Māori perspectives throughout the curriculum. Thirdly, pedagogical strategies should encourage reflective awareness of and respect for

culturally different ways of being and knowing, and a recognition of power imbalances as well as commitment to and strategies for effecting transformations for social justice objectives such as furtherance of tino rangatiratanga and Māori aspirations for te reo me ōna tikanga and culturally appropriate pedagogies for their tamariki.

2.1.1 Identifying Effective Pedagogies for Teacher Education

Providers of teacher education programmes need to be able to clearly articulate their philosophy and goals. Their pedagogy should be grounded in a theoretical base (Spoonley, 1993, p. 99), and be supported by the professional skills to facilitate the necessary process of attitude change. There are many factors to be considered in achieving what can be termed “effective permeation” of anti-racism and bicultural development content within teacher education programmes (Shah, 1989).

A central consideration is the ways in which knowledges are constructed, defined and privileged. Lisa Delpit (1988) has discussed how mainstream educators have controlled the educational discourses, effectively silencing those on the margins. Teacher educators can facilitate student teachers to unveil the “codes of power” that are perpetuated within mainstream educational settings (Delpit, 1988). “Demystifying” the aura that surrounds academic theory and research, through developing critical analysis, can enable students to recognise the power of language (Zeichner et al., 1998, p. 169).

An aim of a teacher education programme committed to bicultural development might be to develop in students attitudes and skills that will enable them to dialogue with parents in the settings in which they teach, in order that they listen to what it is that those parents want them to know about their children and how to relate to them in order to ‘educate’ them. As Delpit has evocatively written,

to do so takes a very special kind of listening, listening that requires not only open eyes and ears, but open hearts and minds. We do not really see through our eyes or hear through our ears, but through our beliefs. To put our beliefs

on hold is to cease to exist as ourselves for a moment - and that is not easy. It is painful as well, because it means turning yourself inside out, giving up your own sense of who you are, and being willing to see yourself in the unflattering light of another's angry gaze. It is not easy, but it is the only way to learn what it might feel like to be someone else and the only way to start the dialogue (Delpit, 1988, p. 297).

This requires a shift from the traditional view of teacher as 'expert' to a notion of the teacher as a humble learner who is respectfully open to different world views and able to demonstrate willingness to responsively incorporate these into the everyday knowledges and practices within the educational setting. The role of the teacher educator is to supportively prepare students to "be vulnerable enough to allow our world to turn upside down in order to allow the realities of others to edge themselves into our consciousness" (Delpit, 1988, p. 297). The barrier of racist belief systems which position those from the dominant culture as 'right' and 'normal' is one which needs to be overcome in order to facilitate this repositioning of the teacher to that of a humble, respectful, receptive listener.

A classroom dynamic that is supportive and encouraging of all members, is another pedagogical strategy consistent with the project of bicultural development. Encouraging a caring supportive learning community through cooperative exercises will engender a commitment to class interaction and develop a mutual interdependence which will enable sharing of personal beliefs and deeply felt ideas (Young, 1998, p. 109). This level of safety will eventually enable a stronger degree of respectful challenge to prevailing attitudes.

2.1.2 Anti-Racism Education as Pivotal

The central inclusion of anti-racism education is fundamental within any teacher education programme committed to equity and social justice. It is necessary to counter the widespread, although often covert, racism that is a deeply entrenched continuing legacy of the history of colonisation in this country. Racism has historically been a tool of Eurocentric states' colonialistic regimes that has in the past

legitimised slavery and created a normative legitimising of white superiority. This has involved the “Othering” of non-Europeans such as Māori (Davies, Nandy, & Sardar, 1993), and portrayals in the literature and other media that have perpetuated this “deeply held fear and hatred of the Other” (Smith, 1999, p. 92).

This legacy remains, although contemporary manifestations of racism in Aotearoa/New Zealand are considerably less blatant than historically acceptable versions such as slavery, Nazism and other extreme forms of racial oppression and discrimination (Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Racism in New Zealand can be seen to constitute an underlying current that has permeated our colonial society, and is intrinsically implicated in how it has been structured and organised and in the way that rationality (economic, individual, group and 'good sense') has been constructed (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 216). The more subtle expression of racism in Aotearoa can be seen in the way Māori are characterised as “the problem” and blamed for their lack of achievement and poor social and health indicators. As Raj Vasil (1988) has written, “Clearly, the Pākehā argument is that the Māori have only themselves to blame for their lack of education and skills and [for] constituting mostly the underclass” (p.33). Māori poverty and perceptions of ‘backwardness’ are seen as self-manufactured and self-inflicted, and therefore Pākehā have no reason to feel guilty or seek to rectify this situation (Vasil, 1988, p. 33).

Racism underlies the pattern of uneven power relations created by British colonisers’ assumption and perpetuation of sovereignty, which has undermined Maori authority structures and debased their world view (Ballara, 1986; Jackson, 1992e; Smith, 1999; Walker, 1990). Even when individuals try to identify and counter racism, the odds are against their success. Paul Spoonley claims that “however much individual teachers or schools wish to avoid being racist, if the surrounding society is racist, then the impact of their endeavours will be circumscribed and probably undermined” (Spoonley, 1988, p. 43).

Qualitative and discourse analysis research has indicated that contemporary racist attitudes in both Aotearoa/New Zealand and Australia are subtle, flexible, ambivalent, and embedded in wider social values which support and legitimise racial inequalities (Sanson et al., 1997; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). These attitudes and inequalities have been reinforced by political and economic discourse which has focused on ‘individual responsibility’, and ‘the level-playing field’ (Sanson et al., 1997). Most individuals are not intentionally racist in their thinking or behaviour, but are nevertheless “dysconsciously” racist (King, 1994, p. 338):

Dysconscious racism is a form of racism that tacitly accepts dominant white norms and privileges. It is ... an impaired consciousness or distorted way of thinking about race as compared to, for example critical consciousness. Uncritical ways of thinking about racial inequality accept certain culturally sanctioned assumptions, myths, and beliefs that justify the social and economic advantages that white people have as a result of subordinating diverse others (King, 1994, p. 338).

Joyce E. King considers that “Dysconscious racism must be made the subject of educational intervention” (King, 1994, p. 342). Anti-racism education is considered by Jim Cummins to be an essential element of educational programmes which genuinely address equity issues across cultures (1988). Cummins states that “the overt goals of multicultural education can be realised only when policy-makers, educators and communities acknowledge the subtle (and sometimes not so subtle) forms of institutional racism that permeate the structure of schools and mediate the interactions between educators and students. In other words, unless it becomes ‘anti-racist education’, ‘multi-cultural education’ may serve only to provide a veneer of change that in reality perpetuates discriminatory educational structures” (Cummins, 1988, p. 127).

In teacher education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, anti-racism education has a key role to play in raising awareness and understanding of the history of repression, of the significance of Māori claims under the Treaty of Waitangi, and of racism at personal, cultural and institutional levels (Kelsey, 1991, p. 47). A key understanding to be

developed is that of the significance of the Treaty of Waitangi as the basis of tino rangatiratanga (Jackson, 1992b, 1992d; Kelsey, 1991).

Beverly Daniel Tatum (1992), suggests that exploring strategies to empower students as change agents is a necessary part of the process of talking about race and learning about racism. She writes that “Heightening students’ awareness of racism without also developing an awareness of the possibility of change is a prescription for despair” (Tatum, 1992, p. 20). As Louise Derman-Sparks and Carol Brunson Phillips have written:

Anti-racism education is not an end in itself but rather the beginning of a new approach to thinking, feeling, and acting. Anti-racist consciousness and behaviour means having the self-awareness, knowledge, and skills – as well as the confidence, patience, and persistence – to challenge, interrupt, modify, erode, and eliminate any and all manifestations of racism within one’s own spheres of influence. It requires vision and will, an analysis of racism’s complexities and changing forms, and an understanding of how it affects people socially and psychologically (Derman-Sparks & Phillips, 1997, p. 3).

Facilitating students of the teacher education programme to develop a critique of racist ideologies and the unequal relations between Māori and Pākehā through informed discussion of the history of these issues is consistent with the ideas from critical pedagogy discussed in section 1.5.3. An essential element of this process is for students to critically reflect upon their subjectivity and positionality as Pākehā and successful products of the dominant culture’s educational system and to be able to apply this capacity for reflection to their role and practice as teachers.

2.1.3 Facilitating ‘Reflective Practice’

Facilitating the development of the ability to be a reflective practitioner, is recognised as an important goal in the preparation of educators (Kitchener, 1983; Lubeck, 1996; Martinez, 1993; Smyth, 1989). Students need opportunities to examine their own theories and be provided with a balance of support and challenge that will enable them to re-evaluate ideas they may have previously taken for granted (Smyth, 1989). The next stage is to explore alternative theories and actions (Smyth, 1989).

This is an integral part of the process for developing a commitment to bicultural development, which involves acknowledgment of racism, and the inequalities within our society through rational informed analysis and which cannot possibly be attained through coercion. Reflection must be based on an analysis of the social, cultural, historical, political, theoretical, and moral context of their work as educators (Smyth, 1989, p. 3). It is acknowledged that developing the ability to think reflectively and to challenge assumptions is dependent on accepting the idea of knowledge as an outcome of rational inquiry and the ability to formulate views on the basis of evaluating experience and evidence (Kitchener, 1983, p. 92).

It is by means of critical pedagogy, according to Darder (1991), that students will be provided with the tools to examine how society has functioned to shape and constrain their aspirations and goals, enabling students to develop the critical capacities to reflect, critique and act to transform the conditions under which they live (Darder, 1991, p. xvii). Darder also points out that critical pedagogy is one of the few educational perspectives to recognise the need to develop a sensitivity to aspects of culture (Darder, 1991, p. xvii).

Reflection on its own does not necessarily translate into change (Lubeck, 1996). This requires students to develop a sense of empowerment and agency. According to Darder, this will be accomplished by creating a 'culturally democratic environment' in which students participate actively and freely, and where they will receive the consistent support and encouragement required for them to develop their analyses and voice, which they can then apply toward their social empowerment and emancipation (Darder, 1991, p. 67). This means that as the students, through reflection on social and political realities, begin to perceive that things should be different, they are able to actively work for change, to become 'challengers' (Smyth, 1989, p. 5). This is particularly crucial if graduates are to become advocates in support of Māori aspirations such as the revitalisation of the Māori language.

2.1.4 'Developmental' Processes in Becoming a Teacher

Despite postmodern critiques of universalism in views of education as a developmental process (Morss, 1996), there is value in conceptualising the process of becoming a teacher to be a journey of growth, albeit one which is always contextually situated, value-laden and culturally framed (Daloz, 1990). Laurent Daloz employs a metaphor that views developmental theory as providing a 'map' of this journey, acknowledging that this map inherently reflects both the interests of the cartographer and those who have selected this particular map to guide their journey. He writes that although maps are to a certain extent prescriptive,

...good maps also offer choice; they are not mere formulas. And while developmental theories do imply direction, none insists that the journey can be taken in only one way or, indeed, that it be completed at all. Just as a map frames the setting for a journey, so does a developmental theory offer a context for growth. It indicates landmarks, points out dangers, suggests possible routes and destinations, but leaves the walking to us (Daloz, 1990, p. 46).

Learning to become a teacher has been viewed as a developmental process (Carter & Curtis, 1994; Daloz, 1990; Peters & Klinzing, 1990, p. 78). Daloz describes a developmental progression derived from the work of Jane Loevinger, Lawrence Kohlberg, and Carol Gilligan:

...each of whom suggested that as we develop, we move first from a 'preconventional' stance, in which our own personal survival is paramount, into a 'conventional' orientation, in which our main concern is to fit into and be accepted by society, and later (if our development continues) into a 'post-conventional' position, in which we derive our decisions from broader considerations than personal survival or a wish to conform (Daloz, 1990, p. 47).

The learning opportunities within a teacher education programme can facilitate this growth towards a 'post-conventionality' that exhibits articulation of one's personal critical analysis through the exercise of 'voice' (Belenky, Clichy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Carter & Curtis, 1994; Daloz, 1990). The research of Belenky, Clichy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1986) documented a process whereby their women students

moved from a passive, disempowered, voiceless state of uncritical acceptance of authority, towards different ways of knowing, which were increasingly more critical, demonstrating attributes of connected and constructivist knowing (Belenky et al., 1986). They consider that:

educators can help women develop their own authentic voices if they emphasize connection over separation, understanding and acceptance over assessment, and collaboration over debate; if they accord respect to and allow time for the knowledge that emerges from firsthand experience; if instead of imposing their own expectations and arbitrary requirements, they encourage students to evolve their own patterns of work based on the problems they are pursuing. These are the lessons we have learned in listening to women's voices (Belenky et al., 1986, p. 229).

For Daloz, key aspects for facilitating this journey of becoming a critically reflective teacher are: a trusting, caring relationship between tutor and student; a safe climate in which students feel respected; and alternative pedagogies that facilitate “developmental dialogue”, by simultaneously challenging and supporting students’ movement utilising tasks specifically designed to challenge assumptions by offering alternative perspectives (Daloz, 1990, p. 225). Daloz explains the facilitation of developmental dialogue as follows:

A primary purpose of such dialogue is to help the student to engage with different perspectives, different ways of viewing a problem or a phenomenon. In the trusting and privileged relationship between a caring teacher and a student, the risk of exploring new ideas is minimized, and the student is encouraged to experiment in ways she might not otherwise try. Such discussions, it should be emphasized, are most effective when the mentor considers her task not to instruct but rather to understand her student’s thought and perhaps to raise questions about it (Daloz, 1990, p. 225-226).

This has resonance with the centrality of the relationship between the teacher educator and students, which is recognised in social constructionism and critical pedagogy theorising. Intrinsic to the process of building relationships are intra- and interpersonal skills, which enable the educator to interpret and respond to the emotional wellbeing of the individual students.

2.1.5 Validating Emotions in Change Facilitation

Many traditional western conceptualisations of education have emphasised cognition, frequently ignoring the emotional component in learning. In fact, emotion has often been positioned as antithetical to ‘objective’ rationality, the designated pathway to truth and knowledge (Andersen & Collins, 1995, p. 7). Nel Noddings (1995), from her standpoint of advocating an ethic of care, has critiqued this coldly rational Western world view:

As we inquire into human behavior and our own in particular, we may find that the reasons for our behavior are rarely beliefs. More often it is something we feel that impels us to action. Traditional views . . . try to overcome this tendency to act on feeling. The result . . . is often a highly rationalized coldness and meanness toward others. Critical thinking guided by an ethic of care encourages us to stay in touch with our own feelings and accept our embodied condition. Such acceptance does not imply approval of every emotional reaction. On the contrary, our hope is that the identification and acceptance of our own emotional states should help us to set them aside (not overcome them) and replace them, first, with a tragic sense that we too are vulnerable to error and evil and, second, with more positive feelings for those we encounter (Noddings, 1995, p. 194).

Noddings, in promoting this emotional inter-connectedness, suggests that it is a precondition for what she terms “interpersonal reasoning” (Noddings, 1995). Educators seeking to create change in individuals (and society) need to recognise the perceptions, feelings and motivations of those people with whom they are working (Loucks-Horsley & Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 18). Kurt Lewin described facilitating social change as:

. . . a process in which changes of knowledge and beliefs, changes of values and standards, changes of emotional attachments and needs, and changes of everyday conduct occur not piecemeal and independently of each other, but within the framework of the individual’s total life in the group (Lewin, 1948, p. 58).

Lewin considered that emotional security was a prerequisite for individuals, and that there should be no pressure placed on people. Instead he advocated a climate which encouraged freedom of expression in voicing opinions (Lewin, 1948, p. 60-62). More recent writers are consistent with Lewin’s views, as in the following example:

Engaging oneself at the personal level is critical to this process of thinking inclusively. Changing one's mind is not just a matter of assessing facts and data, though that is important; it also requires examining one's feelings (Andersen & Collins, 1995, p. 7).

Like Lewin, Brian Fay (1987) emphasises that an effective social change process involves creating for participants "an environment of trust, openness, and support in which one's own perceptions and feelings can be made properly conscious to oneself, in which one can feel free to express and examine one's fears and aspirations, in which one can think through one's experiences in terms of a radically new vocabulary which expresses a fundamentally different conceptualization of the world . . . and in which one can gain the emotional strength to accept and act on one's new insights" (Fay, 1987, p. 113). Many other critical pedagogues also recognise the necessity for awareness of the realm of emotions (Darder, 1991; Freire & Shor, 1987; Giroux, 1983; hooks, 1989; Kincheloe, 1991; McLaren, 1991).

2.2 Policy Contexts

The early childhood teacher education qualification programme at the University of Waikato, which is the focus of this study, has a requirement to implement a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi and bicultural development stipulated by a range of policy documents. These include international obligations, expectations from the New Zealand Ministry of Education, and internal university policies.

2.2.1 International Obligations

Various United Nations covenants have specific bearing on the education of indigenous peoples, such as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1972), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1978), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1978), and the Convention Against Discrimination in Education (1963). The New Zealand government has ratified these conventions, and is therefore obliged to pursue and promote changes necessary to provide Māori children with equitable

educational opportunities (Carr, 1993). In Aotearoa/New Zealand the focus for acknowledging these rights is based in the guarantees to Māori in the Treaty of Waitangi.

2.2.2 Ministry of Education Requirements

The New Zealand Government Ministry of Education has promulgated documents and policies that contain statements regarding the need for early childhood services to demonstrate within their programmes a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Māori aspirations. The Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices (DOPs) for chartered early childhood services (Ministry of Education, 1996a) requires that early childhood centres deliver programmes that are consistent (Education Review Office, 1998) with the early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b). The introduction to the Revised DOPs endorses Te Whāriki as an example of a quality curriculum, and states that early childhood services are expected to identify links with Te Whāriki and also ensure that none of their curriculum is inconsistent with Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 40).

2.2.2.1 Te Whāriki, Early Childhood Curriculum: Background

Te Whāriki, the early childhood curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1996b) was developed in consultation with the early childhood community (Carr & May, 1993). The development process for the early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki, was a deliberate attempt at a Tiriti-based model of bicultural partnership, by means of a collaboration of Helen May and Margaret Carr from the University with Tamati and Tilly Reedy appointed by the National Te Kōhanga Reo Trust (May, 2001, p. 245).

In the draft document, entitled “Te Whāriki, Draft Early Childhood Curriculum Guidelines” (Ministry of Education, 1993), there was a section on domains of ‘appropriateness’ which was an extension of the concept of “developmentally appropriate practice” that has been hugely influential in the early childhood education field within the United States, having been promulgated by their National Association

for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) (Bredekamp, c1987). The draft Te Whāriki was visionary in its recognition of the multiplicity of domains of ‘appropriateness’, suggesting that the curriculum needed to consider more than just developmentally appropriate experiences. In addition early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand was to reflect nationally, culturally, educationally, and individually appropriate learning experiences. Under the heading of “Nationally Appropriate Experiences”, the expectation was expressed that the curriculum should provide for all children to be enriched in their understanding and knowledge of the cultural heritage of both partners to the Treaty of Waitangi. The curriculum was seen as contributing towards the sustenance of te reo and ngā tikanga Māori, making them visible and affirming their value for children from all cultural backgrounds (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 13-14).

The acknowledgment of the importance of “Culturally Appropriate Experiences” recognised that:

One of the purposes of the curriculum is to make available to the next generation the knowledge, skills, and attitudes which are regarded as valuable by their culture. Different cultures have different child-rearing patterns, beliefs and traditions... There may be differences in the way they make sense of their world, communicate with each other, and plan and live their lives. (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 14).

This concept of culturally appropriate education has resonance with other conceptualisations which include:

- culturally relevant pedagogy (Bartolome, 1994; Bowman, 1991; Darder, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1995; O’Loughlin, 1995b; Troyna, 1993);
- culturally responsive pedagogy (Osborne, 1991);
- culturally sensitive approaches (Gonzalez-Mena, 1992; Mangione et al., 1993);
- culturally consistent and inclusive programs (Booze et al., 1996);
- culturally congruent critical pedagogy (Hyun, 1998);

- and educationally effective cultural compatibility (Jordan, 1985; Jordan, 1995).

All of these approaches recognise the “problem of discontinuity” between home and educational setting experienced by learners who are not members of the white middle-class dominant culture (Ladson-Billings, 1995, p. 159). The term ‘culturally *appropriate*’ has been criticised for its normalising tendencies (Osborne, 1991), and the question could well be asked: Appropriate as defined by whom? (O’Loughlin, 1992a). Keri-Ann Hewitt has written evocatively of her discomfort when working as a teacher in a programme which espoused “cultural compatibility” for Native Hawaiian children. Hewitt, a Native Hawaiian, was required to impose culturally incompatible constraints such as preventing collaboration amongst children (Hewitt, 1996).

The concept of “Educationally Appropriate Experiences” in the Draft Guidelines (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 14) required that early childhood curriculum should draw on prior learning and experiences, starting with the learner and the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that children bring to the programme. Familiar contexts and content that have meaning for individual children should be used to provide links between new and prior learning. It is interesting to observe here a continuity of the philosophy articulated by Dr. William Boyd in the 1930s of recognising the importance of the child’s home and culture (cited in Campbell, 1938, p. 489).

The Draft Guidelines also emphasised the need for “developmentally appropriate practice” (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 14), which focuses on children learning through active involvement in freely chosen creative activities, supported by adults who scaffold the children’s working theories of the world. In the U.S.A., the NAEYC document, “Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8” (Bredekamp, c1987) had been criticised for its normative approach which lacked recognition of cultural difference

(Cross, 1995, p. 91; Jipson, 1991; Lubeck, 1994). In response to these kinds of challenges the revised edition (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997) “explicitly acknowledges the powerful influence of [social and cultural] context on all development and learning” (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997, p. 41).

There is a developing overseas literature focusing on cultural diversity issues in early childhood education (see for example Clark, 1995; Creasor & Dau, 1996; Derman-Sparks & A. B. C. Task Force, 1989; Hyun, 1998; Kendall, 1996; King, Chipman, & Cruz-Janzen, 1994; MacNaughton, 1998; Mallory & New, 1994; Stonehouse, 1991). The literature from Australia and the U.S.A. advocates an inclusive approach to all ethnic groups, and does not reflect the emphasis on indigeneity recognised in the Tiriti-based bicultural partnership model developed in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

In 1996, after a period of trialing and consultation, the final “Te Whāriki” document was launched (Ministry of Education, 1996b), having been edited by the Ministry of Education. The section from the Draft Guidelines (Ministry of Education, 1993) which had highlighted the concept of “Culturally Appropriate Practice” had been deleted in the final document, although the commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi was still very evident in what is the first bicultural and bilingual curriculum document for our country. The document is also innovative in that it takes a holistic integrated approach to early childhood care and education, and encourages teachers to actively reflect upon their practice in an ongoing cycle, using as a framework suggested ‘questions for reflection’.

2.2.2.2 Te Whāriki as a Bicultural Document

Te Whāriki reflects a Tiriti-based partnership not only in its development, but also in its final structure (Carr & May, 1993, p.11; May, 2001, p. 244-5). Te Whāriki contains the expectation that all children have opportunities to develop knowledge and understanding of the cultural heritages of both partners to Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p.9). Part B of the document contains a Māori text

explaining the Kaupapa Whakahaere (Principles) and Taumata Whakahirahira (Goals or “Strands”) (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 31-8). Tilly Reedy, one of the key contributors to the development of Te Whāriki, has described the bicultural paradigm expressed in the document as encouraging “the transmission of my cultural values, my language and tikanga, and your cultural values language and customs. It validates my belief systems and your belief systems also” (Reedy, 1995, p. 17). She considers Te Whāriki to offer “a theoretical framework which is appropriate for all.... A whāriki woven by loving hands that can cross cultures with respect, that can weave people and nations together” (Reedy, 1995, p. 17).

Te Whāriki explicitly requires early childhood staff to support the use of the Māori language (Ministry of Education, 1996b). The curriculum recognises that since “New Zealand is the home of Māori language and culture”, “curriculum in early childhood settings should promote te reo and ngā tikanga Māori, making them visible and affirming their value for children from all cultural backgrounds” (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 42). More specifically, “The curriculum should include Māori people, places, and artifacts and opportunities to learn and use the Māori language through social interaction” (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 43). A learning outcome for children from the “Communication” strand suggests that children develop “an appreciation of te reo as a living and relevant language” (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 76). Teachers are required to provide experiences which ensure that “Māori phrases and sentences are included as a natural part of the programme” (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 77).

Bicultural expectations are expressed in statements such as the following:

- Particular care should be given to bicultural issues in relation to empowerment. Adults working with children should understand and be willing to discuss bicultural issues, actively seek Māori contributions to decision making, and ensure that Māori children develop a strong sense of self-worth (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 40)

- To address bicultural issues, adults working in early childhood education should have an understanding of Māori views on child development and on the role of the family as well as understanding the views of other cultures in the community (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 41)

Particular Māori content to be included in the programme are also suggested, as in these examples:

- Activities, stories, and events that have connections with Māori children's lives are an essential and enriching part of the curriculum for all children in early childhood settings (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 41)
- There should be a recognition of Māori ways of knowing and making sense of the world and of respecting and appreciating the natural environment (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 82)

As well as providing some explanations of adults' responsibilities for each strand, and examples for the various goals, the curriculum has a reflexive orientation that invites educators to critique their practice and programmes. Some examples of 'questions for reflection' posed in the document are as follows:

- In what ways do the environment and programme reflect the values embodied in Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and what impact does this have on adults and children? (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 56)
- In what ways is Māori language included in the programme? (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 76)
- What opportunities are there for children to experience Māori creative arts in an appropriate way and at an appropriate level? (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 80)

Te Whāriki recognises that bicultural development in centres should involve local Māori:

- Decisions about the ways in which bicultural goals and practices are developed within each early childhood education setting should be made in consultation with the appropriate tangata whenua (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 11)

- There should be a commitment to, and opportunities for, a Māori contribution to the programme. Adults working in the early childhood setting should recognise the significance of whakapapa, understand and recognise the process of working as a whānau, and demonstrate respect for Māori elders (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 64)

Although the bicultural focus of the final Te Whāriki document had been signaled in the Draft Guidelines, this commitment has huge implications for early childhood education in this country, in that a bicultural emphasis had previously been optional. Helen May, one of the Te Whāriki project directors, recognised that this bicultural emphasis would be a significant challenge for mainstream early childhood education:

...the holistic and bicultural approach to curriculum of Te Whāriki, inclusive of children from birth, was a challenge to staff who were more familiar with the traditional focus on play areas and activities for children in mainstream centres (May, 2001, p. 248).

2.2.2.3 Kaupapa Māori Content of Te Whāriki

An interesting observation of the Te Whāriki document, and one which has resonance with the two versions of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi, is that no translation into English is provided of the Māori text on pages 31-39 of the curriculum. This is presumably because this text is intended for Kōhanga Reo and other Māori immersion settings. This exclusivity could also be a deliberate strategy to protect concepts which belong in the Māori domain, from access by those unschooled in te ao me te reo Māori³⁸. This section considers some explanations of Māori concepts that are utilised within Te Whāriki.

The “kaupapa whakahaere”, or operating framework of Te Whāriki are the four foundational principles: Whakamana, Kotahitanga, Whānau Tangata, and Ngā Hōnonga (explained below) (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 32-33). Wharehuia Hemara (2000) writes that “Whakamana” is a process that empowers children to learn and grow with connotations of the bestowing of prestige (p. 68). “Mana” with its

³⁸ Te ao me te reo Māori – the Māori world and language.

associations of prestige and power, he believes, “defines children’s position within communities”, since it is inherited from tupuna/ancestors, thus placing children within a cosmic order (Hemara, 2000, p. 68). The implication of this positioning is that sustaining the children’s wellbeing “would ensure that they would carry, enhance and maintain their whānau’s mana for successive generations” (Hemara, 2000, p. 70).

Kotahitanga is community unity, demonstrated in the cooperation and support which is reflected in working towards a common goal (Hemara, 2000, p. 72-3). According to Hemara, unification of purpose creates a sense of security and wellbeing (mana atua) for children, whilst establishing common understandings, objectives and goals (mana whenua) (2000, p. 73). Whānau Tangata is considered by Hemara to refer to the recognition of the interdependent and cooperative relationships which sustain tamariki, who were traditionally recognised as being the physical manifestations of whānau and community unity, strength, and aspirations (Hemara, 2000, p. 75). Ngā Hononga refers to the splicing and continuity of kinship relationships, which incorporate rights and obligations (Hemara, 2000, p. 76).

The Taumata Whakahirahira (which parallel the “Strands” of the mainstream text) of Mana Atua, Mana Tangata, Mana Reo, Mana Whenua and Mana Aotūroa are traditional Māori concepts (M. Smith, 1995) (see section 1.1.3). Their application within the Te Whāriki document could be viewed as a repositioning of traditional kaupapa Māori values at the heart of the early childhood curriculum.

Wharehuia Hemara states that “Mana Atua is considered a powerful gift for individuals who conform to particular metaphysical principles and carry out appropriate rituals” (Hemara, 2000, p. 77.) Within Te Whāriki, says Tilly Reedy, Mana Atua focuses on personal wellbeing, recognising the mauri³⁹ within people, other creatures, and inanimate objects (1995, p. 20).

³⁹ Mauri is life principle.

Mana Tangata “is the power an individual gains through their abilities, efforts and taking advantage of all opportunities” (Hemara, 2000, p. 78). Intrinsic to the development of Mana Tangata, the development of confidence to contribute to life, are concepts of “the spirit of generosity and reciprocity, of caring for others and creating enduring personal relationships”, and “of developing emotional maturity and awareness, of learning to deal with fears and inhibitions” in order to experience joy and happiness (Reedy, 1995, p. 20-21).

Mana Reo signifies, according to Hemara, the power of language and communication, and the links between these and mana (prestige), whenua (land), and tikanga (culture) (Reedy, 1995). Similarly, Reedy recognises that “Language is the window to one's culture and transmits the values and beliefs of its people” (Reedy, 1995, p. 21). Mana Whenua, in signifying jurisdiction over land and land-based resources, recognises the intrinsic power land has to sustain life and contribute to people’s wellbeing and security (Hemara, 2000, p. 78). Reedy considers Mana Whenua to be “the development of a sense of sovereignty, of identity and a sense of belonging” (Reedy, 1995, p. 21) She explains the Māori tradition of returning the placenta (whenua) to the land (whenua), which illustrates the connectedness and holism of Māori identity, belonging, and spirituality:

Because of these traditions, the spiritual unity of the child with the land, with its people, and with the Universe at large is as one; the sense of identity for the land of one's birth is inculcated in the person; familiarity and love for the geographic features of home are learned and imprinted in one's mind and love and respect for the land and its environment. The spirit of the land lives in the person; the physical and emotional identity with the land are strengthened through myths, song, dance, and karakia; confidence and self-esteem are the outcomes (Reedy, 1995, p. 21).

The centrality of the spiritual dimension which pervades Māori epistemologies, a perspective very different from secular Western conceptualisations, has been explained further by Te Maire Tau (2001, p. 67).

Mana Aotūroa is often used to refer to metaphysical or intellectual journeys of self-discovery (Hemara, 2000, p. 79). Within Te Whāriki it fosters a sense of exploration and understanding of all aspects of the world and universe (Reedy, 1995, p. 21). Beyond attending to the development of curiosity is the understanding “that developing and practising the universal emotions of peace, compassion and harmony are a responsibility for us all” (Reedy, 1995, p. 21). Whakamana (empowerment) positions children within their communities, according to Hemara. Children who are secure in their knowledge of their whakapapa (genealogy) are integrated in to their communities (Mana Whenua) and are strongly grounded with a sense of security (Mana Atua) (Hemara, 2000, p. 71):

Their contributions (mana tangata) simultaneously feed into the past, present and future and ensure the survival of themselves and their communities. Reciting whakapapa, kōrero tawhito,⁴⁰ waiata,⁴¹ and whakatauākī⁴² teachers children about their communities’ histories and offers them a variety of options for their futures (mana aotūroa). The acts of reciting and teaching (mana reo) whakapapa, kōrero tāwhito and waiata empower children by offering them the medium of language. Because children are part of a continuum, mātua (parents) and kaumātua (elders) are viewed in the same way and learn from their children as they teach (Hemara, 2000, p. 71).

The weaving together of the kaupapa whakahaere and the traumata whakahirahira can be seen in the following example from Hemara (2000):

Because kinship entailed support, cooperation and unity, children could feel safe in the knowledge that they were secure. Expectations of reciprocity ensured that children would enhance the reputations of their ancestors while safeguarding successive generations (mana atua). Reciprocity within a discrete group would produce a sense of belonging (mana whenua), which was how each member interacted and contributed (mana tangata) to the group’s welfare.

Kinship bonds were continually renewed through the medium of language (mana reo). They allowed individuals to extend their boundaries and explore (mana aoturoa) uncharted territory in relative safety (Hemara, 2000, p. 77).

⁴⁰ Kōrero tāwhito are ancient stories.

⁴¹ Waiata are songs.

⁴² Wkakatauākī are sayings, proverbs, aphorisms.

On page 34 of Te Whāriki, four dimensions of the child are outlined. They are tinana (body), hinengaro (mind), wairua (spirit), and whatumanawa (emotions). The concept of wairua is explained by Reedy as follows:

This dimension deals with power and a sense of oneness with the Universe. The student learns that all things are part of the Universe; that all matter is made up of the same forces. The past, present and future are sources of trust, confidence and self-esteem; that internal questions about atua/gods and their place in the Universe are challenges for the mind to explore; that tradition, religious beliefs, philosophy, and modern science are not necessarily incompatible (Reedy, 1995, p. 19-20).

Hinengaro is described as the power of the mind to seek understandings. Reedy explains that "To meet these needs the Māori mind developed the very useful tool of karakia⁴³/incantation, and affirmation. The karakia imprints within the mind and being of the person, the ability to focus on the purpose at hand which may be to seek help for someone, themselves, a job, or to help achieve some goal" (Reedy, 1995, p. 19). Although karakia are often seen as equivalent to Christian prayers, due to the colonising influences of Christian missionaries, it appears that in Reedy's explanation, a strong overlay of Christianity is not apparent. These, and other key concepts such as whatumanawa, the power of emotions (p. 20), and aroha - reciprocal obligation (p. 24) - are central to the Māori philosophy contained within Te Whāriki (1995).

The presence of the separate Māori text points reflecting the two parallel perspectives, mainstream and Māori, does not mean that the non-Māori text is devoid of Māori content. In fact the mainstream text should more properly be described as 'bicultural' in that all children in early childhood settings are required to have access to Māori cultural heritage (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 9). A possible criticism of the document might be that not enough focus is given to explaining the specifics of Māori content that should be made available in mainstream settings. However, this apparent hesitancy may in fact be due to recognition that this material is contextually

⁴³ Karakia are ritual incantations.

situated and can only be determined in consultation with local tangata whenua as stated on page 11 of Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b).

2.2.2.4 Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices

The New Zealand Ministry of Education's Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices (DOPs) (Ministry of Education, 1996a) for chartered early childhood services, requires management and educators to implement policies, objectives and practices which:

- acknowledge parents'/guardians' and whānau needs and aspirations for their child;
- reflect the unique place of Māori as tangata whenua and the principle of partnership inherent in Te Tiriti o Waitangi; and
- are inclusive, equitable and culturally appropriate (Ministry of Education, 1996a).

The supporting document for the revised DOPs, "Quality in Action / Te Mahi Whai Hua" "builds on the bicultural approach to early childhood promoted by Te Whāriki..." (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 6) including a strand containing "bicultural approaches" for each desirable objective and practice section. Quality in Action / Te Mahi Whai Hua lists a range of implications for early childhood educators of Te Tiriti o Waitangi. These are:

- recognising Māori as tangata whenua;
- working in partnership with Māori to develop plans and policies for services;
- addressing equity issues to achieve genuine opportunities for participation by Māori and quality outcomes for Māori children; and
- ensuring that service programmes support the revitalisation of te reo Māori and tikanga Māori (Ministry of Education, 1998, p. 67).

It also recognises that for many Māori, quality curriculum involves the use of te reo (p. 64). The document recommends that educators "ensure the correct use of te reo across the curriculum" (p.48).

2.2.3 University of Waikato Policy

The University of Waikato is situated in the heart of the Tainui iwi, physically sited on land unjustly confiscated in 1863 and returned to Tainui through the negotiated settlement of their Raupatu claim in 1995 (Durie, 1998, p 195-6). Although essentially a monocultural Pākehā institution, based in British university tradition, the University contained within its 1992 charter the following goal:

To create and sustain an institutional environment in which the educational needs of Māori people are appropriately catered for outside a formally constituted whare wānanga (house of learning); Māori customs and values are expressed in the ordinary life of the University; and the Treaty of Waitangi is clearly acknowledged in the development of programmes and initiatives based on partnership between Māori and other New Zealand people and which is characterised overall by

- a spirit of co-operation
- keenness to meet and respond to new challenges
- freedom in the exchange of ideas and information (University of Waikato, 1992, p. 2).

In a paper written in 1995, James Ritchie, of the Centre for Māori Studies and Research at the University of Waikato, listed a substantial number of “markers” and “processes” which were indications of “progress towards biculturalism” (J. E. Ritchie, 1995, p. 3). He considered that this progress could be attributed to the commitment of particular individuals who had promoted the issue, but considered that the institution still fell short of its potential as a bicultural institution.

During 1999, the University reviewed its Strategic Plan. The fifth strategic objective, in a list of five, is “Our commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi”. This objective is revisited on the final page of the document where the following strategies are listed:

- to increase our proportion of Māori students
- to improve our ability to support Māori students
- to provide full career opportunities for Māori staff
- to ensure that all staff have a proper understanding of the Treaty of Waitangi
- to make new appointments which ensure full participation by Māori in the University’s decision-making

- to continue to work in partnership with Tainui and other iwi
- to support Te Roopu Manukura⁴⁴ as a partner to Council
- to develop new thinking about the achievement of our aspirations in this area (University of Waikato, 1999, p. 5)

2.2.4 School of Education Policy

The School of Education within the University of Waikato prioritised the area of bicultural development within its Academic and Administrative Plan for 1993 - 1995.

The first goal listed was:

- A strengthened commitment to the text of the Treaty of Waitangi and bicultural education.

This goal is followed by eighteen specific objectives, which include to:

- Encourage non-Māori students to address bicultural issues , and
- Ensure that all courses have bicultural content where appropriate. (School of Education, 1993, p. 1)

In the Academic Goals Document for 2001-2003, listed as the first of the School's "Values", is the statement that the School's activities will:

- Be consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi and with the policies of non-discrimination enunciated by the University's Equal Opportunities Policy (School of Education, 2001)

Under the heading of "Applying the Treaty of Waitangi", the Strategic Objective is to:

- Enhance programmes in Māori education, including bilingual and immersion programmes, and to make these more responsive to the needs of Māori

The only specific objectives listed for 2001 were:

- Sustain the increased Māori participation in postgraduate programmes
- Ensure the Māori education advisory committee meets regularly and seeks community input (School of Education, 2001, p. 2)

⁴⁴ Te Roopu Manukura is a body comprising sixteen iwi (tribes), that works with the University Council to act as the guardian of the Treaty of Waitangi and ensure that the tertiary needs of the iwi are met (University of Waikato, 2002).

2.3 Previous Research of Relevance to this Study

Research-generated guidelines for teacher preparation programmes are rather uncommon, despite acknowledgment of the importance of utilising research-based theoretical frameworks (Bernhardt & Schrier, 1992). There is little research focusing on bicultural aspects in either early childhood practice or early childhood teacher education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. My own previous research (Ritchie, 1994c) had indicated that the early childhood programme at the University of Waikato was successful in developing in students an awareness and commitment to bicultural development, but was not meeting students' needs in terms of developing their skills to a point where they felt confident to implement bicultural early childhood programmes in early childhood centres.

Research in the same early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato by Jill Mitchell (Mitchell, 2001) found that over the three years of their studies, her 17 student subjects from the same yearly intake increased in their understandings related to diversity issues. Beliefs such as those around cultural diversity were frequently ones which posed a challenge for students since they were "quite startling new ideas or experiences" (Mitchell, 2001, p. 302). Mitchell writes that:

Confronted with new ideas, the participants needed some time to consider them, to try them out, to select what they wanted from the ideas and to attempt to resolve discrepancies with other beliefs they held. If these could not be resolved, they could occasionally live alongside other beliefs without the discrepancy being voiced, or they might cause uneasiness that the participant sought to resolve (Mitchell, 2001, p. 302).

However the opportunities for reflection upon these issues throughout the three-year qualification programme led students to enhance their understandings. Mitchell found that "The teacher was increasingly described as having a proactive role in ensuring diversity was respected" (Mitchell, 2001, p. 131). By the end of their studies, the students had come to characterise the "good teacher" as "a caring,

responsive educator who, as an intrinsic part of their role, appreciated diversity and ensured that understanding of different cultures was a feature of their programme” (p. 131). Mitchell cites “Natasha”, who in her final year wrote that:

The good teacher incorporates biculturalism as well as multicultural aspects into the programme, giving children the opportunity to learn empathy and understanding of the world. By increasing their understanding you show the value of diversity (Natasha, cited in Mitchell, 2001, p. 131).

Mitchell summarised the positioning of the student “Sarah” in her final year, as: “Has and wants ongoing training for biculturalism. Will work with whanau and parents to develop a programme that suits all needs” (Mitchell, 2001, p. 134). Mitchell considers that “Teacher educators need to appreciate that changing beliefs does not simply involve dropping one belief and replacing it with new ideas” (Mitchell, 2001, p. 305). She views the change process as more complex and challenging than this. She writes that “Tensions and belief conflict need to be seen as positive and as part of the questioning of existing beliefs and accommodating to new ideas” (p. 306). This has implications for educators, in that successful accommodation will be facilitated by educators who have an awareness of the change process involved and are comfortable with handling students’ feelings of emotional discomfort.

Pam Cubey’s (1992) research within early childhood centres in the Wellington area identified a “mismatch between policy and practice”, in that commitment to implementing Ministry of Education charter requirements on the Treaty of Waitangi was not necessarily being effectively translated into practice (1992, p. 68). In a questionnaire survey of 38 centres, lack of knowledge was the most cited barrier (eleven centres) to the implementation of the Ministry of Education requirements (Ministry of Education, 1990) regarding the Treaty of Waitangi (Cubey, 1992, p. 56). Negative attitudes of parents and lack of contact with Māori were both cited by seven centres, and apathy on the part of staff and/or parents, lack of resources, and insufficient time, were barriers each reported by six centres. Cubey also found that:

No centre was at the stage of shared partnership with Māori people, nor with the possible exception of one childcare centre, had established effective links

with local Māori. Staff lacked knowledge and confidence and were unsure as to what to do next” (Cubey, 1992, p. 60).

She considered that although centres were “philosophically committed to the Treaty”, a lack of knowledge and apathy on the part of Pākehā have been impeding the implementation of change consistent with this policy commitment (p. 65). She observed that teachers who “already have some knowledge, experience, understanding and confidence” and had the support of colleagues, parents, and management “should be able to develop a programme and work with children and families in ways that reflect the Treaty” (p. 70). Although many staff were asking for help and guidance (p. 68), nearly all the management bodies in her survey had yet to provide “a staged plan for staff development covering the Treaty and related areas” (p. 66). She recommended that more opportunities for in-service training and continuing education be provided for early childhood staff (p. 72). It must be noted that since the introduction of Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b), in 1996, the Ministry of Education has worked with professional development providers to strengthen kaupapa Māori in early childhood programmes (Ministry of Education, 2001). Nevertheless, the concerns Cubey raised as a result of her study have ongoing relevance. She stated that “The question must be asked, ‘What messages are being received by Māori children and their parents who come to kindergartens, playcentre and childcare centres?’” where there is little or token access to their culture (1992, p. 67).

Brenda Soutar (1988) found common issues she encountered whilst working with mainstream early childhood services to support them in providing a meaningful Māori component in their programmes included:

- The view that a Māori component was not necessary because there aren’t any Māori children enrolled.
- Inappropriate messages contained within Māori images selected for display. Soutar questions the hidden messages expressed, for example, if the only

poster with Māori content is one advising Māori not to smoke, or how to eliminate headlice.

- Associating Māori content with natural resources and kōwhaiwhai⁴⁵ panels, which align Māori with nature and traditional paradigms, but do not position Māori as having contemporary relevance throughout the curriculum.
- Token use of te reo, as in an annual “Māori Language Week”.
- A lack of understanding of Māori families aspirations and backgrounds (Soutar, 1988, p.13-15).

Sarah Te One (1998) has provided a brief narrative of an attempt by Pākehā teachers to introduce “a bicultural perspective” in an early childhood centre in a predominantly Māori community. Teachers were described as “despondent” when having had no response to a newsletter and written survey, three mothers invited to afternoon tea to discuss their possible contributions to the programme offered to kōrero⁴⁶ with children, to organise kapahaka⁴⁷, and to run decolonisation workshops. Clearly this was not the contribution the teachers had been seeking. They eventually focused on utilising a Taniwhā⁴⁸ story, obtained from a museum which was popular with children and led to contributions of a taiaha, mere, and korowai⁴⁹ from parents for a display. This narrative indicates that the teachers were uncomfortable with the political dimensions which emerged when parents were asked to define their contributions (Te One, 1998, p. 21). They were more comfortable to retain control over the process by defining the type of Māori contribution and content that they considered appropriate.

⁴⁵ Kōwhaiwhai is painted scroll ornamentation.

⁴⁶ Kōrero is to talk.

⁴⁷ Kapahaka is the performance of Māori dance, song, haka, poi, and so on.

⁴⁸ Taniwha are water-residing super-creatures, often kaitiaki or guardians of a local river or sea.

⁴⁹ A taiaha is a long, bladed wooden weapon. A mere is a short flat stone weapon. A korowai is a woven cloak.

2.4 An Overview of the Primary Research Setting, the Early Childhood Teacher Education Programme

Since February 1990, I have been employed as a lecturer within the early childhood programme at the School of Education, University of Waikato (formerly Hamilton Teachers' College). This is a campus located in a city of approximately 100,000 residents, in the central North Island of Aotearoa/New Zealand. The early childhood programme has an intake of approximately 50-60 students per year. The following sections (2.41 to 2.46) provide some explanations of the nature of the programme, with a particular focus on structures and strategies which are related to the programme's bicultural commitment.

2.4.1 Department of Early Childhood Degree Programme.

In 1989, the early childhood division within the Hamilton Teachers' College, (forerunner of the Department of Early Childhood Studies within the School of Education at the University of Waikato), after consultation with the early childhood community, introduced a new three-year early childhood education diploma qualification programme, which constituted three-quarters of a Bachelor of Education degree (Carr, May, & Mitchell, 1991). This new qualification replaced the former kindergarten teaching diploma with a comprehensive programme designed to equip teachers to work with infants and young children in a range of early childhood settings, including both kindergartens and child-care centres. In 1999 this diploma became a three year degree, a Bachelor of Teaching (Early Childhood).

From the outset the new programme had a commitment to principles of 'biculturalism' and 'equity'. These were two of the seven 'integral themes' underpinning the integration of theory and practice which were pivotal features within the philosophical paradigm of the new early childhood education programme (Carr et al., 1991). The other integral themes were: special needs; infants and toddlers; multiculturalism; links with school; and families and parents. It was

intended that each of these integral themes be considered in the design and delivery of all courses within the early childhood teacher education programme. There are 21 papers in the degree, 16 of which were taught by the Department of Early Childhood Studies. A diagram of the Bachelor of Teaching (Early Childhood) degree structure is included as Appendix 1.1.

Level One papers are as follows:

- Historical Perspectives in Early Childhood Care and Education 1058.112
- The Early Childhood Educator and Professional Practice (Practicum) modules 1058.110 and 1058.111
- Human Development 1051.151
- Cultural Studies One 1058.113
- Exploration and Play 1058.114
- Children's Wellbeing 1058.115
- Two Level One Options papers

Level Two papers comprise:

- International Issues in Early Childhood Programmes 1058.211
- The Reflective Practitioner and Professional Practice Modules 1058.210 and 1058.211
- Cultural Studies Two 1058.213
- Making Sense of the World 1058.212
- Children's Language and Communication 1058.214
- Two further options papers (Levels 2 or 3)
- Family and Community 1058.218*
- Integrating the Arts in Early Childhood 1058.216*

*Taught in the third year of the programme.

Level Three papers consist of the following:

- Developing Early Childhood Programmes 1058.313
- The Professional Educator and Professional Practice Three Modules 1058.310 and 1058.311
- Belonging and Contribution 1058.311
- Inclusive Programmes in the Early Years 1058.312

The programme structure and content has been modified in the thirteen years since its introduction in response to degree restructurings and the ongoing processes of evaluation and review.

A key indicator of commitment to bicultural development was the appointment, by 1991, of three Māori staff to the Department of Early Childhood Studies. These were permanent positions, and this number has been maintained despite an overall reduction of lecturing positions in the Department from the high of 11.5 when this research began, to the current total of eight. All early childhood staff were required by the Department, shortly after they took up their appointment, to attend the two-day Tiriti and Anti-racism workshop offered to first year students.

Courses in the teacher education programme are usually taught over a twelve-week semester, often four class hours weekly. Sometimes they are condensed with more teaching hours over fewer weeks, to fit around the students' block practicum, full-time experience in early childhood centres. Students have one block practicum per year. In the first year the practicum is 17 days or just over three weeks long. The second block practicum runs for 22 days, or just over four weeks, and the third and final block is 30 days, or six weeks long. In addition, in year one they have a series of fifteen one-day weekly 'placements' in early childhood centres. This repeats in the second year with five weeks of half day placements, followed in the second semester with a further three full-day placements spread over three weeks. These practicum experiences are intended to provide opportunities for integration of theory and practice. Opportunities to ground their curriculum learnings in teaching experiences

including implementing new approaches such as integrating Māori content are a key element of the programme, since, according to Michael O’Loughlin, “such praxis is essential if the goal is to change not just people’s words but their actions” (O’Loughlin, 1992b, p. 337).

Most courses offered by the Department of Early Childhood Studies are co-taught by two lecturers. This collaboration has been a strong feature of the Department’s course delivery. Courses utilise a range of formats, many having moved away from the traditional lecture/tutorial model, to employ a range of modes, including more interactive workshop-style sessions. Assessment also varies from traditional tests and essays, to more creative and collaborative seminars and presentations.

2.4.2 Introductory Tiriti and Anti-racism Workshop

A cornerstone of the Department’s commitment to bicultural development is a compulsory two-day introductory workshop backgrounding Te Tiriti o Waitangi and issues of colonisation and racism. Although technically part of the course, Cultural Studies One, 1058.113, it is actually taught in the week before the official teaching semester starts, during the orientation programme. Henry Giroux has described how history can become “hardened into a form of social amnesia” through “a mode of consciousness that ‘forgets’ its own development” (Giroux, 1983, p. 39). In Aotearoa/New Zealand, Maurice Shadbolt has identified a national syndrome of historical amnesia which may previously have been associated with a deep-seated guilt or unwillingness to acknowledge the tensions and treachery of our past (Shadbolt, 1999, p. 40). This amnesia contributes to an inability to understand or show empathy towards Māori regarding the negative effects of colonisation. Students need opportunities to recover the history of this country in order to contextualise their contemporary understandings (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1999, p.137). A component of this is a solid understanding of Te Tiriti/the Treaty and its relevance as a moral and ethical framework for education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This

provides the foundation necessary to translate a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi into practice in early childhood centres, as required by Te Whāriki.

My Masters dissertation (Ritchie, 1990) focused on the content of the Treaty of Waitangi and Anti-racism workshops I facilitated for Project Waitangi in 1989. Since 1989 I have facilitated workshops for Pākehā and Tauīwi students of the early childhood programme at the former Hamilton Teachers' College and University of Waikato (which amalgamated in 1991), whilst a Māori colleague has run parallel workshops for Māori early childhood students. Māori request this parallel format as a safe setting for their exploration of the impact of colonisation. As Leonie Pihama and Kuni Jenkins have explained, separate space for Māori students allows for the repositioning of Māori perspectives as central, creating a 'normalising' effect for Māori experiences, which reduces whakamā⁵⁰, and enables them to express their questions and engage more fully with the material (Jenkins & Pihama, 2001). Separate formats also enable Māori to explore their perspectives without the discussion being dominated by Pākehā (Consedine & Consedine, 2001, p. 181). Irihapeti Ramsden (1997, p. 124) considers that parallel groupings allow each ethnic group to self-identify. Ani Mikaere's experiences lecturing in the Law School at the University of Waikato have also lead her to the conclusion "that for some purposes, Maori and Pakeha students would best be taught separately" (Mikaere, 1998, p. 12).

The parallel workshop structure acknowledges the disparate legacies of the colonisation process, as it has affected Māori and Pākehā. As Robert and Joanna Consedine have written, "Māori and Pākehā have had different experiences in the colonisation process, the origins of which lie in the power dynamic between 'the colonised' and 'the coloniser'" (Consedine & Consedine, 2001, p. 176).

⁵⁰ Whakamā is shyness or shame.

Māori have suffered the demoralization of social, cultural, and economic marginalisation and ongoing racism and this is reflected in the realities of their daily lives, whilst Pākehā live with the privileges and benefits of their historical and contemporary dominance, although many are oblivious to the historicity of this positioning. The parallel structure recognises this positioning and aims to facilitate in participants an understanding of such (Consedine & Consedine, 2001, p. 176).

It is common for some Pākehā and Tāiwi students to query the parallel structure, seeing it as 'separatist' and sometimes reacting negatively as has been reported elsewhere (Jenkins & Pihama, 2001; Jones, 2001). This issue can itself be a useful discussion focus. Pākehā students sometimes ask why there should be any difference in the provision and express concern that they are missing out on what the Māori students are getting. This discomfort to me signifies the dominant group's unwillingness to relinquish control, or to be comfortable with a partnership model which allows the other party to define their own needs.

Another reason for the parallel workshops is to provide Pākehā with a space in which they are safe to be challenged about racism (Consedine & Consedine, 2001, p. 177). As hooks has pointed out, dealing with our racism is an issue around which white people need to accept responsibility, rather than relying on blacks/Māori to assist us (hooks, 1994). The separate workshops to support the different processes of Māori and Pākehā, are supported by the research of Derman-Sparks and Phillips who found that, in their U.S.A., context, whites and blacks experienced different developmental pathways in dealing with anti-racism understandings (Derman-Sparks & Phillips, 1997, p. 28-32).

The Tiriti and anti-racism workshops begin with ground-rules that emphasise respect and a group contract of confidentiality and safety. Participants are assured that there are many different perspectives on these issues, and that people will not be pressured to consider any particular view, but offered various opportunities and frameworks to

support their own journey of understanding. The first day covers the context for the signing of the treaty, a comparison of the wording of the two versions (Māori and English), a small group exploration of the concept of ‘partnership’, and then detailed coverage of both Crown and Māori responses since the treaty signing.

The workshops, and subsequent classes in the cultural issues strands of Cultural Studies One, 1058.113, and Two, 1058.213, employ strategies intended to facilitate a process similar to that which Paulo Freire termed “conscientization” (Freire, 1972, p. 15), using dialogical processes which are grounded in respect for participants’ understandings. This position of security is a basis from which students are encouraged to identify and then critique key Pākehā cultural values and beliefs. A key aim is to develop an awareness of the power of ethnocentric assumptions. One of these assumptions critiqued in the workshop is that of “fatal impact”, the view that inferior peoples would inevitably be supplanted by the superior white race (Belich, 1996, p. 126). These ideas were based in views of European superiority, normalcy, and the assumption of a God-given right to exert their dominance to define the world of lesser peoples (Ballara, 1986; Belich, 1996). Ideas such as these have underpinned Pākehā tendencies to disregard Māori aspirations, to misunderstand Māori intentions, and to explain perceived ‘deficiencies’ of Māori (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 137). They have also been used to justify policies and practices that created and perpetuated inequalities, and, most importantly, to vindicate Pākehā unwillingness to share power and resources in an equal partnership.

Schooling is directly implicated in the marginalisation of indigenous peoples, through the selective portrayal of histories within the curriculum and its underlying theory of knowledge, according to Linda Smith (1999, p. 33). Smith does not view history as being solely related to justice, but considers that:

In fact history is mostly about power. It is the story of the powerful and how they became powerful, and the how they use the power to keep them in positions from which they can continue to dominate others. It is because of

this relationship with power that we have been excluded, marginalized and 'Othered' (Smith, 1999, p. 34).

Since indigenous people have been marginalised, they "do not possess the power to transform history into justice" (Smith, 1999, p. 34). It is therefore a key objective of the programme to provide students with a picture of the history of colonisation and relations between Māori and Pākehā, and this begins with a strong focus on historical matters within the initial Tiriti workshop. The workshop is important in that it begins a process of recognition and validation of Māori perspectives that is to be maintained throughout the three year programme. The rationale for this is generated by the need to redress the impact of colonisation, which has rendered invisible, or misrepresented Māori perspectives on their culture and history. As Linda Smith has written:

The colonization of Maori culture has threatened the maintenance of that knowledge and the transmission of knowledge that is 'exclusively' or particularly Maori. The dominance of Western, British culture, and the history that underpins the relationship between indigenous Maori and non-indigenous Pakeha, have made it extremely difficult for Maori forms of knowledge and learning to be accepted as legitimate (Smith, 1999, p. 174)

The workshop provides frameworks which enable students to appreciate that whilst they have a culture which influences their values and beliefs, other individuals from Māori or other cultures have different but equally valid world views. It is also the beginning of a series of educational experiences which continue beyond the initial workshop, which are intended to provide opportunities for students to gain an appreciation of "uniquely Māori ways of looking at the world and learning" (Smith, 1999, p. 174).

When we begin to discuss cultural matters, quite frequently a student will comment that they do not consider themselves to have a 'culture'. They do not have the perception that everyone is enculturated from birth, rather, they see culture as something people other than the mainstream Western majority possess, something belonging to [other] 'ethnic' groups. They do not have a perception of themselves as a distinct cultural or ethnic group (Spoonley, 1990, p. 29), perhaps because of the

geographical isolation of Aotearoa/New Zealand, and the globalisation of Western/Anglo culture. As Metge points out, because they are part of the mainstream, “Pākehā people find it more difficult than most to see their own culture” (Metge, 1990, p. 15).

White students in the U.S.A. also revealed this denial and ignorance of their own cultural identity (Derman-Sparks & Phillips, 1997, p. 53-54). The inability to recognise their own culture is a fundamental barrier to acknowledging that their perspective is just one possible worldview. If the tendency is for Māori to be seen as possessing their ‘traditional’ culture, but Pākehā are to be considered to be culture-free, then, Wetherell and Potter (1992) suggest, the implication is that Pākehā possess instead the practical trappings of modern ‘civilisation’, technology, ‘common sense’, and society itself (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 135). This dichotomous positioning of ‘possessors of society’ versus ‘repositories of traditional culture’ prevents those from the dominant culture from distinguishing the power and privilege attached to this positioning (Sleeter, 1992, p. 189; Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 135). The result is a self-perpetuating cycle which maintains comfort levels for those within the security of their dominance, since white race privilege and dominance create a “seeming normativity, [a] structured invisibility” of white culture (Frankenberg, 1993), p.6). The dominant Pākehā culture is positioned as ‘normal’, whilst Māori are positioned as “Other” to that norm (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 136) and this ascribes to Pākehā an empowering voice and subject positioning of authority (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 214). Individualistic ideologies also serve to perpetuate a view of culture as an irrelevance, since in treating people as individuals, the Pākehā teacher is actually judging them by uncritiqued Pākehā criteria (Simon, 1996).

Avril Bell has pointed out that “significant numbers of white New Zealanders resist any use of an ethnic identity to refer to themselves” (A. Bell, 1996, p. 145). Many people reject the term ‘Pākehā’, preferring alternatives such as ‘New Zealander’, or ‘Kiwi’. Official forms often offer only the phrase ‘New Zealand European’, and the

N.Z. Police and media tend to use the term 'Caucasian'. Avril Bell considers that this avoidance of 'Pākehā', a term from the Māori language, signifies a rejection of interdependency with Māori (A. Bell, 1996, p. 145), which suggests racist undertones.

A useful framework used in the Tiriti workshops is one provided by Michael King, a Pākehā historian and writer, whose personal qualities and years of research have generated a deep understanding of both Māori and Pākehā cultures. In order for there to be a renewed and respectful partnership between the two, it seems that Pākehā need to assume responsibility for understanding, valuing, and critiquing their own culture. He has written that for Māori and Pākehā to achieve a harmonious accommodation, "both groups and the individuals that constitute them will have to find what poet Allen Curnow called 'the trick of standing upright here'" (King, 2000, p. 44). Paul Spoonley recognises that identifying Pākehā culture and identity is not a straightforward project (Spoonley, 1995), since contestation, ambiguities and uncertainties exist within the cultural identification processes of any ethnic grouping, involving historicities, and evolving over time. Avril Bell suggests that embracing the term Pākehā can be seen as an indication of a post-colonial movement, in that it positions Pākehā as the 'Other' to 'Māori', which is returned to its pre-colonisation positioning of 'normal' (A. Bell, 1996, p. 154).

Like King, Avril Bell suggests that Pākehā face the task of recognising a Pākehā identity. She points out the irony that whilst Pākehā culture and values underpin the national infrastructure, Pākehā turn to te ao Māori for symbols of national identity (A. Bell, 1996, p. 149), such as the Air New Zealand koru, and the rugby All-Blacks' haka. Māori ways of being and knowing are excluded from the powerful domains of governance, but symbolic motifs are detached from their authentic Māori contexts to provide superficial adornment which serves to signify the distinctiveness of 'New Zealand' from the rest of the world.

Claudia Bell (1996), in canvassing the 'everyday myths of Pākehā identity', suggests that egalitarianism; a strong connection with the natural world; individualism; a belief in 'survival of the fittest'; an identification with strong characters; and an obsession with male sports and drinking beer, are examples of identity markers which characterise Pākehā culture (C. Bell, 1996). James Belich considers another aspect of Pākehā belief systems to be, "The enduring myth of exceptionally benign Māori-Pākehā relations, of New Zealand as a paradise of racial harmony..." (Belich, 2001, p. 190). He writes that despite this superficial appearance of harmonious social relations between Māori and Pākehā, "Māori were often subjected to low-profile but widespread forms of Pākehā discrimination and prejudice", such as unflattering stereotypes and patronising jokes. These derive from historical perspectives where European attitudes towards Māori have "always been ambivalent, mixing fear, admiration and contempt", but most commonly have viewed Māori as "a superior kind of savage", according to Keith Sinclair (Sinclair, 1986, p197). Other writers have also identified the insidious undercurrent of racism lurking in the cultural baggage of the Pākehā mainstream (Ballara, 1986; Ritchie, 1992; Sinclair, 1986).

A key task of the early childhood programme, which begins with the introductory Tiriti workshop, is that of enabling participants to identify and "unlearn" racism (Ellsworth, 1989). During the second day of the workshop, a combination of discussion and role-play is designed to facilitate an awareness of racism at cultural, individual and institutional levels (Derman-Sparks & Phillips, 1997). This is a key part of the workshop, since, as Darder has written, racism is one of the "most violent forms of human oppression" in society, and yet it is one of the most difficult for most individuals of the dominant culture to comprehend (Darder, 1991, p. 38), because they have never experienced its negative effects. Describing their discourse analysis of a large number of interviews with a wide range of Pākehā New Zealanders, Wetherell and Potter write that:

The majority of our sample wanted to justify colonial land practices, argue against land compensation, fight against the implementation of affirmative

action and prevent Maori language acquiring any significant status in schools or public life (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 186).

Issues of racism in education are revisited in more depth in the second year course Cultural Studies Two, 1058.213, which includes several sessions which go beyond recognising the impact of racism in Aotearoa/New Zealand and its manifestations in education to consider various strategies for proactively countering racism in early childhood settings, using approaches such as the anti-bias curriculum developed by Louise Derman-Sparks and the Anti-Bias Curriculum Task Force (Derman-Sparks & A. B. C. Task Force, 1989).

Another important content aspect introduced in the workshop and later reiterated in Cultural Studies Two, 1058.213, is to reinforce students' appreciation of the professional responsibility of early childhood educators to attend to Tiriti principles of Māori autonomy/tino rangatiratanga, partnership, and equity for Māori. This means that students realise that bicultural development is not a choice, a 'take it or leave it' option, but a government requirement as mandated in Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b) and the Statement of Desirable Objectives (Ministry of Education, 1996a).

2.4.3 Specialist Courses as well as Integration

A token course within a teacher education degree programme is insufficient treatment of the complex area of culture and education (Young, 1998). Within the early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato, in addition to the 'biculturalism' integral theme, which requires all courses to address these issues in an integrated way, there are two courses that focus specifically on issues of culture and early childhood education. The courses Cultural Studies One, 1058.113, and Cultural Studies Two, 1058.213, have the following rationale:

These courses aim to equip students with the awareness, skills and resources that will enable them to design and implement culturally appropriate early childhood care and education programmes, in accordance with the requirements of the early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki, and the

Desirable Objectives and Practices required by the Ministry of Education.
(Cultural Studies Two, 1058, 213A, Course Booklet, 1999, p.1).

The courses each contain two strands. The first strand is te reo me ōna tikanga which is taught by Māori lecturers. Objectives of the 1999 Cultural Studies Two course included to:

- (a) further develop the knowledge, skills, resources and confidence to implement early childhood care and education programmes which recognise, affirm and support the cultural identity of Māori children and their families and which show Māori culture as visible and of value to children and families from other cultural backgrounds
- (b) develop their knowledge and skills in Te Reo Māori to a communicative and practical level
- (c) continue to develop their knowledge of tikanga Māori

This strong focus on facilitating knowledge of te ao/tamariki/whānau/tikanga Māori, precludes a similar treatment of the many Tauīwi cultures and languages that students may encounter in their future teaching roles, in an increasingly culturally diverse society. However, this intensive focus on Māori, in recognition of their tangata whenua status and the Crown's Tiriti obligations, by engendering in students a responsive and respectful disposition towards Māori, may also transfer to regard for other cultures and their different worldviews.

The second strand covers cultural issues in education. Content of the 1999 Cultural Studies Two course included:

- (a) an examination of the concept of bicultural development and the responsibilities of early childhood educators in this area
- (b) an exploration of the implications of racism for early childhood care and education professionals

- (c) an inquiry into cultural diversity in New Zealand society and the significance for early childhood education
- (d) identification of ways in which early childhood educators can be responsive to the needs of different cultural groups
- (e) opportunities to explore the concept of cultural difference and to develop a deeper understanding of their own attitudes and values.

The area of anti-racism education, first introduced in the introductory workshop as part of Cultural Studies One, 1058.113, is revisited in Cultural Studies Two, 1058.213. (See Appendix 1.2 for course outline information). Videos showing manifestations and effects of racism in New Zealand and overseas are used to stimulate discussion and heighten awareness of the realities of racism and its effects. Readings are intended to contextualise racism in education in Aotearoa/New Zealand and exercises focus on developing strategies for countering racism in early childhood education (Derman-Sparks & A. B. C. Task Force, 1989; Stonehouse, 1991). (See Appendix 1.2 for course topics and readings details).

In addition to the specialist courses, Cultural Studies One and Two, other courses contain parallel Māori perspectives and employ values comparisons. Some examples follow:

In 1994, a submission to the review by Māori staff of bicultural teaching within the early childhood programme, reported that the course “Issues in Early Childhood Care and Education”, 1031.263, contained the following specific topics that addressed Māori/bicultural issues:

1. The philosophy of equity: what is equity, how has it affected educational policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand? What is the responsibility of early childhood educators in terms of delivering equitable programmes, what accountability is there in terms of outcomes?

2. The colonisation of Māori philosophy: examination of the impact on traditional Māori educational philosophy as a result of the superimposition of Western ideology through the assimilationist policy of the education system.
3. Tino Rangatiratanga: Māori initiatives in response to state provision of education, the impact on other early childhood services, provision for the restoration of Tino Rangatiratanga to Māori education, the role of early childhood educators in supporting Māori aspirations for Tino Rangatiratanga.
4. Critique of Recent Māori Education Policy: reconciling Tino Rangatiratanga with Kawanatanga⁵¹?

In 1997, the same course included the following as some of the eleven suggested possible topics for the major assignment of the course, which comprised a newspaper clipping file with accompanying analysis, a philosophical statement, and a final essay, all on the same related topic:

- Te Tiriti o Waitangi: issues for early childhood educators. What is Pākehā responsibility in terms of Tino Rangatiratanga?
- Marginalisation of early childhood care and education, particularly Māori early childhood care and education. The impact of a culmination of low status factors: young children, women, Māori, disability, plus poverty, and resourcing issues.
- Te Reo Māori: Is it an endangered species? Whose responsibility is it to provide adequate resourcing for language revitalisation? How can this be achieved in early childhood care and education? (Department of Early Childhood Studies, 1997, p. 10).

In the year 2000 a Human Development course, “Lifespan: from birth to death”, 1058.111A, coordinated by a Māori colleague in the Department of Early Childhood Studies, provided parallel Māori perspectives on human development (Tangaere, 1997). Assessment of a course indicates the lecturer’s intent in terms of outcomes for students’ learning. In this case, the eleven questions in the final exam included the following:

⁵¹ Kawanatanga is governance, as used in Te Tiriti o Waitangi to refer to the role of the Crown.

- Outline key principles from Māori human development theory.
- Describe a ritual and discuss how this relates to a passage in the lifespan.
- Outline the views of either Freud, Erikson or Maslow, and compare this view with that of a Māori view of human development.
- Discuss the notion of respect, with regard to the older person's role in a particular cultural context.

The year three course, Belonging and Contribution, 1058.311, applies the socio-cultural theory of Rogoff (Rogoff, 1998) to the context of early childhood in Aotearoa/New Zealand through examination of concepts such as the continuum between independence and interdependence and how this applies differently within Māori and Pākehā cultures, asking students to reflect upon their own values and contrast these with Māori values as described in readings such as those from Mason Durie (1997) and Joan Metge (Metge, 1995). Consideration is also given to other Polynesian examples (Borofsky, Howard, & Friedman, 1990), as well of those from other cultural perspectives, such as, for example, the deliberate intention of Japanese parents/caregivers to teach their children “to graciously receive help” (Gonzalez-Mena, 1997, p.13). Later in the course, Māori perspectives on sexuality are explored using readings by Te Rangi Hiroa and Metge (Buck, 1970; Metge, 1995), as a starter for discussion. These two readings are chosen to offer both traditional and contemporary perspectives.

These examples are illustrative of some of the ways in which Māori perspectives and cultural issues have been treated within courses in the early childhood teacher education programme.

2.4.4 Pedagogical Strategies

Within the cultural studies courses there are two strands, which run concurrently. One strand is the cultural issues strand. In Cultural Studies One, 1058.113, this comprises the introductory Tiriti workshops. The rest of Cultural Studies One, taught throughout semester one of the first year, focuses on te reo me ngā tikanga Māori. In Cultural Studies Two, 1058.213, the cultural issues strand runs parallel with the te reo me ngā tikanga Māori strand [see Appendix 1.2]. The cultural issues strand employs strategies which are intended to encourage students to develop their skills of critical analysis, and to become aware of the hegemonic processes that have denied them the knowledge of the history of Aotearoa/New Zealand and of te reo me ngā tikanga Māori that might otherwise have been available to them as citizens of this country.

Meanwhile, in the other strand students are being supported by Māori staff to gain an understanding of te reo me ōna tikanga. This strand aims to provide students with basic competency in te reo and tikanga Māori that will enable its incorporation within their curriculum implementation.

A key focus of the Cultural Studies courses is to explore ideas related to cultural difference. Members of the dominant culture may struggle with issues of cultural difference, since their life experiences may have been cocooned within that mainstream culture, which in itself carries the often sub-conscious baggage of racism and other prejudices. According to Lisa Delpit:

We all interpret behaviors, information, and situations through our own cultural lenses; these lenses operate involuntarily, below the level of conscious awareness, making it seem that our own view is simply 'the way it is'. Learning to interpret across cultures demands reflecting on our own experiences, analyzing our own culture, examining and comparing varying perspectives. We must consciously and voluntarily make our cultural lenses apparent. Engaging in the hard work of seeing the world as others see it must be a fundamental goal for any move to reform the education of teachers and their assessment (Delpit, 1995, p. 151).

Facilitation of a trusting climate and respectful interconnectedness are key tasks for the early childhood teacher education programme. This requires facilitators who are aware of these processes and have the skills to promote them by enacting qualities of respectfulness and caring, showing genuine interest in students' expressed needs and interests, and providing support for their emotional processes (Daloz, 1990; Darder, 1991).

Specific pedagogical approaches include the use of readings. For Cultural Studies One, the course has a text book, Ranginui Walker's "Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou, Struggle Without End" (Walker, 1990). This detailed overview of the history of Aotearoa/New Zealand, is written from a Māori perspective by a highly respected Māori scholar. Utilising this as the course text is a deliberate choice, in that it provides validation of an indigenous perspective (Smith, 1999).

In Cultural Studies Two, the course text is "Becoming Bicultural" by James Ritchie (1992). This text is supplemented by a course booklet of readings (See Appendix 1.2) and these are accompanied by a set of readings guides (See some examples in Appendix 1.2), which contain sets of questions intended to assist students in identifying some of the key ideas contained within each reading. Students are expected to read the required reading, and attempt to address the readings guide questions, before each class. Each class usually begins with an opportunity for students to raise any 'burning issues' that need to be attended to, such as questions relating to assessment. An introductory framework for that week's topic is then provided by the lecturer, sometimes using key points highlighted on overhead transparencies, and often a video is utilised for the same purpose of introducing frameworks for further discussion. Towards the end of the class, discussion is facilitated of the responses students have prepared for the readings guides for that week's topic.

Assessment in the cultural issues module of Cultural Studies Two, includes an essay requiring students to compare their own values and upbringing with that described in an autobiographical piece written by a Māori author. Students can choose from a range of pieces, many of which come from the collection edited by Witi Ihimaera, entitled, “Growing Up Māori” (1998). They are expected to use Chapter Six, “Values” from “Becoming Bicultural” (1992), as a guide to their reflection. This assignment uses the “lens” of auto-biography (Young, 1998), p.112) to facilitate students’ awareness of different cultural beliefs and experiences. This process of grounding students’ reflections in their own experiences is a key tool of critical pedagogical approaches (O’Loughlin, 1995a). In advocating a “pedagogy grounded in experience”, Michael O’Loughlin claims that:

Learning ought to be grounded in students’ autobiographical stories of their life experiences...By sharing stories and by engaging with diverse life experiences (eg. through listening to each other’s stories and through exploration of diverse fiction and autobiography), students gain a sense of how their familial and cultural values shape their world-views, while simultaneously encountering alternate lifestyles and world-views that allow them to imagine other ways of constructing themselves in relation to the world. [Since] critical reflection on the historical and cultural origins of personal experience and cultural norms is crucial to the development of social consciousness and political awareness (O’Loughlin, 1995a, p. 111).

The strand focusing on te reo me ngā tikanga Māori has two assessments. The first, “He Kete”⁵², focusing on developing bicultural competence, has four parts:

- a) Identifying personal learning goals related to the above expectations
- b) Developing strategies to meet these goals
- c) Implementing these strategies during the Block Practicum
- d) Reflecting upon this process (Department of Early Childhood Studies, 2001)

The process for the assignment is described as follows:

Students are to begin by reflecting on their previous practicum experiences, and identify skills that they consider would be useful to develop further. This

⁵² A kete is a flax basket. Traditionally and in this situation it refers metaphorically to be a knowledge receptacle.

could include for example, confidence in utilising a wide range of phrases in te reo Māori, developing a range of waiata⁵³ for use with tamariki, and preparing activities integrating kaupapa Māori. They will then need to select a personal learning goal, related to Te Mahi Whai Hua (Ministry of Education, 1998) and Te Whāriki.

The next step is to identify a range of strategies that will enable them to meet the challenge posed by this goal, and locate the resources that will support this process.

This assignment requires personal commitment, initiative and responsibility. Early childhood staff will, however, be willing to support students in formulating their Kete. The School of Education library contains a wide range of useful and relevant materials.

The Kete, once marked and returned to students, will be implemented during the Block Practicum in Semester B. Students will be required to document and reflect upon this process as one of their practicum requirements (Department of Early Childhood Studies, 2001).

The marking criteria for this assignment were as follows:

- Has listed a range of personal goals and strategies that are practical and relevant.
- Refers to Quality in Action, Te Mahi Whai Hua, p. 64 –70.
- Demonstrates links to the five aims for children in Te Whāriki : Mana Atua, Mana Whenua, Mana Tangata, Mana Reo and Mana Aotūroa.
- Has located a wide range of published resources for use in centres, e.g. Learning Media books, tapes, sets of photographs.
- Clarity of expression and presentation.
- Includes an emphasis on implementing te reo Māori phrases.
- Accurate use of te reo Māori.
- A strong basis in tikanga Māori reflecting Māori culture, concepts and values.
- Appropriateness for use with tamariki in early childhood care and education centres (Department of Early Childhood Studies, 2001).

When students return from their second year practicum, having implemented their “Kete”, the course provides an opportunity for students to discuss their experiences in implementing te reo me ngā tikanga Māori in centres. This reflection needs to be

⁵³ Waiata are songs.

handled sensitively because of the ethical concerns that arise when students critique the extent of bicultural content present in early childhood centres.

The second assessment for this strand requires students to develop and perform a short whakaari⁵⁴ in te reo Māori. This requires collaboration and develops confidence in delivering te reo. The whakaari needs to include the elements of movement, sound, and or waiata; te reo through pūrakau⁵⁵, pakiwaitara⁵⁶, and/or poetry; tikanga; and audience participation. The marks for this assignment are based on correctness of pronunciation and sentence structure; the range and variety of language vocabulary; creativity; reflection of tikanga Māori; and audience participation. Cultural Studies course outlines contain a warning to students that is important to get their phrases and usages of te reo Māori checked by the course tutor to ensure accuracy and appropriateness, before they are assessed and before they are used in early childhood centres.

The final essay requires students to develop a rationale for a Tiriti-based bicultural development process in early childhood education, identify key principles inherent in this, and provide some examples of how they can be implemented in practice, drawing upon their practicum experiences. This is consistent with the praxis required as a goal of critical pedagogy (Bartolome, 1994; Darder, 1991; Freire & Macedo, 1995; Giroux, 1994; hooks, 1994). bell hooks believes that providing students with opportunities to apply their new learnings is important, since sharing how their new ideas have impacted on their thinking and experiences:

...gives them both the opportunity to know that difficult experiences may be common and practice at integrating theory and practice: ways of knowing with habits of being. We practice interrogating habits of being as well as ideas (hooks, 1994, p. 43).

⁵⁴ A whakaari is a show, or in this sense, a performance.

⁵⁵ Pūrakau are myths or incredible stories of superhuman beings.

⁵⁶ Pakiwaitara are legends or traditional stories.

2.4.5 1994 Departmental Review of ‘biculturalism’ integral theme

In 1994 a review was conducted by Māori staff within the Department, into the effectiveness of the integral theme of ‘biculturalism’ within the early childhood programme (O'Malley & Ritchie, 1995). It arose out of a concern to examine the quality and coverage of Māori content within the various courses. This review will be summarised here, since it provides a useful context for the kaupapa of this study.

The findings of the review identified two broad categories into which courses taught by the Department of Early Childhood Studies in the early childhood degree programme could be classified. The first category was that of effective quality and coverage. Courses in this category had some or all of the following characteristics:

- political, social, cultural awareness (e.g. racism, colonisation)
- critical reflective approach
- a strong Māori component - te reo me ōna tikanga
- substantial blocks of time allocated to Māori content - continuous rather than fragmented
- Māori staff exercising autonomy over content and delivery of Māori content
- effective use of adequate, relevant resources in Māori and political awareness content
- assessment which required students to demonstrate critical thinking and learning of Māori content.

In some courses, an effective model appeared to be to address Māori content within a consecutive series of weeks/sessions. It was considered that this model worked well but should not detract from the need to address Māori perspectives in an integrated way throughout the course. Classes taught by Māori lecturers tended to contain a Māori perspective. However, the extent to which Māori lecturers were able to instill their teaching with Māori material was moderated by the ethos and expectations of the course coordinator.

The second category of courses comprised those that were considered to have fallen well short of what could be achieved in terms of Māori content. An example of this would be a token one-off guest spot on a Māori topic, while the rest of the course did not attempt to integrate Māori perspectives or address anything other than mainstream content. In several courses there was clearly too little time allocated to Māori perspectives, which meant that Māori content was likely to have been compromised.

The review report also highlighted the heavy level of responsibilities carried by Māori lecturers. It called for a review of the number of roles carried by Māori lecturers, fearing that Māori staff were in danger of burn-out, and that this in turn would lead to an inability to provide adequate support for Māori students.

A direct result of this review was a strengthened commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi and bicultural education, that was expressed in the Department of Early Childhood Studies adopting in its 1994 Vision Statement a commitment to tino rangatiratanga (Department of Early Childhood Studies, 1994c).

2.4.6 The Ki Taiao Programme

The preference of Māori students to be taught within a whānau grouping, that is, in a separate class for Māori students, had been recognised in 1991 with the introduction of a whānau class for that intake. Māori lecturers were assigned to teach this class where possible.

In 1994 Rita Walker and I were contracted by Te Puni Kōkiri, the Ministry of Māori Development to design a Māori immersion early childhood teacher education programme (Ritchie, 1994a, 1994b, 1994d; Ritchie & Walker, 1994a, 1994b, 1994c). The programme offered Māori students a kaupapa Māori, whānau-based model that allowed them opportunities to develop their competence in te reo Māori me ōna tikanga. It was staffed by Māori lecturers, and students were able to spend some of

their practicum experiences in Kōhanga Reo. There were year one intakes of the Ki Taiao programme at the University of Waikato in the years 1995-1998. However, there were difficulties in sustaining adequate enrollments, and the programme was considered by the administration to be unsustainable. A recent development has been a partnership with Te Wānanga of Aotearoa, a Māori tertiary education provider, to offer Ki Taiao under their auspices, but taught by the University of Waikato, due to commence in 2003.

2.5 Positioning the Study

In the context of Aotearoa/New Zealand, Te Tiriti o Waitangi and concerns for equity require that education settings address issues of cultural responsiveness for Māori children. Disparities for Māori children, a legacy of colonisation, are not improving despite the advent and growth of the Kōhanga Reo movement (Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development, 1998a). Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b) has predicated bicultural development as a project for early childhood care and education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. It is crucial that influential mainstream institutions, such as the University of Waikato, recognise and rise to these challenges (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1997, p. 246). According to the Siraj-Blatchfords, the role of educational researchers within mainstream institutions is to critique our own discourses, identify the contradictions within our practices and scrutinise the promotion of social justice (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1997).

My initiation of this study was a response to my own experiences, which had indicated that mainstream early childhood education services were not delivering culturally relevant programmes to Māori children, and a recognition that honouring te Tiriti o Waitangi required mainstream teacher education, along with early childhood centre programmes and those who delivered them, to address this inadequacy through implementation of a project concerned with bicultural development (Barrett-Douglas, 1989, p. 65; Bishop, 1996, p.18). The intended beneficiaries of this project are ultimately Māori children and whānau, who have expressed their aspiration for their

language and culture (AGB/McNair, 1992; Hirini, 1997; Irwin & Davies, 1994; G. H. Smith, 1995; Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development, 1998a, 1998b). Pākehā and Tauīwi children and families could also be enriched by an appreciation of te reo and tikanga, and this understanding might well contribute to increased understanding of and support for Māori aspirations from within the dominant culture (Waite, 1992). I also considered that the research participants might benefit from opportunities to reflect on their practice. Improving the quality of the programmes offered in the University, and in the field of early childhood education, would be a positive contribution to the wider community.

This study focused on a particular, localised context of one early childhood teacher education programme and the efforts that have been made over the past decade towards bicultural development. Recognising postmodern critiques of the positivist tendency to deliver conclusive, generalisable 'findings' I am forced to acknowledge that the forces of modernism are ever-present, influencing my thinking, pressuring me to 'find a conclusion', to be tidy and authoritative. Despite the necessity of meeting academic requirements I still intended to avoid exploitative academic elitism and to be aware of the limitations of my observations and the theorising that results (Shotter, 1993, p. 48). Nevertheless, I aspired to what Maxine Greene has described as some naming, some sense-making (Greene, 1995, p. 2), of what we have been doing within our programme. I saw the research as an opportunity to generate and document reflection on the structures, ethos, and pedagogies that our programme had been developing, and that were aimed toward facilitating our students' examining their beliefs, developing a commitment to bicultural development and coming to understand how to deliver early childhood practice consistent with these changed beliefs (Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998, p. 169).

My aim was to facilitate a process whereby the research participants and I would be able to collaborate in constructing a narrative told within the context of our experiences and the programme in which we work (Bishop & Glynn, 1999, p. 124-5),

illustrated by selected examples from a range of data including interviews and examples from classes that I have taught, supported of course by a body of cited literature. According to Wideen, Mayer-Smith and Moon, “Such stories capture the richness and complexity of dynamic social situations in ways that correlation coefficients or statistical tables cannot” (Wideen et al., 1998, p. 165). This ecological model of researching one’s own setting acknowledges that everything exists within “an inseparable web of relationships” (Wideen et al., 1998, p. 168).

2.5.1 Delimitations: clarifying the parameters of the study

Chapters one and previous sections of chapter two have provided context as to the focus of this research. It is also useful to identify what this study did not intend to focus upon (Wolcott, 1997, p. 1). The most significant delimitation was the decision to focus on Pākehā lecturers’ responsibility and the mainstream (Auraki) programme rather than Ki Taiao. This research project was based in an acknowledgment that the principle of tino rangatiratanga means that it is for Māori to develop a project which meets their needs and explores Māori purposes within the institution. Whilst Ki Taiao was running, Māori lecturers prioritised their teaching to be within the Ki Taiao programme. Nevertheless, I did not wish to sideline Māori from involvement in a study focusing on the Auraki programme, since I recognised that their perceptions were the most valuable in terms of the accountability of the Auraki programme to Māori aspirations for tino rangatiratanga and bicultural development. Within the Auraki programme, I did not intend to explore the ways in which Māori colleagues taught te reo Māori or other content that they have deemed it appropriate to be taught by Māori only.

Secondly, I did not wish to examine closely the two-day Treaty Workshop format, since that had already been the subject of my Masters dissertation (Ritchie, 1990).

Although I am aware of the complex interplay and overlay of gender and class issues with those of culture and bicultural development, these again were not a particular focus for this study, although I considered issues of racism to be central.

I was also clear that any interpretations must be considered tentative (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997) reflecting my own experiences and orientation and those of the research participants. They are certainly not intended to be prescriptive or generalisable (Bishop, 1996, p. 23).

2.5.2 Research Questions

The research questions stated in my original proposal (J. Ritchie, 1995) were as follows:

1. How has the philosophy regarding the teaching of 'biculturalism' and 'Tino Rangatiratanga' been articulated [within the Department of Early Childhood Studies] since the inception of the new three-year early childhood diploma in 1989?
2. What are the perceptions of lecturers [within the Department of Early Childhood Studies] as to their role in defining and transmitting these concepts?
3. What pedagogical approaches are being used in this teaching?
4. To what extent does the institutional context shape and constrain this teaching?
5. In what ways do former students identify the early childhood diploma as having contributed to preparing them to deliver culturally appropriate early childhood education programmes?

During the course of the study further questions arose concerned with implementation of the 'bicultural' philosophy and practice of early childhood education being espoused in the new early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b):

6. What is happening in terms of ‘bicultural’ curriculum in early childhood centres?
7. What might an ideal process of ‘bicultural development’ in early childhood centres look like?
8. What might be the goals of the teacher education programme, in terms of preparing graduates to implement bicultural development in early childhood centres?

As the research proceeded, and as a result of the emergent coding and co-theorising processes, these questions were refined into four key research focuses or tasks:

- defining ‘bicultural development’ in the context of early childhood care and education in this country
- identifying some key components of the Department of Early Childhood Studies’ bicultural development implementation process
- exploring possible ‘indicators’ of bicultural development within early childhood centres
- implications of the research in terms of clarifying aims of the teacher education programme in terms of preparing graduates to facilitate bicultural development within their future work in early childhood education.

2.6 Overview of Teacher Education Context

The setting of a particular early childhood teacher education programme that is the primary setting of this study, was the focus of this chapter which highlighted some key considerations in the provision of a pedagogy which would contribute to bicultural development. It is suggested that teacher education which is committed to

social justice outcomes will involve pedagogical strategies that are likely to assist students to develop a reflective orientation which includes an anti-racist stance and a commitment to social justice and bicultural development. Aspects to be considered include awareness that education is not a purely cognitive function, but is instead a holistic process which involves people's emotions and is best facilitated through connectedness and supportive respectful relationships.

The range of policy statements surveyed confirm that early childhood teachers, and therefore teacher educators, are required to focus on bicultural development as a primary goal. Salient amongst these is the national early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b), which clearly positions a commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi and bicultural issues as central to the role of early childhood educators in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The bicultural commitments contained within these policies have implications for teacher education providers, since they are endeavouring to prepare graduates who are equipped to deliver on these expectations.

The early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato is one such provider, and as such, has made a commitment to developing strategies which will support this process of preparing students to deliver biculturally responsive programmes in early childhood centres. Key aspects of the early childhood programme at the University of Waikato which are a response to this bicultural commitment include the two-day Tiriti and anti-racism workshop, which constitutes the introductory section of the first of two specialist 'Cultural Studies' courses, and also, the requirement for issues of 'biculturalism' to be included in every course via the mechanism of 'integral themes'. This research project focuses on the mainstream early childhood teacher education programme, and particularly on the role of the Pākehā teacher educators within that programme, rather than on the 'Ki Taiao' programme, the kaupapa Māori early childhood teacher education.

The final two sections of this chapter positioned the study as one initiated to meet academic requirements, but having also a much broader commitment to social justice and ultimately supporting the aspirations of whānau Māori, whilst in the more immediate term facilitating reflection amongst colleagues regarding our programmes' attributes and ways to strengthen our delivery on our bicultural commitment. During the course of the study, the key research questions evolved to focus on: defining 'bicultural development' in the context of early childhood care and education in this country; identifying some key components of the implementation of bicultural development within the early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato; identifying what might be considered to be 'indicators' of bicultural development within early childhood centres; and finally, reflecting upon possible implications of the research findings in terms of clarifying the aims of the teacher education programme regarding the preparation of graduates to facilitate bicultural development within their future work in early childhood education.

Part Two: Methodology

A research methodology is a theory and analysis of the research process (Sandra Harding, 1987, p. 2-3 cited in Smith, 1999, p. 143). Methodology arises from and expresses underlying values (Edge, 1996, p. 17). It is an ethical responsibility of researchers to make explicit these values and the theoretical positioning of their research process. A research methodology is important since it is intrinsic to the production of knowledges that result from that process – the methodological stance frames the research questions, determines the research methods to be employed and shapes the analysis (Smith, 1999, p. 143). Part Two of this document seeks to address these matters by: exploring the theoretical bases of the study (chapter three); explaining the data collection method and documenting the preparative stages (chapter four); and then reflecting on the data gathering and theorising processes (chapter five).

Chapter Three: Methodological Paradigm

3.0 Introduction

Researchers carry with them into their research studies a complex set of “baggage” (Scheurich, 1995, p. 249) which includes their cultural and personal values system and views of knowledge and knowledge construction which have been shaped by previous educational experiences, their location in terms of intersecting issues of culture, gender, power, class, family status and responsibilities, and wider macrocultural or civilisational frames. All of these factors interact in complex ways which impact on the researchers’ views of their roles and general research processes as well as having bearing on each “interpretative moment” at each stage of the research process (Scheurich, 1995, p. 249). Scheurich concedes that it is simply not possible for a researcher to identify exhaustively all of the conscious and unconscious baggage that they bring to the “interpretive moment” (Scheurich, 1995, p. 249-50). However, he believes that researchers should nevertheless attempt to make explicit their “personal baggage”, historicity, social positionality, epistemological and methodological orientations and how this connects to the research agenda (Scheurich, 1995, p. 249-250).

The need for constant reflexivity is a critical consideration of insider research (Smith, 1999, p. 137). Aspects for ongoing consideration include acknowledgement and problematisation of power dynamics in relation to the researcher’s positionality (MacNaughton, 1998, p. 12). Section 3.1 provides a statement of researcher positionality, whilst the remaining sections of chapter three review the key theoretical domains which contributed to the eclectic and emergent methodological paradigm of this study. Critical pedagogy and qualitative research provided a home-base for the study, with post-modernist research perspectives, critical anthropology, and narrative research methodology contributing further insights to this foundation.

3.1 'Positionality' of the Researcher

When I consider the origins of my views, I realize that my personal history, by necessity, contributes considerably to my current belief system. I write from a life lived in many margins, usually while struggling to approach the center of whichever page of my life is unfolding at the moment. It has been that struggle to understand and adapt to various contexts that has led me on the personal journey of discovering other realities (Delpit, 1995, p. 73).

Aware of post-modern concerns with authenticity and positionality, I struggle to unravel the complexity of strands that are woven together in such an indeterminate pattern as the fabric of my life preceding this project of pursuing a Ph.D. Culturally, I think, it does not sit well with me to write in such a self-focused (self-absorbed?) way. Yet it is important that I position myself as 'the researcher' and make enough of a statement about my background, experiences, attitudes, and 'biases', so that I can be transparent to the reader, and thus provide a context from which to proceed further.

I grew up as the eldest of 5 children to psychologist parents. My mother, the daughter of anthropologists, had completed her Ph.D. whilst I was still a baby. Having achieved this, in the style of 1960s motherhood, she spent the next 14 years of my life as a fulltime mother. Both my parents had a keen interest in issues of culture, and were, and still are, avid observers of the human condition in all its manifestations. Due to my father's academic career, with its periods of sabbatical leave, I spent several sojourns in other cultural milieux, learning adaptive strategies to cope with the profound sense of difference that I experienced.

Transferring from Wellington to Hamilton aged six, in 1965, provided another experience of being an 'outsider', as I struggled to adjust to a very different, less child-centred and very traditional school culture. I also remember the shocked reactions of schoolmates to my disclosure, influenced by my atheist parents, that "I don't believe in God", a concept so radical as to be totally incomprehensible to them. My maternal grandmother had consciously chosen to leave her Jewish roots behind in

her new life in New Zealand, and consequently, I did not learn of my Jewish ancestry until I was in my teens. Not surprisingly, my initial reaction was to totally reject the idea, since I believed that I was not Jewish, I was an ordinary 'New Zealander'.

The growing awareness of my Jewish background has significance in my strong sense of commitment to social justice, and empathy with racial and other oppression. According to Jewish belief, the task of humankind is tikkun olam, to repair the world (Robinson, 2000, p. 223-4). The core mandate of Judaism is the endeavour of tzedakah, which in Hebrew means charity, caring, and, and "right action", and whose linguistic root, tzedek, means justice (Pogrebin, 1991, p. 237). "It is clearly the duty of every Jew to seek justice" (Robinson, 2000, p. 243), and to pursue the goal of tikkun olam. Jews are required to "do what is right and good" (Deuteronomy 6:18, cited in Robinson, 2000, p. 243). This applies to both the personal and professional domains.

Despite my parents' academic interests, my childhood exposure to Māori people and culture was not extensive, although probably more than was available to most urban Pākehā children. Growing up in middle-class suburban Hamilton during the 1960s and 70s, I only occasionally had opportunities to engage in friendships with Māori children. Particularly in high school, I recall a feeling of separateness as the streaming system channeled most Māori students into the lower streams. I remember clearly a strong sense of what I would now understand as 'whakamā' to have pervaded my rare friendships with Māori girls, who were shy about visiting my home, and about approaching teachers for help.

I recall being offered, in 1972 for the third form, the choice of French or German language studies and requesting that my parents write to the school asking if I could take Māori. The reply stated bluntly that Māori as a subject offering had not been considered for two reasons. There was not enough demand and there were not enough suitably qualified teachers.

I left high school disillusioned with an oppressive, unimaginative, authoritarian educational system that had turned me off from further educational pursuit. Despite my parents' best intentions I left school at sixteen. I did not feel ready to enter into academic study until I had the confidence in my own critical capacity to withstand what I perceived to be indoctrinatory pedagogy, although I had little understanding of what university courses were like and how they probably differed from high school classes.

After leaving school, for several years I experienced a range of short-term jobs, including two periods working in childcare centres, one in Los Angeles, and one in Hamilton. During this period I independently explored Marxist and feminist perspectives. In 1980-1981 I ended up at Hamilton Teachers' College completing a kindergarten teaching diploma, despite my mother's concerns, since she considered primary teaching to be a better qualification. I chose kindergarten for a number of reasons. Firstly, it was only two years, and I thought I might just manage to be able to last that out (primary was three). I did not ever consider primary teaching as an option, since I viewed the primary and secondary curriculum and bureaucracy to be too constrained. I knew I enjoyed interacting with younger aged children. I also had an idealistic sense that whilst working with young children the regular contact with their families provided a stronger opportunity for creating positive social change. I considered that as an early childhood teacher I might be in a position to proactively work towards social change from the grass-roots by empowering those children and their families.

I also think that early on in my kindergarten training I came to view early childhood education as having the potential to provide a window of opportunity which might enable children to be turned on to the world of books, discovering learning, exploring the world. I remember during one of my first-year practicum experiences the magical moment when a child who had previously shown little interest in books, overheard

me reading a book, joined in, and then was hooked, asking me to read this particular book to him over and over again.

During and after my kindergarten training, I chose to study te reo Māori papers in the University of Waikato Māori Department, under the wise tutelage of Te Wharehuia Milroy, Hirini Melbourne, John Moorfield and Timoti Karetu. I enthusiastically trundled along to many wānanga and hui, generally absorbing as much as I could, since I already appreciated my monocultural deficit in terms of the tangata whenua of the country. I particularly enjoyed studying the history of Māori politics under Hirini Melbourne, and, in the University language laboratory, I assiduously repeated the Lord's prayer in Māori over and over again in response to Wharehuia Milroy's taped version.

1981, my second year of training as a kindergarten teacher, was the year of the infamous Springbok Tour. I passionately disagreed with the government's decision to allow the tour, and attended talks by Robert Molotsane, Sam Ramsamy and Donald Woods in order to become better informed as to the state of race relations in South Africa. I was arrested on the rugby field in Hamilton, on a Saturday, in the midst of one of my teaching sections, and was subsequently convicted and fined for disorderly behaviour. I was most indignant that my political stance was being redefined by the Police and Court as 'Disorderly Behaviour', when from my perspective, it was Robert Muldoon's government that was out of order.

My experiences as a kindergarten teacher in the early 1980s did not temper my idealism, although they provided a reality check in that most of the teachers with whom I worked were conservative, monocultural, middle-class Pākehā women, who were comfortable with the kindergarten status quo, which was at that time characterised by being a very middle class package. Kindergarten teaching colleagues appeared to feel rather defensive and threatened by any suggestion of change. Although most of the kindergartens in which I taught had 60-65% Māori

rolls, these teachers made absolutely no concessions to this very visible ethnic presence in terms of culturally relevant content within their programmes. Neither did they appear to attempt to connect with the Māori families, but instead problematised them and their children.

I was often very uncomfortable with the comments and actions of the teachers I worked with, and sensed huge misunderstandings in these teachers' perceptions of the Māori families. A few examples will perhaps illustrate my perception of what was happening. At one kindergarten, in an economically depressed community where many people were unemployed and workers were mostly in low-paid labouring jobs, the kindergarten head teacher made comments about the fact that "these people are never up early in the morning". She also found it annoying that mothers would come in person to see her to confirm details about the written notice detailing the annual trip by bus to a zoo. She would repeatedly remark "Why don't these people ever read their notices? It's all written down there for them." My two colleagues both found the behaviour of one of the Māori boys very difficult. He was seen as a "ringleader", who would quite often lead the rest of the boys in an impromptu haka as a teacher was trying to settle the children for a mat-time. It was not until later, when the family invited only me to their son's fifth birthday party, that I realised that this child's mother had perceived the negativity of the two teachers towards her son. And yet, despite these sorts of tensions, the parents still brought their children to the kindergarten, wanting their children to have a good start to their education.

After leaving kindergarten teaching to become a mother, I slowly finished my B.Soc.Sci. and then, enjoying the intellectual challenge of part-time University study, as an adjunct to full-time mothering, I chose to continue with post-graduate studies in counseling. There were no Masters courses in early childhood education available, so I chose the counseling programme because I considered that it might complement the skills I had already gained in working with children with those for working with adults and community. The topic for my dissertation, 'Honouring the Treaty of

Waitangi. Some Pedagogical Considerations' (Ritchie, 1990) arose from my anti-racist commitment which I now wanted to apply in my own work. In 1989 I began facilitating workshops for Project Waitangi, an organisation which had received a limited amount of government funding with which to educate Pākehā in particular about race relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In the dissertation I applied my learning from studying the work of Paulo Freire to this analysis of the philosophy and pedagogy we were utilising in these workshops. I identified that we had developed an approach consistent with Freirean ideas of conscientization and praxis (Freire, 1972), in that it focused on empowering participants, offering them frameworks with which they could pursue their own process of analysis well beyond the two-day duration of the initial workshop.

By this time I had a second child with my partner Joe Murray, of Ngāti Kahungunu, a teacher. I have now been parenting young children since 1984 and we have a total of six children, whose ages range from two to eighteen. All of them have been raised bilingually, attending Kōhanga Reo, and the older four have also been pupils of Kura Kaupapa. I have been a whānau member of various Kōhanga since 1987, and for a period of time, involved in a Kura Kaupapa whānau. These years of being often the only Pākehā in a Māori context, have been a source of valuable learning and challenges. I am constantly aware, even as a parent within mainstream early childhood education settings of the need to temper my tendency to offer suggestions, lest it be taken as criticism from an arrogant 'expert'. This situation is even more delicate when the context is a kaupapa Māori education setting.

In 1990, having completed my Masters degree, I began teaching in the early childhood teacher education programme at the Hamilton Teachers College, which was in the process of amalgamation with the University of Waikato. For a number of years, I resisted the pressure to begin doctoral studies. I wanted to consolidate myself in my University teaching, and to maintain a balance of being an available and responsive parent to our children. I continued to research and write about how I was

applying my commitment to anti-racism and bicultural development within our programme (Ritchie, 1994c, 1996a).

In 1994 Rita Walker, my Ngāti Porou colleague, and I were contracted by Te Puni Kōkiri, the Ministry of Māori Development to design a Māori immersion early childhood teacher education programme (Ritchie, 1994a, 1994b, 1994d; Ritchie & Walker, 1994a, 1994b, 1994c). I particularly enjoyed the research aspect of being involved in this contract, whilst valuing the learning which came from being closely involved in a project that was Māori-driven and involved wide consultation with iwi.

In 1996 I settled on a Ph.D project that I hoped would support my colleagues and myself in our work, would use processes that would be non-intrusive to my colleagues and other respondents, would adopt dialogical methodology, and would aim to be affirming of the positive developments, rather than negatively critical, whilst still allowing for self-critique, and an opportunity for useful theorising.

3.2 Critical Pedagogy as a Key Methodological Context

Critical pedagogy, as discussed in section 1.5.3, was a foundational theoretical domain for this study. A critical, reflexive orientation was an essential component to the on-going process of developing an emergent methodology (Edge, 1996, p. 19) that was contextually located within and responsive to my particular research setting. As McLaren has written:

Critical educational research... attempts to situate the construction of meaning within the lifeworlds of the participants themselves and the specificity of historical trends and cultural forms that shape the subjectivities of the participants. Research within the critical educational tradition creates conditions which enable individuals to investigate their own reality and the social conditions which shape their daily lives (McLaren, 1991, p. 18).

An understanding of critical pedagogy required an avoidance of mainstream research practices which often unwittingly perpetuate oppressive systems (McLaren, 1996, p. 126). Not only did critical pedagogy inform the study at the wider theoretical level,

but it contributed significantly to the methodological paradigm, which incorporated many principles and practices from my reading of critical pedagogy writings. Beyond the overall commitment that the research project would have positive outcomes in terms of social justice objectives (praxis) (Darder, 1991, p. 82-3; Freire, 1972, p. 28), these outcomes were to be identified through enabling participants to a sense of ownership regarding the process and the objectives for any changes identified.

A specific methodological implication was that I as researcher maintain a critical and reflexive orientation throughout the research process. This meant that I endeavoured at all times to be aware of and sensitive towards the interaction between my own and participants' positionalities. Processes needed to be comfortable, empowering and responsive (Bartolome, 1994, p. 188), and to provide opportunities utilising dialogical methods which would enable participants to illuminate their realities and give voice to their perspectives and objectives (Darder, 1991, p. 68; Giroux, 1983, p. 203). Utilising this idea of critically reflective dialogue allows for the engaged presence of the interviewer, who is able to give voice to her own perspectives, which become a contribution to the dialogical negotiation of meaning:

. . . we may actually welcome the opportunity to intervene, to influence our respondents in this way. . . . Within an educational action research project a dialogical approach to the interview may therefore be considered as a legitimate aspect of the on-going process of intervention (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1997, p. 243).

In employing a critical stance to the methodological paradigm it was important to be wary of superficial and glib attention to these 'principles and practices' without reflecting upon the wider implications. Central to this is ongoing scrutiny of power relations between researcher and participants (Bhavnani, 1990, p. 143), particularly when the research is positioned in a context where there exist longstanding historical imbalances in cultural power dynamics, and is being conducted by a non-indigenous researcher with indigenous participants (Smith, 1999). As Kum-Kum Bhavnani has written, the idea of 'giving voice' needs to be complemented with an analysis of "who

are the potential hearers, and why they do not hear?" (Bhavnani, 1990, p. 152). Furthermore, it is suggested that researchers need to consider "who is being empowered and in whose interests does that empowerment serve?" (Bhavnani, 1990, p. 152). For a project concerned with bicultural development in early childhood teacher education, this raises the dilemma of the teacher educators' role, as determined by Ministry of Education expectations, of empowering future Pākehā teachers to deliver Māori content in early childhood centres. A concern requiring consideration is to explore whether Māori consider this to be in their interests, and, if the potential benefits to Māori children in terms of culturally responsive and empowering early childhood experiences are considered meritorious, to identify ways to ameliorate a situation where the uneven power relations could otherwise prove to be disempowering for Māori.

3.3 Qualitative Research

Having previously dabbled with quantitative surveys which had only skimmed the surface of the attitudes and reasons that I had been seeking (Ritchie, 1994c), I was determined to utilise qualitative methodology in this study. On course appraisal forms, I always value the comments from students in the open sections much more than the numeric ratings also gathered. I sensed that the open-ended, emergent approach offered by qualitative methodology would provide me with richer, more personalised, more emotional data, from which the values and assumptions of participants would be easier to ascertain. I saw the study far more as a 'meaning-making' endeavour than as an 'information gathering' exercise (Bruner, 1990, p. 137). Critical qualitative research also allows the researcher to draw upon her or his own experience, and utilise empathetic understandings and intuition (Kincheloe, 1991, p. 31).

The model of critical qualitative educational research advocated by Kincheloe (1991) emphasises the importance of social theoretical questions of ethics and democracy in relation to educational purposes and vision (Kincheloe, 1991, p. 82). I was

committed to a style of research that would benefit participants, and that would not be at all exploitative or abusive of their goodwill in agreeing to support the research kaupapa. I intended my approach to be interactive and relational rather than hierarchical (Wagner, 1993, p. 31).

I saw myself as an insider or participant/researcher whose role was to facilitate a process in which the construction of knowledge integrated research, practice and theory (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1997; Smith, 1999; Wagner, 1993, p. 31). I intended that documenting the processes being employed in our early childhood teacher education programme would be a collective process. I was aware of the tension that existed in that in undertaking to meet the requirements of my PhD degree, which are determined by an individualistic academic paradigm, I was instigating what I hoped would be a collaborative endeavour with participating colleagues to identify philosophical and theoretical principles of pedagogy related to bicultural development within our programme. To a certain extent, I was banking on the willingness of colleagues to support the project, in the knowledge that we shared a “community of interest” (Bishop, 1996, p. 28) based in our advocacy of bicultural kaupapa within early childhood education in this country, and a shared concern for Māori families’ and children’s aspirations for the revitalisation of te reo Māori. I was also placing on myself the responsibility to be professionally accountable to my research participants, and to establish processes that would feel positive and comfortable for them.

3.4 Ethnographic Research Approaches

Ethnography offers an exploratory, naturalistic, holistic, multimodal, and interpretative approach to the study of people and communities (Aubrey et al., 2000; Schensul, 1985). Ethnographic research is contextualised within wider social, cultural, political and economic settings (Aubrey et al., 2000, p.137). Ethnographic methodology provides a means of identifying and giving voice to alternative world

views, an essential element of any project relating to bicultural education (Delpit, 1988, p. 282). "A major task for the ethnographer is to understand what sociocultural knowledge participants bring to, and generate within, the social settings that they create together" (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 138).

Cultural anthropology ethnography, as described by Carol Barnhardt (1994), was particularly relevant to this study, in that "The centrality of culture in understanding, describing, and interpreting phenomena is what distinguishes *cultural anthropology ethnography* from other genres of ethnographic research" (Barnhardt, 1994, p. 11-12). Barnhardt identified that cultural anthropology ethnography involves the following key components:

- (1) the importance of respect for participants *and* for their world views
- (2) the value of exploratory or discovery-oriented research using an inductive approach in a natural setting, and
- (3) the necessity of a holistic perspective interpreted through cultural constructs (Barnhardt, 1994, p.13).

Ethnographic skills enable researchers (and educators) to frame their interpretations and understandings within a broader, holistic cultural canvas than one viewed through a monocultural ethnocentric lens (Eisikovits, 1995, p. 265). Ethnographic approaches require researchers to be attuned to nuances of cultural [mis]representation:

Ethnography, the science of cultural jeopardy, presupposes a constant willingness to be surprised, to make interpretative syntheses, and to value - when it comes - the unclassified, unsought other (Clifford, 1988, p. 147).

It is recommended that ethnographic researchers adopt a stance of "anthropological humility" whereby they "must humble themselves to the mysteries of the

communities they are studying” (Holliday, 1994, p. 31). It is considered essential that both data and interpretation of data are shared with participants:

Ethnographic observation should inform the participants about their ways of being and help them to understand themselves better. Ethnography thus makes explicit to a community, that which they already know implicitly. (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 138).

The research process thus enables the community to focus on their collective understandings in more depth and detail. Ethnographic approaches are flexible and responsive, allowing for hypotheses and research questions to emerge and become refined as the study progresses (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 57). The research report by Carkeek, Davies and Irwin (1994) on the school experiences of Māori girls, for example, illustrates the importance of adopting an approach that emphasises the process of the research, and reminded me to maintain an awareness that there are always multiple perspectives (Carkeek, Davies, & Irwin, 1994).

Critical ethnographic approaches (Barnhardt, 1994) include a critical awareness of power dynamics both in the wider political and cultural context in which the research is situated, but also within the research process itself. Key aspects of critical theory such as dialogue, resistance, and student voice, are applied to the research process, which positions culture and respect for the world views of participants as central elements. Critical ethnography requires further, that researchers reflect upon how we as researchers deal with our values, identifying our positioning and historicity. A critical ethnography approach recognises the positioning of the researcher within the research process (Quantz, 1992, p. 472), and requires an analysis of how this reflexivity influences the research process (Aubrey et al., 2000, p.153). Ethnographic discourse analysis can include not only the interactions between researcher and participants, but the reactions of the researcher (Rhedding-Jones, 1995, p. 486).

3.5 Post-modernist Perspectives

Post-modernist theorising is not a methodological paradigm on its own, yet the challenges it poses provided salutary reference points to my emerging methodology. Post-modernist thinking rejects the positivistic search for universalist models and understandings (Constas, 1998; Noddings, 1995). Instead of focusing on producing over-arching all-encompassing frameworks, the emphasis is placed on understanding knowledge as a situated construction, the connections between knowledge and power, how domains of expertise evolve, who benefits or is harmed by dominant discourses, and how language communities of knowers describe and make sense of their world and work, according to Nel Noddings (1995, p. 72). In addition to offering this critique of positivism and the pursuit of “grand narratives” (Constas, 1998) postmodernism requires methodological attention to the recognition of the partiality of understandings (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Sleeter, 1996); the valuing of localised, situated knowledge (Constas, 1998; Lave, 1993); and the need to create openings so that previously silenced voices are heard (Lincoln, 1995; MacNaughton, 1998; Simon, 1987).

Denzin and Lincoln (1998) have offered the metaphor of multiple lenses, which I find particularly useful:

Poststructuralists and postmodernists have contributed to the understanding that there is no clear window into the inner life of an individual. Any gaze is always filtered through the lenses of language, gender, social class, race, and ethnicity. There are no objective observations, only observations socially situated in the worlds of the observer and the observed. Subjects, or individuals, are seldom able to give full explanations of their actions or intentions; all they can offer are accounts, or stories, about what they did and why. No single method can grasp the subtle variations in ongoing human experience. As a consequence, qualitative researchers deploy a wide range of interconnected interpretive methods, always seeking better ways to make more understandable the worlds of experience that have been studied (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 25).

Utilising an eclectic mix of methods and sources of data in this search for meaning and for ways to make sense of a particular setting, has a strong appeal for me as part of a research paradigm.

Joe Kincheloe (1991) has proposed a stance of methodological humility as a valuable positioning for the researcher. He explains that this is required as a response to the postmodernist exposure of the world as an uncertain and complex place, which has implications for the role of the researcher as a pursuer of knowledges:

Methodological humility is an inescapable characteristic of a postmodern world marked by a loss of faith in scientific salvation and the possibility of a single frame of reference, a common vantage point from which we might all view the world. Methodological humility eschews the positivistic impulse to dominate the world through a knowledge of it (Kincheloe, 1991, p. 58).

The extreme relativism of some postmodernisms can render the pursuit of knowledge a redundant exercise (Constas, 1998; Sleeter, 1996). In a 1999 paper, I wrote that:

I accept the down-to-earth argument of Mark Constas that educators cannot escape the role of being legitimisers of knowledge and values (1998). Those of us who are teacher educators cannot retreat into an indeterminate postmodernism detached from the realities of children's, families', and teachers' immediate lives. Whilst seeking to avoid the indiscriminate imposition of grand narratives we are still looked upon to provide guidelines which will enable future teachers to deliver ethical and culturally relevant pedagogy (Ritchie, 1999a, p. 1).

Postmodernisms that aim merely to critique ways of knowing, without a pragmatic application and goal of contributing to the betterment of society have been described by Constas as displaying an "academic hedonism" (Constas, 1998, p. 32). He considers that a postmodernist avoidance of legitimation is inconsistent with the needs of the discipline of education, since:

...education, both as an institutional entity and as a discursive community, is directly concerned with the legitimation of knowledge [epistemological concern], the legitimation of practice [pedagogical concern], and legitimation of values [moral concern]. If educational researchers choose to recede from these legitimating practices, then they will indeed contribute to the malaise of

conservatism that so many academics, postmodern and modern alike, see as an abhorrent feature of present-day education (Constas, 1998, p. 30).

I concur with Nel Noddings' view of the value of some aspects of postmodernist thinking, which are worthy of inclusion within an eclectic methodological paradigm:

In sum, postmodernism is a mood that shakes the whole structure of modern thought. It challenges cherished assumptions, methods, attitudes, modes of thought, and values. Thoughtful educators should be aware of ways in which its proponents help us to think better about educational problems, but they should be wary of accounts that merely use postmodern buzzwords or that lure readers into accepting potentially harmful moves along with helpful ones. One does not have to accept every pronouncement of postmodernists to be postmodern. Indeed, it might be better especially from the postmodern view, to reject such labels entirely (Noddings, 1995, p. 75).

Perhaps one of the most useful applications of postmodern thinking to research processes is that postmodernism requires a liberation, a freeing up of one's tendency to follow a prescribed recipe, it poses the requirement to challenge, to 'deconstruct' one's thinking and assumptions at every turn, permitting and endorsing the thinking of the unthinkable (MacNaughton, 1998, p. 7).

3.6 Narrative Methodology

As I proceeded to read more literature on methodological processes, I found resonance with narrative enquiry as a particular mode of qualitative research in keeping with my critical and eclectic methodological aspirations. Narrative modes of enquiry are contextualised and holistic, and validate personal historicities, encouraging participants to make sense of their lives (Richardson, 1997). Constas has suggested that "narratively constructed presentations of educational phenomena can enhance communication between researchers and those in the larger educational community, such as teachers, administrators, policymakers, and parents" (Constas, 1998, p. 30), since the findings are contextually relevant and meaningful. Laurel Richardson considers "narrativising" to be a site of moral responsibility which, in recognising the salience of power differences, can respond to the ethical challenge of

addressing social inequities by providing collective storying which may offer collective solutions (Richardson, 1997, p.34).

According to Janesick (1998), adopting a narrative approach involves:

- Presentation of solid descriptive data
- Identifying categories
- Exploring relationships and patterns, searching for cultural themes or domains
- Locating within the personal experience, or self-story, key phrases and statements
- Interpretations of meanings of phrases, and clarification of these meanings with participants
- Relating these meanings to key themes
- Offering a tentative statement of the area being studied in terms of the key themes identified
- Being alert to points of tension and conflict “and what does not fit” (Janesick, 1998, p. 48-49).

Constas (1998) is concerned that narrative enquiry requires of a researcher specific qualities and skills which enable her/him to reflect upon the role of researcher, and the way she/he “contributes to, represents, and possibly distorts the narrative accounts of another person’s experiences” (Constas, 1998, p. 31). There is a need for an awareness and balance here between the requirement for the researcher to offer the empathy and warmth within the conversational relationship that will demonstrate an ethic of care (Noddings, 1995), show responsiveness, and engender the intersubjectivity required of a genuine interlocuter, and the need for restraint and what Bishop and Glynn have termed “disallowing the dominance of self” (Bishop & Glynn, 1999, p. 126).

3.7 Issues of Accountability, Representation, and Ethics

It is essential in this type of qualitative, critical, narrative ethnographic research approach to prioritise attention to issues of accountability towards participants, representation of their perspectives, and constantly maintain vigilance with regard to ethical responsibilities and processes. In relation to the ethical framework of duties, rights, and harm/benefit, it is suggested that the researcher consider the following questions:

- Is the research fair and right (does it serve social justice)?
- Will participants be treated respectfully?
- Will they benefit ? (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 160).

Linda Smith (1999) has proposed a similar framework to be applied in cross-cultural research situations such as this study. These are the questions she considers need attention:

- Who defined the research problem?
- For whom is this study worthy and relevant? Who says so?
- What knowledge will the community gain from this study?
- What are some likely positive outcomes from this study?
- What are some possible negative outcomes?
- How can the negative outcomes be eliminated?
- To whom is the researcher accountable?
- What processes are in place to support the research, the researched and the researcher? (Smith, 1999, p. 173).

Margaret Carr (1997) has also identified a range of accountability measures relevant to interpretive studies such as this. They include:

- Transparency of data collection.
- Identification of researcher assumptions.
- Ethical procedures.
- Explaining the role of the researcher.
- Justifying the kinds and amount of data gathered.
- Ensuring robustness of data (Carr, 1997, p. 90).

These domains of accountability raised by these three sources can be summarised as: accountability in terms of the researched participants and community in the sense that they are fully informed and support the research purpose and perceive it as

meaningful and worthwhile in terms of likely social justice benefits; accountability in terms of research processes that are ethical and respectful; and accountability in terms of the authenticity of data and data interpretation which involves honesty, transparency and self-scrutiny on the part of the researcher.

As I initially developed this research project I was aware that there were issues of cultural 'appropriateness' related to the research purpose and process that needed to be made explicit. My PhD proposal to the Higher Degrees committee of the University of Waikato contained the following statement:

The principal researcher acknowledges the principle of Tino Rangatiratanga as espoused in Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi, and the potential for social research to be produced in defiance of Māori self-determination. This research will be conducted as a partnership with Māori lecturers and with full accountability to the Māori participants, carefully negotiated with those concerned, and respecting their rights, sensitivities and interests (Smith, 1992b; Te Awekotuku, 1991; Teariki & Spoonley, 1992). This research is conducted with an awareness of the power of Pākehā institutions to redefine what is Māori, and to inappropriately assume cross-cultural application of 'universal' theoretical principles (Stairs, 1988). One of the tasks of this research will be to make explicit these dilemmas and to develop a methodology which is overt and empowering. The outcome of the research is intended to contribute to expressed aspirations of Māori, the revitalisation of te reo Māori and tino rangatiratanga (Waite, 1992).

Some concerns raised by bell hooks (1989) are relevant here. She considers that:

When we write about the experiences of a group to which we do not belong, we should think about the ethics of our action, considering whether or not our work will be used to reinforce and perpetuate domination (hooks, 1989, p. 43).

Other considerations are to explore ethical issues of race privilege and personal motivation, enquiring as to why it is important that particular perspectives be offered, and acknowledging that this work is different from that done by a member of that ethnic group (hooks, 1989, p. 44). In a pedagogical context hooks warns of placing another ethnic group (in her context black Americans) in a servicing role meeting the needs of the dominant group (hooks, 1989, p. 47).

hooks (1994) has also provided insights into the dynamics of relationships between women from dominant and oppressed groups. When she asked black women about factors that distinguish relationships with white women that are not exploitative or oppressive, “A common response was that these relationships had two important factors: honest confrontation, and dialogue about race, and reciprocal interaction” (hooks, 1994, p. 106). The implications for this are that a Pākehā researcher who seeks to work with Māori participants should take responsibility for being informed about issues of colonisation, and to have an ongoing commitment to confronting her own racism as well as racist ideologies and practices in her social and institutional context. hooks also writes of feminist possibilities for white and black women to work collectively:

...we must have more written work and oral testimony documenting ways barriers are broken down, coalitions formed, and solidarity shared. It is this evidence that will renew our hope and provide strategies and direction for future feminist movement (hooks, 1994, p. 110).

I consider ethics and respectful relationships to be central issues in the research process, and respect to be a fundamental principle. Barnhardt emphasises the need for the researcher to manifest genuine respect for participants and their worldviews (1994, p. 30). Meaningful interactions are best generated within mutually respectful relationships (Bishop & Glynn, 1999, p. 121). Respect is the key to gaining insight, since it enables a genuine receptivity, and ‘acts of recognition’ of the other’s perspective (hooks, 1994, p. 186). I genuinely wished to honour the time and energy and thought that my participants were prepared to gift to the project, with respectful and honest treatment of them and the material that was generated through their involvement.

3.8 A Reflexive and Emergent Methodology

As the research proceeded, I began to realise that my methodology was in itself an emergent process, which could be aligned with a number of 'schools' of methodological terminology, but in fact formed a life of its own. The process of writing a 'methodology chapter', required me to pin myself down, and yet, I tended to resist the attempt to try and neatly categorise my approach within any or even several neat boxes. I concur with Holliday's view that all techniques and methodologies must be continuously in question (Holliday, 1994, p. 31).

A principle I derived from critical pedagogy, critical ethnography and narrative methodological approaches, was to incorporate ongoing reflection of my positionality as part of the research process. Mark Conchas has written that "Educational researchers interested in writing narrative accounts must understand the way their own experiences, backgrounds, biases, and subjective views influence the research process" (Conchas, 1998, p. 31). Making explicit one's ideological positioning or 'baggage', one's 'social positionality and epistemological orientation', is particularly important with regard to the interpretative process (Scheurich, 1995, p. 249).

I wondered about the means to identify one's 'biases'. The word itself carries somewhat negative connotations. I wondered how a 'bias' differs from an attitude, a perspective, a paradigm, or modus operandi? Was it possible to make all my conscious 'biases' transparent, let alone uncover those buried within my subconscious? Like Heshusius, who asks "Are there parts of us that are not subjective?" (Heshusius, 1994, p. 16) I wondered, "Are there parts of us that aren't biased?" Perhaps the terminology of 'bias' is itself becoming outmoded as post-modern theorising requires the researcher to locate her or himself explicitly within her socio-cultural context, to acknowledge, as far as possible, her subjectivities and positionality which inform her understandings and 'biases'.

Linda Smith considers that

...academic writing is a form of selecting, arranging and presenting knowledge. It privileges sets of texts, views about the history of an idea, what issues count as significant; and, by engaging in the same process uncritically, we too can render indigenous writers invisible or unimportant while reinforcing the validity of other writers. If we write without thinking critically about our writing, it can be dangerous (Smith, 1999, p. 36).

In order to attend to these concerns I was attracted by the concept of “methodological humility” (Kincheloe, 1991, p. 58) - which has resonance with Holliday’s notion of ‘anthropological humility’ (1994, p. 31) (see section 3.4). The notion of methodological humility is considered a useful approach for non-positivistic, critical, qualitative educational researchers:

The humble researcher practices the form of inquiry which is humble in the sense that respects the complexity of the socio-educational world. Humility in this context is not self-depreciating nor does it involve the silencing of one’s voice; humility implies a sense of the unpredictability of the educational microcosm and the capriciousness of the consequences of one’s inquiry (Kincheloe, 1991, p. 58).

3.9 Overview of methodological paradigm

The methodological paradigm for this research project was emergent and reflexive, situated within a qualitative orientation and drawing upon critical pedagogy, critical anthropology ethnography, and narrative methodologies, informed by postmodernist perspectives. Intrinsic to this methodological framework were notions of praxis, participant voice, and researcher participation in shared meaning-making with colleagues who shared a community of interest, that of early childhood care and education and teacher education. A commitment to maintaining respectful and caring relationships with participants and consulting them regarding the methodological processes in which they were to be involved, as well as securing their contribution to the interpretation of the data were essential aspects which were employed in order to sustain the integrity of this study. As a researcher I was aware of the reflexivity of my positioning, and sought to engage in ongoing critical reflection relating to my role

and its impact on the research processes, and the intersections between cultural and power dynamics within the data gathering and interpretation stages.

Chapter Four: Method

4.0 Introduction to Chapter Four

Research method, the processes implemented in order to derive research data and findings, are more than a series of pre-determined steps which the researcher can methodically proceed through in a formulaic uncritical fashion. Demonstrating an accountability and reflexivity about the research process is an essential component of the research project, since it reflects upon the credibility of the knowledge presented. As Linda Smith has written, "Method is important because it is regarded as the way in which knowledge is acquired or discovered and is a way in which we can 'know' what is real" (Smith, 1999, p. 164).

Data in this study came from a range of sources, utilising ethnographic and qualitative instruments of individual and group audiotaped interviews with colleagues in the university and wider early childhood community; audiotaped class discussions; samples of students assignments; observations in early childhood centres; and an open-response written questionnaire to graduates of the programme. I also kept a personal journal of anecdotal incidents such as conversations or observations at the university or in early childhood centres, insights from the literature, questions that arose, and tensions that emerged throughout the study which was intended to ensure an ongoing critical reflection in keeping with the reflexive nature of my positioning as researcher, colleague, and university lecturer.

4.1 Overview of Data Collection and Codes Used

There were three groupings of data gathered in this study. The first, or 'stage one data' was derived from a series of interviews (see appendices 3.1 to 3.1.5). This interview data was supplemented by a range of 'stage two data', which includes: observations within early childhood centres; audiotaped classes from University of Waikato courses in early childhood education; samples of student assignments, and a survey of graduates from the early childhood teacher education programme (see

appendices 3.2 to 3.2.4). The final phase of data collection was a further interview, a co-theorising hui with Māori participants (see appendix 3.3).

The first stage of data collection was conducted in 1997 and involved interviews with eighteen different participants (see Appendix 2.1 for a detailed chronology of research process). Participants include: four Māori colleagues and four Pākehā colleagues from the Department of Early Childhood Studies; three Māori and three Pākehā graduates from the early childhood programme at the University of Waikato; and another group of participants who were working as facilitators of professional development for early childhood centres (one was Pākehā and three were Māori). I also interviewed a colleague from another early childhood teacher education programme who had an interest in cultural issues. Some of the participants fell into dual categories, and therefore had two codes assigned to them. Aside from one interview with two Māori colleagues, all the rest were on an individual basis, and all were facilitated by me. Two of the interviews were not recorded due to a faulty tape-recorder, and have not therefore been utilised in the study, although they still informed my thinking and understandings of the issues they raised.

The coding system used in this thesis includes markers of their role, whether they are Māori or Pākehā, and a number, allocated chronologically, which is necessary to differentiate each participant from that grouping. Therefore, for example, “CP1”, refers to the Pākehā colleague that was interviewed first. Overviews of the data from Māori colleagues are situated in Appendix 3.1.1; from Pākehā colleagues in Appendix 3.1.3; from Māori graduates in Appendix 3.1.2; from Pākehā graduates in Appendix 3.1.4, and from the professional development facilitators in Appendix 3.1.5. There was a further large group interview conducted in 2000, with six of the eight Māori participants, and the codes for these begin with MPH, for Māori Participants’ Hui, and then a number to differentiate them, based on the order in which they initially spoke. Data from this hui is presented in Appendix 3.3. Each

phase of data collection was conducted only after ethical approval had been obtained through the relevant official process.

In 1997 and 1998, I tape-recorded class discussions from my course, Cultural Studies Two, 1158.13. These are identified by the use of the codes [CS2, 97] or [CS2, 98]. These data are presented in Appendix 3.2.2. A further set of data was collected from observations of thirteen different early childhood programmes, in 1998, which is presented in Appendix 3.2.1. Some samples of students' work were gathered over the period of 1996 - 2000, and these are given a code, such as: [SWY3P3]. This code indicates firstly that the excerpt used comes from student's work (SW). Next it shows the year of study - in this example a year three course is indicated by Y3, and then that the work was written by a Pākehā student. The final number is to differentiate the different writers from the same grouping. The example [SWY3P3], then, indicates that the quote was taken from an assignment written in a year three course by Pākehā student number three. An overview of these data is contained in Appendix 3.2.3.

A further source of data was obtained from a written survey of graduates of the early childhood programme in the year 2000. The survey was supported by the Department of Early Childhood Studies and had the joint purpose of providing information designed to contribute to internal departmental programme and course reviews. The questionnaire was designed in consultation with all colleagues within the Department of Early Childhood Studies in that year, who were invited to contribute questions related to their areas of teaching. It requested open-ended responses to these questions. The survey sample comprised two distinct groups. One set of the questionnaires was issued to completing students in the final week of their studies in the year 2000. Data from the thirteen questionnaires returned by these students is identified using the code RG (recent graduate) followed by a number. The other respondents are seventeen former graduates of the early childhood programme at the University of Waikato, whose contacts were provided through the university's

Alumni Office. Data from these questionnaires is coded PG for “prior graduate”, also followed by a number to differentiate one from another. These data are presented in Appendix 3.2.4.

4.2 Preparing for the Interview Process

4.2.1 Individual interviews

One of my early methodological challenges, was in preparing to proceed with the planned interviews to begin in first semester 1997. At first I felt reasonably relaxed about interviewing skills and the anticipated process, but some cautionary words from one of my supervisors, and from a prospective participant, alerted me to the fact that I needed to become more clear of my role as interviewer, and the process of effectively facilitating interviews which would deliver useful material.

As a result of reading and writing on the subject of interviewing techniques, I saw my role as being to develop a process whereby, from the stories of participants, I was able to construct my story of our stories, attempting along the way to ensure that there were sufficient opportunities for those participants to clarify my interpretations or usages of parts of their stories. Sections reviewing interview processes and group interview techniques follow in the next chapter, on data gathering.

My review of literature pertaining to interviews in qualitative research identified the need to be wary of positivist pitfalls such as a presumption of objectivity, and to guard against misrepresenting meanings by taking items out of their original context (Limerick, Burgess-Limerick, & Grace, 1996; Scheurich, 1995).

With regard to terminology, I initially chose the term ‘informants’ as I was seeking to become informed through their contributions. However, this term has a cold feeling to it, resonant of spies and informers. The term ‘interviewee’ was avoided as I perceived it to have a diminutive association. The alternative of ‘participants’, had appeal, although as the principal researcher, I was also a participant. “Participant”

indicates that the role is more collaborative and that the power dynamics are less skewed than in a traditional paradigm. As Scheurich (Scheurich, 1995) says, debate such as this is really no more than semantics in that the choice of terminology is ultimately less important than what occurs in the actual interactions. Of primary importance in the interview process is to respect the agency, creativity, and resistance of participants as meanings are negotiated (Weiler, 1988, p. 21 cited in Scheurich, 1995, p. 247).

A participant/researcher stance involves valuing the knowledge and experience of both researcher and participants, recognition of the shifting power dynamics, and the multiplicity of intentions and motivations, both conscious and unconscious, on the part of both parties. The researcher is not adopting a neutral or naïve stance, but comes from a position of insider, informed and interested in the subject matter. “Treating the researcher’s experiences as central to the research makes space for a new kind of knowledge”, according to Limerick, Burgess-Limerick, and Grace (Limerick et al., 1996, p. 450). The sharing of information in the interview process can be regarded as a gift “of time, of text, of understanding”, in that the participants are allowing the researcher to use their stories as part of the researcher’s development of her story/thesis (Limerick et al., 1996, p. 458). This perspective involves reciprocal respect, and sensitivity on the part of the researcher. The researcher is dependent on the participants’ willingness, goodwill, and active participation in enabling the researcher to be a conduit for their knowledge.

My original intention was to create a situation of ‘joint construction of meaning’ by participants and researcher (Limerick et al., 1996, p. 458) within a series of semi-structured interviews, starting with a ‘personal story’ approach framed in terms of the participants’ personal experiences (Wolcott, 1987, p. 48). The events described by the participants would then provide a potential source of elaboration on underlying themes and patterns. Misinterpretation due to ambiguities and tenuousness of language being used to convey meanings can be somewhat tempered by checking

processes such as relaying texts and interpretations to participants for correction, and clarification during the course of subsequent interviews.

4.2.2 Interview Strategies

Inviting the participants to determine time and place for interviews can contribute to their comfort levels by allowing some sense of control and security. The goal of the researcher in the early stage of the interview is to establish rapport, demonstrating a genuine desire to learn “their truths as they define them” (Tammivaara & Enright, 1986, p. 221). Participants may be more competent than they are verbally able to express in the interview context. They may also not have reflected on the material that they are being asked to focus on.

A useful technique to encourage participants within the interview format is the “Expressive Autobiographical Interview” in which the participant is asked to relate her/his experiences chronologically, with prompting questions at relevant points to facilitate specific information regarding both the participant’s behaviour and knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs (Spindler & Spindler, 1987, p. 25-26). In formulating questions, the researcher needs to monitor the extent to which her own assumptions are being reflected, and to allow for the fact that these may not be shared by the participants. Participant observation or insider knowledge may be useful in the process of tailoring questions which spur the participant to provide valuable responses. Indirect questions regarding the participant’s work can be useful in providing detailed responses (Tammivaara & Enright, 1986, p. 222), for example, such questions as “Can you describe a tutorial session that dealt with bicultural content?” Concretely framed questions might similarly be useful, such as “What changes regarding bicultural issues have you observed since you have been involved in the programme?”

Questions about the participants’ feelings require a degree of rapport and trust to have first been established. Open questions are useful in that they have more scope and

allow participants more control. These can be followed up with focus questions to clarify an issue. Examples of phrasing of low control questions are “I am wondering if...?” and “Do you think....?” (Tammivaara & Enright, 1986, p. 222-224). The researcher needs to be wary of filling in the ends of participants’ sentences as a means of demonstrating empathy, as this can impose the researcher’s interpretation.

Thus, in establishing rapport with informants in the interview setting, we must monitor the assumptions that we intentionally or unintentionally embed in our *informants’ answers*, just as we must monitor the assumptions that we intentionally or unintentionally embed in our *own ethnographic questions* (Tammivaara & Enright, 1986, p. 226).

I recognised the challenge raised by the need for this kind of self-monitoring whilst simultaneously maintaining a genuine focus on what the participant was saying.

4.2.3 Group Interviews

I knew from experience that Māori colleagues preferred to operate collectively, and I had read Valerie Suransky’s (1982) description, in her research into ideology in child-care centres, of her unpreparedness for the preference of a group interview. She had been shocked when arriving, having prearranged to conduct individual interviews with the staff of a black child-care centre, only to discover the whole teaching team ready and waiting for a group interview (Suransky, 1982, p. 153). Her initial misgivings (“How can I handle five staff members all together? Will they be honest?...”) were replaced by her understanding of the different reality of her participants in terms of the *collective structure* of the interview. It was suggested by my chief supervisor, that I should read more on the subject of group interviews in preparation for facilitating these with Māori participants.

The methodology of focus groups, developed as a tool in business sector marketing research, has been recognised as having potential application in educational research, where it may prove useful, for example, in ‘probing the subtleties of institutional management problems’ (Brodigan, 1992, p. 1). The distinguishing feature of focus group research is open group discussion, focusing on the research topic, but with a

free-flowing inter-change by group members, facilitated by the researcher/interviewer. The facilitation role may be less directive than in a one-to-one situation. Advantages of focus groups include the fact that a large amount of information is delivered within a short duration, usually 90 -120 minutes, which is less time-consuming than written surveys or multiple individual interviews (Avery & Zabel, 1995, p. 22-23); that group members are stimulated by each others' contributions (Creason, 1991, p. 3); and that participants are less inhibited, more candid and spontaneous than in individual interviews. In a group situation, for example, one individual's comments can trigger a chain of reactions from others in the group (Avery & Zabel, 1995, p. 23).

There are several possible applications of focus group (Brodigan, 1992, p. 2). They can be used in a qualitative pilot stage to identify participants' terminology and understandings in order to formulate a subsequent quantitative questionnaire (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 27). They can form part of a triangulation procedure, supported by another data collection method or be utilised to provide further interpretation of quantitative data eg. mail or telephone surveys. They may also be employed as a primary source of research information (Brodigan, 1992, p. 2).

The first important component of a successful focus group is to have clearly established research goals. As Avery and Zabel state, it is necessary to "Define what the purposes of the study are. Determine what information is needed. The purpose of a focus group is not to arrive at a group consensus, change attitudes, or resolve conflicts, but to collect qualitative data to answer research questions" (Avery & Zabel, 1995, p. 25). Group size can range from 4-12, and it may be helpful to have groupings of people with common experiences and understandings in order to create an atmosphere conducive to sharing of personal views (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 32).

4.2.4 Group Interview Strategies

The planning for a focus group interview process involves identifying participants who will be representative and useful to the study; deciding on the number of separate groups and sessions per group; the choice of a comfortable location; allowing for provision of drinks and snacks; organising audio-taping equipment; preparation of a discussion guide and of the facilitator. An effective facilitator will be enthusiastic, knowledgeable in group dynamics and skilled in group facilitation (Avery & Zabel, 1995, p. 25; Brodigan, 1992, p. 3-4) as well as having an in-depth understanding of the research topic (Creason, 1991, p. 4). It is also imperative that the facilitator be a good listener, and be able to draw out reticent participants (Avery & Zabel, 1995, p. 25). Useful probing questions include: "Give me an example of ..." or "Could you explain further..." The facilitator's role is to encourage everyone to participate, and create an atmosphere which is conducive to listening as well as talking, in that each person feels that their contribution is respected and valued. A useful phrase to generate this sense of individual validation might be "If your experience or perception is different, that is exactly what I want to know" (Creason, 1991). In terms of group dynamics, the facilitator can try and avoid a situation whereby a dominant sub-group or 'group think' stifles individual perspectives that differ from the majority. A useful phrase could be, for example, "Does anyone have a different view on this?" (Creason, 1991, p. 5). The facilitator will need to be aware of dynamics such as a dominant group member monopolising the process (Avery & Zabel, 1995), p.24). Whilst this situation can provide leadership and focus, there is the risk that it could prove inhibiting to others (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 29).

According to Creason, the facilitator/moderator's job is to guide, enhance, cue, expand, and listen, directing in a non-directive way (Creason, 1991, p. 6). The facilitator can aim to maintain a balance between keeping her/ his involvement to a minimum using a non-directive approach whilst still maintaining a focus on the research topic. It is important for the facilitator to keep in mind that in a group interview situation, the interaction between participants is more significant than the

interaction between interviewer and interviewees (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 25-26). The group can be empowered to do its own maintenance by using suggestions such as the following: “If you do get off track, someone will usually pull us back to the topic. I’ll jump in if I have to, but one of you will probably do it anyway before I have to”. To refocus the group back to the research topic, the following phrase could be appropriate: “Just remember that what we are talking about is....”.

The facilitator’s discussion guide might contain 5-6 questions in sequence, with suggested follow-up probes (Avery & Zabel, 1995, p. 25). Avery and Zabel suggest that “Rather than gathering superficial information about many ideas, it is better to gather in-depth information about a few issues” (Avery & Zabel, 1995, p. 25). The written guide would begin with welcoming the participants, followed by introductory remarks which explain the purpose, and lay out simple ground-rules such as the researchers’ wish to hear everyone’s perspectives, e.g. “I really value your thoughts and opinions - you all have relevant expertise, and this is a time to share what has been effective for us”; “There are no right or wrong answers”; and a reminder that anonymity will be protected (Avery & Zabel, 1995, p. 25; Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 32). This could be followed by a round where each participant briefly introduces her/himself, leading on to the key focus questions.

A suggestion for audio-recording was to have two machines in order to provide two copies, one for the researcher and one for transcribing, and also to provide a back-up in case of equipment failure (Brodigan, 1992). Although video recording is useful, in that it provides a source of data unavailable on audio-tape, such as facial expression and body language, I decided that videoing our interviews would be much more obtrusive audio-taping and likely to make participants more self-conscious.

A further role of the facilitator is to try to moderate the tendency for people to talk over each other, in order to generate a climate of respect and sense that every participant is being heard. If several people speak at once, it can be inhibiting to less

assertive participants, who do not wish to compete for the floor. It is also very difficult to decipher the tape-recording. Immediately after the session, the facilitator/researcher can add detail through written notes to supplement or highlight aspects of the session. It may also be useful to have a co-facilitator/researcher to note-take throughout the interview, as a guide to transcription, and as a back-up in case of equipment failure. Questioning can range from very open and unstructured to more structured and specific formats (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 25). Some examples of open, less structured questions are “What key words or phrases would you use to describe your experience relating to X?” or “What would be the ideal scenario for X?” (Burns, 1994, Appendix J; Creason, 1991, p. 5). Visual stimuli and very concrete questions can be useful in providing a group focus, useful especially when working with younger interviewees (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 30).

Transcription of group interviews can be very challenging, with people talking over each other, and the difficulty in identifying individuals. A possible means of overcoming the identification issue is to treat the group as an entity and not identify individuals within it or ascribe views to individuals (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 30-31), although this will possibly obscure some of the specificity of the data. It is also useful to have an assistant, who may be one of the participants, who is prepared to take handwritten notes which can serve as prompts for clarification purposes during the transcribing process.

Watts and Ebbutt (1987) observed that the group dynamics in their research into school children’s attitudes to science classes delivered interviews which reflected “an infectious downward spiral of shaded awfulness” (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 31) in that the children’s negativity was exaggerated in an increasingly vicious cycle as they influenced each other. The researchers countered this dilemma by refocusing their purpose to be one of attempting to identify constructive content. “This became our central organising concept. Our approach became one of teasing out perceptions of good practice so that, within our synthesis, we attempted to reverse the sense of what

was said, to make positive the negative” (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 32). They commented:

Data is not value-free, researchers are not (and cannot be) purely objective, analysis and interpretation are not dispassionate acts. Both the researched and the researchers have objectives in mind at the outset. Our own approach was clearly value-laden and as we wrote our ‘story’ through the data we attempted, where possible, to outline our position and prior assumptions. The fact that the majority of the students described something less than [ideal] did not prevent us building a picture of their view of what good practice might be (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 32).

Group interview situations are a useful means of countering interviewer control in that groups are less amenable to influence than individual interviewees, particularly when the facilitation encourages opportunities for a free-flowing and interactive exchange of views (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 32). A potential disadvantage is that participants may not reveal more personal issues (Watts & Ebbutt, 1987, p. 33). Essential to effective facilitation is that the facilitator has an in-depth understanding of the research topic in order to recognise and follow up profitable lines of inquiry. The quality of the facilitation skills and background knowledge of the interviewer are both crucial in eliciting quality data from a group interview situation (Avery & Zabel, 1995, p. 24). This placed the onus on me as the researcher/insider/interviewer to create a comfortable interview situation which would be conducive to the collaborative dialogue I was intending to facilitate.

4.2.5 Question Preparation

With study leave approved for first semester 1997, and a new baby in my arms, I approached the impending interviews with a need to feel ready. Feeling prepared for me is to have lots of material organised and available, and ‘knowing my stuff’. For my lectures and classes, I utilise a good range of readings, and have well-ordered notes, overhead transparencies, and workshop/discussion questions arranged in advance.

With my experience in teaching and working with students, and also my Masters Degree in Counseling, I was aware of interpersonal dynamics. I also felt a certain confidence in that my interviews were to be with colleagues, former students, people I already knew reasonably well who were interested in the research kaupapa. I was concerned for their comfort, and that having agreed to participate, their involvement would not result in any inconvenience. I had already ascertained for example, that some of my Māori colleagues preferred to have a group interview.

Through my NuDist coding of literature, mainly from critical pedagogy perspectives, I had in late 1996 produced 30 plus questions. These were questions that I initially thought I would like my participants to respond to, taken directly from my indexing of key ideas I had identified from my reading. I initially shared my list of 30 questions with two colleagues - one Māori and one Pākehā, as a sort of pilot in order to get their feedback as to the appropriateness of my focus. I received contrasting reactions. The Pākehā colleague balked at the length of the list, the technicality of the language, and the presumption that I would seek answers from her in such an academic and uninviting manner. “Whose doctorate is this Jenny?” she jokingly demanded! She suggested I do some reading on interview techniques about processes that would encourage participants to share their ideas through telling their stories. Although I was taken aback and felt defensive initially (thinking, “Surely she should be comfortable with terms like ‘pedagogy’, these questions are for fellow academics, they don’t need to be ‘dumbed down’”...) and took a blow to my confidence as an ‘interviewer’, I quickly saw that in fact her advice was very wise.

The Māori colleague reacted completely differently. She took the questions home and decided that she would answer them all, one by one, as a form of relaxation when she was working on her computer. I kept reminding her to give me critical feedback about the questions. I had by now realised that I should have refined the questions more before letting her start on her answering. She instead presented me with a

computer disc with her answers, in April, 1997, as I began my interviews. She also arranged an interview time for the group of Māori colleagues.

After consultation with my chief supervisor, Dr Barbara Harrison, I decided to take the advice of my colleague and read some articles on interview techniques. Barbara also suggested that I should prepare myself for the particular circumstances of group interviews, so I read some material on this subject also. Interestingly, I found it quite difficult to locate information on group interview processes. After writing two brief literature reviews [see sections 4.2.1 to 4.2.4], my confidence in my role as ‘interviewer’ was partially restored, but I still felt some anxiety about such things as my tendency to interrupt and to finish off sentences for others when they were pausing. The thirty plus questions derived from the critical pedagogy literature were totally cast aside, and I now had 5-6 questions [see following section 5.1.2]. I had now realised that I could not expect my participants to sit down and directly answer my research questions, but that through encouraging them to tell me their stories around their experiences of bicultural development, I would hopefully gain the material that would eventually enable me to answer those questions. These are the reformulated interview questions.

4.3 Interview Questions

The interview questions which follow were intended to provide some consistency and structure, to be used in an informal way to guide and focus the participants, and to be supplemented by any relevant prompts that emerged in response to participants’ responses.

Interview Questions for Colleagues:

1. Can you tell me about your background and how you came to early childhood education as a career?

2. When did you become aware of 'bicultural' dynamics? Follow-up: Can you talk about how you have worked through some of these issues in your work?
3. Can you describe any tutorial sessions that dealt with bicultural issues that you have facilitated?
4. What changes have you observed regarding bicultural issues since you have been involved in the programme?
5. How do you view the relationship between 'bicultural' and multi-cultural dynamics?

Interview Questions for Graduates:

1. Can you tell me about how you came to early childhood education as a career?
2. When did you become aware of 'bicultural' dynamics in early childhood education?
3. Can you describe any situations or experiences that have contributed to your understanding of what bicultural early childhood care and education is about?
4. What changes have you observed regarding bicultural issues since you have been involved in early childhood care and education? Probe: What would be the ideal scenario for a bicultural centre?
5. How do you view the relationship between 'bicultural' and multi-cultural dynamics?
6. What resources have you found useful in implementing bicultural teaching? How has Te Whāriki contributed?

These were designed to encourage the person to share their experiences, grounded in their practical realities, and did not focus on 'pedagogical principles' or use academic jargon. I knew that it would be important for me to use appropriate probing and follow-up questions to draw out the participants' ideas as they related to their experiences, building on the information that they had shared, whilst steering the

discussion toward the material that I was hoping to obtain. I was initially unsure of effective ways to provide useful probes to follow-up my initial questions which would not interrupt the flow of the participant, and I was also unsure of how successfully I would be able to moderate the tendency of ‘steering’ the conversation towards my own agenda.

4.4 Selection of Participants

I decided to interview a range of people whom I knew shared my interest in the kaupapa of bicultural development in early childhood education, and early childhood teacher education. This could be considered as “purposive sampling” which is more likely to increase the range of data generated than the alternatives of representative or random sampling (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 57). Participants invited included colleagues in the Department of Early Childhood Studies, graduates of our programme who were now implementing bicultural approaches, and colleagues working in the area of early childhood professional development. These professional development facilitators were employed through Ministry of Education-funded contracts which were established to support the introduction of the new bicultural early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b). These people were a valuable source of insight regarding the kaupapa of bicultural development in early childhood care and education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, since this was a key aspect of their professional responsibilities in terms of supporting early childhood teachers to deliver Te Whāriki. They were likely to encounter on a daily basis the strategies and barriers that early childhood teachers were facing as they grappled with the bicultural requirements contained within the curriculum document, and would also have knowledge of effective skills in facilitating these teachers to become more competent in their bicultural practices.

I approached eight colleagues in the Department of Early Childhood Studies in person, and all agreed to participate. I thought that the four Māori lecturers might well want to be involved in the study as a collective unit. I also approached four

Pākehā colleagues, selecting those who had some experience teaching in courses dealing with cultural issues.

I invited the participation of six graduates, three Māori and three Pākehā, whom I had known during their period at the University, to have been interested in bicultural issues. The reason for this is that I wanted to work with people who would be enthusiastic toward my kaupapa, and who would be more likely to have been implementing bicultural approaches and to have been reflecting on this process. There was little point in interviewing someone with no interest in the subject. Of the graduates I initially contacted, by phone, all but one agreed to participate. The one who declined, apologetically explained that she was in a difficult professional situation and asked that I approach her again after this was resolved.

The four professional development facilitators were also personally known to me, and were contacted initially by phone. All immediately agreed to participate.

4.5 Summary of Research Method Utilised

This research project adopted a qualitative, ethnographic approach which utilised a range of sources, primarily individual and group interviews, supplemented by a number of further sources of data which included observations in early childhood centres, audio-taped classes, samples of student assignments, and a written open-response questionnaire survey. The interviews were an open-ended co-exploration of some key questions (see section 4.4), in which participants were encouraged to tell their stories of the relevant experiences and beliefs (Spindler & Spindler, 1987, p. 25-26) prompted by an interviewer who was able to contribute from an informed, or “insider” position to a joint negotiation of meaning (Limerick et al., 1996, p. 450, p. 458). The next chapter considers issues which emerged during the interview and transcription processes, and also in relation to the stage two data collection.

Chapter Five: Emergent Insider- Researcher Methodology

5.0 Introduction to Chapter Five

In line with my critical stance, and my commitment to showing my biases and subjectivities, part of my research kaupapa involved recording some of my reflections on my research process in a working journal. Drawing upon this documentation of the research process, which is also a journey of becoming a more experienced researcher, this chapter endeavours to “show my working” (Carr, 1997, p. 128) as I proceeded with data collection and analysis. A chronological overview of the data collection and processing stages of the study is available in Appendix 2.1.

In this chapter, the processes utilised for initial data coding and analysis are outlined. Issues of accountability and representation, which are particularly significant for my role as a Pākehā researcher working with Māori (as well as Pākehā), participants are considered. Attention is given to issues pertaining to the stage two data sources.

The role of insider-researcher was a central feature of this study. Some examples of aspects of the research that were a surprise even to an insider-researcher, are outlined, and reflective journaling is posited as a tool to support the critical reflection that is an essential feature of ‘insider’ research processes.

5.1 Interviewing Experiences

My first interview was with a Pākehā colleague that I knew would be supportive and interested in the questions. I think I chose her as a warm-up which indicates I was perhaps more anxious than I had realised. My six-month old baby was present during the interview, which could have posed a distraction, but fortunately, my colleague was very motivated and committed to the kaupapa of the interview, and kept talking freely as I occasionally had to tend to the baby. This initial interview went on slightly longer than I had anticipated, which alerted me to the fact that I should forewarn future participants to allow at least an hour.

My experience of transcribing this interview was quite enlightening, mainly due to the fact that I talk so fast. For years my students have mentioned that I talk fast, particularly during lectures, and I have tried to slow myself down and become more conscious of my tendency to race ahead as ideas present themselves to me. Not only did I find my speed of talking difficult, but I also found that I tend to chop and change direction in mid-sentence, and often during my utterances. For years I have cringed while a particular radio announcer does a similar thing when he is interviewing people, introducing first one question and then without pausing spinning off into a second and then sometimes even a third question as a form of clarification. Much to my chagrin, I found myself guilty of similar incompetence. Another irritating tendency was to complete sentences for my colleague if she paused towards the end of a sentence, something I had read about and had determined not to do. The depth of thinking and experience that my colleague shared during the interview was extremely insightful and brought home to me a genuine appreciation of the fact that participants are providing the researcher with a koha, a generous gift of the sharing of their knowledge and life experiences (Limerick et al., 1996).

I proceeded to interview three more Pākehā colleagues in a similar fashion. One was a very long and thoughtful interview, conducted in the home of the participant. The other two were shorter and less in-depth, conducted in the participants' own offices. These last two colleagues were less involved in the kinds of teaching that I was exploring, so I was not surprised when these interviews were not of the same depth as the previous two. Learning from the model provided by a fellow doctoral candidate, I gave all the participants a small koha⁵⁷ after the interview to acknowledge their sharing of their time, energy and ideas.

⁵⁷ A koha is a gift.

The proposed group interview for Māori colleagues was a less straight-forward process. The first date, arranged by one of the colleagues, ended up with only one person managing to arrive at my home at the arranged time, and she was not the colleague who had initiated the arrangement! The two of us eventually proceeded with lunch and then a one-to-one interview in which my colleague gave generously of her experience and ideas. I later managed to arrange an interview for two Māori colleagues which took place at work. Even though we used the early childhood kitchen, and had tea and biscuits, it did not seem as relaxed to me, and did not take as long as it might have. I realised afterwards, with some discomfort, that I should have suggested that we begin with a karakia. Perhaps having only two people (as well as the interviewer) was not enough for the benefits of a group process to take effect. It was also possible that these two colleagues were less aware of my kaupapa, and had not taught in as many of the specific courses that might have equipped them to provide me with more material. A fourth Māori colleague chose to be interviewed in my office.

Interviews with three Pākehā graduates of the programme were conducted in my home, at their request. I found these interviews particularly interesting as I had not anticipated what a student's perception might be. I was aware during these interviews of the power effects of my position as their former teacher.

I also conducted three interviews, all at their workplaces, of Māori graduates of the early childhood programme. I was appreciative of their time, conscious that we were at their workplace, and yet very grateful that each one of them gave so freely and thoughtfully, providing me with long interviews and valuable insights. I was also aware of ethical issues arising in terms of confidentiality matters.

The final category of interviewed participants was that of Professional Development Facilitators. I considered that these people were at the cutting edge of working out what Te Whāriki means in terms of bicultural curriculum, as they are contracted by

the Ministry of Education to support practitioners with the implementation of the document. There are strong parallels between our role as pre-service facilitators, and the work of these in-service professional development providers in that both groups are working at finding ways to build understanding of the bicultural requirements of the new curriculum document. Two were interviewed at their workplaces, one in my home, and one in my office at the university. I found interviewing these people harder, as they were perhaps less focused on my specific kaupapa of the university degree programme. The data that they shared, was again, very rich and thought-provoking.

5.1.1 Interviews as an Emergent Process

As I conducted the series of interviews, over the period of April-June, 1997, I began to notice that I was feeding ideas from previous interviews into the current one. Initially my responses were constrained by my positionality in that I was fresh to the situation and open to each person's perspective, aside from the insider knowledge I already held. However, as the interviews proceeded, I began to notice that some themes were recurrent, and this information inevitably began to inform my subsequent interviews. To illustrate this process, in this section I track the emergence of the idea of bicultural commitment being something that is "heartfelt".

In my third interview, a Māori graduate had made the comment that her bicultural orientation reflected her bicultural upbringing:

GMI: Biculturalism to me has always been a part of my life always, right from early, . . . and so it was very much the culture that I was brought up in. It was bicultural the whole time, my education was bicultural. And then coming, like the kids, with [her children] going to kindergarten we had a bicultural centre and it's just always been a part of my education and my children and the centres that I've been in.

JR: And is it a part of what you do in your early childhood practice?

GMI: Yes, and also in my life too. I mean it comes from the heart not because you've been told.

The next interview was with a Pākehā graduate. Again the “heart” concept was introduced by the participant:

JR: What is it that you think contributes to your ability to do what you do, what proportion of it is commitment and what proportion is knowledge, is it a fair mixture of both?

GP1: Yes, a lot of it is knowledge I think, but a lot is in your heart sort of thing. It is because I want to understand Māori people and I have been given the knowledge to understand about injustices. Mind you it is the political climate at the time too, I seem to waste so much energy justifying why Māori people are being given things back so to speak.

My sixth interview was my second with a Pākehā colleague. This participant not only introduced the “heart” concept but used it repeatedly throughout the interview. In this excerpt she is describing different processes of introducing people to issues pertaining to the treaty and anti-racism:

CP2: I have this real kind of clear understanding of my own processes and how and I have also talked to, enough people who I have seen that be very damaging, that damage is done. Damage is done by, by forcing people in to things that they don't have a heart for yet. You know, if you say to someone you have got to learn a language and you have got to pronounce it right they don't actually believe it themselves, well they won't.

JR: So do you see the goal of our treaty workshop as to create in those students ...

CP2l: Heart. Yes, I think it is. That's part of it. . . [Later] we have talked about this a lot, and it's about the different ways . . . in to people to get that heart right... [Later] because there is a heart level involved I think they need time to process really. . . [Later] the heart has to be right. It's like people have got to have a desire and a want and then they have got to actually have some skills to be able to go, and confidence, to go and seek out.

Later in the interview, I picked up on the “heart” terminology and reflected it back to the colleague:

JR: One of the things I think is important, I wonder what your opinion is, when we work with students, is our own credibility as people, how we come across, how we connect with them as people as lecturers, what do you think about that, your relationships with students is that part of winning over that heart?

CP2: It is a fundamental core to winning that heart actually.

In the very next interview, the “heart” idea was introduced again by the participant, this time the third Pākehā graduate:

JR: Probably without any commitment you could have all the knowledge in the world but not really do much?

GP3: Exactly, I mean what is it really, just a waste of time really. If you haven't got the commitment to actually implement something and feel the you know, the heart to do it, then it is one of the hardest things to do.

During the tenth interview, one with a Māori colleague, I fed into the discussion the “heart” idea:

JR: Oh well, if you have any thoughts on that later on. That's one that's really interesting to me at the moment. I am getting this thing, it's got to be in the heart, it has got to be right there, and it's coming from not just you - it's coming from other interviewees and I'm thinking “How is it that we are going to get it in there?” I don't believe that you've got it or you haven't, I think you can learn these things and so...

CMI: And some of the graduates that have gone out from here, have...

JR: Absolutely.

CMI: Have really really got it in here. But it is getting it in there!

This chronology of excerpts show that the idea of heartfelt commitment was one which was repeatedly being introduced by participants, to the point where I began to suggest it myself as a useful possible framework for understanding the nature of commitment to bicultural development that we were discussing.

From two interviews in particular, I became interested to find out what was happening in terms of bicultural development in early childhood centres. One of the professional development facilitators described some exciting changes she had seen in centres:

PDFM1: Well they took that back to the centre and they read it in te reo. 95% of the kids are Tauīwi, there are only about 10% Māori. All the kids in that whānau love that kōrero⁵⁸, they loved it so much that they made another pukapuka⁵⁹ on a similar theme. The kids would predict the pages, say the te reo, and one of the choice things was that the kids wouldn't just go and pick it because you thought they should, they would actually go and get that book

⁵⁸ Kōrero is speaking or in this case, narrative.

⁵⁹ Pukapuka are books.

when their parents brought them in and take it to their parents, and share the pukapuka with their parents from themselves. So to me that's like magic. Because that's kids validating kaupapa Māori because those practitioners they set that ball rolling, so they are very important as change agents. So you had the teachers, the kids, the families, all awhiing⁶⁰ the kaupapa. I thought it was just so powerful, awesome.

The other instance came from the interview with one of the Pākehā graduates [GP2] who described how she and her colleagues had been encouraging the involvement of Māori whānau in her kindergarten to the extent that a kuia⁶¹ was supporting their attempts to incorporate local Māori history and stories into their programme. As a result of hearing about these developments, I felt it important to collect some first-hand data in the form of observations of a range of early childhood centres, to provide some context of current practice in terms of bicultural development. This led to the data presented in Chapter Eight, “Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Services.”

5.1.2 Emergent Data Analysis: Coding Data Using NuDist

In qualitative early childhood research, coding is about making sense of the data, identifying patterns of meaning that have been negotiated and illuminated during interview discussions (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 126). I chose the qualitative data analysis programme Q.S.R. NuDist because it had been recommended by colleagues. Realising that computer programmes such as NuDist are dependent on the skill of the person utilising them (Avery & Zabel, 1995, p. 26), I took opportunities to attend a workshop and receive some tutoring in the use of the programme. The key data analysis process involved using NuDist to code interviews and other material in a manner that has been described as “paradigmatic analysis of narrative data” (Wideen et al., 1998, p. 162). It was an emergent process in which codes were generated from and in response to the raw data, rather than being imposed from a previously identified framework.

⁶⁰ To awhi is to embrace, foster, cherish.

⁶¹ Kuia are female elders, “keepers of knowledge” (Walker, 1996, p. 20).

The process utilised also had resonance with grounded theory methodology as developed by Strauss and Corbin (Strauss & Corbin, 1999). Key features of this methodology are:

- an intention of theory development
- theory is grounded in data systematically gathered and analyzed, through continuous interplay between analysis and data collection
- theory is generated from the data (or existing theory is elaborated and modified using the data)
- sources of data can include interviews, observations, and documents of all kinds including media materials
- grounded theory requires that participants' interpretations and perspectives become incorporated into the researchers own interpretations/conceptualisations
- researchers must accept responsibility for the interpretive role. It is not sufficient merely to give voice to viewpoints
- grounded theories are grounded directly and indirectly on perspectives of participants, connecting this multiplicity of perspectives with patterns and processes of action/interaction
- distinction is made between coding and theoretical coding
- substantive theory is generated by the making of constant comparisons and the asking of theoretically oriented questions
- theories are traceable to the data that gave rise to them, within the interactive context of data collecting and analysing, and analysts (both researcher and participants)
- researchers need to question and skeptically review their own interpretations at every step of the inquiry
- through a process of reciprocal shaping, the researcher gives confirmation back to the participants

- this reciprocal shaping increases theoretical sensitivity, as does scrutinising the literature for further insights relevant to the emerging theory developed through the “continuing conversation” with the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1999, p.158-179).

As I slowly read through each interview, selecting sections of dialogue chunk by chunk, I would ask myself “What is she/he saying here?” The ‘chunk’ would then be coded to a particular ‘node’, if one already existed, or a new one created to meet that need. The nodes were emergent, in that I did not list them in advance, in order to line-up with key ideas identified from previous theory, but created them only in response to key ideas as they appeared. Through this step-by-step process, common themes were generated, clustered under particular ‘node’ headings and sub-headings. The process was one of identifying key meanings for each statement/cluster of statements. As new nodes emerged, I often needed to review previously coded data and include under more recently identified nodes examples of data not previously identified in this way. A particular chunk could be coded to several nodes, as there were often various aspects contained within a particular utterance or exchange. I was reluctant to categorise too narrowly the multiple meanings and range of ideas contained within even a small segment.

As I revisited interviews at different periods of the study I noticed that different themes and interpretations would emerge. This confirms the subjective nature of the project, and that my own subjectivity was shifting as I was informed from a wider range of experiences and the sharing of insight from participants.

5.2 Issues Pertaining to Interview Data

A number of issues were particularly salient to this study, in which a Pākehā researcher was working in an area which required the involvement of Māori participants. These include: contestation of meanings; transcription issues, researcher imposition and selectivity of data; and representation of Māori voice. Narrative research methodology was useful in these matters.

5.2.1 Conversations and Contestation of Meaning

Shotter (1993) cites Bakhtin (1986), suggesting that words only have meaning in context. Utterances are shaped by people's intentions, expressive of that person's being. "It is here, at these moments, when meanings are being 'negotiated' (to put it mildly) or 'fought over' (to put it more strongly) that politics is at its most acute" (Shotter, 1993, p. 41). Shotter sees negotiation of meaning as an on-going process of interaction:

Perhaps, rather than *already* having a meaning, we should see the *use* of a word as a *means* . . . in the social making of meaning. Thus then, the 'making sense', the production of a meaning, would not be a simple 'one-pass' matter of an individual saying a sentence, but would be a complex back-and-forth process of negotiation between speaker and hearer, involving texts and assumptions, the use of the present context, the waiting for something later to make clear what was meant before, and the use of many other 'seen but unnoticed' background features of everyday scenes, all deployed according to agreed practices or 'methods' (Shotter, 1990, p. 164).

Bishop makes a salient point in this regard. He writes that "Stories are related within the cultural frame of reference and the language of the research participant, rather than that of the researcher" (Bishop, 1996, p. 25). He also points out that meanings are contextually situated. As I wrote preliminary papers focusing on data from firstly Pākehā colleagues (Ritchie, 2000b), and then Pākehā graduates (Ritchie, 1999c), I found it difficult to pluck a statement out of context. The holistic nature of the conversation needed to be reflected which included my voice as interviewer. The meanings were not solely those of the participant but were being co-constructed as we listened to each other (Bishop, 1996, p. 31):

GP3: Well coming from, with like my past experience in childcare I had a lot of strong unity forming within that childcare centre, and a lot of the women there were Māori women and I just thought we really I need that support to get through. And I thought that a whānau group is a lot better than having just one body of people going in all different directions. Having one body going in the same direction is always better.

JR: Exactly. So you value that support you get from a group?

GP3: Definitely. Most definitely. You sort of can't get that group when you've got all these individuals going that way and that way. Okay you can

get a couple of friends or whatever but, when it comes down to it you don't have that unity. So I thought well yeah I'll give the whānau group a go. I'm pleased I did . . .

In this exchange I scaffolded what the participant had said, and this was received affirmatively. However, reading and re-reading the transcripts, I sometimes felt myself cringing at assumptions I made, and the ways I reinterpreted what the participant had been saying. In some instances the participant let me know that my interpretation was inappropriate as in the following example, where the participant rejects my attempt to explain the behaviour she has described:

PDFM3: And I have had to stop and say "Hey – some things you can't use in this way" because I noticed I take all my natural resources and do a workshop on them, and all of a sudden Tauivi had no respect for them. They were using them for collage and you know Playcentre are actually the worst, sorry I have to say this. The Playcentre mums will say "if you brought them why can't my child use them because he wants to use it"? You know. And I can remember this child, and I took lots of resources along, and these are the ones that the children can use, and these ones are for display, and for talking about. And the little boy was very skilled in wanting. He picked out all the valuable ones, and he wanted them, and his mum couldn't really see why, "Well why did you bring them then?". And it was a very very tense moment of trying to explain that. But they were also taonga... we have got from all over the motu⁶². And there are some things that people need to see the beauty and to share that with.

JR: It is probably a reflection of a Pākehā value of acquisitiveness. You know, wanting things, to possess things do you think?

PDFM3: No. I just think they had no idea of the value. They were just things that I collected because you can pick them up off the beach. Like pāua⁶³ shells, I mean they're precious now.

In another example, a colleague corrects my assumption that bicultural development within the degree programme is a response to Te Whāriki:

JR: Oh great, I didn't know that. So that's kind of come in since the inception of Te Whāriki, is that to do with Te Whāriki? I think Te Whāriki has had an influence on how we have been doing cultural things?(tone of voice is questioning)

⁶² Motu is island, here a general term referring to the country.

⁶³ Pāua are a type of abalone.

CP3: I don't think, oh in here, no I don't. I think we would have done that anyway. We were already. This, as a team, we were pretty well already committed to that I think. Te Whāriki is being woven into that, and Te Whāriki is actually being used, but no it was happening before.

JR: It was happening anyway. . .

In the following exchange, the colleague resisted my suggestion, restating her own perspective:

JR: In terms of what we are doing with students, what do you think we are doing in terms of biculturalism, tino rangatiratanga with them? I mean, what is our aim, is our aim to give them an understanding of tino rangatiratanga or CP2: Yeah, I think for me, this would be kind of a personal aim - but I don't actually have an awful lot to do with it, with the specific teaching of it - is that they understand what that concept is and, at very least, they don't stand in the way of that concept. So that when Māori are wanting to create initiatives that they will, and this is not just in education initiatives, but they will actually be "Yep fine. We are not going to stand in the way, we are not going to block that".

JR: Perhaps even support it.

CP2: Yeah, I mean that would be kind of really nice, but my kind of aim would be that they don't block, because I think it's less important whether they support it or don't support, if they are not getting in the way.

These sorts of corrections indicate the agency of participants, in that in at least some instances they felt able to counter the interpretations I was imposing. They also demonstrate my agency as a participant/researcher in influencing the conversations with my own perspectives, which sometimes are endorsed and other times rejected in a negotiated mutual construction of the narrative.

5.2.2 Transcription Issues

I personally only transcribed one interview, the first. Having transcribed many interviews during my Master's studies, I knew the value of doing one's own transcription, but also that this is a time-consuming endeavour. Having the rest professionally transcribed saved time, but created issues that required follow-up. I needed to go back and check tapes to see what the transcriber had missed or misinterpreted. Sometimes Māori words or names were not recognised by the

transcriber. These needed to be corrected, sometimes with a phone call to the participant, before the transcripts were sent to them.

Transcribers used a series of three close dots [...] to indicate an incomplete sentence, due to interruption or tailing off. When I was deleting material from an excerpt I used spaced dots [. . .] to indicate that something was missing. Reasons for these omissions were incoherence, confidentiality, or moving further into the interview to where the participant returned to the same issue. I avoided doing this as much as possible, to preserve authenticity. Shotter (1993) is concerned that "our commitment to thinking within a system, from within an orderly or coherent mental representation – the urge in reflection to command a clear view . . . – in fact *prevents* us from achieving a proper grasp of the pluralistic, non-orderly nature of our circumstances" (Shotter, 1993, p. 19). I was very aware of having to curb my tendency to want to tidy the data in order to make it more 'accessible'.

Transcripts were sometimes somewhat incoherent, and two of the participants commented to me that they had been unimpressed with what they had said once it was presented to them as a transcript. Like Debra Schroeder (In Schulz, Schroeder, & Brody, 1997) I endeavoured to reassure them of the value of their interview, citing several examples of particularly useful contributions, and emphasising meanings as being more important than the sometimes jumpy phraseology.

I also became aware that the transcript was an incomplete record of an interaction. In one transcript I am recorded asking "How do you feel about people trying to use Māori and using it incorrectly? For the benefit of the tape, can you describe that facial expression?" The participant had screwed her nose up in an expression of disgust!!!

5.2.3 Impositional Tendencies in Selectivity of Data

The issue of data selection is salient in a study such as this one. Interviews were often long, some even rambling, and of necessity only a limited number of representative exchanges or quotations can be chosen to illustrate key ideas. As Harry Wolcott has said:

Were we not selective, and thus subjective, in our focus, we would not be able to construct our accounts at all. Without some preconceived idea of what is to be described, there can be no description. Every step of the way – from setting a problem and selecting an appropriate place, person, or group for studying it; to selective focusing within that setting; to decisions about what gets recorded and which elements of the recorded material find their way into the final account; to the style and authorial voice for accomplishing your purpose – reflects both conscious and unconscious processes of focus and selection (Wolcott, 2001, p. 36).

I was conscious of the need, therefore, to make explicit “. . . the *processes* by which research material is [selected or] omitted” (Bhavnani, 1990, p. 143). It is the identification of “key ideas” from the broader context of the interview transcript that is central, and then, secondarily, the selection of an excerpt or excerpts to illustrate the idea (Aubrey et al., 2000; Janesick, 1998).

In qualitative research such as this, where the number of participants was small, and where the semi-structured nature of the interviews encouraged the participant to tell her or his own story, the frequency or typicality of a particular idea is not a particular concern (Stake, 1998). I was more concerned to recognise the authenticity of each participant’s perspective and to give voice to the issues they shared. The notion of voice “is connected to the control of power and the legitimation of specific . . .discourses as acceptable truths or rejected fallacies” (Darder, 1991, p. 66). Although it became apparent that certain ideas were appearing across a range of interviews, this was influenced by my role as the interlocuter, who was on occasion deliberately feeding in as a suggestion, a framework that had emerged from a previous interview. Hence, frequency of a particular issue was not necessarily a valid criterion for inclusion in further theorising.

Excerpts in the data sections [see Appendix 3.1] were selected because of their illustrative nature, with the intention that they provide the reader with clear descriptive slices of the participants' analyses of the issues. Like Alison Jones, I was aware of my role in framing and shaping what 'emerged' (Jones, 1992, p. 19). This approach of generating and illustrating emergent themes has been criticised as reflecting "impositional tendencies" on the part of the researcher who pursues a process in which participants have no control (Bishop, 1997, p. 35). It is acknowledged that this research process does not reflect genuine power sharing. Ultimately the initial overview created from highlighting aspects from the participants' stories can be no more than the 'representational ideology' (Scheurich, 1995, p. 241) of the researcher, illustrated through this selective use of the material gathered from participants. In the privileged role of 'researcher', I concede that it is inevitable that I may well have re-interpreted the participants' original meanings through this process of selecting and arranging various excerpts to construct an overview of understandings that emerged during the analysis process. As Linda Smith states:

Researchers are in receipt of privileged information. They may interpret it within an overt theoretical framework, but also in terms of a covert ideological framework. They have the power to distort, to make invisible, to overlook, to exaggerate and to draw conclusions, based not on factual data, but on assumptions, hidden value judgments, and often downright misunderstandings (Smith, 1999, p. 176).

Including extensive quotations is a deliberate means of maximising the participants' voices (Bishop, 1996). I also ensured that all the participants saw the preliminary sections (as included in Appendix 3.1) in which I had begun to utilise excerpts from their transcripts, and they were invited at this time to provide responses to these documents in order to ensure that the participants were comfortable with the selections I had included, and the ways they had been interpreted.

As I proceeded with the research process, I became aware of a growing sense of wanting to tell my own story (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 12). This was however, tempered by cautioning from my supervisors, who warned me to foreground the data, and the voices of the research participants, in order, perhaps, to avoid what has been described as “narcissistic, egotistical ethnographic self-indulgence” (Bruner, 1993, p. 6, cited in Lincoln & Denzin, 1994, p. 578). In a similar vein, Linda Smith has warned of the pitfall for insider researchers to develop an “official insider voice” (Smith, 1999, p. 139), whereby they come to assume that their own experience is all that is required. She describes this as arrogant, and believes that it is essential that insider researchers 'test' their own taken-for-granted views (p. 139).

Legitimation of a project such as this lies in the authentic representation of the participants' interests, the extent of the honesty of the narrative, the integrity of the description of the research context, and its allegiance to its stated intention (Lincoln & Denzin, 1994), in this case, that of critically illuminating a project committed to bicultural development. In attempting this process, I recognised that, like Alan Peshkin, “At the many crossroads of my interpretive journey, I made decisions that affected the meaning of old data, the new data I sought to collect, the ongoing substance of my thinking, and what eventually I would write” (Peshkin, 2000, p. 5). Each time I revisited an original transcript, I would find material that had not previously seemed as salient, and this resulted in a spiraling process of reflection. This reflection was at all times tempered by my commitment to ethical responsibilities to accurately portray the perspectives of my participants, and be as clear and honest in recognising and owning my own views, recognising my power as researcher and the need to make overt my own ideological framework (Smith, 1999, p. 176)

5.2.4 Accountability Processes

Recognising the importance of attending to issues of accountability (see section 3.7), I was aware of the delicate balance involved in my relationships with participants in terms of my dependence on their data and the need for them to be comfortable with their participation and the way their contributions were utilised. I was continually aware of the many demands that were already part of their busy lives. There was an element of reciprocity contained within these relationships between researcher and participants. I was aware that my participants, despite their support for the kaupapa, saw the research as my project. I was, on the other hand, dependent on their contributions, and despite my best intentions of consultation and collaborative meaning-making, had the ultimate power as to how they were ultimately presented:

No matter how laudable the interviewer's intentions, it was inescapable that the participants were required to expose their personal meaning structures, which were taken away as data or text to be analyzed (Limerick et al., 1996, p. 455-6).

With the first stage of data gathering, the 1997 interviews, participants were sent copies of their transcripts and asked to make any alterations or additions they considered appropriate. Three of the sixteen participants returned these with changes. As I wrote up sections of data containing illustrative excerpts from the interviews (see appendix 3.1), I sent these drafts to the participants, with their 'contributions' highlighted, so that they could let me know if they were uncomfortable with how I had utilised their statements. I was aware that:

Interpretation always involves making subjective, inferential judgments regarding the meanings that participants ascribe to particular expressions, actions, or objects (Hatch, 1995, p. 127).

It was important, therefore, to provide opportunities for the participants to read drafts which demonstrated the ways I was selecting and framing their words and meanings. One colleague returned her copy with suggestions, which were helpful in a general editorial sense rather than refining or redefining my use of specific statements. When I followed up in person the non-response of other colleagues, they indicated that they were comfortable with what I had written. It is reasonable to concede that this lack of

response, if interpreted as “compliance with the researcher’s analysis and constructions” (Bishop, 1997, p. 36) is a problematic aspect in this research. Whether this renders the research invalid, as Bishop claims, is debatable. As Limerick, Burgess-Limerick and Grace admit, “The researcher’s powerful control of the interpretation and resulting presentation appears to be inescapable...” (Limerick et al., 1996, p. 458). What is perhaps worthy of consideration is that the relationships I had with these participants were close and respectful, and that there was a degree of trust involved. I consider that if I had seriously misinterpreted their intended meanings, they would have made the effort to let me know.

As the thesis writing proceeded, I felt some discomfort in taking on the interpretive role of researcher, a positioning which implies “an authoritative and distanced” academic stance (Jones, 1992, p.19). I was also conscious of a tension between wanting to preserve the authenticity of the data, and my ethical responsibilities to participants. This meant sometimes choosing to delete identifiable material or make more generalised statements which avoided the potential for identifiability.

On completion of the first full draft of the thesis, in March 2002, each interview participant was sent a personalised document which was an individualised collation of each section within the draft thesis in which their material or references to it had been marked with highlighter pen to enable quick identification. This use of a compilation of the relevant full sections, rather than mere excerpts with perhaps a preceding and/or following sentence, was intended to place the participant’s contribution in a more meaningful context, whilst still not being onerous in terms of the amount of reading, and time, required. In the accompanying letter I explained the enclosed document and its purpose in terms of accountability and requested that they check the use of their material and inform me of any suggestions or changes they required. I also invited them to request the full draft thesis if they were interested in viewing the whole document.

The table that I prepared to facilitate the preparation of the individualised documents was interesting in its own right, in that it shows clearly the extent of the use of material from each interview participant [see table in Appendix 2.4]. This provides a useful overview of the depth of coverage and supports my intention to ‘give voice’ to each participant.

5.2.5 Representation of Māori Voices

Since my early work in Project Waitangi, I have been committed to a working principle of accountability to Māori (Ritchie, 1990). In Project Waitangi, Kirikiriroa⁶⁴, we invited Māori monitoring of our workshops and found this to be a valuable process. It is up to Māori to determine what Māori knowledge, from the vast amount now available in the public domain, is appropriate for inclusion in the bicultural kaupapa. It is up to Māori to identify what processes are appropriate for whānau Māori. Even though this study was led by a Pākehā, I acknowledged that it was dependent on Māori expertise. I felt a great hesitancy as to how I could utilise this Māori knowledge whilst avoiding exploitative or inappropriate appropriation.

I was also concerned about issues of confidentiality, particularly for the Māori colleagues because of the smaller number. Although I wanted to be able to utilise personal stories, for example people’s backgrounds and motivations for becoming involved in early childhood, since they indicated a commonality of agenda, a community of interest, in terms of wanting a Māori cultural identity for their children, these stories were potentially identifiable. I wanted the participants to be able to speak freely and have a sense of safety within the interview, and this necessitates a guarantee of anonymity. At first I considered including the Māori colleagues’ voices in a combined section with the Māori graduates and professional development facilitators. However, on reflection, this ‘other voices’ idea felt like a marginalisation or ‘othering’ that seemed extremely inappropriate, in a project that sought the

⁶⁴ Kirikiriroa is a name for Hamilton.

validation of these experts. I decided that the issue of possible identifiability would have to be dealt with in other ways, firstly by removing any information that I considered risked identification, and secondly by asking the participants themselves to check for this possibility.

The issue of Māori representation was of such importance, that I decided to organise a hui with Māori participants to discuss preliminary ‘findings’ and the ways in which I could deal with issues such as identifiability of participants, and the potential for me as Pākehā to misrepresent their meanings. This was an opportunity for the spiral or koru discourse advocated by Bishop (1996). I would be able to present back to the group a koha of some tentative understandings for their consideration, moderation, and modification. It was an opportunity for a reality check and for Māori participants to steer my interpretations and direction for the final stages of the study. I was also aware of the need for me to temper my enthusiasm in order to maintain a genuine responsiveness which whilst positing frameworks for participants’ consideration, did not impose these as fixed (Lather, 1991), but instead allowed for the opportunity to create shared meanings (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 127).

Shotter (1993) positions accountability within a framework of belonging and contribution, which means “being *accountable* to others in the sense of being able to justify one’s actions to them, when challenged, in relation to the ‘social reality’ of the society of which one is a member” (italics in original) (Shotter, 1993, p. 193). A ‘sense of belonging’ requires more than this; it implies participation and contribution within the community that one is part of:

a sense of ‘being at home’ in the reality which one’s actions help to reproduce. For to live within a community which one *senses* as being one’s own, a community for which one feels able to be answerable, one must be more than just a routine reproducer of it; one must also play a part in its creative reproduction and sustenance as a ‘living’ tradition – where . . . a living tradition can be thought of as a historically extended, socially embodied argument, containing what one might call reflexive arguments, that is arguments about what should be argued about, and why. Thus to participate

in the reproduction of the tradition, one must be able to participate in such arguments.

To do this, and to be able to feel that in doing so one is contributing to one's own world, one must be able to participate in the argument, interpersonally, in interaction with others, as well as intrapersonally, in one's 'thinking', in one's own 'inner speech' (Shotter, 1993, p. 193).

In our shared commitment to early childhood education, and in particular to improving Māori children's experiences of early childhood education, and to the revitalisation of te reo me ōna tikanga, the Māori colleagues and I share a community of interest, and a willingness to participate in discussion, or argument, about what this amorphous entity 'bicultural development in early childhood' might be, and what that means for us as teacher educators.

5.2.6 Application of Narrative Research

This study does not entirely fit with narrative inquiry as described by Connelly and Clandinin (1990) in that the research was not initiated by participants (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). I initiated the research project to meet Ph.D. requirements, with the support of colleagues, rather than it being an initiative of the Department of Early Childhood Studies or graduates of the early childhood programme. Nonetheless, the study has involved the constructions of various kinds of narrative. These include those of the individual participants who were interviewed, my own personal on-going commentary, the interplay between my research reflections and teaching in both pre-service and in-service sites, and the narrative of the research story as it begins to take on an entity of its own.

As a 'narrative' researcher, I was concerned with the balancing of my participants' voices with my own. Hauser reports that as she proceeded with her study with a teacher colleague:

The interviews were like conversations because, as Janet talked, I responded with stories from my own experience. . . . [T]he data became mutually shared

knowledge, rooted in the intersubjectivity of our interactions (Hauser, 1995, p. 67).

In some interviews I contributed more to the conversation than in others. Perhaps not unexpectedly, the longest, most in-depth conversation was with the colleague with whom I had the longest-standing professional relationship. Another very fruitful interview was with one of the professional development facilitators. This interview took place at my home after we had shared a meal and these relaxed circumstances no-doubt contributed to the value of the discussion. In the group interview with two Māori colleagues, I found that the conversation tended to take on a life of its own, and my role lessened accordingly. It was not so necessary to monitor myself for a tendency to dominate conversation.

Acknowledging the reality of the uneven power dynamics between researcher and participants means that this ostensibly jointly constructed knowledge must be scrutinised as the data are further 'processed'. Bishop and Glynn (Bishop & Glynn, 1999) are concerned that the tendency for "researcher imposition" needs to be tempered by ensuring that participants check the researcher's interpretations in a process of "spiral discourse" (Bishop, 1996, p. 28; Bishop & Glynn, 1999, p.195). This means that it is not only the original data gathering, but also the ongoing analysis of that data that becomes a mutually negotiated process, a form of collaborative grounded theorising which also delivers accountability in terms of legitimation and representation issues. Rather than seeking to demonstrate researcher 'objectivity' as required in other paradigms, "inter-subjective agreement" is utilised (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 57).

These issues are particularly pertinent for me in that as a Pākehā, I am very aware that tino rangatiratanga dictates that Māori define and legitimate Māori knowledge, values and pedagogy. Feeding back ideas which were emerging from the data within Departmental hui, and to the School of Education of the University of Waikato (Ritchie, 1997) provided one means of accountability, but this setting was not

necessarily the most conducive for Māori colleagues, nor appropriate for the other Māori participants. This led to the arranging of the separate hui for the Māori participants. It is considered particularly important in qualitative early childhood research that the research data and findings are supported by the participants of the community (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 115). This, in turn, requires attention to relationships, ethics, and process

5.2.7 Relationships and Ethics

Linda Smith has identified some ethical guidelines that fall out of kaupapa Māori perspectives (Smith, 1999). Central to these is the underlying principle of respect.

From indigenous perspectives ethical codes of conduct serve partly the same purpose as the protocols which govern our relationships with each other and with the environment. The term 'respect' is consistently used by indigenous peoples to underscore the significance of our relationships and humanity. Through respect the place of everyone and everything in the universe is kept in balance and harmony. Respect is a reciprocal, shared, constantly interchanging principle which is expressed through all aspects of social conduct (Smith, 1999, p.120)

Respect is not only fundamental to the establishment and maintenance of relationships, but also integral in maintaining the integrity of both participants and researcher. If not already present, the researcher needs to work to establish this relationship and credibility through personal contact, making themselves and their purposes known, which can be seen in the expression “Kanohi kitea” (the seen face, that is present yourself to people face to face). They are encapsulated in sayings such as “Aroha ki te tangata” (respect for people) and “Kaua e takahi te mana o te tangata” (do not trample over the mana of people). They also require care and sensitivity on the part of the researcher, which is seen in “Titiro, whakarongo ... kōrero” (look, listen ... speak) and “Kia tupato” (be cautious). These ethical protocols also require that the researcher reciprocate the generousities shown to her, as in “Manaaki ki te tangata” (share and host people, be generous) and demonstrate humility, which is expressed as “Kaua e mahaki” (don't flaunt your knowledge) (Smith, 1999, p. 120).

These views from kaupapa Māori perspectives are consistent with what Nel Noddings has described as “an ethic of care” (Noddings, 1995). Carol Gilligan (1982) sources this ethic in the primary relationship of parent and child.

The experiences of inequality and interconnection, inherent in the relation of parent and child, then give rise to the ethics of justice and care, the ideals of human relationship - the vision that self and other will be treated as of equal worth, that despite differences in power, things will be fair; the vision that everyone will be responded to and included, that no one will be left alone or hurt (Gilligan, 1982, p. 164).

The early childhood profession reflects both this ‘natural’ caring, which is a spontaneous response, say between parent and child, and ‘ethical’ caring, which is motivated from an altruistic, idealistic sense of responsibility. According to Noddings, “Ethical caring’s great contribution is to guide action long enough for natural caring to be restored and for people once again to interact with mutual and spontaneous regard” (Noddings, 1995, p. 187). This ethic of care is not constrained by ethical policies and guidelines, but reflects the discussions and interactions of members of the community of interest, where “A fundamental principle might be: Always act so as to establish, maintain, or enhance caring relations” (Noddings, 1995, p. 188). An ethic of care rests on the premise of non-violence, that is, that no one should be hurt (Gilligan, 1982, p. 174).

As an early childhood education professional I bring this ethic to my research orientation. Almost all the participants interviewed in this study were people with whom I had longstanding relationships. The relationships pre-existed the research kaupapa. Narrative research relies on quality of relationships and such ingredients as mutual regard and trust, honesty, and a sense that people are cared for and about (Schulz et al., 1997). The ethic of care applied to a research context means that the researcher honours her relationships with participants and knows that to misrepresent their meanings would damage the integrity of both data and relationships.

Standard ethical procedures were followed, including re-applying for further ethical approval when a previously unanticipated source of data was considered to be worthy of pursuit. In addition, I became very conscious of maintaining ethical processes on an ongoing basis. The main problems that arose were identifiability issues, which were dealt with through consultation and careful screening of data being presented.

5.3 Issues Pertaining to Stage Two Data

The following sections problematise the processes employed in the data gathering within early childhood centres, from student assignments, class discussions, and the written survey of graduates. It begins with a discussion on issues of data justification and robustness.

5.3.1 Justification of Types of Data, and Robustness Measures

I had originally intended to conduct a second series of interviews of the original participants in which we would revisit some of the themes that had emerged from the first round of interviews. However, this did not eventuate for a number of reasons. Two of the Pākehā colleagues left the University early in the study. In fact, of the eight colleagues interviewed in 1997, only three remained at the University in 2001. Also, shortly after their interviews, two of the graduates left the country and a third left the early childhood profession. A number of aspects had emerged from the interviews which were worthy of further exploration however, such as examples of bicultural development that were described as occurring in early childhood centres. Instead of interviewing all the participants for a second series, I decided to pursue other sources of data, such as observations of early childhood centre programmes, and a written survey of graduates from the university teacher education programme, whilst still maintaining accountability processes with those participants still available. In 2001 I conducted a co-theorising hui with Māori participants which was intended to be an accountability measure as well as an opportunity for them to offer their interpretations and perspectives to the study-in-progress.

My proposal had stated that I would survey “Records of meetings, discussions, and decisions pertaining to bicultural development within the programme” intended “to document the collective processes which determine policy and practice within the Department of Early Childhood Studies, pertaining to bicultural development issues”. Consequently, data such as: samples from course outlines and practicum booklets; the internal bicultural review by Māori colleagues led by Amiria O’Malley, of the Department’s commitment to biculturalism (Department of Early Childhood Studies, 1994b); the report to the School of Education Bicultural and Multicultural Practice Review (Ritchie, 1997); University position statements; and School of Education Academic and Administrative plans (School of Education, 1993, 2001) have been woven into this document. They are included within relevant sections, rather than appearing as a separate data appendix. Courses are discussed in section 2.4.3 with supplementary course material contained in appendix 1.2. I report on the Departmental Bicultural Review is covered in section 2.4.5. University of Waikato policy statements are briefly considered in section 2.2.3, and the School of Education’s Academic and Administrative Plan is covered in section 2.2.4

Transcription accuracy was an issue in terms of robustness of the data. I particularly had problems with the transcripts of class discussions, which had many omissions due to the transcriber finding the material unintelligible. This required me to replay the tapes and correct as many omissions as I could.

A further issue was that of “ethical loyalties”, where participants described actions of colleagues in less than favourable terms (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 121). This required that I use discretion in line with the exercise of what Nel Noddings has termed “exquisite sensitivity” (1994, p. 181), with the end result that occasionally otherwise interesting and relevant data had to be omitted.

The term "descriptive adequacy" in ethnography means sufficient documentation of data is provided to enable an outsider to understand the description (Aubrey et al.,

2000, p. 115). In an attempt to deliver descriptive adequacy, relevant aspects of the early childhood teacher education programme were described in sections 2.4 to 2.4.6 and the degree structure appears in a diagram in appendix 1.1.

Measures of “trustworthiness” have been proposed as a qualitative research alternative to reliability, validity, and objectivity (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 57). These include prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, peer debriefing, thick description, checking of data interpretation with participants, and independent auditing of the research process. This study complies with the components of prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, thick description, and checking of data interpretation. My involvement in the kaupapa of bicultural development preceded the commencement of the research, as did relationships with participants, ensuring that over this preceding period and during the research project, I had “time to build trust and understand the culture of the context” (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 57). My role as a participant observer has provided opportunities “to identify persistent and salient features” (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 57). The secondary data provide a means of triangulating instances across the different sources. Including large chunks of data supports thick description, in providing a depth of information. Procedures were implemented for checking interpretations with participants. I was also accountable to my colleagues in the Department of Early Childhood Studies, feeding back my learnings as appropriate. My data, in the form of original transcripts and tapes, was available to my chief supervisor for auditing purposes.

Appendix 3.1 contains the data sections which were written up identifying key themes from each source. The format employed in this thesis, of including longer protocols of data in an appendix, with selected illustrative excerpts utilised in the main body of the text, is a structural arrangement recommended by Harry Wolcott (2001, p. 132).

Ensuring coverage of the full range of interviewed participants, so that all voices were heard is another issue of relevance to this study. Appendix 2.4 was created as a record of which chapters and sections of the draft document contained references to data from each interview participant. This enables me to send each participant an individualised document including only the relevant parts of the thesis, although they were invited to request the whole document if they wished. Although the numbering of chapters and sections has been revised in the final thesis, appendix 2.4 demonstrates that all participants' voices were given significant attention throughout the document.

5.3.2 Observations in Centres

I was aware of the inadvisability of trying to deliver an 'anecdotal' discussion (Graue & Walsh, 1995), based on previous informal observations, during visits to early childhood centres for non-research purposes. However, I was clear that it would be useful to endeavour to ascertain some recent examples of the ways that early childhood centres were trying to deliver a bicultural curriculum as mandated in Te Whāriki. Prompted by descriptions, from some of the interviews, of developments in this area, I decided to gather a further set of data, based on observations in early childhood centres. As this had not been covered in my initial ethical application, further approval was obtained through the School of Māori and Pacific Development ethics process. I made contact with colleagues in early childhood centres, ensuring ethical principles of informed consent, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm were in place. I was provided with a list of kindergartens by the Kindergarten Association, and approached the Head Teachers of these by phone. I also approached the managers of a number of early childhood centres where I already had relationships with staff. I was pleased and a little surprised by the warmth with which my requests were received by both management and practitioners, since I had been mildly anxious that they may have perceived my kaupapa as threatening or a criticism. Only one childcare centre did not reply to my initial approach. Although I knew some of our graduates were employed at this centre, I did not know the manager. I can

understand that an approach focusing on their bicultural content could well have been intimidating, particularly when it was not tempered by a pre-existing positive relationship with the prospective researcher.

I carried out thirteen observations of different centre programmes. This number was intended to create a pool of data that would render individual centres invisible and prevent identifiability. The one-off nature of each visit was problematic, in that it was a very superficial glimpse into their programme, and such a short (approximately three hours for each visit) time cannot generate in-depth understandings of the rationale and focus for the programming. Conversations that I had with staff during the visits were often very revealing and led me to consider the idea of setting up yet another source of data collection, through facilitating a support group for teachers interested in bicultural development. However, I decided that this kind of collaborative project would have to wait for a later opportunity. Relationships with colleagues in centres were important here, in that I did not want staff to feel uncomfortable with my presence. The longstanding partnership between my team of colleagues at the University of Waikato and our Associate Teachers in early childhood centres could well have been a factor. Our team has credibility in the early childhood profession, and we aim to conduct ourselves ethically and with commitment and caring in our encounters over both practicum and research processes. As Carr has written:

Practitioners know that the researcher has the capacity to understand what it is really like for them in the setting, because she has been there herself. They may see her therefore as being less judgemental enabling them to act naturally (Carr, 1997, p. 96).

In keeping with my propensity for being well-prepared, I had ready a list of items from Te Whāriki which might assist me in determining what I was looking for as examples of 'bicultural development in centres' (see appendix 2.3). Although I had prepared this list, I did not actually refer to it whilst in centres, because I did not want staff to get the impression that I had some kind of check-list with which I was

evaluating them, as this was not my purpose. I made written observation notes of visual indicators such as Māori song charts on the walls, and of any reo or other Māori content that I noticed in use during the session. I was also alert to any involvement of Māori whānau during sessions, but this did not occur during any of my visits.

5.3.3 Student Assignments

These data are a collection of previously marked student assignments, gathered from 1996-2000. They were made available to me when I asked the writers if they felt comfortable contributing a copy of a particular assignment, that I had recently marked, to this research. The assignments are the work of eleven different students (there are two items, one year 2 and one year 3 from the same student). I did not keep a record of how many assignments were requested in total. After marking a group of assignments, I might attach a note explaining that I was interested in a copy for my research to several individual assignments (from a total class number of approximately 45-50 students). I would request assignments for various reasons. They were not necessarily assignments that received the best marks. I recall requesting one assignment that actually failed, because even though the student had a distinct voice, she had not met all the requirements, but, understandably, the student did not decide to provide that one. In addition to requesting examples that seemed to express ideas articulately and distinctively, some I saw as being representative of that particular assignment, summing up the required material effectively. In other instances, I valued the depth of reflection and personal insights displayed. Another criterion was when I noticed that the student was offering ideas that were different from the rest, in that they went beyond what had been covered in classes, or sometimes contradicted or critiqued the material that had been available through course readings and class content and discussion. After returning the assignment with my request attached, there was no follow-up from me. It was entirely up to the student to respond or not. If a student responded to my request, I would offer to photocopy the assignment to avoid students bearing the expense. Students all signed

permission for their work to be used in this study. I had no control over whether or not students bothered to respond to my requests, and was most appreciative when students approached me to say that they were comfortable for me to have a copy. Students were aware of my research project through class discussions, and two of these intakes had previously consented to having class discussions taped for the study (see section 5.5.4). When they offered an assignment to me, I would clarify that they knew what the research was about, that their work would be cited anonymously, and then ask for their written consent. The resultant pool of assignments are a very small selection and cannot be seen to be representative of the assessment of any particular course or of the wider body of student work.

Most of these assignments were written for me as the course coordinator/marker. They were generated from courses that I had designed and taught and the students' agendas were, understandably, to pass that assignment and the course as a whole. The key issue with this particular set of data seems to be that students, in completing set course assignments, were trying to please me as the marker. This means that their writing may not necessarily represent their actual beliefs at the time, but those that they anticipated would give them the pass or grade that they sought. This is an issue that is essentially irresolvable. Samples of their work were useful to the study, however, in demonstrating that these students were engaging with the material at hand, and often in ways which were original and insightful. I therefore have included some of these examples under the assumption that the students wrote their assignments with a genuine commitment to their written statements.

5.3.4 Class Discussions

A range of class discussions were audiotaped, after students had been informed and had given written consent for this, during the course Cultural Studies II, in 1997 and 1998. The format of the class was such that only a small part of each class, the whole-group discussions, lent itself to being audiotaped. The class would begin with some input, often a video, and then in small groups, students would discuss this input,

and then their responses to the weekly reading guides that they were expected to have prepared for each class, based on the required readings. I would shift around these groups, supporting the discussion, ensuring people were keeping on task, responding to queries, and challenging as appropriate. The final discussion at the end of the class, which was intended to draw out key learnings from that session's kaupapa, was the 'taped' section.

I felt extremely self-conscious every time I turned on the tape, and this cannot have helped students to feel relaxed. I was very disappointed in the resultant transcripts. Lots of dialogue was lost, either muffled or unintelligible as people talked over each other. The end result was that there was a predominance of my contributions. This is not necessarily a bad thing, pedagogically speaking, in that academic rigour in terms of critical pedagogy (Freire & Shor, 1987) means that I facilitate the learning process through modeling and sharing of my knowledge and insights, in order to illuminate students' own understandings. hooks believes that lecturers should share personal narratives with students since this serves to link theory with reality (hooks, 1994, p. 21). She explains that "It is often productive if [lecturers] take the first risk, linking confessional narratives to academic discussions so as to show how experience can illuminate and enhance our understanding of academic material" (hooks, 1994, p. 21). She considers that:

Hearing each other's voices, individual thoughts, and sometimes associating these voices with personal experience makes us more acutely aware of each other. That moment of collective participation and dialogue means that students and [lecturer] respect - and here I invoke the root meaning of the word, 'to look at' - each other, engage in acts of recognition with one another, and do not just talk to the [lecturer]. Sharing experiences and confessional narratives in the classroom helps establish communal commitment to learning (hooks, 1994, p. 186).

What was helpful pedagogically was not necessarily useful in terms of my research objective of giving voice to students! I had hoped for rich examples of a dialogical process, and this was most definitely not the outcome. After working with the transcripts, I felt I needed to go back to the original tapes and check for accuracy of

transcription. Doing this led me to appreciate the difficulties encountered by transcribers. I also noticed that in initial classes the discussion was less flowing, but as students became more forthcoming, it became harder to transcribe, as students talked over each other more!

5.3.5 Graduate Survey

This survey was conducted on behalf of the Department of Early Childhood Studies with the approval of the School of Education Ethics Committee. Its primary purpose was to gather information to contribute to processes of programme and course review, as well as secondary purposes such as to contribute to this study. Questions in the written survey were collated from colleagues' suggestions, and the final questionnaire was submitted to the Ethics Committee. The survey was sent by mail to graduates listed with the University of Waikato Alumni Office, and handed out in the final week of classes to a group of graduating students.

There was a very poor return rate from the addresses supplied by the Alumni office which turned out to be out of date. From 125 mailed out, only 15 were returned, while 20 were returned as undeliverable. Thirteen of the 31 graduating students returned a questionnaire. The total number of questionnaire responses is 28.

Data from the prior graduates are much richer. The answers are generally longer and more in-depth. They had these posted to them at their homes and could fill them in at their leisure, as opposed to the year 2000 graduates who mostly filled them in at the end of a class, although some took them away and returned them later, in order to devote more time to the task.

Although the questions were deliberately open-ended, there are limitations to this form of data collection. One was the time that respondents were able to dedicate to a rather long-winded survey. Anonymity may well have enabled the respondents to be

frank, which is an advantage, but interesting ideas could not be pursued or clarified as there was no means of follow-up.

5.4 Dilemmas of the Insider-Researcher

An aspect of the study that had not been particularly salient at the outset, but became more apparent as the research proceeded was that of the dialectic of being a participant/researcher. Throughout the duration of the study, I traversed repeatedly a continuum that included the positionings of observer, observer as participant, participant as observer, and participant (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1998). During most of the research period I have not been proactively researching, as my lecturing responsibilities have taken precedence, except at the end of the teaching year, or during two separate three month periods of study leave. In carrying out my lecturing role, and in particular whilst visiting students doing their practicum in early childhood centres, and also whilst facilitating professional development sessions for practicing teachers, I was frequently conscious of the observer role and my ongoing reflection as 'researcher'.

When I was actively collecting data I became aware of the paradox inherent in the ethnographic role of participant observer (Aubrey et al., 2000, p.116). The tension exists in the requirement to be simultaneously both passive observer and active participant. In interview situations, I was conscious of the demands that I focus intensely on what was being said, and my intention to respectfully avoid influencing or disturbing the participants' sharing. Yet I could not remain totally passive since it was also a responsibility that I contribute my own perspective to the interviewee or group. At times this conflict became more apparent, such as when I was taping classes with second year students, and I found myself becoming instantly self-conscious as soon as the tape recorder was turned on which affected my ability to facilitate the discussions as naturally as I would have otherwise. I suspect that the taping also affected students' responsiveness, particularly initially.

Another issue was the difficulty in identifying the source of a particular idea as being mine or someone else's, and the extent that I may have influenced not only the initial interview, but the interpretative process as well. This is particularly true for the student assignments.

I often found myself in situations that would provide 'great data', a staff meeting discussion, for example, but which were not part of my legitimate data collection. If I recorded some discussion anecdotally in my journal, I felt that I could not include it in my analysis without some kind of ethical process of checking back with colleagues, which was too problematic retrospectively. I also experienced a sense of 'wearing many hats', in my roles as researcher, lecturer, 'practicum visitor' and facilitator of professional development workshops with early childhood teachers. The role of a 'practicum visitor' is to assess a student during her 'block practicum' teaching experience as to her proficiency in a range of pre-determined competencies. Staff at one centre where I was assigned to visit one of our third year students were attending a series of professional development workshops on bicultural development that I was facilitating, and one of these teachers had also been one of my research participants. As I arrived for a practicum visit, the head teacher asked me which hat I was wearing that day!

5.4.1 Journaling as a Tool to Support Researcher Reflection

It is recognised that insider-researchers are in a situation which requires a high degree of care based in an awareness of the reflexivity involved in their dual (or multiple) roles (Smith, 1999, p. 137). Journaling was a tool that I employed to assist me in maintaining rigorous critical reflection regarding these matters.

My journal was not a source of data, but a record of some of the tensions that arose for me as a researcher, and some insights that emerged from conversations, observations or literature that I was exploring. The journal itself was fragmentary and disjointed, and a very incomplete record of my experiences and reflections.

Entries in the journal were often hastily and sketchily recorded, and also a rather arbitrary selection of my ongoing internal reflective monologue.

A methodological issue to be considered is the extent to which “to include description of the researcher as participant” (Stake, 1998, p. 104). Respect for my participants and their expertise necessitates that I give precedence to their voices (Hatch, 1995, p. 128), and yet to ignore my role in the phenomena that I am studying would be inaccurate and a misrepresentation. Re-reading my journal, I decided not to include excerpts as a separate data section, due not only to its somewhat erratic and irregular nature, but also because of the ethical issues surrounding the use of anecdotal material which included comments noted regarding discussions during Departmental hui, from tea-room conversations with colleagues, observations made whilst visiting students during their practicum, and so on. Despite these reservations, the journal undoubtedly served to inform my reflective and writing process, proving to be a tool for reflection rather than a source of data.

Reading through my research journal shows a progression of questions and insights arising from data collection and analysis, and from ongoing readings of the literature. In 1997 I raised these questions:

- If Te Whāriki is a holistic integrated curriculum, can bicultural content become holistically integral? If so how?
- Who defines what is culturally ‘appropriate’ in any given situation? In the absence of Māori?
- Is Te Whāriki a major milestone for bicultural early childhood education?

I also envisioned the three domains of early childhood pedagogy, Pākehā and Māori culture as three overlapping circles:

- early childhood pedagogy: e.g. learning through play, learner centred

- Pākehā values, e.g. individualism, do-it-yourself
- Māori values, e.g. cooperation, collectivism, wairua

Further reflection indicated that the way in which this model actually ‘overlapped’ the content areas is problematic, in that early childhood pedagogy, at least, pre-Te Whāriki, was very much a Western product, reflecting the individualism of Western conceptualisations of ‘the child’.

After coding the original interviews from 1997 I noted in my journal initial impressions recognising the importance of participants’ childhoods, their backgrounds, to developing commitment, and comfort zones for effectiveness.

On reading Linda Mead’s (1996, p. 27) doctorate, in which being Māori is repositioned as ‘normal’, I wondered how mainstream teachers can be equipped to deliver this sense of Māori identity as normal, when to them it is not?

Another journal entry reflected on Edward Said’s caution regarding the problem of essentialism (Said, 1993). This raised the dilemma of how much and what specifically to teach of Māori values and culture, in that by reducing [Māoriness] to essentials “you are likely as a consequence to defend the essence of experience itself rather than promote full knowledge of it and its entanglements and dependencies on other knowledges. As a result, you will demote the different experiences of others to a lesser status” (Said, 1993, p. 36). In my journal I noted that:

Our role is not to act as interpreters of tikanga Māori, of Māori values and perspectives, but we can instead act as a bridge by creating in our students a receptivity, responsiveness, respect, interest, and valuing of these, so that they will grow and read for themselves what Māori have already released into the public domain [JR Journal, August 1998]

Laurent Daloz’ (1990) review of adult learning developmental theorists had explained growth as a series of transformations in our ways of making meaning in which we form new, more adequate ways of making sense of the world (Daloz, 1990). He

views stereotypes as unhelpful inadequate oversimplified and overgeneralised categories, that need correction. As I reflected on these ideas, I commented in my journal that learning about different cultural values required the same sort of corrective awarenesses, in order to avoid the potential for essentialising.

In October of 1998, I made a journal entry, having nearly finished my observation visits to early childhood centres, regarding my preliminary impressions (before coding and analysing my recorded data). It indicates that my experience fell short both methodologically, and also in terms of delivering the robust data I might have been expecting:

Firstly, methodologically I didn't do what I had imagined I might do and record interesting interactions (a la Suransky Polokow) between teachers and children or even between children - my visits were too short and superficial for me to get that close to the people as one might do in a longer more authentically ethnographic situation. I made lots of notes on the visible things: signs, word, song, and phrase charts, books and puzzles . . . I've realised that what is not there is as interesting or indicative as what is. This is true also, and especially for the use of te reo, which is virtually non-existent in most centres. . . [JR Journal October 1998]

5.4.2 Surprises for the Insider

The role of being an insider-researcher contains some inherent dilemmas (Smith, 1999). There needs, in particular, to be a high degree of awareness and sensitivity to ethical concerns and clarity about different roles assumed at different moments and settings:

The critical issue with insider research is the constant need for reflexivity. At a general level insider researchers have to have ways of thinking critically about the processes, the relationships and the quality and richness of the data and analysis. So too do outsiders, but the major difference is that insiders have to live with the consequences of their processes on a day-to-day basis for ever more, and so do their families and communities. For this reason insider researchers need to build particular sorts of research-based support systems and relationships with their communities (Smith, 1999, p. 137).

As an insider-researcher, it was sometimes difficult to separate what I knew from my insider position, from what I had learnt from the ‘researcher’ standpoint. I was always conscious of the subjectivity of my position as researcher (Wolcott, 2001, p. 36). Commenting on a particular discussion section in the first draft, one of my supervisors wrote “A lot of JR in here – is there a sense in which you have set out a personal position before we have the argument or the data. More than this, does this matter?” She suggested that I identify any unexpected findings, or ‘surprises’ that had emerged for me. In order to reflect upon this challenge, I employed two processes. The first was to re-read each of the interview data sections, noting aspects that really stood out as significant. Secondly I re-read my research journal. This section reports on what arose from that process.

During one of the interviews with Māori colleagues I remember being quite surprised that both participants were adamant that the competencies for students on practicum regarding use of te reo were too low. I had suggested that since students were having so much difficulty reaching the existing levels, that we might consider lowering them, but the Māori colleagues spoke strongly against this suggestion. This signifies the depth of Māori commitment to te reo as a central aspect of bicultural development. Another point that came through strongly from the Māori colleagues was the frustration they felt working within such a monocultural institution, their condemnation of institutional gatekeeping, and commitment to kaupapa Māori and tino rangatiratanga. They also saw a role for Pākehā colleagues to support these aspirations.

As I had compiled the data section from the interviews with Māori colleagues (see appendix 3.1.1), I noted some questions in my research journal:

- If bicultural early childhood education is about “making Māori things real” (CM4), how “real” are we making it for our students?

- How well are we supporting our Māori colleagues and how well did we deal with the tension between relying on their expertise in a partnership model, and enabling them autonomy to focus on the Ki Taiao programme?
- How much have we learnt from these people with Kōhanga Reo backgrounds which has been applied across into the mainstream in order to help us envisage what a bicultural programme might look like?

Interviews with Pākehā colleagues revealed the notion that I labeled “partnership models”. This involved Māori colleagues delivering Māori content. This was either a recognition of tino rangatiratanga, but was also related to their sense of a lack of competence in this domain. Barriers that they identified included feeling this lack of expertise, needing more support from Māori colleagues, time constraints, and workload pressures. One also identified “basic racism” as an underlying factor:

I don't know what, I know it's laziness on my part or prioritising, but I think there is an element of laziness and that's the basic racism. I think that we can espouse one thing . . . but in practice we are somewhere else and that's good enough [CP2].

The interviews with Māori graduates revealed an awareness of Pākehā students’ processes of coming to terms with bicultural issues and identified ways in which they, as classmates had supported this:

So we saw our role as being to coax them through the process or help them understand and we did that as much as possible [GM2].

They had, during their time as students within the early childhood teacher education programme, presented challenges to the programme director regarding the early childhood programme, advocating for changes to benefit Māori, such as the introduction of the whānau group. One of the Māori graduates also made me aware of some of the cautions around sensitivity to spiritual domains and the need for Māori guidance and mentoring of bicultural development in centres.

Reflecting on these data I was surprised that the Māori graduates were not more critical of the teacher education programme. I noted a number of issues to be raised for further consideration with these graduates and the other Māori colleagues at the co-theorising hui:

- What are the most important things we need to do to help prepare our Pākehā and Tauīwi students to implement bicultural development in early childhood centres?
- What are the goals of bicultural development in early childhood centres?
- What are the indicators that bicultural development is happening within a particular early childhood centre?
- What are the best strategies for us at the University of Waikato to achieve these goals?

The Pākehā graduates' interviews presented an optimistic perspective regarding their implementation of bicultural development in early childhood centres. I was interested to find that Te Whāriki, the new early childhood curriculum, was already so integral to their planning and teaching, particularly since these graduates had come through the teacher education programme before the final curriculum document was available, although they had used earlier drafts (Ministry of Education, 1993). I enjoyed their confidence, and enthusiasm. I was delighted to hear of examples whereby staff were working collaboratively, bringing Pākehā parents on board, inviting the participation of a kuia to provide local hapū/iwi knowledge to be incorporated within the early childhood programme, and exercising bicultural development leadership within their early childhood sector. The emergent theme of generating a "heart-felt commitment" was also something unanticipated.

From the professional development facilitators I learnt about their careful and respectful model of bicultural development facilitation with practicing teachers. I heard wonderful examples of bicultural development. Warning bells were again sounded in examples of Pākehā appropriating and disrespecting things Māori.

The co-theorising hui with Māori participants resulted in the revelation of the concept of the whanaungatanga approach as a model for early childhood teachers' implementation of bicultural development. At this hui Māori colleagues also raised concerns about being confined to teaching only Māori content within courses in the teacher education programme. One colleague was concerned, from the point of view of being a parent, that Pākehā early childhood teachers should represent things Māori to her children. Another colleague described her role as a 'mentor' for Pākehā students struggling to develop competency in te reo me ngā tikanga Māori.

The overarching link in dealing with the insider positioning was my mind and role as participant/researcher and facilitator of the research process. The challenge for me as a researcher was to utilise my tacit knowledge (Kincheloe, 1991), p. 29) to make sense of all the data, relying of course on hui with Māori participants to steer the interpretative process. Kincheloe writes that a critical qualitative researcher can perceive holistically, extending knowing to a higher level through a capacity to grasp the realm of the felt, the emotional, the unconscious, illuminating unexamined usages, unintended meanings, "revealing insights that open windows into the significance of experience" (Kincheloe, 1991, p. 29). In this sense the researcher is, her or himself, a sophisticated research instrument (Aubrey et al., 2000; Kincheloe, 1991).

Central to this researcher process is the quality of reflexivity, the ability to interrogate one's own influence on the research process (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 153). This reflexivity may be a shared process with research participants. "In adopting as educational research practice informed by reflexivity the researcher must be actively committed to a constructive engagement with both his/her research respondents and audiences" (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1997, p. 243). This reflexivity requires an openness and responsiveness to intuition to intervene in the rational thought process (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 154). This reflexivity allows us to reconsider

our present cultural understandings and also those about the past. Bruner (1990) writes of:

our capacity to turn around on the past and alter the present in its light, or to alter the past in the light of the present. Neither the past nor the present stays fixed in the face of this reflexivity. The ‘immense repository’ of our past encounters may be rendered salient in different ways as we review them reflexively, or may be changed by reconceptualization (Bruner, 1990, p. 109 – 110).

Recognising the difficulty created by our immersion in our own socio-cultural and temporal positioning, Aubrey, David, Godfrey and Thompson (2000) suggest that although we may attempt self-scrutiny of our ‘biases’, perhaps a supplementary option is “to do our best to have others interrogate our position ...” (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 153). Some instances of this interrogation occurred at the co-theorising hui with Māori participants, and, of course, from my supervisors. Self-monitoring steps include questioning whether one is projecting one’s own feelings and views about the world onto the participants, keeping observer comments in a separate journal, and rigorous scrutiny as to the ways we align ourselves and make assumptions (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 162). Qualities of honesty, sensitivity, humility and integrity, as well as attention to ongoing ethical considerations are required (Aubrey et al., 2000, p. 167-168; Smith, 1999, p. 120, p.137). Insider researchers are faced with the reality that they must live with the consequences of their processes on a day-to-day basis, ultimately fronting up with their publicly disseminated findings. This highlights the need for careful attention to ethics, and accountability within the research process.

5.5 Key Learnings from Data Gathering and Interpretation

My learnings on methodology from this study have been many. My experiences have deepened my understanding of qualitative methods, and highlighted aspects such as:

- the central importance of respectful relationships and on-going dialogue with participants which demonstrate an ethic of care
- the notion of a research community of interest
- ethical processes as an ongoing consideration

- trustworthiness as a criterion for ethical process
- care in audio-taping and transcription
- accountability, legitimation, and representation issues
- the sensitivity and critical analysis required as an insider-researcher
- the desirability of maintaining an emergent orientation to the research process, specifically applied within interviewing, data collection processes and data analysis and interpretation stages
- the value of co-theorising of the data

I have also realised that good methodology, which involves a well-thought out, ethical and methodical process is likely to deliver the useful 'rich' data which makes a study meaningful and valuable in terms of clarifying potential social justice processes. The discussion in this chapter demonstrates that data gathering and interpretation is not necessarily a straightforward, tidy process, but that its very "messiness" can be a positive feature in that this reflects the complexities and realities of the participants' views of themselves, of the researcher and the research topic (Bhavnani, 1990, p. 143-144). Reflecting on her own doctoral research project, Jeanette Rhedding-Jones wrote that, "In part the arbitrary nature of the data collection predisposed me to random readings of events, sites and texts. But it seems now, looking back, that there are orderings of meanings" (Rhedding-Jones, 1995, p. 484).

The research process which evolved in this study is characterised as being an eclectic and emergent, qualitative and ethnographic response to the situation of being an insider-researcher. Key features were the quality of the pre-existing relationships with participants which were sustained throughout the study by attention to caring and respectful processes. Accountability and representation issues were also attended to by sharing all draft interpretations with all interview participants, and by involving Māori interview participants in a co-theorising hui. The process employed in this project of gathering data from a wide range of sources and filtering these through discussion with participants, can be seen to have resulted in what Denzin and Lincoln

have described as a bricolage, “a complex, dense, reflexive, collagelike creation that represents the researcher's [and participants'] images, understandings, and interpretations of the world or phenomenon under analysis" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 4)

Part Three: Discussion on Findings

Data in this project came primarily from interviews with Māori and Pākehā colleagues in the university teacher education programme, graduates who were working as early childhood teachers, and facilitators of professional development programmes for early childhood staff. Further sources of data included observations in early childhood centres, audio-taped classes, samples of student assignments, and a written open-response questionnaire survey. After these data had been processed and shared with participants, a co-theorising hui with Māori participants was an opportunity which contributed further data/analysis. The collations of the various categories of data have been presented in Appendix Three, which contains separate data sections as follows:

- 3.1 Stage One Data: Initial Interviews
 - 3.1.1 Māori Colleagues
 - 3.1.2 Māori Graduates
 - 3.1.3 Pākehā colleagues.
 - 3.1.4 Pākehā graduates
 - 3.1.5 Professional Development Facilitators

- 3.2 Stage Two Data: Further Sources
 - 3.2.1 Bicultural development in centres
 - 3.2.2 Class Discussions
 - 3.2.3 Students' writing
 - 3.2.4 Graduate Review
- 3.3 Co-Theorising Hui

During data analysis, utilising the emergent coding and co-theorising processes, four key research focuses became evident:

- defining ‘bicultural development’ in the context of early childhood care and education in this country;
- identifying some key components of the Department of Early Childhood Studies’ bicultural development implementation process;
- exploring possible ‘indicators’ of bicultural development within early childhood centres ; and
- clarifying aims of the teacher education programme in terms of preparing graduates to facilitate bicultural development within their future work in early childhood education.

These four areas provide the organizational structure of the following discussion chapters. The next four chapters, six to ten, each outline the findings around one of the four key focuses of this study. Chapter six outlines the findings pertaining to the concept of bicultural development in early childhood care and education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, based in Te Tiriti o Waitangi. It explores participants’ views on Te Tiriti o Waitangi as a paradigm for partnership between Māori and Pākehā, the significance of tino rangatiratanga, and Māori aspirations for their tamariki mokopuna.

Chapter seven focuses on bicultural development within the site of the early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato, reporting participants’ perspectives on key aspects of this particular context, whilst chapter eight considers features of bicultural development evident from observations in early childhood centres such as childcare centres, and kindergartens. After identifying in chapter eight the potential that exists for bicultural development in early childhood settings, chapter nine returns to the arena of teacher education, exploring, from

participants' perspectives, what some goals might be for the early childhood teacher education programme.

In chapter ten, some dilemmas which emerged from this study of bicultural development in an early childhood teacher education are canvassed. Chapter eleven provides an overview of key findings of the study. The final chapter, twelve, is a reflection on the study and its implications.

Chapter Six: Bicultural Development In Early Childhood Care and Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand

6.0 Introduction to Chapter Six

This chapter explores the interviewed participants' views on understandings regarding bicultural development in early childhood care and education, the context of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and Māori aspirations for their children's education which include te reo me ōna tikanga. Although kaupapa Māori early childhood services exist, in the form of Kōhanga Reo and Māori immersion early childhood centres, it is recognised that many tamariki Māori attend mainstream settings. The model of bicultural development for mainstream early childhood settings was considered by participants to be a culturally inclusive paradigm, which in validating te reo me ngā tikanga Māori, also generates a sense of respect for all cultures present in that early childhood centre. Barriers to implementation of bicultural development identified by participants are also considered.

6.1 “Tino Rangatiratanga for Me is About Māori Rights”: Explanations of Tino Rangatiratanga

Tino rangatiratanga, and its expression in education as “Kaupapa Māori” (Smith, 1997), were of paramount importance to Māori participants in this study. Māori colleagues, for example, had prioritised their teaching to focus on the Ki Taiao kaupapa Māori early childhood teacher education programme. A Māori colleague considered that:

Tino rangatiratanga for me is about Māori rights, which is linked directly to the social, political, economical and cultural wellbeing of Māori people. It is about being able to determine processes which ensure that all of the above produces positive outcomes for the Māori nation. To me the key word is 'tira'⁶⁵ which indicates to me the collective wellbeing, so whatever people do as individuals within kaupapa Māori, the connotation is that it will benefit or contribute to the wider social scene [CM2].

⁶⁵ Tira is a company of people as in a group of travellers or a choir.

This explanation also contains a strong sense of collectivism, which is intrinsic to a Māori world view (Patterson, 1992, p. 11; Walker, 1998), but is not prominent in Pākehā society which is dominated by “rugged individualism” (Patterson, 1992, p. 13). Ranginui Walker (1995) considers that “Pākehā in New Zealand would have a better future if they threw in their lot with Māori” because of the kaupapa of caring for the group, as opposed to the individualism of current social policy. This he sees as having resulted in “a loss of social services, a loss of the welfare state and loss of caring” (1995, p. 33). Interestingly, tino rangatiratanga is also used to refer to individual self-determination, as seen in the statement by Areta Koopu, that “Tino rangatiratanga is understanding first and foremost who you are and what your goal is in life” (Koopu, 1995, p. 93).

Tino rangatiratanga was seen by this Māori colleague to be a key aspect of bicultural education, which involves Pākehā supporting Māori-defined aspirations:

Bicultural education should ideally contribute to tino rangatiratanga. Bicultural education should have a political agenda. I'm talking specifically of the sharing of Māori knowledge with Tauīwi. How and what is to be shared should be determined by Māori and to what extent. The process of bicultural education should enable Tauīwi to be clear about their role in supporting tino rangatiratanga [CM2].

It was recognised that exercise of tino rangatiratanga as a Māori right and aspiration required the reciprocal support of non-Māori. At the co-theorising hui for Māori participants, a professional development facilitator was uncomfortable about this situation, since she considered that non-Māori were not allowing Māori to be self-determining: “they're still not handing over control”. She seemed resigned to this uncomfortable situation where Māori exercise of tino rangatiratanga was dependent on collaboration with non-Māori, saying, “Well, we can't get tino rangatiratanga until we work collaboratively anyway” [MPH1].

A Pākehā colleague considered that the aim of the teacher education programme should be to generate in mainstream students an understanding of tino rangatiratanga which meant that they would not block Māori endeavours. The programme should endeavour to ensure that :

... they understand what that concept is and, at very least, they don't stand in the way of that concept. So that when Māori are wanting to create initiatives that they will - and this is not just in education initiatives - but they will actually be: "Yep fine. We are not going to stand in the way, we are not going to block that" [CP2].

This perspective implies that a passivity on the part of Pākehā and Tauīwi will be adequate in enabling Māori to pursue their aspirations. Whilst it is necessary for Pākehā to stand aside and let Māori define these goals, it is also the case that the actual realisation of these Māori-defined goals may be constrained by the mainstream institutional structures within which they are forced to operate, since these are usually controlled by Pākehā. Durie has used the example of the marae to illustrate the ambiguities in terms of implementation of tino rangatiratanga (1998, p. 222-223). He points out that when marae are established within mainstream institutions such as the army or a university, there may well be tensions when marae tikanga and autonomy are constrained or appropriated by that institution or even by national laws.

The Pākehā colleague was aware of the dilemma that tino rangatiratanga is inevitably constrained within a mainstream institution such as a University:

I guess that it's a really interesting issue within a Department with this huge hierarchy of the University over it. How much self determination can the Ki Taiao people actually have in reality? I don't think, that we as a department, actually really come to some sort of understanding. I think there is a general understanding about what we mean by biculturalism about that it is a structural, political level rather than just a little bit of few songs here and there. I think that tino rangatiratanga has such big implications for so much, so much [CP2].

She recognised that delivering on a commitment to self-determination for Māori was a concept with implications for major structural and political change, moving well beyond the safe confines of 'biculturalism'.

There are at least two different pathways for implementation of tino rangatiratanga. One is for Māori to be self-determining, to a greater or lesser extent, within a mainstream framework. In this situation the tino rangatiratanga project may be led by Māori within a wider institution in which non-Māori are dominant and in positions of control. Ki Taiao is an example of an attempt to instigate a tino rangatiratanga model within a mainstream institution. This pathway is problematic in the extent to which mainstream institutions, which lack commitment to or processes for genuine power-sharing or consultation, will allow and sustain Māori independence. The other model is a parallel Māori pathway which is developed outside of the mainstream, and which is therefore less inhibited by those constraints. The Kōhanga Reo movement is an example of this. Both pathways, however, are dependent on the goodwill of the Crown to honour its Tiriti obligations and deliver the resources that will enable this Māori self-determination.

Another Pākehā colleague saw expression of tino rangatiratanga as Pākehā accountability to Māori:

There needs to be a commitment to working sensitively in the area, and a commitment to not just going ahead and doing what you think is right without checking it out, and I guess that's where it sort of fits in with tino rangatiratanga, that, um, when working biculturally, I hope this comes through, I've always felt that you're accountable to iwi. That in fact, I shouldn't be doing anything unless its been checked out by iwi [CP1].

A key issue seems to be the power dynamics within the collaboration between Māori and Pākehā, that is, who is leading the process, and the extent to which Māori are able firstly, to define the terms, goals, and processes, and secondly are resourced to ensure the implementation of these goals. These dynamics are often complicated by the fact that Pākehā hold the powerful leadership positions within hierarchically

organised institutions which run according to Pākehā-defined operational values and principles such as individualism and meritocracy which avoid consideration of equity issues and resist transformations which would transfer decision-making and resourcing into Māori-driven initiatives.

6.2 “We still need to work in partnership”

There is a tension, inherent within Te Tiriti o Waitangi itself, between tino rangatiratanga (Article Two), or Māori self-determination, and the Crown responsibility to ensure provision for Māori (Article Three). This tension was evident in the discussion with Māori participants at the co-theorising hui. One of the Māori professional development facilitators expressed concern that in her experience, non-Māori were reluctant to hand over to Māori the power and control that would enable them to make their own decisions. Pākehā, she believes, are:

still not allowing Māori to determine, they're still not handing over, they still want to have the control. They see the support as the controlling still.... they are not endeavouring to bring Māori forward and put Māori into those positions to actually determine their own pathway collaboratively [MPH1].

Despite this obstacle, she considered that “My whakaaro⁶⁶ is that we need to still work in partnership” [MPH1]. It is the nature of the partnership between Māori and Pākehā that is the consideration here. Some partnerships may reflect more respectful and reciprocal power dynamics than others. As Huia Jahnke has written, “Māori have yet to be convinced that partnership as they understand it is equivalent to the definition of partnership fabricated by the state” (Jahnke, 1997a, p. 110).

Other Māori participants also recognised these dilemmas, but considered their role to be one of being agents for change charged with the responsibility of shifting Pākehā attitudes:

MPH5: So, therefore, the dilemmas are there in terms of respectful partnership happening, there is a dilemma there and a tension, but the reality

⁶⁶ Whakaaro is an understanding, thought, or plan.

is we still have to kind of work with it and move to shift it, don't we? That's the biggie really.

MPH3.: It's the shifting.

MPH5: It's the shifting.

MPH3.: And I think that that is where we're really placed right now.

MPH5: It's helping to be change agents really.

A partnership that reflects a commitment to bicultural development needs to grapple with issues of power sharing, and ensure that Māori-defined aspirations are the focus. A Māori colleague positioned issues of equity and empowerment as central. She viewed key tasks as being “To empower Māori to take control and to empower Pākehā to 'let go' of that power and work collaboratively towards equity. In many cases this process should be worked out cooperatively between both parties” [CM2].

Māori, marginalised within a majoritarian political system and ideology (Ritchie, 1992), “cannot achieve justice or resolve their grievance without Pākehā support”, according to Ranginui Walker (Walker, 1990, p. 234). The Māori participants' views are consistent with Walker's statement that “Pākehā are as much a part of the process of social transformation in the post-colonial era as radical and activist Māori” (Walker, 1990, p. 234).

6.3 Tiriti-based 'Partnership': a Pākehā and Tauīwi Responsibility

The nature of the role for Pākehā and Tauīwi within a Tiriti-based partnership is a key consideration of bicultural development. Bicultural development in education can be seen primarily as a political process which does not necessarily require that individual Pākehā and Tauīwi demonstrate a personal bilingual and bicultural facility, yet nonetheless requires their commitment and advocacy. A Māori colleague made this comment:

I don't see Pākehā/Tauīwi roles as directly teaching te reo or tikanga Māori. I would view them more as advocates for the political and social rights of Māori. This is not to say that they should not know te reo or be informed of tikanga, these are important tools when working at a certain level such as with tamariki and parents. At another level I view Pākehā advocates as

supporting Māori aspirations more at the management level, right at the power base [CM2].

This role of advocacy in support of a Māori aspirations can be seen as a central tenet of bicultural development and a manifestation of Tiriti partnership. This excerpt also indicates some inherent tensions, in that using these “tools” of te reo me ngā tikanga Māori, when working with tamariki and whānau, whilst not necessarily directly teaching them, requires some expertise in order to demonstrate respect for and commitment to Māori language and culture, to ensure that they are incorporated appropriately into the early childhood programme. Furthermore, current early childhood education pedagogy emphasises child-centred approaches, in which an environment is offered to enable children to explore, scaffolded by their teachers. According to Te Whāriki:

The curriculum builds on a child’s needs, strengths, and interests by allowing children choices and by encouraging them to take responsibility for their learning (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 20).

Obviously, children, in exerting their agency, are only able to make those “choices” from amongst what is socially, culturally, and logistically available to them within the early childhood centre environment. Teachers need therefore to have the skills and knowledge to make te reo and “Māori ways of knowing and making sense of the world” (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 82) an available option to children. Teachers, whilst encouraging Māori whānau to be involved in the programme, cannot rely on this as the sole source of Māori content.

6.4 “The Main Focus is our Tamariki”: Māori Aspirations for Bicultural Development

Māori aspirations as expressed by Māori participants in this study were that tamariki Māori should have access to their birthright and heritage of te reo me ōna tikanga. For all of the Māori participants this was a central motivation in their ongoing involvement in the field of early childhood education.

Māori participants considered that despite the fact that many Māori children attend mainstream early childhood services, their whānau still want them to gain facility in te reo and tikanga Māori. As a Māori professional development facilitator at the co-theorising hui made clear, many whānau Māori want their children to have access to both kaupapa Māori and western educational opportunities:

They want kaupapa Māori, they really do want te reo, but they feel whakamā in a kōhanga environment, because they are actually not te reo speaking themselves. Some of the things they've talked about is they are wanting all those things that they do at kindergarten and Playcentre, so we're talking about activity, choice and options [MPH1].

Māori colleagues within the university were committed to their task of preparing mainstream early childhood teachers to appropriately support tamariki Māori and their whānau:

These are people who are going to go out into a teaching position and they are going to be in the front line of groups of children of whom many will be Māori. But not only is it important to me for Māori children to know and to see that they are being acknowledged in the way that programmes have been designed by their teachers, take account of what's important to them, but it is also important for the other children in other families who are in those centres as well [CM3].

These colleagues believed that their work was important in contributing to future early childhood teachers having the capacity to deliver culturally 'safe' (Ramsden & Spoonley, 1993) and responsive programmes to whānau Māori. Their commitment was such that they were prepared to tolerate the tensions and discomfort they experienced as Māori working collaboratively alongside Pākehā. These dilemmas were recognised as being a downside of a process that is aimed ultimately at improving outcomes for tamariki Māori:

MPH3: And that's where this collaborative way of working is just so important. It's not easy! But it's healthy! [laughter]

MPH1: Is it?

MPH3: Yes it has to be...because I think the main focus for us, when we look at it now, and when we looked at it six years ago, the main focus was our tamariki, and whatever we could do outside that circle to advance things

for them, then we were moving forward and that's what our focus still has been.

6.5 “An Inclusive Model”

There is a tension evident in the early childhood community between bicultural and multicultural perspectives. As one of the Māori colleagues said:

I think there is a section of early childhood in the field that are quite comfortable to look at the multicultural, but they don't want to look at the bicultural. I talked to one person about it and she feels that we should be able to greet everybody that is respecting everybody's cultural [identity], and then we talked about that this is a Māori place, this is tangata whenua – “Oh no we are all Kiwis”. And so I think that people are accepting of multicultural, there is still a group that is accepting of multicultural because it is just sort of an overview . . . [CMI].

This suggests that for many early childhood teachers, favouring a multicultural approach allows for a superficial treatment of cultures other than the dominant mainstream. This is an approach where Māori content has no particular recognition or tangata whenua status.

A Tiriti-based bicultural paradigm, whilst acknowledging the indigenous status of tangata whenua, is inclusive of the cultural diversity on the Crown side of the ‘partnership’, as a Māori professional development facilitator explained:

PDFM1: I have to endorse the bicultural kaupapa, and I do totally, because I don't believe it excludes a multicultural perspective, I think it embraces . . .

[Later]

JR: . . .so that when we are talking about bicultural we are not talking about just purely Pākehā and Māori?

PDFM1: No, we are talking about all our wider whānau. Because they are descendants of the Crown.

JR: They have come in on the Crown immigration policies.

PDFM1: That's an inclusive model.

This participant's use of the Māori term ‘whānau’ to refer to the broader grouping of peoples contained within the Crown, or Pākehā and Tauīwi side of the treaty partnership, seems to be emblematic of the “inclusiveness” of the paradigm she refers to. As Patricia Grace has written, “The treaty is for everyone, a treaty of allowance,

by which people come from many lands under crown responsibility, as treaty partners to tangata whenua” (Grace, 2000, p. 27). The difference between this inclusive bicultural paradigm and those which are ‘multicultural’, is that in the bicultural framework, not only are issues of culture and difference validated, but in addition, Māori are accorded recognition as the indigenous people for whom this country is the only homeland of their language and culture.

Māori colleagues pointed out that it is not only Māori children but their whānau who will benefit from bicultural development within their early childhood centres:

It also goes not only to the tamariki but to the mātua⁶⁷ as well, and whānau. That's why it is important as well, because it reaches not only directly the children but indirectly the results and repercussions from it [CM4].

This extends beyond whānau Māori to other children and their families as well:

But not only is it important to me for Māori children to know and to see that they are being acknowledged in the way that programmes have been designed by their teachers, take account of what's important to them, but it is also important for the other children in other families who are in those centres as well, because it is kiwi land, New Zealand, and we are here, Māori are here. And if we were to go elsewhere, to another country, I would think that it would be very important for us to learn about the other groups in that country as well [CM3].

Early childhood education was recognised as being a key site for social change in terms of developing cultural awareness and establishing positive attitudes about cultural differences:

If we are trying to look at harmonious relationships we are not going to be able to do that unless we have a good understanding of each other. And it starts really early. And children, as we know it, at a young age, they don't have any hang-ups. But if they are not sort of grounded in this sort of thing it is only about three or four years later that they are going to be subjected to all the other kinds of views about how valuable this is, and they are not going to be able to stand up to that [CM3].

⁶⁷ Mātua are parents.

6.6 Barriers to Implementation of Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Centres

Although bicultural development can be seen as a key responsibility for Pākehā in early childhood education, this is not straightforward, given the history of colonisation and the monocultural dominance of mainstream culture. Historically, although early childhood services have been receptive to meeting the needs of the communities that they serve, most Pākehā teachers have felt ill-equipped in terms of delivering Māori content. Barriers continue to exist in terms of teacher commitment and competency, and at the levels of qualification requirements, resourcing and support.

A Pākehā colleague described her previous early childhood teaching as reflecting “just an awareness that there are differences, but not an acknowledgment that I had to do anything about it” [CP4]. Another spoke of “valuing people, those sort of general things, but there weren't any questions raised of ‘Are we meeting the needs of Māori families?’ at that time” [CP1]. A third spoke of her recognition of a mismatch between what was being offered in kindergartens by well-intentioned middle-class teachers: “and I was one of them, the inability, my inability, to meet those needs of the Māori children” [CP3].

It is hard to measure progress towards bicultural development in early childhood centres. According to one of the professional development facilitators:

For the past two and a half years, working as a facilitator for the Professional Development Contract for Te Whāriki and being in a wide variety of early childhood centres, I still see many places which do not appear to see acknowledging the dual cultural heritage of New Zealand as important and none where the programme is truly bicultural, although two Playcentres have been trying hard [PDFP1].

A participant at the co-theorising hui stated that “while we would like to see kindergartens and so forth take on the responsibility of bicultural development within those centres, somehow I get the feeling in reality, that's not as good as we hoped it

would be” [MPH3]. Another considered that, the commitment to bicultural development being addressed in the early childhood sector needs to be supported in the wider community, particularly at the level of government policy, and by the media:

The only way that it's going to happen, the only way it can happen for educationalists to pick up the bicultural aspect that you're wanting to do, Jenny, is by media exposure, and that its an okay thing to do, and it's a powerful learning thing. Its got to be bigger than us, its got to be a national effort...[MPH1].

The co-directors of the Te Whāriki early childhood curriculum development contract have also recognised the need for government support in terms of ensuring that the curriculum is implemented to its fullest potential, saying that without government assuming this responsibility to ensure the structural fabric of funding levels, quality staffing and training requirements are in place, the new curriculum “will not make much of a difference for children” (May & Carr, 1997, p. 235).

6.7 Overview of Bicultural Development as a Project for Mainstream Early Childhood Settings

It was made clear by participants in this study that Māori aspirations for tino rangatiratanga require the support and advocacy of Pākehā colleagues. A key focus of bicultural development is to generate this understanding amongst Pākehā and Tauwiwi of their role within a Tiriti-based partnership, to be one of ensuring that Māori are able to exercise tino rangatiratanga over educational and other domains. Māori participants, although committed to kaupapa Māori education, were prepared to work in partnership with Pākehā colleagues within mainstream early childhood education settings because of their commitment to ensuring educational benefits including te reo me ōna tikanga were delivered to tamariki and whānau Māori attending mainstream early childhood centres. It was considered that efforts towards bicultural development in centres were falling short of the potential, although educators in some individual centres were committed and trying hard to improve their delivery.

Chapter Seven

Bicultural Development within the Department of Early Childhood Studies at the University of Waikato:

7.0 Introduction to Chapter Seven

This chapter reflects on the processes identified in this study which have been implemented by staff of the Department of Early Childhood Studies, in order to deliver on the stated commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. It covers key features of the bicultural development process implemented so far, which include the introductory workshop on Tiriti and anti-racism issues, paralleling Māori perspectives throughout the curriculum, and partnership models of shared teaching by Māori and Pākehā colleagues, which enable Māori lecturers to deliver Māori content.

7.1 Lecturers' Aspirations

Two aspects were identified as being central to the preparation of early childhood teachers in terms of their preparedness to deliver early childhood programmes which have a focus on bicultural development. The first was seen as the goal of generating in Pākehā and Tauīwi students a “heartfelt” commitment to the notion of bicultural development. Secondly, for Māori colleagues in particular, there was a concern to ensure that teachers who were being released from our teacher education programme were going to be well-prepared in terms of having learnt to critique and counter racism, as well as being competent to find ways to deliver Māori content responsively and appropriately.

7.1.1 “Creating Heart”: Generating a Commitment to Bicultural Development

A Pākehā colleague identified her commitment to bicultural development as operating at two levels, a personal commitment and a professional commitment attached to her responsibilities within the teacher education programme:

..and its one of the dilemmas within the programme is we have a commitment to teaching in a way that's fostering people's bicultural development, and enabling people to work towards bicultural development, but how do we check it all out? How do we know what's right and what's okay, what's our domain to teach, and its an on-going dilemma for me, and one of the difficulties that I have is even knowing when to ask, when in fact all of our Māori colleagues are so extremely busy, so, when I do get the okay, when they say, yeah, I make a commitment to following that up, whenever possible. . . [Later] Also part of my commitment to bicultural development within my teaching and for myself, is to do what I can for my own professional development. And one of the things that I did was to attend the Te Whāriki course on bicultural perspectives at the beginning of last year [CP1].

This idea of “fostering people’s bicultural development” was salient in the interview with another Pākehā colleague. She described the idea generating a heart-felt commitment, which became a recurrent theme during the study:

JR: So do you see the goal of our Treaty workshop as to create in those students...

CP2: Heart. Yes, I think it is. That's part of it. Part of it is to orient them to being open to this stuff.

This colleague provided valuable insight into this process of “creating heart”, or commitment to bicultural development, and which she personally considered to be a moral imperative. Strategies she identified for generating in students an understanding of and commitment to bicultural development included:

- the importance of generating a receptivity to bicultural development early in the programme, and to avoid a feeling of ‘compulsion’
- recognising that offering a range of different approaches increases the likelihood of reaching a greater range of students
- the importance of students’ accessing factual information
- the need for care in regard to the emotional impact on students of learning about the injustices of the past
- that for some students a useful framework is the concept of partnership and respectful relationships

The idea of heartfelt commitment being of central importance was reinforced by comments from two of the Pākehā graduates:

Yes, a lot of it is knowledge I think, but a lot is in your heart sort of thing. It is because I want to understand Māori people and I have been given the knowledge to understand about injustices [GP1].

Exactly, I mean what is it really, just a waste of time really. If you haven't got the commitment to actually implement something and feel the, you know, the heart to do it, then it is one of the hardest things [GP3].

This points to the purpose of the teacher education programme as being much wider and deeper than one of a mechanical, technical process of preparing teachers with the requisite skills. The extent of bicultural competence achieved by student teachers is immaterial if they lack the commitment to pursue bicultural development in early childhood centres. It also raises questions as to the ways and means of establishing this “heartfelt” commitment.

7.1.2 Creating Culturally “Safe” Teachers

Recognising the ignorance regarding te ao Māori, and the latent racism within the wider New Zealand society, bicultural development was seen by Māori colleagues to be a key strategy in preparing incoming students to be ‘culturally safe’ in their future work with tamariki and whānau Māori:

... many of the new students in the auraki [mainstream] intake pose a possible threat to these children and their whānau not to mention non-Māori. If this is my criticism of these students I also believe it is our duty to make sure that these people are safe by time they are ready to leave us. Māori content in courses is one strategy of breaking down these barriers [CM2].

The term “cultural safety” derives from the work of Irihapeti Ramsden in the area of nurse education, which she terms “Kawa Whakaruruhau” (Ramsden, 1994a, 1994b, 1997; Ramsden & Spoonley, 1993). Culturally safe practice has been informed by the “history, memory and pain” experienced by Māori and is intended to ensure equitable access and emotional safety for Māori in health services. According to Ramsden, this cultural safety practice requires educational provision for future nurses

which generates “a profound understanding of the history and social function of racism and the colonial process”, and “a critical analysis of existing social, political and cultural structures and the physical, mental, spiritual and social outcomes for people who are different” (Ramsden, 1994b, p. 23). It is also “designed to create emancipatory change” (Ramsden, 1994b, p. 23) through enabling people to negotiate adaptation to provisions (Ramsden, 1997, p. 125).

As discussed in section 6.4, Māori colleagues recognised that many tamariki Māori do not attend Kōhanga Reo or other kaupapa Māori early childhood centres, yet this choice does not indicate a lack of concern on the part of their whānau for their Māori culture and identity. For a range of reasons, many Māori families have their children attend mainstream educational settings. However, these families still place a high emphasis on their children learning and speaking te reo (see section 1.2.4). Māori lecturers in the programme saw their role within the Auraki [mainstream] early childhood teacher education programme to be one of contributing to improving the quality of this provision for tamariki in mainstream early childhood centres.

7.2 Pedagogical Approaches

Some pedagogical approaches implemented within the Department of Early Childhood Studies at the University of Waikato, in line with the commitment to bicultural issues, were documented in this study. They include: the compulsory introductory Tiriti and Anti-racism workshop; interactive teaching which encourages critical reflection; and employing strategies which recognise the role of emotions in learning, particularly learning which involves critiquing one’s own values and beliefs.

7.2.1 Introductory Workshop: Te Tiriti and History of Colonisation, Cultural and Racism Awareness

A Pākehā colleague saw value in the early positioning of the compulsory introductory Tiriti workshops which provide students with information on the background to the

signing of Te Tiriti, the colonisation which followed, and an exploration of issues of racism:

I think that what we do right from the beginning of our programme in terms of the Treaty courses, puts the bicultural stuff in the place which is a very important starting point...so most students from that very point are ready to look at what it means to be working biculturally to start with, and then to be transferring across some of the principles that they're talking about and that they're working with [CP1].

The benefit of these workshops was also mentioned by two of the interviewed Pākehā graduates. One commented:

I mean like the courses that we did in the first introduction blocks about the Treaty of Waitangi and different bicultural issues and things like that, it sort of made a lot of people open their eyes [GP3].

Eight of the surveyed graduates mentioned that the Tiriti workshops had been valuable in providing them with the opportunity to cover material that they had not previously had access to:

I found the Treaty workshops at the very beginning really great. I had no previous knowledge about the Treaty. . . [RG9].

. . . Te Tiriti o Waitangi from a Pakeha perspective was great. . . A whole cultural awakening for a lot of Pakeha, understanding differences [PG12].

Treaty Waitangi – found out why it was still an issue. Equity and education. Equity – how we don't all have the same advantages and choices [PG14].

The introductory workshops also aim to give Pākehā students the opportunity to identify with their own culture. As the Pākehā professional development facilitator stated, if people feel positive about their own cultural identity, this may well contribute to a positive orientation to those from different backgrounds:

..and being able to feel good about your own culture because I think you have to feel good about your own, but also to value diversity. One would hope that would be the outcome if people were well informed and had time to work through a whole lot of hang-ups [PDFP1].

In earlier versions of the programme, 1990-1991, students could elect to take this workshop as an option at various junctures throughout their three years. We found

that this was ineffective, since students were not sharing baseline understandings, which underpinned teaching in subsequent courses. A Pākehā colleague stated:

And I remember [in a year three course on 'Multiculturalism'] having to try and explain about . . . biculturalism that you know...it was so hard for students because I don't think they were having Treaty at the beginning then [CP4].

Another Pākehā lecturer stated that “the reason that it is in the beginning is so that they are open to the stuff that comes after, and if you have it half way through you will have wasted the first courses” [CP2]. Another problem with the staggered workshops was that if the receptivity towards Māori content is not generated, students may be resistant. This had once manifested in the previous kindergarten qualification programme in the disrespectful treatment of a kuia who had been invited as a guest speaker in a first year Māori studies course. As a result of this, I became convinced that having access to Māori perspectives was a privilege that could only be earned by students becoming informed about these historical issues and dimensions of racism. The workshop is intended to engender attitudes of respect towards Māori perspectives and appreciation of opportunities to enhance understandings of these matters that will be offered to them throughout their courses.

In 1993 we tried breaking the workshop into two-hour units and teaching them on a weekly basis as part of a year one first semester course. This again proved to be ineffective. The momentum and group dynamics were dissipated in this format, and the power of the messages seemed to be lost amid the routines of shuffling in and out of classrooms week after week. A colleague who has co-facilitated workshops with me spoke of the emotional connection that is built up during a two-day workshop as a useful process, as being one of the “different ways in to people to get that heart right” [CP2].

7.2.2 Interactive Teaching and Praxis

Both Māori and Pākehā colleagues favoured interactive, work-shop style classes. A Māori lecturer explained her favoured teaching approach:

Generally, I like the students to find information for themselves. . . My job is also to have a sound knowledge of the content and to provide a clear indication of what information needs to be sought when working together on readings, viewing a video or listening to speakers. Provision of newsprint and pens is important also as students like the idea of summarising their ideas by mind-mapping. Feeding back to the group enables free discussion. My job is also to pose questions in order to generate critical thinking and to keep everyone on the kaupapa. Many times clarification is sought from students, so knowing the content is really important when students find themselves in a tight spot. Preparation and planning are fundamental to effective delivery. If lecturers are not prepared, students detect this. Students pay a lot of money to come here so they should expect quality. Money issues aside, I think the kaupapa deserves more attention and shonkiness should be viewed as a personal attribute and not part of the kaupapa [CM2].

A Pākehā colleague also described an interactive teaching approach:

. . .so I try to refer to readings like Metge and Kinloch (1987), those sort of types of aspects, where students are able to more appreciate that the way that you interact on a personal basis is not necessarily going to be appropriate in another culture and that there can be huge cultural differences, and to try and increase their awareness of that - that's mostly through readings, and discussion of individual experiences. I think for most of the classes that I run I try as much as possible to run things in a reasonably practical interactive way, because I like that way of teaching, anyway. Some students who are expecting lectures get a bit sort of hōhā⁶⁸ with it I suppose - role-plays . . . [CPI].

These descriptions share features with Freirean ideals of problem posing and critical analysis, and rigour on the part of the educator (Freire & Shor, 1987). They are also consistent with paradigms of practical inquiry and critical praxis which focus on concrete problem-solving in specific situations with the goal of increasing the

⁶⁸ Hōhā means wearied with expectation, importunity, anxiety. Can also mean wearisome.

students' ability to respond proactively within their future teaching situations (Lubeck, 1996, p. 162).

The previously mentioned Māori colleague was also applying knowledge gained from research developing pedagogical strategies within the Ki Taiao programme, to her mainstream teaching:

These being teaching and learning approaches, knowledge base and the environment. The major principle underlying all of the above is the concept of whakamana⁶⁹. This research has influenced my teaching approaches drastically and has really affirmed the view of my job as a facilitator of learning, not a teacher. This term teacher is a bit too heavy for me as it indicates a position of power . . . Our jobs as Māori educators are to control and implement as many of the changes as we possibly can within the confines of a monocultural structure. We can do this at the students' level. In the end, what has evolved is the whole issue of being an effective facilitator. Hell, the research reveals certain things need to be addressed, so as far as I am concerned do it! [CM2].

Pākehā lecturers were making use of literature from Māori sources, as course readings, and using these as the basis for discussions. They were careful to check the appropriateness of Māori material with Māori colleagues, as a Māori colleague confirmed:

Between staff and all of that, they were conscious about this and they will ask and say who would be good in this and readings and so on, there's been a bit of that going on for the content of different courses [CM3].

A key focus of the programme is the integration of theory and practice. The programme attempts to provide opportunities for the 'theory' of bicultural development to be applied during practicum experiences. Over the three years of the degree programme, students experience a range of different early childhood settings and programmes, many of which may not provide strong models of bicultural

⁶⁹ Whakamana means to give prestige to, to give effect to, to make effective, rectify, and is also used to mean to refer to empowerment, as in Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 14).

development. This creates tension for students, which is acknowledged and explored through written requirements such as reflective journals, individual practicum 'de-briefings' and class discussions. Examples of students' reflections on practicum indicate that even though the competencies required are not being modeled by staff in many early childhood centres, as students persist in their implementation they are rewarded with positive responses from children. For example, a student recorded incremental changes over a year three practicum, as shown in the following excerpts:

WEEK TWO

Kept on using the singular words. Had a better response this week from the children. . . I spent about quarter of an hour with two morning children teaching them the te reo numbers. The response from their learning was great. They really felt like they had learnt something and felt very proud of themselves. I checked with them later in the session to see if they still remembered them and they did. So that was really great . . .

WEEK SIX

It is so neat to see the children using te reo and gradually picking it up and integrating it into other curriculum and play areas themselves. So this week has been really neat and rewarding for us as staff to see the breakthrough with the children [SWY3P8].

This progression in which the student has persisted in her implementation of te reo over a period with increasingly positive reactions from the children is fairly typical of those that students have documented in their practicum records. It demonstrates the praxis of students implementing bicultural development in their teaching practice.

7.2.3 Validating Emotions

A Pākehā colleague described the emotions of her own process of becoming committed to honouring Te Tiriti o Waitangi:

That was very much for me, that the injustice of it, the wrongness of it, caused grief and that was terrible and it didn't really matter what the facts were - do you know what I mean. The accurate historical stuff was kind of an irrelevance because people were in pain and that needed to be changed and that was very much I guess what impacted on me [CP2].

This colleague emphasised the importance of recognising and responding sensitively to students' "fears and hostilities". Māori colleagues were also aware that working with non-Māori students to generate a receptivity towards kaupapa Māori involves an awareness of this emotional component:

I think a lot of Pākehā students really want to know, but a lot of them are scared. They are afraid of saying or doing the wrong thing . . . [CM4].

Venturing into uncharted learning territory involves a fear of the unknown (Daloz, 1990). In terms of attempting to learn te reo, the second language acquisition literature provides some insight into emotional aspects. Crawford describes the "affective filter, a term for all the emotional barriers which may impede the second language learning process, including low motivation to learn the language, and a fear of sounding foolish" (Crawford, 1992, p. 212).

According to hooks (hooks, 1994), lecturers need to have compassion for the pain that may arise for students in giving up old ways of thinking and knowing and learning new approaches (p. 42-43). A Māori colleague used the term "mentor" to describe her role in supporting non-Māori students, and considered this the most important strategy in supporting their change process:

It was really important to have a mentor that she could sort of touch base with and just confirm things like, you know how we were saying, some people have a fear of entering into that arena because of the mistakes, so having a mentor that was the biggest factor. . . .Because we talk about, if you are going to move in this direction, we talked about we all need a kaitiaki⁷⁰ to move us along this pathway. That was a pivotal factor. And of course being able to make the mistakes. I always say, "Hey, while we are here, let's make those mistakes and feel okay about it. No one is going to jump down you... Let's try it out and when you get out there and you need to come back and touch base that's okay" [MPH3].

Darder suggests that central to generating democratic processes of bicultural pedagogy,

⁷⁰ A kaitiaki is a guardian (Ritchie, 1992, p. 56-7) or in this sense a mentor.

is the role of the bicultural educator who functions as guide, model, and support, and who facilitates the critical (and often fearful) journey into the previously prohibited terrain of the bicultural discourse - a discourse that is often only felt or sensed, and seldom articulated (Darder, 1991, p. 69).

Lecturers can also model our emotional engagement with the world, through sharing our experiences and passions, talking about our feelings, and generating a shared sense of humanity, enjoyment and humour (Freire & Shor, 1987; Simon, 1992). As a Pākehā graduate stated, “I mean it should be an enjoyable experience” [GP3]. One of the Māori participants was clear in both her initial interview and at the co-theorising hui, that it was very important that non-Māori students were exposed to positive experiences and role models [MPH4].

7.3 Positioning Māori Knowledge as Central

The following sections outline some of the issues surrounding the commitment to including Māori perspectives within courses taught by the Department of Early Childhood Studies within the teacher education programme. Paralleling Māori and Western knowledges also makes way for the validation of other world views, decentering Western understandings from the positioning which has allowed them to assume the status of [mis]representing universalistic truths.

7.3.1 “Making Māori Things Real”

A review of the effectiveness of implementation of the integral theme of ‘biculturalism’ conducted by Māori lecturers with the Department of Early Childhood Studies in 1994, had indicated that the most effective model was to ensure that Māori perspectives are taught holistically, as a parallel strand of content within each course topic (O'Malley & Ritchie, 1995). One of the Pākehā lecturers considered that in order for this to be effective, a baseline understanding needs to be put in place first:

One of the things that I believe very strongly is that if you are going to have bicultural issues as an integral theme that is running right throughout the courses then there are two things: first of all that it's really setting people up for failure and setting that idea up for failure if you don't give people a thorough understanding, because people come with misconceptions about

what bicultural development is, they come with fears and hostilities and stuff. They come with ignorance basically, lack of knowledge and misinformation that they have got from all over the place. And, therefore, if you are saying "Okay now in all these classes we are going to look at Māori content" - Māori perspectives in the music class or whatever, people will switch off from that and will not learn it unless they have a philosophical understanding of why that's important, and also if they don't have an understanding of it being a "win-win" situation I guess. I think a lot of, I'm talking about Pākehā not Māori...a lot of Pākehā think that it is either Māori or Pākehā, and if Pākehā give, this is what they come to this issue with, if we give an inch we will lose. Māori will take. And I think that to me it is really important to realise that whole thing of diversity is, you know, there is richness in diversity, that it will be a win-win situation.....Before you can look at colonisation and childrearing you have got to have a basic understanding of colonisation before you look at specifics of it [CP2].

One of the Māori colleagues used the phrase, “Making Māori things real”, which reflects the goal of paralleling Māori knowledge with Western knowledge. This is not to say that Māori things have not ‘been real’ in the past, but is a recognition of the extent to which that they have been rendered invisible to the mainstream by the assumption of colonialistic superiority. Not only does this paralleling of the two knowledge bases validate Māori epistemologies/mātauranga Māori, but it also allows for a relativistic comparison and critique of positivistic, ethno-centric views, through re-positioning Western knowledge as only one knowledge base or world view alongside many others. This idea was raised at the co-theorising hui, where one of the participants stated, “It’s about recognising the academia in Māori ways of knowing and being - [Māori] are actually carrying those two sets of knowledge” [MPH5]. This participant continued to explain that:

Its actually seeing Māori children, not as where the deficit is, "Oh Māori because they don't have this and they don't have that". . . I'm saying, you know, "Shift your thinking, it's actually about where you place your thinking", because our kids actually carry two sets of knowledge [MPH5].

What this participant has highlighted is that in addition to generating an understanding of different world views, this process of paralleling of Māori and Western knowledge bases will enable students to recognise the bicultural paradigm that Māori children and families draw upon as an asset. Recent developments in the

area of evaluating early childhood programmes in the early childhood sector in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Podmore, May, & Mara, 1998) follow a Learning and Teaching Story Framework, which uses a “child’s voice” to ask questions based on the Te Whāriki strands:

- How do you appreciate and understand my interests and abilities and those of my family?
- How do you meet my daily needs with care and sensitive consideration?
- How do you engage my mind, offer challenges, and extend my world?
- How do you invite me to listen and communicate, and respond to my own particular efforts?
- How do you encourage and facilitate my endeavours to be part of the wider group? (Podmore et al., 1998, p. v).

In order to answer these questions for a Māori child, requires an understanding of that child as a Māori person, embedded in a different world view from that of the dominant mainstream Pākehā/Western modality that serves as the ‘norm’ and has such ‘normalising’ power. Seeing Māori children as bicultural and often bilingual is a repositioning that validates their knowledge, in contrast to ‘deficit’ views of Māori and other ‘minority’ children that have been critiqued by Judith Simon and others (Coxon, Jenkins, Marshall, & Massey, 1994; Jones, McCulloch, Marshall, Smith, & Smith, 1990; Simon, 1996; Smith, 1999).

This model, which parallels Māori and Pākehā/Western perspectives, challenges not only the assumption of superiority of Western knowledge but also the positivist view that there are truths and universal theories that Western science has identified for us all to assimilate. As the Siraj-Blatchfords have stated, “What is at stake is the canon itself” (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1999, p. 136). This dual-epistemological model is consistent with calls to bring the knowledge bases of other cultures from the margin to the centre of the curriculum, an approach James Banks has termed,

“transformative” (Banks, 1996, p. 339). According to Banks, this transformative approach,

...helps students to understand how knowledge is constructed and how it reflects the experiences, values, and perspectives of its creators. In this approach, the structure, assumptions, and perspectives of the curriculum are changed so that the concepts, events, and issues taught are viewed from the perspectives of a range of groups, including men and women from different social-class, ethnic, and racial groups (Banks, 1996, p. 339).

This de-centering of the Western canon is also a strategic way of encouraging students’ critical and reflective capacities. Along with consideration of Māori perspectives on a particular topic, further contrasts can be offered which demonstrate that there is no fixed set of universal western knowledge, but that instead, “the cultural archive of the West represents multiple traditions of knowledge”, and is not in fact “a cohesive system of people, practices, values and languages” (Smith, 1999, p. 44).

7.3.2 Tino Rangatiratanga and Inclusion of Cultural Diversity

Models of multiculturalism and cultural diversity can be used as a means to obfuscate the Tiriti-based obligation to Māori as tangata whenua (Ramsden, 1994a; Smith, 1986; Sullivan, 1993). The model that we have been using in the Department is one that is Tiriti-based and inclusive of the cultural diversity represented on the Pākehā and Tauīwi side of the treaty partnership. A Māori colleague described how she presented this kaupapa in a course she had taught:

CM3: I will just use the last examples I had, when I was doing “Supporting Bicultural Programmes, Partnership With Parents”, I started off saying when I talk about bicultural programmes I’m really referring to Pākehā and Māori. Those are the two groups that we will be talking about in this course. But they were constantly coming back and saying “I want to do so much language with all the groups with these children represented in centres”. And I would say, “This would be very difficult, that’s why we just limit it to just you looking at it realistically - how you would go about doing it for two groups”. So that was my attempt to . . . deal with bicultural issues rather than...

JR: And Māori comes first, it’s not to rule out the others?

CM3: The truth is that once you have got that one right for the two groups it is only a simple matter to implement the same ideas for others.

In an assignment, a student reconciled Māori Tiriti-based paramountcy with her concern for equity for children from diverse backgrounds:

Whilst all of these multicultural factors are true in Aotearoa New Zealand's culturally diverse setting, there is also a unique situation of a bicultural partnership that must be recognised. During the colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand by the Europeans there was an accord signed called the Treaty of Waitangi or Te Tiriti O Waitangi. This was signed between the crown, lead by the English governor, Hobson and over 500 Māori (indigenous people of Aotearoa) chiefs in 1840. This has been seen as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand as suggested in Ritchie (1996). The treaty consisted of both an English and Māori version and discrepancies in the translation of these have been identified as major issues of concern in terms of upholding of this agreement. The Māori version of the treaty promised to protect Māori tino rangatiratanga (Authenticity and self determination) and Taonga (treasures including land, language and culture) in return for European settlement (Ritchie 1996). For a number of reasons, primarily institutional racism by the Pakeha dominated New Zealand government, this treaty has not always been honoured by the Pakeha side. This has led to injustice and disempowerment of the Māori People that is still needing to be addressed and equated today (Ritchie 1996) [SWYP31].

Recognising that respecting Māori aspirations for tino rangatiratanga and protection of taonga can happen in tandem with affirmation of cultural diversity, that the two ideas are mutually conducive, is a useful paradigm. It is in contrast to tokenistic attempts at 'multiculturalism' which position Māori with other non-Pākehā 'ethnic minorities' at the margins of the dominant mainstream.

7.4 Exploring Cultural Values

Fundamental to growing in one's ability to understand different ways of viewing the world, is to come to see one's own cultural perspective as one of many, all of which are equally valid. Since culture "determines different styles of learning and thinking" (Carr, 1993, p. 2), a key responsibility of educators is to make the connections with each child's cultural paradigm. Cultural differences come to be viewed as important to be recognised and responded to, and this cultural recognition and validation or

“confirmation” (Noddings, 1994, p. 177-8) can be seen as a fundamental task for any teacher.

7.4.1 Recognising One’s Own Cultural Paradigm

Integral to the de-centering of the dominant monocultural Western canon and the development of a reflective, critical analysis of cultural and educational issues, is the process of facilitating Pākehā and Tauīwi to explore their own culture and values. Course readings, class content, (see appendix 1.2) and discussions provide a framework and forum for discussing these values, as shown in the following examples from the course Cultural Studies Two, 1058.213.:

Student 3: I'm English and I don't know whether you want this example but even the table, plate thing is really foreign to me still it's like if you invite someone to your home you provide it for them you know.

JR: Yes you don't expect people to bring pot luck dinners.

Student 4: Well would you want to cook a meal for 20 people? Come on!

Student 3: If you invite 20 people to your home then you should cook it for them! [CS2, 97].

This comparison between British and Pākehā expectations regarding hospitality protocol shows the distinctiveness of New Zealand’s informal social scene. The following examples are from discussions regarding values changing between generations:

JR: I think I'm more strict on my kids than my parents' generation.

Student: So am I, but it's a different world, and I wouldn't dare put my kids in the clothing that Mum put me in. You know things like that [CS2, 98].

Student: But what about that time thing. I think in a way we're still trying to come around to their thinking, because I know with my grandparents, I was saying, oh, going to do this at such and such time in the future, and they said "Why don't you just live for today, you might not be here tomorrow?"

JR: Oh really.

Student: You know, live for the day [CS2, 98].

This last example arose from reflections on Australian aboriginals’ very different time orientation as reported in a course reading (Harris, 1990). The reading is chosen

deliberately because the values described are such an extreme contrast to Western values. The intention is that this will ameliorate the tendency demonstrated by some Pākehā students, of inclining to over-emphasise commonalities between Pākehā and other cultures, in an attempt to see us as 'all one people'. This can be seen as an assimilationist, normalising tendency, which, however well-intentioned (Delpit, 1988, p. 285; Simon, 1996), only serves to deny the existence of very real differences between one's own values system and that of another culture. This denial of Māori children's Māoriness is in effect a denial of their right to a positive identity as Māori. Furthermore, it serves to reinforce Pākehā ethnocentrism and affirm Pākehā cultural dominance, whilst creating an inequitable situation in which Māori children are constantly being judged by Pākehā/Western standards (Simon, 1996, p. 40-41).

Gaining an in-depth insight into a different set of cultural values can aid the process of reflecting on one's own set of values and how they reflect the values of the culture we have been raised in. As a student wrote in an assignment for the course, Cultural Studies Two:

Firstly we must look to ourselves to see where our own beliefs, values and prejudices lie. As educators we have a great deal of influence over the children in our care who easily perceive our attitudes good and bad. In her research on Pākehā teachers view of Māori children Judith Simon (1996) found that many teachers "automatically link Māoriness to educational problems". She continued by saying that this in turned "negatively influenced the educational performance of the Māori pupils through their, (teachers), low expectation of them". Staff need to be encouraged to be honest with themselves and to understand their own culture, how they think and how they perceive others (Stonehouse, 1991, p91) [SWY2P2].

This student's writing is consistent with the Te Whāriki statement that "The expectations of adults are powerful influences on children's lives", which means that adults need to "recognise their own beliefs, assumptions, and attitudes and the influence these will have on the children" (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 30). The student continues:

Most teachers being from the dominant Pākehā culture explains Metge,(1990, p15), "find it more difficult than most to see their own culture. ...Pākehā people take theirs for granted as the norm". By looking at their own culture and becoming proud of their own cultural identity Metge argues that they will be more likely to develop respect for other cultures. Being strong in our own identity will also help stop us from being threatened by what other cultures have to teach us. It is not a matter of which way is best but a realising that there are different ways to look at the same thing [SWY2P2].

One of the Māori graduates described how the Māori students in her intake had supported Pākehā class-mates around these issues of exploring culture and difference:

GM2: So we saw our role as being to coax them through the process or help them understand and we did that as much as possible.

JR: How would you do that? Just by talking with them?

GM2: By talking about the issues. Also taking on board the issues like respecting what they had to say and probably advising them to come from their perspective rather than try and come from a Māori perspective. So I think that bonding that we had [within the Māori issues course] was helpful not only to us but also to our Pākehā colleagues.

Interestingly, these Māori students, in encouraging their Pākehā class-mates to recognise the validity of their Pākehā cultural perspective, demonstrate that Māori, as bicultural people, have no difficulty understanding 'Pākehā' culture as an entity, and consider it to be the appropriate identity framework for Pākehā. A Māori graduate of the teacher education programme, working in a Kōhanga Reo stated that:

Being able to include the child's language and culture into our programme empowers the child to be given the opportunity to develop skills, knowledge in an environment that is similar to her/his home and wider community. It has assisted me in developing strategies to: provide the child with learning experiences that are meaningful; ensuring parents and their whānau feel welcomed and comfortable to participate within the Kōhanga Reo [PG11].

7.4.2 Appreciating Cultural Differences

During the interview with a Māori graduate, I had been intrigued by her description of how she would encourage Pākehā students to recognise that Māori children were culturally different from Pākehā, and the pedagogical implications of this:

Because I do believe, and I did believe at that time that Māori children are sensory children and that's why they are so different to Pākehā children so coming from that line of thought, I use that quite a lot. And it was quite a learning for my Pākehā colleagues I think because they hadn't seen a child from that, or hadn't seen a Māori child from that perspective that they are sensory children. So I'd role-play what a Māori child was like. They'd have to touch and look under there and those types of things and then my Pākehā colleagues would say, "Oh yeah they do!" . . . [GM2].

This view that Māori children are “sensory” is supported by Ian Cormack, who writes that:

Creating an effective learning environment for Māori students should mean that visual, auditory, haptic, and kinesthetic learning styles are all acceptable in our classrooms, they should all be catered for (Cormack, 1997, p. 169).

This position is supported by research studies conducted with indigenous peoples that consistently indicate that indigenous children are “more successful in processing visual and spatial information than they are in dealing with verbal stimulation” (Ryan, 1992, p. 166). Although Macias (1989 cited in Ryan, 1992, p. 167) cautions that verbal difficulties in some children are due to the mode of education requiring them to use English as a second language, research indicates that indigenous children “should be exposed to a wide variety of instructional strategies” which “take advantage of student strengths, while at the same time, equipping students with knowledge and skills that would increase their life chances” (Ryan, 1992, p. 168). The subject of recognising without stereotyping culturally appropriate learning styles is one which is discussed in the course Cultural Studies Two.

In addition to countering the ‘normalising’ tendency described previously, there is another somewhat paradoxical agenda of countering the other extreme of seeing ‘different’ as ‘other’. Students discussing their experiences overseas showed an ‘othering’ tendency as in the following example:

Student: Once in Spain, 'cause we used to just stay at the beach all day and come home five o'clock and have a meal and then want to go to sleep but their whole, the whole town has been asleep all day and they're just going all night, midnight there was noise, kids and everything.

JR: That's right. They have their meal about 9 or 10 o'clock at night.

Student: Yeah [laughter from class] and in the hotel and everything it's just terrible.

The process here is that of de-centering from an initial position of mono-cultural ethnocentrism. Antonia Darder has pointed out the racism inherent in “consistently judging and comparing bicultural students’ success to that of students from the dominant culture, and in expecting bicultural students to incorporate dominant cultural values as their own” (Darder, 1991, p. 39). Teachers who have not critiqued their ethnocentric monoculturalism are likely to misinterpret and inauthentically portray other cultures’ realities. They are unlikely to understand the subtle nuances, and inner complexities of the reality of bicultural children’s experiences and identities and, as a consequence, may violate these children’s self-determination (Darder, 1991, p. 39-40).

A related issue is that of raising students’ awareness of a further ‘pitfall’, that of stereotyping characteristics of different cultural groups. Students in the Cultural Studies Two (1997) course demonstrated an awareness and avoidance of stereotyping:

Student 1: You have to remember that if you've got say a group of Indian children that they're all different as well. You can't class them as the same [CS2, 97].

Student 1: I was thinking of another one ... not judging them by their colour, like sometimes you can say, oh, right, now ... all of that culture over there you just sort of assume that it's one culture and think oh, yeah, their beliefs are that ... because they actually can be all totally different.

JR: Good. Good point.

Student 2: Skin colour isn't a very good judge of culture anyway [CS2,97].

These students have indicated that they are able to recognise and critique totalising tendencies that seek the false security offered by the seductive ideal of commonality (MacNaughton, 1998, p. 7). Robin Lakoff (1990) has explained, that:

People have a great intellectual need to categorize. The world is a chaotic and complicated place. If we saw every thing and every person in it as unique, we

could not develop predictions or generalizations about the right way to respond in each of the many situations we encounter. We could not make sense of our universe: making sense depends significantly on forming appropriate and useful categories and making proper assignments to them. . . . And . . . the power of the categorization to mold attitudes and affect behavior is truly awesome and often terrifying (Lakoff, 1990, p. 180-181).

A counter to this propensity to stereotype is to encourage students to be open-minded towards and respectful of different worldviews. Jerome Bruner describes open-mindedness as “a willingness to construe knowledge and values from multiple perspectives without loss of commitment to one’s own values” (Bruner, 1990, p. 30).

Māori colleagues appreciated the importance of engendering an understanding of cultural difference:

CM3: How do we get people to acknowledge that we are different?

JR: Yeah. Because to me this is a core problem.

CM3: Yes because you get back on that old theme about, like Peter Sharples used to use it a lot, it is important they know what those differences are and to accept those differences and to also know that there are similarities.

The following is an example from a class discussion from Cultural Studies Two (1997) around commonalities and differences between Pākehā and Māori values:

Student 2: The honesty and respect for your family and your elders.

JR: And that was similar?

Student 1: Yeah.

Student 2: Also like in relationships with your, like your community you know you have the tribes and that sort of thing.

JR: Right, I think so, I think that you'll probably find just about every culture would have a very strong value on family because it's the only way that that culture is going to survive isn't it, is by having another generation to survive and succeed.

Student 2: But don't the Māori sort of extend more back to their ancestors than we sort of tend to do? [CS2, 97].

This shows a more respectful orientation towards different values than was evident in the earlier discussion regarding different practices in European countries which had taken place at the beginning of the course. In order to effectively work with children

and families of cultures different to their own, students must move beyond a reliance on uncritiqued stereotypes to develop a receptivity to the subtle nuances of different cultural discourses and communication styles which will enable them to build the bridges of relationships and meaningful communication:

As a consequence of each cultural group having developed its own particular communicative style, miscommunications in ethnically mixed conversations are numerous, including differences in how turns are taken in conversations, use of metaphor and indirect language, organization of talk, and more subtle features such as the rhythmic or tonal patterns of speech. Being able to make accurate interpretations requires either sharing communicative or ethnic background, or having enough communicative experience with the other group to make sense of the alternative styles (Delpit, 1995, p. 144).

As students become more receptive to and exposed to te reo and tikanga, they may perceive the distinctiveness of Māori expression through experiencing, for example, the richness of Māori use of metaphor, personification of atua, and the significance of cultural meanings contained within whakatauki⁷¹ and waiata.

It was also suggested by the Pākehā professional development facilitator that respect and understanding generated towards the Māori worldview might transfer as students encountered children and families from other cultural backgrounds:

I suppose if you develop the skills of appreciating differences more, that is not so much a skill as an attitude of appreciating things Māori do and the things they hold dear, you must be developing sensitivity to another culture. One would think then that it would open up your way of thinking about other cultures and groups [PDFP1].

One of the recent graduates surveyed made a comment that endorses this speculation:

I feel I am much more aware of cultural issues. I would have liked to learn more of other cultures, but what I have learnt in a bicultural context will help lead to understanding in a multicultural context. I feel I have the basics I now need to apply them and learn from there [RG10].

⁷¹ Whakatauki are sayings, proverbs, aphorisms.

This view was also expressed by one of the Pākehā lecturers, who considered that through her involvement in early childhood education, her growing appreciation of things Māori had contributed to a decrease in her racism toward other cultures:

I guess, I think, I can only come from a personal statement - that by understanding Māori and through the commitment to that culture that I have had much more understanding for Asian and far less racist as far as other cultures go [CP4].

7.5 Partnership Models

The term ‘partnership model’ was one suggested by both Māori and Pākehā colleagues as a preferred way of operating, here explained by a Māori colleague:

For me I quite often had thought that it would be really neat that if there could always be two people doing a course and it goes parallel for anything that you are doing, but then there would be all the constraints of money to be able to do that. I mean Māori people are just such a precious resource now [CM1].

Pākehā colleagues had described various partnership approaches. One preferred to involve Māori colleagues or Māori guest lecturers to teach the Māori content within her courses. Another described a course in which the Māori and Pākehā lecturers co-taught the first four principal lectures of the course, in a more collaborative fashion, introducing material from both Māori and Western perspectives. This teaching was reinforced by providing readings that offered parallel Māori perspectives to the Western material, and also supported by contributions from Māori students within the class.

Recognising that Māori staff should be responsible for teaching Māori content, and admitting their own lack of bicultural knowledge and competence, Pākehā staff favoured having Māori lecturers delivering Māori content within the courses, in order to fulfill the intention of the integral theme of ‘biculturalism’. They were sensitive to the issue of Māori control of Māori knowledge:

I think I've tried to hold onto the fact that I'm privileged to have, or to be given any information, that is really the right of Māori to have, and tried to be

sensitive in what I do with that, even though I probably don't always get it right [CP1].

During the time of these interviews, Māori lecturers were primarily committed to the Ki Taiao programme, which raised issues for Pākehā lecturers when this partnership model was not always available. A Māori colleague commented on the consultation and collaboration that occurred as Pākehā staff sought advice as to ways in which Māori content could be addressed:

Between staff and all of that, they were conscious about this and they will ask and say who would be good in this and readings and so on, there's been a bit of that going on for the content of different courses [CM3].

However, another Māori colleague had felt some discomfort about the ways she had been employed within a particular course, considering that the input required of her was limited to a specific focus, and that Māori content was not integrated throughout the course, in that she “couldn’t see how that [Māori perspectives] was being covered” [CM1].

Partnership models can involve varying levels of collaboration, from one where the Māori and Pākehā colleagues work hand-in-hand to determine content, pedagogy and assessment, to ones where Māori are brought in to do a section. The bicultural review conducted by Māori staff in 1994 had been critical of the more tokenistic models used in some courses (O'Malley & Ritchie, 1995).

7.5.1 Pākehā Lecturers’ Responsibility

There was a lack of consistency in the perceptions of Pākehā colleagues as to their particular responsibilities within the programme. Whilst two of the Pākehā colleagues did not see their role as one of directly teaching te reo or tikanga (see section 10.4), the other two considered that if Pākehā were to deliver Māori content, this needed to be done with respect and authenticity:

Yes, you need to do it well, and without offending [CP3].

Even the two colleagues who had indicated that did not see their role as teaching specialist Māori content, felt they should do more in terms of utilising te reo Māori:

But I feel sometimes I should know more . . . [Later] I think pronunciation is essential. That's something that we all need to have a kick in the backside for [CP4].

I mean I think I can look at it from my own perspective that I know I could be doing a lot more modeling to students... [Later] I mean I have made a commitment this year to try and make sure that, to say "Kia ora"⁷² or "Morena"⁷³ when I start classes or when I come into classes if there are students there and stuff like that. Now I mean that's pretty pathetic quite frankly, I should actually be doing a lot more than that. And I am not even doing that reliably [CP2].

Another colleague identified work pressure as a factor which impeded her ability to make more effort at incorporating te reo me ngā tikanga Māori:

I mean I'm certainly guilty of you know forgetting or getting too busy and thinking oh you know. . . . [Later] It would take me a long long time, and a lot of work to get on top of that. And I just, well I've been doing my thesis and I just haven't had time, that's the pressure of work [CP3].

This sense of workload pressure was linked to the prevailing ideology within the institution by one colleague:

I do sense that there is a shift in the climate. I don't know whether this is part of this tape really, this thing, but it's that whole market economy, market forces...I mean I just sort of think now if we had a Māori language class, one hour a week, how many staff members can come to it. People wouldn't go. I don't know what's changed but there is something that's changed within our department that says, "if it's not vital you don't do it" . . . EFTs⁷⁴ and outputs, and stuff, the market economy. You're going to have to address it because I think yes it is that whole thing [CP2].

The reality of increased workloads in order to deliver better 'productivity', contributed to these colleagues feeling less able to focus on enhancing the Māori

⁷² Kia ora is used here as a form of greeting.

⁷³ Morena means "Good Morning".

⁷⁴ EFTs are "effective full-time students. This is jargon for a unit of financial measurement within the tertiary sector.

delivery within their courses. This is in contrast to the rhetoric of ‘level playing field’ equity espoused by the free market ideology of the new right, which has fabricated an illusion that it will deliver equity to Māori in terms of equal access to educational achievement (Poata-Smith, 1996).

7.5.2 Recognising Pākehā Students’ Resistance

Another consideration with the partnership model, is that of determining which content is, in fact, a Pākehā responsibility. Māori colleagues described as “draining” the experience of resistance from Pākehā students:

It is draining for one person to cover that. I quite often find that when there is only resistance or the negative stuff comes about I think they pour it out on the Māori tutor and it is often at that time that they actually have to hear a non-Māori saying the same things and they accept them. Just leaving it to Māori just to get those messages - they need to hear it coming from other sources to reinforce that and confirm for them, "Yes this is the way" [CM3].

And also, I think that the tutor needs to be someone who is able to handle all the negative kōrero that the Pākehā students do put across with their pathway. Without getting offended and realising that it is just like ignorance or fear or maybe they really are negative and it doesn't matter. But the tutor needs to be able to handle all, because it's really negative and it gets really draining [CM4].

A Māori colleague was clear that students were the products of a community and education system that had not provided them with the requisite knowledge and attitudes that would have created a more positive and receptive disposition towards the taonga of te reo and tikanga:

And that's the hard part because people don't know the background to all those issues and sometimes the resistance is related to that outside influence [CM3].

Study of the Treaty of Waitangi and related history is not compulsory in New Zealand schools, although it is part of the most recent social studies curriculum implemented in 1999-2000 (Consedine & Consedine, 2001, p. 134). This lack of background knowledge can lead to resistance from students who are encountering it

for the first time, as Ani Mikaere (1998) experienced as a lecturer in the Law School at the University of Waikato. Pākehā students of a compulsory stage one Legal Systems course taught by Māori lecturers had complained to the media about the Māori content of the course. Mikaere describes how she and other Maori lecturers felt uncomfortable dealing with Pakeha anger and guilt:

...I felt that I was being held partly responsible for the guilt of Pākehā students at being told the truth about how they had come to hold power in Aotearoa. I considered that to be extraordinarily unfair. Because I am Māori, Pākehā power is my problem. The fact that the monocultural education system has failed to inform Pākehā about the brutality of colonisation becomes my problem, for it is left to me to tell them (Mikaere, 1998, p. 9).

Similar resistance from Pākehā students to Māori (and Tongan) lecturers was reported by Alison Jones (Jones, 2001), who illustrates her discussion with excerpts from students' journals in which one described feeling offended by being termed 'Tauwiwi'. Another felt uncomfortable during an exercise focusing on aspects of marae:

"The activity in which we were asked to pick out and comment on an aspect of the meeting house [marae] made me feel extremely uncomfortable and stupid. I thought it served to emphasise rather than diminish my status as an 'outsider'. The activity assumed a prior knowledge which I did not have . . ." (Jones, 2001, p. 282).

This example from Alison Jones' student is interesting. The student felt she was being positioned as an 'outsider', and considered that the lecturer assumed that she, and probably the other Pākehā students, knew more about te ao Māori than was the case. Jones speculates that Pākehā students object to being positioned as ignorant (p.283). Critical pedagogical approaches recognise the need for connecting with learners' backgrounds and previous understandings (Bartolome, 1994; Freire, 1972; McLaren, 1991; O'Loughlin, 1994b, 1995a; Sleeter, 1992). It may be that it is more appropriate for Pākehā lecturers to be positioned as responsible for encouraging Pākehā students to examine their own backgrounds and identify the interpretative frameworks which filter and colour their understandings and receptivities. Certainly, dealing with issues such as racism requires a climate of safety for participants.

Pākehā feel more comfortable in addressing their own racism when the discussion is facilitated by a Pākehā lecturer who can use personal examples and model her/his own strategies for self-monitoring of assumptions and interpretations. It is possible to structure courses to ensure that Pākehā lecturers can tutor classes in which issues such as racism are to be discussed, enabling Pākehā to exercise leadership in modeling a countering approach, and thus avoiding the potential for Māori lecturers to be exposed to hostility.

7.5.3 Demands Placed on Māori Lecturers

Pākehā colleagues were aware of the demands that teaching in Ki Taiao and the mainstream programme were placing on their Māori colleagues:

How do we know what's right and what's okay, what's our domain to teach? And its an on-going dilemma for me, and one of the difficulties that I have is even knowing when to ask, when in fact all of our Māori colleagues are so extremely busy, so, when I do get the okay, when they say, yeah, I make a commitment to following that up, whenever possible . . . [CP1].

This issue was raised by Māori colleagues at the co-theorising hui, who expressed concern that they often felt that they were spread too far, across too many courses in order to deliver a 'Māori perspective' in each course. The problem of overload for Māori academics has been recognised by Graham Smith (in Hotere, 1997). Smith believes that the small number of Māori academics in New Zealand tertiary institutions are very pressured, as they struggle to meet their obligations towards the Māori community and the demands of their academic institution. This "dual accountability", says Smith, creates contradictions and tensions (in Hotere, 1997, p. 10). One of the Māori lecturers in the Department of Early Childhood Studies adapted Rangimarie Rose Pere's (1991) metaphor of te wheke, the multi-armed octopus, speaking eloquently of her many additional roles (Walker, 1995). These included supporting her own whānau; serving on the Board of Trustees of her local Kura Kaupapa; being part of the management team for the rumaki⁷⁵ stream at a

⁷⁵ Rumaki education is total immersion in te reo Māori.

nearby high school; holding the position of chairperson of a small Māori Private Training Enterprise; facilitating Treaty workshops for Māori; and face-to-face recruiting of potential Māori students; whilst studying to upgrade her qualifications.

7.6 Some Indicators of Bicultural Development within the Department of Early Childhood Studies.

Māori colleagues pointed out a number of indicators of bicultural development within the Department of Early Childhood Studies at the University of Waikato. Fundamental to the capacity to offer a bicultural focus is the commitment to employing Māori lecturers. Since 1992, the total of three Māori lecturers has been sustained, although overall numbers of early childhood lecturers has dropped from 12.5 to eight. Departmental staff have supported the establishment of Te Hunga Māori, the Māori lecturers' sub-group within the Department of Education Studies. Intakes from 1991 until 1995, when Ki Taiao began, offered Māori students the opportunity to join the whānau group, which was a Māori student class grouping. Māori lecturers were assigned to as many of the whānau group's classes as was possible. In 1994, Te Hunga Māori conducted a review of the implementation of the 'biculturalism' integral theme review, by asking lecturers in the Department to explain the ways in which they attempted to maintain the commitment to the integral theme of biculturalism within each of their courses (see section 2.4.5). Following this review, Te Hunga Māori conducted audits of Departmental course outlines, in order to consider the selection, delivery and extent of the inclusion of Māori content within each course.

Māori lecturers' aspirations were also supported by the commitment to Tino Rangatiratanga made in the 1994 Department of Early Childhood Studies Vision Statement (Department of Early Childhood Studies, 1994c). positive efforts by staff including secretaries in areas such as ensuring te reo Māori is used appropriately and correctly within Departmental materials.

The development, in 1994, and instigation of delivery, from 1995-2000, of the Ki Taiao Māori immersion early childhood teacher education programme was another area in which the Department of Early Childhood Studies had demonstrated a commitment to Māori aspirations for tino rangatiratanga and te reo me ōna tikanga and its expression in kaupapa Māori education.

7.7 Graduates' Views of the Teacher Education Programme's Processes

An important 'stakeholder' of a teacher education programme is the student clientele of that programme. One aspect of this study involved considering the views of graduates of the programme regarding the programme's efforts to prepare Pākehā and Tauwi students to implement bicultural development in early childhood centres. These data were gathered through two primary means. The first set of these data came from the 1997 interviews with six teachers who had previously graduated from the programme (see appendices 3.1.2 and 3.1.4), and the second key source was the written survey of recent and prior graduates (see appendix 3.2.4).

For one of the Pākehā graduates interviewed, her bicultural learning had been significant:

To me it was the learning of why we should value biculturalism. That was the biggest thing for me, why we should actually value it and it is part of who I am and who every New Zealander is. That was the thing, it let me grasp hold of it and didn't turn me away. Yeah, I think that was the biggest thing [GP2].

Graduates in the survey were mostly favourable as to the treatment of the integral theme of biculturalism, eight of them mentioning biculturalism as an area in which their thoughts had been challenged during their studies, as in the following examples:

I have had a complete turnaround regarding cultural awareness and in cultural/Māori te reo and tikanga into daily programmes. I always thought it was a bit overdone and couldn't see the point, however now I have a better

understanding and more confidence in integrating and including the skills I now have [RG13].

Bicultural issues – showed the importance that ecce [early childhood care and education] teachers should have an understanding of relative issues as well as a knowledge of tikanga and te reo Māori . . . [PG3].

The course challenged my ideas in many, many ways. One being through biculturalism, Māori society and multiculturalism. I find that in the working situation that there are many people who are so uninformed about the history of New Zealand in particular, and it is great that we were well informed at Teachers College and we can convey information to others, i.e. parents. Not many people understanding that te reo is an official language of New Zealand [PG5].

In response to the question regarding the opportunities to strengthen cultural awareness within the programme, 20 graduates considered the programme had enhanced their cultural awareness. Some examples include:

Think early childhood training prepared me well in this aspect. Cultural issues have become extremely important to me following my early childhood training. I learn from my Māori children – as a Pākehā, they are my role models [PG1].

Cultural issues are a challenge in teaching roles as even today many parents/caregivers are against biculturalism. The things I learnt at Waikato Uni have helped me express to parents/caregivers why this is an important aspect of our curriculum [PG3].

Looking back I feel that biculturalism papers studied while at school of education provided a good foundation/baseline, e.g. Te Tiriti o Waitangi workshop provided basic information . . . I received (and still have) a lot of great readings relating to cultural issues. I am unsure how early childhood courses could have better prepared me, I think it comes back to the level of maturity and receptiveness of individuals [PG13].

Absolutely great – much more aware of the child family as a whole (holistic approach), e.g. respecting child is understanding cultural values and beliefs [PG14].

Learning about the historical, social, political, economic and cultural contexts of other cultures helped me develop strategies in terms of being culturally sensitive and understanding what my role is in providing an environment that is culturally and developmentally appropriate. To

understand the whole context of different cultures has helped me personally and professionally in terms of feeling confident and comfortable with making children and their families feel comfortable and connected. Knowing even simple greetings, familiar customs and rituals is a start . . . The child has the right to learn their culture and language. It is the responsibility of all people caring for children to provide those opportunities and learning experiences [PG11].

Graduates were, however, critical of the extent to which the programme had delivered in terms of preparing them to utilise te reo me ōna tikanga within centres. In the cultural awareness section, fourteen respondents asked for more te reo and tikanga, whilst in the final, open section, six respondents raised this issue, such as in the following examples:

I feel a lot more knowledgeable about cultural differences now. I don't feel the course of CS1 and 2 teaches us enough te reo to enable us to feel confident using te reo in early childhood settings. More te reo would be useful [RG12].

Cultural issues (bicultural) needs so much more emphasis. Students are expected to have a high level of competency in te reo and tikanga, but have little information to go on. Should have more emphasis on social issues that influence children and their families [RG4].

A Māori colleague had recalled that one intake of third year students had petitioned the Department regarding the inadequacy of their preparation to deliver on that commitment. Their petition, which had been signed by most of the class, had requested that there be additional teaching of te reo Māori, added within the third year of the programme where there was none, since they felt that relying on the Cultural Studies courses taught within the first two years was not sufficient:

I remember with [the] 3rd years that went out at the end of 1993, and they were a committed group, but they were lacking in competence in te reo they really were. And were really shy. Because they hadn't had a lot of practice here, and I know that at one stage just simple greetings, as I saw them and they saw me, but to go out into a centre and use te reo they were really nervous too because there weren't others in the centre that were using the language as well. There was a group of them that pushed about that, the practical side and actually using the language [CM1].

A course which included a module of Ataarangi⁷⁶ classes intended to strengthen students' reo was introduced after this petition was received, but was lost when the programme was subsequently restructured. One of the interviewed graduates had raised the issue of inadequate preparation towards delivering practicum competencies for te reo:

I think there was a big expectation when we were on practicum and things like that, to be speaking te reo a lot of the time and we just didn't have it. We had a lot of support people to help us like, I know, I used the lecturers to get phrases that I wanted to have while I was there, but not as an actual part of the course [GP2].

One of the surveyed graduates suggested that “Continuing on to a level 3 course would be useful – how to set up and maintain partnerships with local iwi for example” [RG9]. Another recent graduate considered the teacher education programme had increased their awareness of difference:

All the courses have challenged my existing ideas and I have become a lot more tolerant and open-minded of differences [RG12].

In terms of evaluating the content priorities of the programme, the issues of a lack of ‘Cultural Studies’ in the third year, and general inadequacy of te reo preparation are worthy of further consideration.

7.8 Overview of Bicultural Development within the Teacher Education Programme

Generating commitment and competency were key aspects identified by participants as goals for their work with students in the mainstream early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato. Pedagogical strategies consistent with critical pedagogy which recognise the need for interactive dialogical workshopping-style teaching, where attitudes and emotions are respected, and individual students are mentored through their change processes, are a central feature

⁷⁶ Ataarangi is a Māori language instruction method using immersion

described by colleagues within the teacher education programme. Partnership between Māori and Pākehā lecturers can ensure that Māori content is taught appropriately, positioned alongside Western content within courses, and that Pākehā lecturers take responsibility for assisting Pākehā students to recognise their historicity of racism and positioning as members of the dominant and colonialist culture. Culture, as a central feature of any educational interaction, becomes a matter of respectful critique, whereby students are offered frameworks which enable them to recognise that their world view is only one of many, despite the tendency for Western perspectives to assume the status of 'normal' with the consequent othering of non-Western cultural perspectives.

Graduates considered that although they had gained a deeper understanding of bicultural issues, they still had concerns about the level of competency that had been achieved within the three year programme, suggesting that there could be a stronger focus on te reo me ōna tikanga, particularly within the third year of their studies. This indicates that despite the progress so far, there is a need for ongoing evaluation of ways to further bicultural development within this teacher education context.

Chapter Eight

Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Education Settings

8.0 Introduction to Chapter Eight

Te Whāriki, the New Zealand early childhood curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1996b) has only been a requirement for government funded early childhood centres since 1998. This chapter discusses the realities of implementation of this bicultural curriculum in early childhood centres, identifying some key areas within an early childhood setting which would indicate a commitment to bicultural development. It begins, however, with a discussion on the fact that the curriculum document appears to be read and applied selectively by those with no interest in bicultural matters. My understandings in this area were informed by a number of sources. During the interviews in 1997 (see Appendix Three) I had asked participants to consider, “what would be the ideal scenario that you could have in terms bicultural content?” In 1998 I observed thirteen different early childhood centre sessions, to gather notes on what might be construed as indications of a commitment to bicultural development (see Appendix 3.2.1). Working as a facilitator of professional development in the area of bicultural development with early childhood teachers was also a valuable source of insight.

8.1 Te Whāriki: the Dilemma of a Non-prescriptive Curriculum

Te Whāriki attempts to avoid the pitfall of being overly prescriptive, by providing a framework for each individual setting to apply in their own distinctive manner. This non-prescriptiveness, whilst empowering of well-qualified early childhood teachers, may be more problematic where staff are not well prepared to deliver on its expectations (May, 2001; May & Carr, 1997). The interview data had indicated that many challenges had been created by the new bicultural paradigm required by Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b). Many participants were clear that in some early childhood centres, teachers completely ignore the requirements for Māori

provision threaded throughout the document, as indicated in the following statement from one of the interviewed Pākehā graduates:

You can use Te Whāriki, it is so open, yes, it is really difficult. I have seen people use Te Whāriki really well, but they are not using the bicultural aspect of it. You know absolutely excellent teachers too... [GP1].

Students noted similar observations in written assignments:

During practicum and placements as part of my early childhood training, I have become aware of a number of early childhood educators, who have chosen not to make an effort towards change within the centre in moving from the domination of Pākehā value systems to a bicultural stance that is to the benefit of all children. Change inevitably means that not everyone will agree and some educators may feel unable to cope with this negativity. They may also be unable to really examine their own value systems and put the rights of the child ahead of their own attitudes and beliefs. Even in centres that have Te Whāriki as their curriculum document, I have seen all aspects of Maoridom ignored [SWY3P9].

While the Te Whāriki document could be used with consideration only for the dominant Pākehā culture, its implications and that of the DOPs (Desirable Objectives and Practices) (Ministry of Education, 1996a), place the onus on the staff of centres to look at the cultural backgrounds of all children in their care to see that their needs are being met in relation to these documents. So how do we go about putting into place practices which will reflect the principles of the treaty, and Te Whāriki giving each child's culture the value and respect it deserves? [SWY2P2].

Some participants were disappointed with the lack of progress in terms of bicultural development in early childhood centres. For example, a Māori participant at the co-theorising hui considered that “while we would like to see kindergartens and so forth take on the responsibility of bicultural development within those centres somehow I get the feeling in reality, that's not as good as we hoped it would be” [MPH3]. These statements indicate that the bicultural requirements within the document are viewed as optional or unimportant by some early childhood teachers. The non-prescriptive nature of the document means that it is possible to be selective in the focus adopted, and the Māori content within the document can easily be marginalised.

For many mainstream teachers, even those keen and committed, it can be difficult to understand what is required of the new bicultural mandate in the Te Whāriki document, and how to create it. There are few models to offer insights into what an ‘ideal’ bicultural development process might look like. This poses difficulties for the teacher education programme, in that students are often placed for their block practicum teaching experiences, into early childhood centres where there is little incorporation of te reo me ōna tikanga. Students then find it difficult to implement their practicum requirements which require them to incorporate te reo and tikanga within their planning and teaching interactions, since the staff are unable to support this, and the children are initially unresponsive to this new material.

At the co-theorising hui, the question was raised as to, “How far are we asking our centres to go in this whole area of bicultural development? There are no benchmarks” [MPH3]. There are a range of specific examples given in Te Whāriki, such as the expectation that “Activities, stories, and events that have connections with Māori children’s lives are an essential and enriching part of the curriculum for all children in early childhood settings (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 41) (see section 2.2.2.2). The supporting document for the Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives integrates sections on “bicultural approaches” throughout its elaborations on implementation of the required objectives (Ministry of Education, 1998). Margaret Carr’s “Biculturalism Position Paper” (Carr, 1993), written as part of the development of Te Whāriki, had also sketched out some practical examples of implementation. Yet there were very few early childhood centres in our region demonstrating a strong commitment to bicultural practice. Reflecting on the interview data, I realised that as teacher educators, we needed to be more aware of what implementation of an early childhood centre programme committed to bicultural development might involve. The interplay between theory and practice is a key focus of our teacher education programme. This means that we need to be informed by as well as serving as informers of the early childhood field.

Although “there are no benchmarks” [MPH3] for bicultural development, as teacher educators part of what we do is to inspire our students to develop a vision of what they might strive towards as teachers. It seemed useful to identify what some centres had been attempting in terms of implementing a commitment to bicultural development, bearing in mind the emergent, contextually-responsive nature of the process. Ideas offered as descriptive characterizations can take on a normative force and come to serve as an explicit guide (Olson & Bruner, 1996, p. 23; Simon, 1992, p. 38). As Olson and Bruner (1996) state, "In this way mere descriptions can have a 'looping' effect - the effect of creating what they first merely purported to describe" (Olson & Bruner, 1996, p. 23-4). David Ingleby describes this syndrome simply as: “The theory... creates its own truth” (Ingleby, 1986, p. 312).

A further consideration beyond the risk of creating ‘recipes’, is that of the dominant mainstream redefining and appropriating things Māori (Smith, 1986). This is a dilemma that is difficult to resolve. Cultures, including both the mainstream Pākehā domain, and Māori, are complex and amorphous. They are both constantly changing, shifting, and borrowing from other cultures and part of this process involves re-assignment of meanings. Ensuring Māori self-determination of their cultural domain can be problematic when there are few or no Māori staff or families present in the early childhood centre. Yet, if Māori families perceive that a particular centre offers them something Māori, they are more likely to attend in increasing numbers. Even when Māori are fully involved in the bicultural development process within a mainstream centre, the outcomes are likely to be novel and particular to that local context and not transferable across settings. As Cathie Jordan has written, “If children are to be educated in ways that are compatible with their cultures, then solutions to educational needs and problems need to be developed locally, with and for the different populations and communities that schools are trying to serve” (Jordan, 1995, p. 97). It is important, though, that the role of mainstream teachers in bicultural development should not be characterised as one of being gate-keepers, pre-determining Māori content within the programme, but instead one of acting as ‘key-

holders' (O'Loughlin, 1995a), or facilitators of a process in which whānau Māori ultimately define and control the content and delivery of tikanga and mātauranga Māori.

8.2 Environmental Symbols

The physical environment is a cultural representation, containing powerful symbolic messages of identity (Simon, 1987, p. 371). Joan Metge (1990) has discussed the powerful effects of the implicit messages contained within symbolic statements and usages, as seemingly innocuous as the languages represented in the educational setting (p. 42). And yet these matters are often afforded only a peripheral glance.

It was encouraging that nine of the thirteen centres I observed had some form of bilingual welcome sign. The visual statement that a centre makes to an approaching family is one of the first 'markers' to consider, in that the written signage and other symbols give out strong messages, before there is any face-to-face contact. In her research with Māori families in a mainstream centre, Simone Shivnan quoted a grandparent for whom the maihi⁷⁷-shaped entrance gate had been a powerful symbol of tikanga Māori, engendering for her and her whānau a sense of belonging:

"It sort of reminded me of a marae gate...without even the karanga⁷⁸. I always found, with my own children, when you actually stand at the gate of a marae, you can feel excitement, or you can feel...you know there's a lot of things you might feel, grief and things like that. I have found the gate here was a very welcoming one, and before I even got to the door, before I met any staff at all, or knew the programme, there was a real enticement. And it does...I had my granddaughter here the next day to actually enroll" (In Shivnan, 1999, p. 88).

This is in stark contrast to the dramatic portrayal made by Donna Awatere in her 1984 treatise, "Māori Sovereignty", that there was a sign, visible only to Māori, above each kindergarten, playcentre, school or university which read, "Māori Keep

⁷⁷ Maihi are the carved facing boards on the gable of a Māori whare (house).

⁷⁸ Karanga is a call, in this case summoning entry to the marae.

Out: For White Use Only” (Awatere, 1984, p. 21). She went on to write that because non-Māori cannot see the sign, for them it does not exist, and they therefore see no need to take it down.

Beyond a welcoming gateway, other markers of a commitment to bicultural development could include signage welcoming people in te reo as well as English, whakairo⁷⁹ or other Māori symbolism, or even as observed in one centre, a cheerful message on a white board outside on the pathway up to the centre welcoming people with a “Kia ora parents/whānau”, and inviting them to fish and chips for lunch on Friday. Once inside the centre, the theme of making Māori feel welcome can be enhanced by similar visual messages, such as the displays of Māori-themed children’s art observed in many centres.

Eleven of the centres had Māori posters and material prominently displayed. Two of the centres had a large wall display on the topic of Te Whāriki, which featured kōwhaiwhai borders, and other Māori symbolism. One centre had many Māori phrases on the walls, such as greetings and farewells in Māori adjacent to the main doorway. This centre also had a series of poster supplied by the Department of Health featuring pictures of Māori mothers and infants, with wording in Māori inviting readers to consider immunization for their children. Brenda Soutar has written of mainstream early childhood settings that “As a Māori, I feel great entering an environment that presents Māori in a positive light” (Soutar, 1988, p. 14). She is critical of some of the instances she has observed, considering that when posters urging Māori to stop smoking or eradicate headlice are the only images of Māori presented, this can create a negative impression. She urges centres to present Māori images as positive role models for all children. I also noticed that in two centres, Māori alphabet friezes and song charts were positioned too high to be accessible to

⁷⁹ Whakairo is carved ornamentation.

children, which could also impart messages reinforcing the marginalised social positioning of Māori.

One centre had assigned an annexed area to be what they termed their “Papatuanuku Ruma”⁸⁰, a grammatically incorrect title, since in Māori adjectives follow nouns. Soutar (1988) has criticised this association of te ao Māori with a nature area or natural resources, since she believes that “Children should also experience an environment where Māori is not just nature and kōwhaiwhai panels” (p. 14). This portrayal confines children to a view of te ao Māori that is very limited, unless Māori material is integrated throughout the curriculum.

A comfortable whānau-friendly environment might include a comfortable sitting area with couches and tea-making facilities in order to contribute to families feeling ‘at home’, described by a participant in Shivnan’s research as a “whānau feeling” (Shivnan, 1999, p. 88). One centre had called a meeting of Māori parents, at which they had asked for suggestions and support in developing Māori aspects within their programme. One of the outcomes was a proposal for children to be involved in creating a Māori welcoming display for outside their building. Any plan to develop Māori symbols within the centre environment needs to be driven and monitored by the relevant Māori community who can become involved in an ongoing collaboration to transform the centre’s environment as part of the centre’s bicultural development process (Darder, 1991, p. 124). Nonetheless, it is up to the teachers to initiate such a process (Delpit, 1988).

8.3 Kanohi ki te Kanohi: Teachers Initiating Welcoming

More important than signs and symbols is the availability and demeanour of staff. As Delpit has pointed out, it is teachers who, from their powerful positions, must take the

⁸⁰ The correct phrase should be “Te Rūma Papatuanuku” – The Papatuanuku Room. Papatuanuku is the Earth Mother.

initiative in emanating the receptivity that will build relationships with families who are not of the dominant culture (Delpit, 1988, p. 297). At the co-theorising hui, it was pointed out [MPH2] that some teachers do not consider 'making cups of tea' for parents to be part of their professional role. Indeed, ratios of only three teachers to 45 three-four year old children in kindergartens make supervision a serious consideration, before one starts to consider the possibility of offering cups of tea! For many early childhood teachers their focus on the children's educational and supervision needs preclude them allocating time to chat with parents/whānau. Yet it is this very availability and personal contact that will contribute to Māori families' sense of being welcomed and eventually belonging to that centre.

A group of kindergarten teachers, with whom I facilitated a series of professional development workshops in 2000, included greeting families in te reo and building trusting relationships with whānau and tamariki as some of the 'markers' of bicultural development in the 'interpersonal' category. It is the teachers, who are the qualified, paid professionals, who are responsible for initiating both the relationships with whānau, and the bicultural development process.

Perhaps what is needed here is a conceptual shift whereby teachers come to consider building relationships with families to be a central pedagogical responsibility. Previously, child-centred teaching approaches have challenged the early childhood profession to reconceptualise our role as teachers to be one of joint responsibility with children for negotiation of meanings and planning of activities (Greenberg, 1992a, 1992b). The proposed change is a further democratisation of our role, one which involves the reciprocal participation of teachers in the community and lives of the families with whom they work is in line with democratic and Freirean ideals (Darder, 1991, p. 65, 71).

8.4 Maximising Available Resources

Many early childhood centres have sets of poi and tititorea⁸¹ near the music or mat areas. During my observations in centres, in three centres they were used in structured mat-times, where the teachers were facilitating this use. However, I did not observe them being used as a self-chosen activity initiated by the children themselves. This scenario could indicate that it requires the teachers to make the effort to introduce unfamiliar materials to children.

Many of the Māori jigsaw puzzles that I observed during my observations displayed depicted traditional ‘artifacts’ such as a waka or taiaha⁸². In one centre there were no puzzles with any Māori images, although one featured a range of different colours labeled in Māori. During one of my visits, the relieving kindergarten head teacher spoke of her concern about the lack of Māori resources in the centre, which was not financially able to re-equip. She commented that she has identified a pattern of poor Māori resources in many of the kindergartens she relieves in and during her time in each she seeks to rectify this situation, which sometimes involves persuading the parent committees of the need to prioritise Māori materials. Her experiences were similar to the poignant note struck by one of the Pākehā graduates, working in an under-resourced centre, who said that even though her kindergarten

...hasn't had much to spend because we are a poorer kindergarten, but people are still coming and saying "Oh, you know you run a wonderful bicultural programme" and I have sort of had a waka and a wahine⁸³, half a dozen measly little puzzles and there is a lot of kindergartens with you know wonderful looking Māori representation but I still think we are using it better because we're talking and we can use lots of Pākehā stuff and it's being used biculturally because we're just talking about things [GP1].

The centre observations indicated that the potential for maximising the usage of Māori materials is currently under-realised. Seven of the thirteen centres did not

⁸¹ Poi are a light ball with string attached, swung rhythmically to accompany song. Tititorea are short sticks also used rhythmically with song.

⁸² A waka is a canoe, and a taiaha is a long bladed weapon.

⁸³ A wahine is a woman.

display a favourable proportion of Māori books for the children during my visit. For example, a very well equipped centre had approximately 250 books available to children, of which only eight were in te reo.

There is an increasing range of wonderful books, audio-tapes, CDs, posters, photograph sets, jigsaw puzzles, and so on, available which utilise te reo me ōna tikanga. The “He Purapura”, “Ngā Tamariki Iti, and “Waiata Kōhungahunga” series from Learning Media are examples of quality, readily available resources. Many of these resources are delivered at no cost by Learning Media to early childhood centres. Utilising these resources is clearly a key tool for early childhood teachers. The issue is clearly not one of availability, but instead lies in the area of commitment and/or confidence.

8.5 Te Reo: Issues of Quality and Extent of Usage

During my observations in centres, teachers used commands and waiata as their main vehicles for te reo. The other common use of Māori was of a Māori word inserted into an English sentence, for example, “Do you want some fruit? Some panana or some āporo?” This usage was viewed positively by a Māori professional development facilitator:

She'll say “Oh, go get your pōtae⁸⁴, where are your kamupūtu⁸⁵”? They integrate that like throughout their te reo. And that's choice! [PDFM1].

However, there is a tension here between acknowledging the efforts being made, and seeing them as insufficient or possibly unhelpful. Integrating single Māori words into English sentences can be seen as a token effort to use some Māori language. Using Māori words for colours and numbers, although having a certain generic transportability throughout the programme, is nevertheless a use of the language that in avoiding any reference to tikanga Māori does not require any particular knowledge

⁸⁴ A pōtae is a hat.

⁸⁵ Kamupūtu are gumboots.

of mātauranga Māori. It could also be seen as inadvertently perpetuating the dominance of English/Pākehā over Māori.

Waiata were sung by teachers with children in eight of the thirteen centres during my observations. Six of the centres displayed the Ministry of Education issued series of waiata posters, “Waiata Kōhungahunga” on their walls. In conversation with a teacher who was a graduate of the University of Waikato programme during one observation, she commented that confidence was still a barrier for her in terms of her use of te reo, but that waiata were an easier way for her to incorporate te reo, since the format and repetition facilitate the correct use of grammar and pronunciation.

A Māori graduate stressed the importance of correct pronunciation and usage, considering that, “if people are going to learn Māori they need to learn it properly” and finding it “offensive if people are using it inappropriately or incorrectly” [GM1]. She spoke of her efforts to encourage Pākehā colleagues to establish relationship with Māori which would enable them to check their usages in order to improve authenticity:

..to me it's offensive if it's not right and it's hard, you know you don't want to stop them, but you want to say “It's said like this”. We had quite a discussion because people said “Well how are we supposed to learn if we can't try?”, and I said “Well you need to find somebody, and I know that it's hard” because I know it's hard here to find somebody to support you in it. Whether it's a family that attends your centre or somebody that you know or a local marae [GM1].

A third year student provided a thoughtful critique of the misuse of te reo in centres:

The issues raised are problematic because early childhood centres are only one domain in which Te Reo is spoken. Undoubtedly some children will only experience it here. If then the language is ignored, used ‘wrongly’ and without respect and/or as mere token gesture, so it will remain that way in the eyes of those children who do not learn otherwise. For non-Māori children this means the negative value systems of the dominant culture are reinforced, and for Māori children their culture is not respected, and is undervalued. They are then disempowered [SWY3P9].

A graduate in the survey, was aware of the value of te reo in affirming Māori children's cultural identity, writing that "Te reo Māori can be used in the centre to help children feel welcome, that there is a place for them" [PG15].

Non-Māori teachers are wary of causing offence, which can be an inhibiting factor. Checking phrases and pronunciation with a Māori speaker is necessary. Utilising audio-tapes of songs and stories is another way to address this issue. As Māori families become more involved in the centre, those adults who are speakers of te reo may well begin to support the use of te reo in the centre. This is likely to deliver a more authentic model of "communicative competence" (Philips, 1993, p. 3). A third year student, writing in an assignment in the course The Professional Educator, 1058.310, had a positive approach to addressing barriers to including te reo:

Even though we have all of these policies to make us use te reo Māori, if you cannot speak the language then you have problems. One solution to that problem is to go to night classes and learn the language. Get the whānau of the children involved in the centre they are valuable resources. Go out into the community; consult local iwi, the local marae, Māori friends or other adults and children (Bradley 1996 p19). They will be of great help in teaching you the language and culture. In centres use music to teach the language (Bradley 1996 p18). Use echo songs of Māori and English. Also use stories, dance, poi etc. (Bradley 1996 p18). Start off with basics of little phrases and greetings to implement the language and after a while you will be able to move onto bigger sentences. One thing to remember is that it takes time but I believe that it can be done [SWY3P7].

This student indicates a readiness to utilise practical strategies, which involve whānau Māori exercising leadership in this domain, in order to meet the expectations for te reo required by Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b) and the Ministry of Education's Desirable Objectives and Practices for early childhood centres (Ministry of Education, 1996a).

8.6 Integrating Tikanga: the Whānau Can Weave Their Own

There were few examples of tikanga Māori being integrated into centre routines observed during my visits. During my time in the centres, only one of the thirteen had a karakia before kai⁸⁶. This centre also had a notice on the wall, which stated "Remember our tables and benches are for kai only".⁸⁷ Tikanga was being made available to children through the use of stories, such as the Maui⁸⁸ legends. The story of Maui catching the sun was being read to children by a graduate of the University of Waikato programme during one of the observations, and three other centres had the picture books available.

The interviewed Pākehā graduates, however, described how their programmes inclusively incorporated te reo and tikanga in ways that had clearly moved beyond tokenism, instead demonstrating an underlying philosophical commitment:

I still incorporate and encourage a lot of multiculturalism in the programme, but you can use tokenism and get away with it, you can't with Māori. . . . And if I have got say a Samoan child I will try a bit harder, but I have all sorts of different things around and it is respecting the human race sort of thing. . . . You just sort of have little bits, whereas bicultural is not little bits, it's the whole thing [GP1].

What actually happens is that we are strong enough to be committed to our biculturalism but also be flexible enough to allow other things to come in . . . [later] For me I look at te reo Māori, tikanga Māori as an inclusive programme. It should be just part of everything that you do. It just comes naturally [GP3].

When describing a centre that she considered to be effectively implementing a bicultural development process, a Māori professional development facilitator stated that te reo and tikanga "are not made as big things in the centre, they just fit there and

⁸⁶ Kai is food

⁸⁷ It is inappropriate to use cooking utensils for other than food purposes, due to tikanga pertaining to tapu and noa (Metge, 1976, p. 58-61).

⁸⁸ Maui was a mythical demi-god or intermediary ancestor, who accomplished many legendary feats, including acquiring knowledge from his supra-normal ancestors (Walker, 1996, p. 19-20).

they flow. That's when I think we are bicultural, when they are a natural part of the programme. They are not a big deal" [PDFM2].

It appears that when teachers make a commitment to bicultural development, the most effective strategy is to identify things that can be done well, and build from these beginnings. A Māori professional development facilitator described how she worked with teachers to encourage them to begin to weave their own whāriki, or bicultural early childhood programme, beginning by a workshop familiarising them with the Māori expectations within the Te Whāriki document (Ministry of Education, 1996b):

So it's actually siting themselves in terms of Te Whāriki-making, and that it's part of their own process to weave. Once they start weaving with Te Whāriki themselves then they start to own those threads too [PDFM1].

Māori whānau may then respond to this validation and begin to feel a sense of belonging, leading them to contribute to strengthening the bicultural development process within the centre, as in the case described by one of the Pākehā graduates where a Māori grandmother had been helping them to locate local stories and other relevant resources. Ultimately whānau Māori can contribute to programme planning, implementation and evaluation. A Māori professional development provider described this collaboration as a process where "the whānau can weave their own" whāriki, or programme.

8.7 Policy Commitment, Management Leadership and Support

Māori participants at the co-theorising hui were committed to kaupapa Māori models of educational provision, yet still recognised that bicultural development was necessary in mainstream early childhood settings, despite the problems of lack of staff commitment and knowledge. They saw that bicultural development was dependent on the support of management:

It's possible. It depends who is actually driving the waka at the top [MPH5].

One of the Pākehā graduates stated that “Part of our kaupapa of our kindergarten is actually to have te reo Māori . . . and if they don’t like it, well... well it is in our management policies, and our management plans”. This indicates the value of a policy level commitment to bicultural development which can be used as a useful rationale with non-Māori parents who may be unclear or unhappy about what they see happening in the centre. In the survey responses, a previous graduate seemed to be having difficulty getting management to recognise the necessity for a commitment to bicultural development, writing that “I find the main issue now is helping management committees to understand DOPs [Desirable Objectives and Practices (Ministry of Education, 1996a) in regards to the implementation of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in the centre – programme/policies” [PG10]. Unsupportive management was identified by professional development facilitators as one of the impediments to progress in bicultural development. Co-theorising participants also highlighted the need for consistent leadership and support at management level. The process of bicultural development is ongoing and needs to be sustained beyond staff changes, both in the centres and in management positions.

8.8 ‘It’s Becoming Part of Their Knowing’: From Teachers to Children to Parents

One of the Māori professional development facilitators described how non-Māori children were demonstrating an interest in furthering their own Māori knowledge:

And a really neat thing was the way kids up and ask for te reo Māori, they’ll say “What’s the Māori name for that bird, cause we were in the bush”, and I think that’s choice. It’s non-Māori asking kaiako⁸⁹ for, “Can you find out what that word is in Māori”. Powerful depth, it’s like saying we want to know, it’s valuable [PDFM1].

⁸⁹ Kaiako are teachers.

At the co-theorising hui, a different participant shared her recent experience of children role-playing a Maui story in the playground, which she described as evidence that it was “becoming part of their knowing” [MPH3].

Non-Māori parents were described by one Pākehā graduate as supporting their children’s interests in things Māori:

And the response we get from parents is that, yeah, kōrero Māori at home, you know, and that’s great too, because the parents will, if they are keen parents, will pick up on that and start working with that as well [GP3].

One of the professional development facilitators related her experience of a sort of ‘chain reaction’ in one centre. It had begun at a workshop where staff had written a book in te reo, which they then used with the children. It became very popular with the children, who then shared that passion with their parents:

All the kids in that whānau love that kōrero, they loved it so much that they made another pukapuka on a similar theme. The kids would predict the pages, say the te reo, and one of the choice things was that the kids wouldn’t just go and pick it because you thought they should, they would actually go and get that book when their parents brought them in and take it to their parents, and share the pukapuka with their parents from themselves. So to me that’s like magic. Because that’s kids validating kaupapa Māori because those practitioners they set that ball rolling, so they are very important as change agents. So you had the teachers, the kids, the families, all awihiing the kaupapa. I thought it was just so powerful, awesome [PDFM1].

This anecdote reinforces the responsibility of early childhood teachers as change agents in initiating a process of bicultural development. This same participant considers it part of her facilitation of process to enable early childhood teachers she is working with “to recognise change process, and themselves as change agents” and link this to outcomes for children [PDFM1].

8.9 Overview of Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Centres

Te Whāriki, the New Zealand early childhood curriculum (Ministry of Education, 1996b) has only been a requirement since 1998, and many centres are still unconcerned with the expectation that they address its bicultural aspects. However there are a number of early childhood centres that have made considerable progress in their efforts to do justice to this bicultural curriculum. Features of this bicultural development included: teachers taking the initiative to create an environment that was culturally friendly for whānau Māori; making the time to invite whānau into the centre and build relationships with them; not only obtaining but making extensive and comprehensive use of the wide range of Māori resources such as books and waiata, integrating these throughout the programme; and ensuring that the centre had a clear commitment to bicultural development which was shared with attending families.

Chapter Nine: Teacher Education and Bicultural Development

9.0 Introduction to Chapter Nine

This chapter explores aspects identified in this study which support the process of preparing early childhood teacher education graduates to effectively implement bicultural development in early childhood centres. New Zealand Government-mandated documents require early childhood teachers to “reflect the unique place of Māori as tangata whenua and the principle of partnership inherent in Te Tiriti o Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 1996a). As teacher education providers, it is necessary to reflect upon how we might best equip our students for the challenges that lie ahead. This ongoing reflection is consistent with critical pedagogy in that it employs reflexive dialogue with the focus of praxis.

9.1 Commitment, Confidence, and Competence

Three of the Pākehā colleagues pointed out that a commitment to bicultural development was present in both personal and professional facets of their lives, for example:

Also part of my commitment to bicultural development within my teaching and for myself, is to do what I can for my own professional development [CP1].

One of the Pākehā lecturers considered that a commitment to bicultural development applied to both the professional and personal domains:

I think we're trying to develop a professional commitment if not a personal commitment. [A personal commitment] is probably important too [CP2].

Generating an understanding of and commitment to a Tiriti-based bicultural development process is a primary focus, which can only be grounded in a knowledge of te Tiriti o Waitangi, tino rangatiratanga, and the history of colonisation and respect for the tenacity and ongoing viability of Māori ways of being and knowing. This is

all the more necessary, given that the majority of students come to us with only a very hazy understanding of these matters:

At the beginning of my university education I had little knowledge of Māori culture and language. . . [RG2].

. . . I think I was quite unaware before commencing School of Education courses. . . [PG12].

According to Irihapeti Ramsden, “People who teach those who have been colonised should have a profound understanding of the outcomes of such experience because it is a very different from the experience of the children of the colonisers” (Ramsden, 1994a, p. 23).

A major aim of the two Cultural Studies courses is to enable students to articulate an understanding of the rationale for bicultural development; this is demonstrated in the following example from a student assignment:

Acknowledging cultural diversity in a positive manner provides children with an understanding of who they are and allows children to accept and affirm differences (Clark, 1995). Throughout New Zealand's history Māori have been denied their right to cultural diversity. Colonisation brought with it the need for a Treaty, but the good intentions of this treaty were not upheld thus creating a grave injustice against the Māori people (Walker, 1987). As educators we have a responsibility to rectify these injustices and provide the children of today the understanding and ability to create a society which addresses the needs and accepts the view and beliefs of Māori (Ritchie, 1992) [SWY2P10].

Students’ depth of commitment and understanding can be enhanced through familiarity with relevant research. A practical example of this is an exercise used in Cultural Studies Two, 1058.213, where, working in small groups, students develop a list of arguments in support of the use of te reo in centres, based on the course readings for that topic. Accessing these knowledge bases corresponds with what Skutnabb-Kangas has termed the knowledge or cognitive component of “bicultural competence” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1991, p. 312).

Along with this theoretical understanding and commitment is the need for practical knowledge and skills that will engender in students a confidence in their ability to deliver the professional responsibilities this commitment entails. Key knowledge bases are mātauranga Māori, taught by Māori staff in tandem with the Western content within the teacher education programme, and a working knowledge of te reo Māori. As a third year student wrote:

In educating oneself the focus should be on the cultural values and beliefs of Māori and why these are important to young Māori development. Early childhood educators should also extend their knowledge, learning to reo and if possible learn to make resources that reflect Māori culture, in order to provide a rich cultural environment for the children to which they serve (Kia Hiwa Ra, 1995). To have a true bicultural curriculum educators need to focus on the Māori view and build the curriculum around this, instead of having a curriculum, and then adding on a Māori view (Durie, 1995) [SWY3P3].

A Māori colleague considered that te reo me ōna tikanga were “important tools when working at a certain level such as with tamariki and parents”, and that “How and what is to be shared should be determined by Māori and to what extent” [CM2]. Michael King feels that knowledge of te reo Māori is essential if one is to have credibility working with Māori people (King, 1999, p. 117). He considers that demonstrating facility in te reo indicates “sincerity of interest”, whilst ignorance of te reo is perceived as “a lack of caring” (King, 1999, p. 117). Students are required to use te reo and tikanga Māori during practicum, and although initially they may find it difficult, they generally report that they are rewarded with positive responses as was demonstrated in the student’s reflection from a year three practicum (see section 7.2.2), where by the sixth week she reported that it was “really neat and rewarding for us as staff to see the break through with the children” [SWY3P8].

A difficulty frequently and repeatedly identified by students on their teaching practicum is the lack of te reo and tikanga evident in the early childhood centres in which they have been placed. As students temporarily visiting that setting, they are awkwardly positioned since to meet their academic requirements for that practicum experience, they need to take the lead in terms of the incorporation of te reo and

tikanga within the teaching programme. In this situation, it is difficult for this implementation to move beyond a tokenistic and mechanistic level. This level of presentation of te reo me ōna tikanga, whether by teaching staff or students, is problematic in terms of issues of authenticity, holism, and often accuracy.

Irihapeti Ramsden considers that “Colonisation is continued by the selective co-option of Māori ideas and rituals which become redefined, stereotyped and rigidified” (Ramsden, 1994a, p. 21). Patricia Clark has made a distinction between employing superficial cultural icons, such as songs or dress-ups clothing within the early childhood programme, and moving much further to include deeper signifiers such as culturally-specific patterns of interaction and emotion, philosophical conceptions, and childrearing practices (Clark, 1995, p. 155-156). The specific cultural values and patterns of interacting can only be ascertained through developing relationships with the families/whānau of children in the centre. This requires students to develop a respectful responsive orientation that will enable them to foster these relationships through which the sharing of such special knowledges becomes possible. This capacity is similar to Skutnabb-Kangas’, “behavioural component” of bicultural competence, which relates to “the capacity to act in culturally appropriate ways with members of a given cultural group” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1991, p. 312).

9.2 “Te Whāriki Makes the Māori Things You Do Real”

A further central knowledge base for the early childhood teacher education programme is the depth and extent of expectations for the delivery of Māori content contained within Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b). A Māori colleague saw important validation of Māori knowledge in the Te Whāriki document:

The other thing for Pākehā students is Te Whāriki makes what you do, or the Māori things you do, real. Whatever you're doing in class and when you do link it to Te Whāriki, "Oh okay it's real then" [CM4].

The imperative within Te Whāriki to implement mātauranga Māori, was seen as an essential knowledge base for her bicultural development facilitation process by one of the professional development facilitators:

For me the crunch stuff, in terms of utilising Te Whāriki as a support, total support system for themselves, is to weave through Te Whāriki and to identify the whole document tautokos⁹⁰ Māori curriculum. To actually look at those specific comments that highlight marautanga⁹¹ Māori. "All our children shall have access to the heritage of both partners of Te Tiriti o Waitangi". To go right through the document and pull out every principle, you know kaupapa whakahaere⁹²...[PDFM1].

The implication here is that the role of the teacher education programme in terms of bicultural development is multifaceted. There are at least three core components: firstly, to establish a commitment to bicultural development as a professional responsibility; then to familiarise students not only with the knowledge of the requirements pertaining to integrating Māori perspectives into their early childhood programmes, for which Te Whāriki serves as a guide; and lastly, to provide them with sufficient support and opportunities to develop the confidence and competence to do this well.

9.3 Initiates as Initiators

As a result of the recent bicultural requirements, a paradoxical situation exists in that early childhood teachers who have recently graduated into the profession, are often required to demonstrate leadership in the area of bicultural development, in many instances, instigating bicultural approaches where none have previously existed. The reality for graduates from our degree programme, is that they will be entering a sector where qualifications are not required of staff. Ministry of Education policy, however, means that early childhood centres have a funding incentive aimed at improving the quality of early childhood education, to employ staff with higher qualifications such

⁹⁰ To tautoko is to support.

⁹¹ Marautanga is curriculum.

⁹² Kaupapa whakahaere is used here to refer to the principles of Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 14).

as a university degree in early childhood education. This means that university graduates in early childhood education are often better qualified than most, if not all, of their colleagues. Inevitably, they will be looked towards for leadership, based on their recent qualification, particularly in this area of bicultural development, as a Māori professional development facilitator explained:

Because our training is set up in such a way that you are up with the latest developments, the latest thinking and concepts, ideas, leadership has got to be part of that because they are going out into a field where. . . you know the majority of cases, the other people working with children haven't even been through a three year programme. And so it is more and more because those with the diploma of teaching are being put into those leadership requirements for licensing quality etc. So it is a really important part. The bicultural is probably being one of the areas where I feel leadership, they have needed all those skills and support [PDFM2].

The issue of leadership arose in the interviews with two of the three Pākehā graduates, and in one of the three Māori graduates. This Pākehā graduate was already being seen as a role model in her implementation of bicultural approaches:

GP1: ... well we will be talking about rainbows and uenuku sort of thing, but I have to make that effort, and say "Okay uenuku – he uenuku tērā". And get everyone saying it so

JR: So you are very much playing a leadership role?

GP1: Yeah, I have a lot of teachers come and see me at [her kindergarten], to implement biculturalism, and every time that happens, you know to have a good bicultural programme, every time that happens I'm just horrified. I think "Oh I've got so far to go!"

This Māori graduate working in a mainstream early childhood centre was integrating te reo throughout her teaching:

GM1: I guess it's just plugging along and because I often just fall back, I just flick into Maori and I can't help myself and the kids sort of look at me and "Oh, okay, [her name] is starting again" sort of thing. But it's been really interesting watching our children because they will use...

JR: They are more receptive than perhaps. So your kind of approach is leading by example in some ways.

GM1: Yeah I guess so. Also I think I have an expectation that people will learn and will use Māori.

Effective leadership in this area requires communication and advocacy skills that will enable these new teachers to facilitate a shared commitment and understanding with colleagues, management, non-Māori families, and whānau Māori within their centres:

Probably at the moment one of the biggest areas that you need really really good communication skills to get your thoughts, but to bring other people on board is where you're at on the continuum, so that within that communication concept could be a real focus so that they have more of that practical. They have got wonderful ideas and knowledge about being bicultural, but to actually work that with bringing others on board [PDFM2].

This seems to be compatible with the role envisaged for teachers by Giroux and McLaren, of being “self-determining agents of political and pedagogical change”, which involves building alliances with parents (Giroux & McLaren, 1992, p. 11).

9.4 A Reflexive and Respectful Orientation

Most students coming from the New Zealand secondary education system have been trained in an authoritarian transmissive or banking model of education (Freire, 1972; O’Loughlin, 1994a). They have been required to absorb and then regurgitate chunks of knowledge in order to pass exams and standards. They often come to the teacher education programme seeking recipes that will enable them to pass the courses and then apply them in their future teaching.

A key task of the early childhood education programme is to enable students to move from simplistic perspectives to embrace a critical paradigm which recognises the complexities, tensions, and multiple alternatives within the realities of teaching (O’Loughlin, 1994a). From this reflexive orientation students will be able to apply skills of critical analysis to their increasing awareness of their own cultural identity, their understandings of other worldviews, and to their future roles and responsibilities as teachers. This was demonstrated in the quotation from a second year student (see section 7.4.1) who wrote that, “Firstly we must look to ourselves to see where our own beliefs, values and prejudices lie. . . Staff need to be encouraged to be honest

with themselves and to understand their own culture, how they think and how they perceive others” [SWY2P2].

Skutnabb-Kangas considers this “metacultural awareness”, which includes metalinguistic awareness, to be a key component of “bicultural competence”.

Metacultural awareness, he believes:

relates to an understanding of the distinctiveness and relativity of one’s own (and other) *cultures* and languages, consciously being able to reflect over one’s own and other cultures, at times distancing oneself from them and looking at them as objects (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1991, p. 312).

This is also similar to the concept of “multiple/multi-ethnic perspective taking” advocated by Eunsook Hyun which involves “recognition that the existence of multiple realities inevitably leads to divergence in human endeavour”, and that “individual family ethnicity [is] the source of cultural perspectives” (Hyun, 1998, p. 48).

This reflexivity, an ability to reflectively refer back to one’s prior knowledge and understandings (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1997, p. 237), will enable graduates to inform their teaching practice with their deepening knowledge of their history and of mātauranga and tikanga Māori. This in turn may engender a respectful stance towards things Māori, and an appreciation of the different ways of knowing and habits of being embodied in Māori children and their whānau. This process may correspond to what Skutnabb-Kangas has described as the affective/empathetic/identificational component of “bicultural competence”, which “relates to deep, positive feelings about and attitudes towards a culture, an understanding of it from the inside, and an identification with it or parts of it, including acceptance of (most of) its norms and values” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1991, p. 312).

This respect for Māori and other world views may be enhanced by increasing awareness of historical and contemporary manifestations of racism and socio-economic effects within society (Culpitt, 1994), and education in particular (Rashid, 1981; Simon, 1996). Concomitant is commitment to and knowledge of strategies for countering racism and other forms of prejudice (also an expectation of Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 18). As a year three student wrote in her assignment:

The early childhood education sector is very proud of the progress made toward valuing biculturalism and embracing multiculturalism within our early childhood education curriculum, Te Whāriki, (Ministry of Education 1996). This has begun the advocacy struggle to re-educate Aotearoa New Zealand about the rights of its indigenous people, the Māori, the roles of the intrinsic second culture, the Pākehā and the inclusion of the valued immigrant society. However it is vital that early childhood professional vindicate these values through implementing culturally appropriate programmes, attending professional development courses, seminars and workshops on cultural diversity and sharing this information with other professionals as well as reflecting these values in policy and practice. By becoming intolerant of any form of racism, prejudice or discrimination professionals actively advocate for diversity and acceptance. Educators need to respond to any such incidents to ensure that children develop positive attitudes towards difference [SWY3P1].

9.5 A Whanaungatanga Approach

Some exciting models were described by participants whereby Pākehā early childhood teachers were involving Māori families significantly within the programme. One of the Pākehā graduates explained how they had been developing their centre programme following a professional development course focusing on bicultural development that had focused on the expectations for Māori content within Te Whāriki:

GP2: I think looking at their families as individuals. And looking at who they are now and where they have come from and the people that are relevant to them. . . Our big focus is trying to find information about people in the area from the past and important figures in Māori history.

JR: You are talking about very local, specific to your hapū?

GP2: Yes, very local, and we have approached one of our grandparents, and she is sort of our kuia, we don't want to impinge on her too much because she

is a very busy lady. . . And yeah, she is sort of helping us . . . to find out about relevant people, relevant events which we can incorporate into stories, books, pictures, whatever we want to do so that it is part of our programme.

According to Wally Penetito (1998), “Reclaiming whānau/hapū/iwi histories must be an important element in the knowledge-to-identity equation and one everybody can get involved in” (Penetito, 1998, p. 105).

A Māori graduate explained how important the “whānau concept” had been in her search for appropriate early childhood education for her children. For her, the whānau concept meant her children were getting the same messages at their early childhood centre, as from their home whānau. In other words, the values and experiences were consistent between home and centre:

. . . they’re getting the same messages. That’s how I perceive whānau concept being of benefit to not only my children but to me as well [GM2].

It was not until the co-theorising hui that the term “a whanaungatanga approach” emerged for this process, where ultimately, the centre whānau of staff, children, and families “can weave their own” [PDFM1] bicultural kaupapa for their centre. A participant at the hui coined the term, a “whanaungatanga approach” when describing the differences she had observed between the professional styles of Māori and Pākehā colleagues:

Non-Māori may take the stance of “Okay, I’ve got this checklist of things to do – A,B,C, and keep within the timeframe”, while Māori may go off and work within a collaborative whanaungatanga approach... where they achieve the same outcome, but come through different processes of getting there [MPH6].

This whanaungatanga approach seems to be a key strategy of bicultural development in centres, and one which satisfies the tino rangatiratanga requirement for Māori control over mātauranga Māori, and Tiriti-based notion of ‘partnership’. It also reflects the Te Whāriki ‘principle’ of Whānau Tangata/Family and Community and ‘strand’ of Mana Whenua/Belonging (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 14-15). The “Family and Community” principle is that “The wider world of the family and

community is part of the early childhood curriculum” (p. 14). Mana Whenua/Belonging requires that “Children and their families feel a sense of belonging” where children and their families experience an environment where connecting links with the family and the wider world are affirmed and extended and they know they have a place (p. 15). As Māori parents and whānau become more comfortable within the centre, they can be encouraged to become more and more involved. Eventually they can collaborate with the programme planning, implementation, and evaluation. In doing so, they are defining what is culturally appropriate for their children (Ministry of Education, 1996a), and contributing to the knowledge construction process for their centre (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1999, p. 136). They are moving from the margins to the centre (hooks, 1984) of their children’s early childhood centre experiences, and providing cultural and linguistic congruence to support their children’s learning (Bartolome, 1994; Hyun, 1998). More important perhaps than this is the shifting of cultural power dynamics that are modeled for all participants in that centre, children, families, Māori and non-Māori.

A whanaungatanga approach requires early childhood staff to develop warm relationships and utilise democratic processes with each other, with children and with families/whānau. This has resonance with the “relational ethics” described by Nel Noddings (1994) which focus on establishing and sustaining a caring relationship, by focused deliberation on the encounters between human beings involved in the particular setting and employing practices such as dialogue and confirmation (p. 173-4). This collaboration with whānau Māori will enable staff to “build bridges between cultures”, as a year two student wrote:

As teachers it is up to us to make bridges between the cultures of our centre. We need to address fears and concerns with openness and respect for all. We must acknowledge differences and value them. It is not for us to integrate all the cultures of the centre into one but to hold the philosophy of Te Whāriki that "the early childhood curriculum supports the cultural identity of all children, affirms and celebrates cultural differences, and aims to help children gain a positive awareness of their own and other cultures", (Ministry of Education, 1996, p18). Through consultation with parents and the wider community we must make sure that we are representing their culture in a way

that they are proud of and is not a token gesture. Hopefully we can empower all the children in our care to be positive about themselves, to reach their full potential and to respect the right of others to do the same [SWY2P2].

This requires qualities of empathy, respect, and a willingness to relinquish power to adults outside of the teaching team. As Ted Glynn stated, "showing respect toward another person's culture" can be demonstrated by showing "that you're prepared to learn something about it, not in order to control it" (in Bishop, 1996, p. 104). "Responsiveness, respectfulness, and reciprocity" are words used in the early childhood literature to describe characteristics of effective teacher interactions with children (Podmore and May, cited in Brown, May, Meade, Podmore, & Te One, 1998, p. 9). These qualities could equally be applied to building relationships with whānau Māori and other adults in early childhood centres. Te Whāriki itself, is considered by one of its key contributors, Tilly Reedy, to emphasise respect as a central quality for the early childhood curriculum:

Te Whariki a theoretical framework which is appropriate for all... A whariki woven by loving hands that can cross cultures with respect, that can weave people and nations together. Te Whariki is about providing a base that teaches one to respect oneself and ultimately others (Reedy, 1995, p. 17).

The whanaungatanga approach also requires a reconceptualising of the construct of teacher as 'expert', since we cannot be experts in another person's culture, if we do not share that cultural background. A Māori colleague at the co-theorising hui was uncomfortable with the prospect of non-Māori educators representing Māori culture to her child [MPH4]. Teachers from the dominant Pākehā culture, this participant suggested, require humility, in order to prevent the misrepresentation of Māori cultural symbols and meanings and to be vigilant as to the limitations of the role of a Pākehā facilitator of bicultural development. There needs to be a sensitivity to the feelings that may be aroused in Māori parents and grandparents who have been denied opportunities to learn to speak their own (Henry, 1995, p. 16).

Linda Mead has pointed out that when they are in Māori contexts, Māori women are comfortable enough to voice their concerns and opinions. "The problem is not

therefore, one of being able to voice, but of the authority which is accorded such voice, or, put another way, the problem of being heard” (Mead, 1996, p. 108). The challenge for non-Māori teachers is to create the conditions for those Māori whānau members that will enable them to feel they are heard. This requires the teachers to be able to not only initiate the dialogue, but to demonstrate their genuineness to really listen (Delpit, 1988). Frances Kendall considers that hearing, rather than listening “requires a greater commitment to communication. Really to hear others you have to be willing to open your mind and heart to them. You have to set aside your stereotypes, assumptions, and defenses to take in what the person is saying and feeling” (Kendall, 1996, p. 137).

Teachers also need clarity, courage and conviction in order to cope with the inevitable tensions, contradictions, and possible criticism. The bicultural development process will require ongoing negotiation:

Fostering cultural pluralism requires mutual respect for differences in ways of viewing reality, making decisions, organizing for action, and solving daily problems of survival and growth. Furthermore, it requires skills in negotiating difference so that common ground is understood, discussed, and appreciated. These differences must be negotiated so that all people are strengthened and confirmed rather than negated . . . (Schensul & Schensul, 1992, p. 197).

This will require a knowledge of, and sensitivity towards, Māori and other culturally different approaches to conflict resolution. This has resonance with Roger Simon’s vision of a “pedagogy of possibility”, which involves creating “a climate of trust and respect, patience and mutual recognition, reciprocal support and a sense of collaborative struggle” (Simon, 1992, p. 63). Frances Kendall points out that genuine power-sharing in decision-making may mean that teachers are in the position of disagreeing with the outcome of those decisions, a situation which she considers demonstrates “taking others’ culture seriously” (Kendall, 1996, p. 135). This could be an uncomfortable position for members of the dominant culture, so used to controlling things “our way”, but as Barbara Rogoff points out, "During

collaboration, disagreements are an important tool for learning" (Rogoff, 1998, p. 725).

In addition to the knowledge bases already identified, students need preparation to be ready to take a proactive stance in implementing bicultural development. An example from this study included preparing and disseminating kaupapa Māori material, a story of Ranginui and Papatuanuku⁹³, to parents before it was used in the centre. In another centre, staff had written their own story in te reo (with the help of a Māori professional development facilitator) which proved to be very popular with children, who in turn shared it with their parents. Before implementing te reo me ōna tikanga creatively within the programme, it is imperative that this is checked for accuracy, authenticity and appropriateness. There is already a wide range of Māori material available in the public domain that is 'safe' to access, such as those provided by Learning Media.

9.6 Bicultural Development as an Ongoing Personal and Professional Commitment

A final attribute that our teacher education programme had successfully instilled in the graduates interviewed, was a passion for ongoing learning. Graduates had both attended and facilitated professional development workshops focusing on bicultural development. As novices in relation to te Ao Māori, non-Māori are privileged to have these opportunities to enhance their understandings and apply this within their centres. No matter what the priorities are, there is a limit to what can be attained within a finite three-year degree programme. If graduates leave with a hunger for more knowledge, that will ensure that they continue to grow and develop as people and as teachers. A student reflecting on her positive practicum experience in a bicultural centre wrote that:

⁹³ Ranginui and Papatuanuku are the Skyfather and Earthmother.

In the end for me my feeling of being culturally aware is not just to be aware of other cultures, but to be also aware of your own cultural identity. For me the experience in my centre on practicum has made me look at my identity within my cultural background more. I find myself now relating to the "Treaty of Waitangi", more now the better understanding I have obtained of the 'Māori' and other cultures. I am more in-tune to my place within the natural heritage of 'Aotearoa', and my culture as a person in general. This I think has opened up my mind to the many varying cultures and people out in the world today. One thing I believe in though despite worries, fears and insecurities I have grown within my culture and am a better stronger more determined person because of my better understanding. I hope to and intend to make some noticeable changes out there within society as it is today and as it will be in the future [SWY2P4].

9.7 Overview of Goals of Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Teacher Education

This study has identified a number of components which may contribute towards graduates of the early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato being prepared to implement bicultural development in early childhood centres. They are essentially in the position of supporting a new era in early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, one which is necessitated by the early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b), and the Ministry of Education's requirement for government funded centre's to comply with its Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices (Ministry of Education, 1996a), implementation of which is supported by the Ministry's document "Quality in Action. Te Mahi Whai Hua" (Ministry of Education, 1998).

In these early years of implementation of this new bicultural era in early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, recent university graduates will need to have developed understandings, commitment, and practical competence which will enable them to have confidence since they will often be the initiators of bicultural development in early childhood centres where existing staff lack these qualities. Fundamental to these qualities is that of a demeanour of respect towards Māori and other cultures, and a reflexive approach to their role(s) as teacher which will enable

them to establish environments, climates, and relationships where whānau Māori feel valued and encouraged in their participation within the early childhood centre.

Chapter Ten

Dilemmas of Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Teacher Education

10.0 Introduction to Chapter Ten

The implementation of bicultural development within the primary setting of this study, a university early childhood teacher education programme, is not without its tensions and contradictions. This chapter identifies some key dilemmas which have emerged from this study and which impede the translation of policy level commitments into meaningful practical processes. Issues include: the reality of working within a Pākehā-dominated conservative mainstream institution; conflicting values which mean that Pākehā may not share the absolute commitment of Māori to their reo and tikanga; and the need for Māori to maintain tino rangatiratanga over the domain of Māori content, whilst working in partnership with Pākehā colleagues. Issues also arose regarding the options and support available for Māori students and institutional regard for the wellbeing of Māori staff.

10.1 “Empowering Pākehā to Let Go of Power”

This study suggests that there appears to be an underlying theme of unequal power dynamics operating at both individual and institutional levels. At both levels, a related goal of bicultural development might be “to empower Pākehā to 'let go' of that power and work collaboratively towards equity” [CM2]. James Banks considers two key dimensions of his paradigm of transformative knowledge and multicultural education to be an equity pedagogy which facilitates successful outcomes for all students, and an empowering school culture and structure which will ensure this educational equity and cultural empowerment which will require systemic reform at all levels of the institution (Banks, 1996, p. 338). This focus on change being framed as the responsibility of teachers and administrators is different from previous conceptualisations whereby, those working for social change

...have focused on oppressed groups, such as young children, women, the working classes and people from minority ethnic backgrounds. In contrast to such approaches, and in the interests of these dominated groups, the self-interests of dominant groups (including teachers) need to be invoked to support change... (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1997, p. 246)

The Siraj-Blatchfords believe that research (such as the present study) may be utilised to challenge those from the dominant group from within their own discourses, enabling them to identify the contradictions within their practices and suggest ways in which these may be resolved in the promotion of social justice (Siraj-Blatchford & Siraj-Blatchford, 1997, p. 246). The systemic nature of the change required is as Banks (1996) suggests, an important consideration, since monocultural dominance is exercised through institutionalised discursive practices which are embodied in technical processes, in patterns for general behaviour, and in pedagogical forms which simultaneously both impose and maintain the patterns of dominance and oppression (Foucault, 1977, p. 200).

10.2 Rhetoric is Not Enough

Both Māori and Pākehā colleagues considered that institutional barriers impeded the transfer of philosophical commitments into practice. Colleagues were critical of the institution's management in terms of Tiriti obligations and the apparent lack of understanding of and commitment to tino rangatiratanga. According to two Māori colleagues:

Yep, and we don't get led from above. More so you get these things put up so that they can't happen. I mean even senior positions above us put in these gate-keeping things so that you can't truly work along a model line. The Early Childhood Department's got really really committed people, but they have blocks all the time [CM1].

Taking a stand on issues to do with tino rangatiratanga have been pretty pathetic. On entering into this debate I have found the persons really uninformed on the issue, a huge time waster. My attitude to this sort of ignorance is 'go away, get informed and let's discuss this later'. I feel my time is too valuable to waste on this nonsense. Interestingly enough, I do not find many challenges on the issue of tino rangatiratanga as long as it remains rhetoric. I find the challenges come at the level of implementation. This is

when I have experienced a mismatch of theory into practice. In reference to the Ki Taiao programme, course content and programme structure have generated many debates. I believe the conflict comes with the introduction of different knowledge codes, creating a panic-stricken reaction and a feeling of loss of control. The loss of control comes from lack of knowledge which puts the whole saying of 'knowledge is power' into reality for me. I have witnessed some bizarre coping strategies and weak arguments such as 'the quality has to be the same as..' and 'assessment has to be the same as..' and 'Ki Taiao courses have to be the same as...'. What I see through these 'same as..' statements is the lack of acknowledging that there are genuine cultural differences that need to be addressed and validated and the insinuation that anything different can be doubted from a definition of quality by monocultural standards . . . I guess in a nutshell, this is racism in action [CM2].

This colleague was clearly frustrated that although the institution had established the Ki Taiao programme, leadership were requiring that structural constraints be transferred across from mainstream programme using a rationale of 'quality', which she saw as racist monocultural imposition.

A Pākehā colleague expressed similar concerns about the tensions around implementation of tino rangatiratanga:

I guess that I think it is a really interesting things because my feeling, as a Department people are quite comfortable with biculturalism, is fine it sounds nice, tino rangatiratanga is much more - if you are talking about a tenuous hold, it's finger tip stuff [CP2].

For both issues of 'biculturalism' and tino rangatiratanga', it appears that there is no doubt about the policy level commitment of the Department of Early Childhood Studies, as expressed in the Departmental "Vision Statement" since 1995, and in the Department's submission to the 1997 School of Education Bicultural Review, but less assurance about the effectiveness and extent of implementation. The same Pākehā colleague saw the ongoing commitment to bicultural development as tenuous, and dependent on the institutional leadership:

I think that it's because there is at a really fundamental level a lack of commitment within the organisation. [Later in interview]: Yes, it like, it's all this tightening up and it's the thing that goes very often. [Later]: and I think

there is a level of, like... you know if we blinked it would slip back. I think it's a tenuous - the bicultural issues have a very tenuous hold...[CP2].

At the co-theorising hui, in May 2001, participants were very concerned that the Ki Taiao programme had recently been disestablished. This was seen as another example of the institution's lack of commitment to Māori aspirations, when their experiences convinced them of the desperate need for more qualified Māori early childhood teachers.

10.3 Partnership Demands: Delivering the Māori Content of Courses

The concept of partnership models of course delivery, despite its basis in Te Tiriti o Waitangi, is not without some tensions. Māori colleagues, appointed as part of the Department's commitment to 'biculturalism', were frequently assigned to teach Māori content within courses:

It seemed as though I was viewed by many, not only those in our Department as the 'Māori expert' and in a way had to become a generalist [CM2].

This limiting of their teaching to 'the Māori section' of a course had negative effects. They were unable to demonstrate their expertise in Western knowledge, and there was a perception that this ghettoised the Māori content, diminishing its values in the eyes of the students:

The message that students get is that Māori can only do Māori stuff, practical stuff like weaving, not the "academic" stuff [MPH4].

The Department's commitment, in late 1994, to tino rangatiratanga coincided with the instigation of the Ki Taiao programme, and this created further tensions as Māori colleagues were developing this programme, whilst still being required to maintain a lesser presence in the mainstream programme in order to provide their expertise in te reo and tikanga Māori. Pākehā lecturers in courses where Māori were no longer available were faced with difficult choices. Some alternative strategies other than

removing Māori topics, included attempting to bring in suitable guest speakers, or teaching the topic themselves using readings by Māori as the basis for discussion.

10.4 Contestation of Content

An on-going consideration is the prioritising or privileging of content within the early childhood teacher education programme. Selection and placement of topics, and the extent of their treatment, need to be regularly re-evaluated, and Māori colleagues' views attended to, as courses and the programme are reviewed. A key example is that of the teaching of te reo, a very demanding task when the clientele are monolingual speakers of English, and course contact hours are limited. In the survey data, graduates clearly felt that their preparation in terms of competence in te reo was inadequate, and requested not only more help in pronunciation, but also in learning Māori sentence structure:

More Māori pronunciation [RG1].

More Te Reo needs to be taught, especially pronunciation . . . Students are expected to have a high level of competency in te reo and tikanga, but have little information to go on...[RG4].

More Māori language, especially Māori sentence structure [RG5].

I feel a lot more knowledgeable about cultural differences now. I don't feel the course of CS1 and 2 teaches us enough te reo to enable us to feel confident using te reo in early childhood settings. More te reo would be useful [RG12].

One Māori colleague had suggested that too much was expected to be covered within the two Cultural Studies courses which have responsibility for this task, alongside a range of other content (see Appendix 1.2 for 1999 course outline topics). Only limited changes tend to be made within the constraints of all the other goals of the teaching programme which prohibit expanding the Māori content. Change is also dependent on the motivation of course coordinators. In 2000, for example, a section

on issues of bilingualism, second language acquisition, and strategies for revitalisation of te reo was shifted out of Cultural Studies Two, 1058.213, and into the course Children's Language and Communication, 1058.214.

There are also issues of selectivity (Metge, 1990, p. 34) in knowledge construction. Considerations include whether Māori content is being taught holistically and in context, and Māori self-determination of Māori knowledge. A Māori colleague had described how she had felt marginalised in a particular course:

I have been involved with [a particular course], I did [a particular] section within that, and I couldn't see where that integral theme was within that [course] programme. I mean within the [particular] section I talked about the accountability and all the concepts that happen for kōhanga and tried to talk about looking at [the topic] from both Pākehā and Māori perspectives and what it means in the actual centres. But in the rest of the course programme . . ., I couldn't see how that was being covered. I tried to talk to [the course coordinator] and ask, but then I thought well perhaps I should have been pushing it but I was there to do the [particular] section not the total. I wasn't there for the total things [CM1].

The impression given was that her Māori expertise was utilised tokenistically in only one section of the course, rather than being integrated in a parallel structure consistently throughout the entire range of course topics. This marginalisation of Māori content can give students the impression that the Māori section is of lesser status, an 'inessential' side-line to the mainstream content (Mohanty, 1994, p. 151).

A Pākehā colleague also had feelings of discomfort in ensuring delivery of Māori content, and was sensitive to the workload issues faced by Māori colleagues:

I'm often caught between what is okay to do and what isn't, and like one of the things for me in terms of our programme is that I've always hung out for having Māori lecturers come in to do things in courses such as "Growth and Wellbeing" on Māori health and physical development from a Māori perspective and um, I've had to work hard to keep that in there, and that's at a real cost, I know, that's at a cost to the staff that are having to come in and do that, and I guess for me, its trying to work out ways that I can repay that, I suppose, but that's hard to do. But when we do have input from Māori staff in the Auraki programme, one of the things I try to do is to be there as well, so that I can then integrate what they have said when we get to other parts of the

programme, so that I can then link back, “Remember what [the Māori colleague] said about that?” [CPI].

This colleague is aware that having a Māori colleague come in to deliver a section of a course, can mean that students dismiss that as secondary content, and was determined to keep trying to facilitate the students making links to the Māori content. At the co-theorising hui, Māori staff raised a similar issue, that of feeling confined to doing ‘taha Māori’⁹⁴. One Māori colleague had considered that this situation gives students the message “that Māori can only do Māori stuff” such as weaving harakeke⁹⁵ and this is seen as non-academic “practical stuff” [MPH4]. Reyes and Halcon (1988) consider this ‘typecasting’ as a form of stereotyping which “confines minorities to the outer fringes of academia”, and has the added disadvantage of “severely limiting White students’ access to ethnically diverse points of view, resulting in a shallow education from a monocular perspective” (Reyes & J., 1988, p. 304-305).

A Pākehā lecturer described the reaction of students when, after attending a teachers’ refresher course on the Māori content of Te Whāriki, and having consulted the Māori presenter to check whether this would be appropriate, she offered some explanations of this kaupapa Māori material in a third year course. She reported that:

. . . that had quite an amazing response from the students, because they didn't know that the Māori part of Te Whāriki could be different [CPI].

This raises the issue as to how much the teacher education programme focuses not only on the bicultural expectations threaded throughout the document, but also on providing explanations of key concepts of the document from a Māori perspective, such as that expressed in the Māori text on pages 31-39 (Ministry of Education, 1996b).

⁹⁴ Taha Māori is the Māori dimension, or a Māori perspective.

⁹⁵ Harakeke is flax.

All 12 recent graduates surveyed valued their preparation to utilise the document, with four commenting that all courses required reference to Te Whāriki in assessment. Despite their reporting that knowledge of Te Whāriki was covered comprehensively in the current version of the programme, 10 of the same 12 graduates requested more preparation in terms of te reo and/or Māori culture. This indicates that these graduates perceive that to deliver the bicultural imperative within the document requires a higher bilingual/bicultural competency than they have attained.

10.5 “The Ultimate Bicultural Person”?: Pākehā Lecturers as Role Models

A fundamental issue raised in this study is the issue of the extent to which the teacher education programme should aim to generate individual bicultural/bilingual competency in graduates of the programme. This has implications for the professional expectations for Pākehā lecturers in terms of their ability to be effective role models in this regard. Whilst two of the Pākehā lecturers felt that they could have a role in delivering Māori content, as long as it was done with genuine sensitivity and as authentically as possible, the other two were clear that this was not part of their teaching role:

I feel that I don't think it's appropriate for me to be teaching Māori content. [Later in interview]: I also don't want to teach Māori content, that's the other thing. I don't, I can't [CP2].

I think it makes it difficult because you know we strongly feel that we shouldn't be speaking or teaching Māori things. So, what do you do?...I suppose there are things you can do, but I'm never sure. Sometimes, as you know, I blunder in and think oh yes that's okay for that and it's not. I try to keep my mouth shut. I try to listen [CP4].

There is a tension evident here, in that respect for tino rangatiratanga, Māori authority over the Māori domain, could well be a justification for Pākehā to leave any Māori teaching to Māori staff. This raises the issue of whether as part of demonstrating a

commitment to bicultural development, all staff, of both teacher education programmes, and also early childhood centres, should be required to demonstrate facility in te reo and knowledge of tikanga.

A Māori colleague introduced the concept of “the ultimate bicultural person”:

The ultimate bicultural person to me is someone who is bilingual and bimondial (to quote Margaret Carr's flash word), this being someone who has a good grasp of both te reo Māori and English and has a working knowledge of both systems [CM2].

Pat Hohepa (1978, p. 106) has written of the “ideal of biculturalism, of being able to belong to two worlds” which enables the bicultural/bilingual individual to be firmly rooted in one cultural tradition, but have an informed knowledge of and empathy with others, switching languages and cultures as appropriate. He notes, however, that most people with this facility in Aotearoa/New Zealand are Māori or other Polynesians. James Ritchie (1992) makes it clear that in his view, no amount of sensitivity or experience towards te ao Māori can alter the fact that Pākehā remain outsiders to that world (p. 52) who can only operate effectively within te ao Māori, by firstly working on their own attitudes, and secondly adopting a framework which he describes as “bicultural awareness” (p. 65) which manifests a profound respect for principles such as Rangatiratanga and Kotahitanga (p. 56-58). He cautions becoming complacent in that “The task of understanding is never complete” (Ritchie, 1992, p. 64).

An aspect of bicultural competence is that of “knowledge of the language/languages pertaining to that culture” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1991, p. 312). Skutnabb-Kangas has expressed criticism of monocultural/monolingual teachers, considering that they lack the metacultural awareness which is a fundamental component of bicultural competence (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1991). Darder has pointed out that the “powerful relationship between culture and language” is a significant consideration in bicultural and bilingual education (Darder, 1991, p. 73). The second language acquisition

literature stresses the fundamental importance of exposure to good role models of that second language (Ritchie, 1994d).

If bicultural/bilingual facility is part of what is required for effective leadership of bicultural development in early childhood centres, there are implications for Pākehā lecturers in terms of their professional responsibility. Students had expressed concern, according to one of the Pākehā lecturers, that some of the Pākehā lecturers did not have sufficient competency in te reo, to pronounce the name of the early childhood curriculum, “Te Whāriki”, correctly. Māori lecturers have been appointed with particular regard to competency in te reo and tikanga as a requirement. Two of the four Pākehā colleagues interviewed had studied te reo at the University, and the Department had arranged a course of Te Ataarangi⁹⁶ classes for staff, although very few were able to sustain this commitment. The resolution to actively study te reo needs to be maintained over a long period if fluency is the desired outcome. The level of fluency in te reo required to integrate even simple phrases throughout their teaching was beyond that of most of the Pākehā lecturers, unless they were to prepare specifically for each class, utilising the support of Māori colleagues. It would be possible for them to prepare phrases in advance of classes, and have these checked by a Māori colleague, although this would require extra work by all concerned. Consistent frequent use of te reo Māori in an integrated way throughout all the courses is similar to content-based pedagogy for second language acquisition which requires that regular subjects be taught through the medium of the second language (Ritchie, 1994a). By being constantly exposed to good models of te reo in all their classes, teacher education students, like young children in early childhood centres, would become increasingly more competent and comfortable with te reo Māori.

There appears to be a somewhat confused and paradoxical situation here regarding the continuum of bilingual/bicultural content and delivery within courses. Pākehā

⁹⁶ Te Ataarangi is a Māori language instruction method using immersion.

recognised that Māori aspirations for tino rangatiratanga required that Māori oversee Māori content and delivery, and they sought advice from Māori colleagues in this regard. They clearly preferred to have a Māori colleague available to teach Māori content in all their courses, yet recognised that the Māori lecturers had chosen to work primarily in Ki Taiao and respected this as an expression of tino rangatiratanga. Despite their reluctance to deliver Māori content, they considered correct use of te reo to be a reasonable expectation on their part.

The allocation of time, content and staffing within the teacher education programme in relation to the objective of preparing students to deliver a bicultural curriculum needs to reflect this bicultural commitment. If lecturers are not all individually bilingual/bicultural, then the Department needs to consider alternative pathways by which to ensure coverage within each course.

10.6 The Centrality of the Significance of Te Reo

Participants were concerned about the authenticity of usage of te reo. A key manifestation of this is that of correct pronunciation. As a Māori professional development facilitator said:

To say our people's names, to me that's crunch. Children's names, whānau names, places like Waikato, Miropiko, Hukanui, Taupiri, all these local, before you just move anywhere else. To address these things for whānau and give them the honour of having those names said correctly is paramount [PDFM1].

A Māori graduate pointed out that mispronunciation can cause offence:

I think if people are going to learn Māori they need to learn it properly. I find it offensive if people are using it inappropriately or incorrectly . . . to me it's offensive if it's not right and it's hard, you know you don't want to stop them, but you want to say "It's said like this" [GM1].

Further to this concern for maintaining the integrity of the language is the consideration that knowledge of the language is the key to understanding Māori concepts and world views. As Te Maire Tau has stated:

Obviously, language is the critical factor. You can never have a complete grasp of mātauranga Māori without a solid understanding of the language (Tau, 2001, p. 68).

Although it would be unrealistic to expect non-Māori students to aspire to such a comprehensive level of understanding of te reo me ōna tikanga, consideration needs to be given to the extent to which te reo competency is an objective for the early childhood teacher programme, since, in common with most non-Māori New Zealanders, very few of the students arriving in the mainstream intake have any facility with the Māori language. There are several pathways that can enhance students' competence. One is direct teaching of the vocabulary and grammar of te reo, using the medium of English to explain, another is the Ataarangi method, where students are taught through immersion utilising rākau⁹⁷ as props, and the third is through maximising students' exposure to te reo, through including it as much as possible in classes, in a form of "content-based" language learning (Ritchie, 1994a).

It was recognised by staff in the Department that the majority of students performed poorly on the competencies regarding te reo. I wondered, during the interview with some Māori colleagues, whether these competencies were set too high and that our expectations were unrealistic:

JR: Well what do you think about competencies in that regard at the moment. I think they say . . . ; first year it's just simple Māori phrases. Second year is starting to use it in a range of the curriculum, and the third year is integrating it throughout the curriculum, is that too much for them?

CM3: I think that the first year the competencies are not strong enough.

I was surprised that these Māori colleagues were critical of the standards required for early childhood students in terms of the competencies required on practicum, and that they felt strongly that these expectations should not be lowered. They clearly saw that the reliance on Cultural Studies courses to deliver some basic competence in te

⁹⁷ Rākau, actually trees or wood, refers here to coloured Cuisenaire Rods, more commonly used as a mathematics resource.

reo was insufficient:

A part of that could be because, like in first year, the only class where they have any Māori is in Cultural Studies. It's that little square again. . . it should just be there, a natural, it should be just naturally integrated [CM4].

One of the Pākehā graduates interviewed also advocated instead an immersion-like approach:

I think if the University, I mean this is just my personal point of view, if the University actually created an environment where it was actually just going very freely as in the creativity side of te reo Māori, using those phrases and just doing simple phrases and things like that then a lot of sort of prejudices would be dropped. I think it should be included into everything [GP3].

Graduates in the survey data also suggested that their preparation in terms of te reo should have focused more intensively on te reo Māori, specifically pronunciation and sentence structure. In response to a question regarding the programme's effectiveness in enhancing their cultural awareness section, fourteen respondents asked for more te reo and tikanga, whilst in the final, open section, six respondents raised this issue.

An issue raised by this study is the extent of preparation given to students to equip them to serve as linguistic models, in accordance with the expectations of Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 76) and the Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives (Ministry of Education, 1996a, p. 47) that centres promote children's appreciation of te reo as "a living and relevant language". The early childhood teacher education programme should be preparing graduates who are competent to deliver these requirements. This has implications for the extent of the prioritisation of te reo Māori teaching within the programme. The current situation where only half of each of two courses is dedicated to te reo me ōna tikanga appears to be inadequate, and this is a consideration that should be of concern during future programme reviews and restructuring. In addition to finding a slot in year three which could be dedicated to a further intensive focus on te reo, as had been implemented in a previous version of the programme, attention could be given to utilising more reo

within all the other early childhood courses, in addition to the focus on Māori perspectives that is already required.

10.7 Pākehā Fears as a Pākehā Problem

People can experience fear of change, fear of difference, and fear of the unknown (Daloz, 1990; Prasad, 1996; West, 1993b). Bicultural development in education creates situations in which “guilt, history, fear, defensiveness and hope all limit as well as produce the possibilities for teaching and learning” (Jones, 2001, p. 289). Pākehā fears were an underlying current in this study. Fear was particularly associated with making mistakes and their uncertainty about utilising te reo and tikanga, and with offending Māori. An example is provided by a Pākehā student who wrote in an assignment:

I am guilty of 'clamming up' in the presence of Māori parents, for fear of offending by speaking their language of which they may or may not have knowledge of [SWY3P9].

The project of bicultural development involves, according to a Māori colleague, “empowering Pākehā to let go of power” [CM2]. Derrick Bell (Bell, 1992) has written, of the U.S.A. context, that white people may fear a loss of power and control in delivering equity to blacks. Fear can also be immobilising (Freire & Shor, 1987, p. 55). As a Māori colleague [MPH3] related how one of her Pākehā students had said: “It’s easy not to try. I could leave it out there. I don’t have to. It makes my life so simple. But, I will never know how successful I am until I try”. The colleague’s relationship with that student had supported her to move beyond passivity to a position of optimism. Affirming the realities of Pākehā positionings, which may include emotional reactions to being in situations where they are no longer in control, are part of a process of enabling them to move beyond this fearful, immobilised situation, to one which is capable of embracing the possibilities of change (Freire & Macedo, 1995, p. 385).

hooks (1989) considers that the Western orientation of ignoring emotions is because from our cultural standpoint, pain is categorised as negative (hooks, 1989). She instead posits the reconceptualisation of seeing pain as “a constructive sign of growth”, leading to new perspectives, clarity and a greater sense of wellbeing (hooks, 1989, p. 102-103). This is consistent with the Māori perspectives contained within the early childhood curriculum document, Te Whāriki. Tilly Reedy has written that the Taumata Whakahirahira of Mana Tangata involves developing emotional maturity and awareness, and learning to deal with fears and inhibitions in order to achieve joy and happiness (Reedy, 1995, p. 21). Bicultural development in early childhood education offers the prospect that this can be an aspiration in our work with young children particularly in relation to generating a positive orientation towards te reo me ōna tikanga. If this is achieved, the current situation of widespread (Pākehā) societal resistance and disinterest towards te reo me ōna tikanga will eventually be replaced instead by a prevailing attitude of respect and sense of comfort towards te ao Māori.

10.8 Issues Regarding Māori Students

10.8.1 Whānau: Support for Māori

The issue of support for Māori students was raised by Māori lecturers who had experienced a lack of support in their endeavours to facilitate successful outcomes for their Māori students:

So rather than, even this structure, they go on about bicultural and you know the Māori is an important theme to our programme etc., they don't put the rest of the systems in place to help . . . Those are the little things that to me show whether you are bicultural or not. You can do all the fancy words, and I'm aware in the course programme that they have sections or whatever, but the rest of it Jenny, and that's what I find quite hard at times [CM1].

One of the Māori graduates expressed her concern about the lack of retention of students in her intake. She believed that addressing the lack of support for Māori students was a potential remedy for this situation:

I think when I started there were eleven Māori students but there were only two of us who graduated so that was really sad. [Later] . . .and only two Māori students graduated, I think that's going back to me talking about the whānau concept that's a valid reason as to why that needed to be set up - that whānau group. Because the whānau concept in that institutional environment is very important, or it's very determining on whether you achieve or don't achieve [GM2].

The statement of another Māori graduate, who was a product of the intake which had provided a whānau option, which was a separate class grouping for Māori students, endorses this view:

Whānau for me was, and for a lot of Māori students, the best thing ever that's happened [GM3].

This preference for the whānau option by Māori students points to the high value on collectivity and interdependence within Māori culture (Jahnke, 1997b). Māori identity is essentially a collective identity, and Māori operate from a sense of collective responsibility (Patterson, 1992, p. 24). Providing the option for Māori students to have a parallel grouping is consistent with Māori aspirations for autonomy and collectivism (Walker, 1998), but is often seen as 'separatist' (as discussed in section 2.4.2). Creating space in which Māori becomes 'normal' is clearly of benefit to Māori (Jenkins & Pihama, 2001), but is also an expression of Article Two Tiriti responsibilities for ensuring tino rangatiratanga, since, according to Arohia Durie, "Tino rangatiratanga is a theory of collective action" (1994, p. 113). This expression of tino rangatiratanga can pose structural challenges for the institution, in that it requires staffing by Māori, and has timetabling implications. Physical space was also an issue, in that Māori colleagues and students in the Ki Taiao programme expressed a desire for a whānau room, which is outside of usual University teaching room provision, although an early childhood teaching room was eventually made available to the last intake of Ki Taiao for most of their classes.

10.8.2 Māori Students as Experts

Two of the Pākehā colleagues had mentioned that Māori students can be a valuable resource, adding depth to Māori perspectives in classes. They regretted that with Māori students choosing the Ki Taiao option, they were not present in the Aoraki classes:

I guess one of the realities for me is that since the Ki Taiao programme started, there's been less diversity within the class for people to sort of draw on others' experiences and share their own experiences... and that wealth of experience, which once [Māori students are] feeling safe enough to share it, which they can share for themselves, and which others are learning about by listening and hearing - that is as important as anything, I think [CP1].

Ellsworth (1989) has described the resentment felt “by ‘students of color’ that they were expected to take the burden of doing the pedagogic work of educating white students and teacher” (Ellsworth, 1989, p. 316). This was also an issue raised by hooks (1994), who cautions that this may place “an unfair responsibility onto the student” (p. 43). The quote from the Pākehā lecturer indicates, however, that she was aware that although she valued the input of Māori students, she was also aware that there needed to be a certain level of safety created before Māori students might feel ready to contribute within her classes.

10.8.3 Māori Students Are Already Bicultural

According to Brenda Tahi, “In New Zealand today, virtually all Māori are bicultural”, to a greater or lesser extent (Tahi, 1995, p. 64). A Māori graduate had explained that she saw her bicultural awareness as stemming from her upbringing, which was “bicultural the whole time”, which meant that her bicultural commitment “comes from the heart not because you've been told” [GM1].

The existence of the Ki Taiao programme had meant that the Māori lecturers were concentrating on developing this kaupapa Māori programme based around the needs of their Māori students who no longer attended the mainstream classes. Meanwhile, courses such as Cultural Studies One, 1058.113 and Cultural Studies Two, 1058.213,

could focus on the needs of their non-Māori students in developing bicultural competency. Now, with the demise of Ki Taiao, there are renewed implications for the early childhood teacher education programme in terms of recognising the different needs of Māori students. They may not need to spend time in class on basic pronunciation of te reo Māori, for example. This is particularly true for the new generation of Kōhanga Reo graduates who are now entering the tertiary sector. If numbers permit within each particular intake, provision exists to reintroduce whānau class, the separate class grouping for Māori students that preceded Ki Taiao. However, the programme has not attracted the required number of students for this to eventuate. Meanwhile it is important to maintain vigilance to ensure that options exist for Māori students to be affirmed as Māori within the mainstream programme. Strategies for this include ensuring that Māori students are able to focus on Māori aspects within their assessment by, for example, having a choice of Māori leaders as seminar topics in the course Historical Perspectives in Early Childhood Care and Education, 1058.112, and also by ensuring that teaching and assessment is consistent with Māori-preferred pedagogy, such as collaborative group work (Cormack, 1997). Wally Penetito considers that “There is a need for an absolutely clear picture about what is happening for Māori within teacher education” at the various tertiary institutions” (Penetito, 1996, p.16).

10.9 Respect for Māori Domains: “If You Are Going to Use it, You Use it Right”

The delivery by non-Māori of Māori content creates inevitable tensions. A key difference between Māori and Western worldviews and “alternative ways of coming to know, and of being” (Smith, 1999, p. 74), is in the arena of wairua, or the spiritual dimension. For Māori, “Wairua is implicit in all aspects of life, both the seen and the unseen” (Goulton, 1998, p.115). Māori and other indigenous peoples’ worldviews are imbued with a pervasive awareness of the spiritual relationships connecting the natural world and the universe (Knudtson & Suzuki, 1992; Metge, 1976). This is a reality that is “difficult for Western systems of knowledge to deal with or accept”

(Smith, 1999, p. 74), creating a barrier for monocultural Pākehā in terms of understanding “the unique, primordial and spiritual relation of Māori with their land” (Sharp, 1995, p. 129). As Linda Smith explains:

The values, attitudes, concepts and language embedded in beliefs about spirituality represent, in many cases, the clearest contrast and mark of difference between indigenous peoples and the West. It is one of the few parts of ourselves which the West cannot decipher, cannot understand and cannot control... yet (Smith, 1999, p. 74).

Within tikanga Māori, it is customary to mark beginnings and endings with rituals which recognise the spiritual significance of these moments. Linda Smith explains that "Rituals are performed and people are brought together to make the transition from one point that the state of being to another a peaceful and settled process" (Smith, 1999, p. 103). Within Pākehā contexts, there is a tendency to be pragmatic and focus immediately on the business at hand, without taking the time to establish a sense of spiritual wellbeing and interconnectedness first.

One of the Māori graduates, who was working hard with Pākehā colleagues in a mainstream early childhood centre to increase the Māori content within their programme, expressed some cautions relating to spiritual matters:

I think it's a spiritual thing where I feel like you are given so much and if you take too much it's ... It's hard for me to explain because it's in here and I just think that you have got to be really careful [GM1].

She recognised that it was more difficult for her, since she was working outside of her own tribal area, and felt the need for the support of a tribal elder:

But I find personally I believe that if I am going to implement a real bicultural programme, what I call really genuine, I need support from an elder [GM1].

A Māori professional development facilitator raised issues of Pākehā appropriation of Māori concepts:

And to me I have a real concern about non-Māori delivering Māori, because their perception is not the same as Māori, and I am continuously in argument about what does manaakitanga mean, what does aroha mean, what does koha

mean, over and over again, because someone has gone and got training – its dangerous! [MPH1].

She was concerned that Pākehā did not have an authentic appreciation of important Māori conceptualisations, and was offended when she saw them misused. This participant also raised issues of Pākehā not respecting or appreciating the taonga being offered by Māori, already referred to in section 5.2.1.

Whether it was appropriate at all for non-Māori to represent te ao Māori was an issue also raised in this study. At the co-theorising hui, a participant expressed concerns that she, as a parent, would be troubled by Pākehā teachers transmitting Māori content to her children:

The worst thing that can happen is that there's a Pākehā who stands to represent me on behalf of me and the way I see the world. ...For me as a young Māori mother, the message is that that Pākehā knows more about being Māori than I ever could, therefore I failed straight away...[MPH4].

Ella Henry (1995) whilst acknowledging the validity of Pākehā support for kaupapa Māori, has sometimes experienced negative emotions, finding it “spooky and ironic” when Pākehā speak Maori:

On a bad day, it pisses me off. On a good day I think, Well, it's one way of surviving. I mean, I find it frustrating when I meet Pākehā who speak better Māori than me (Henry, 1995, p. 16).

A similar view was expressed by the New Zealand Playcentre Working Party on Cultural Issues, who wrote:

Māori may be offended if a Pākehā does something which is rightfully a Māori role. On the other hand, it can be hurtful if Pākehā expect Māori people to know something and they do not have that knowledge (Working Party on Cultural Issues - Rōpū Hanga Tikanga, 1990, p. 24).

The Māori graduate working in a Pākehā setting [GM1] spoke of her insistence that colleagues work hard at correct pronunciation and usage of te reo: “if you are going to use, you use it right”, and was offended by inappropriate usage. She insisted that

Pākehā colleagues needed to work to develop relationships with relevant Māori that would enable them to verify that their usages were appropriate. Helen May (2001) cites a kindergarten head teacher who related a similar perspective:

I remember a Māori parent coming to see me in the early stages and saying, 'If you can't speak the language properly then you shouldn't be doing it at all.' ... That was important (cited in May, 2001, p. 192).

Since it is a requirement of the early childhood curriculum that children are provided with opportunities "to learn and use the Māori language through social interaction" (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 43) and that "Māori phrases and sentences are included as a natural part of the programme" (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 77), teachers need to gain competence and strategies which will enable them to deliver these aspects authentically and sensitively. Languages do not correlate symmetrically, and our innate ethnocentrism means that when venturing in to learning a new language, it is very easy to impose a Pākehā understanding onto a Māori concept. Aroha, for example is often wrongly equated with Western notions of romantic love. This transposition of a Western worldview misses the reciprocal obligation and responsibility which are inherent in the Māori concept (Patterson, 1992, p. 20). This dilemma of cultural imposition is a form of recolonisation which remains problematic. Linda Mead (1996) has written of her wonderment that despite the onslaught of colonisation which has infiltrated Māori conceptualisations, Māori have continued to hold on to Māori "ways of knowing and engaging with the world" (p. 419). Te reo Māori has been a cornerstone of this resistance, through encapsulating those values which reflect and define te ao Māori. As Mead has written, "Our landscape still exists in our language" (1996, p. 419).

Some Māori are clearly uncomfortable with the positioning of Pākehā acting as a conduit for te reo me ngā tikanga Māori. Linda Smith (1999) has highlighted that the ongoing struggle for maintaining validity of indigenous knowledges may be shifting from being one of seeking recognition for indigenous worldviews to one of maintaining control over their own knowledges. She also points out that as non-

indigenous people become more aware of indigenous perspectives an additional challenge arises for Māori and other indigenous peoples, one that involves having to prove the authenticity of their traditional beliefs and knowledges (Smith, 1999, p. 104). There is a further ongoing tension within te ao Māori between tikanga and modernity, and with regard to intra-Māori contestation of tikanga (Mead, 1996, p. 408-409). Issues such as having regard to the mana whenua⁹⁸ of local hapū/iwi are important considerations which have implications for mainstream education settings.

The over-riding concern remains that ultimately, there must be ongoing vigilance regarding the danger of Pākehā capture of Māori philosophies, in effect causing a re-colonisation of Māori philosophy (Jackson, 1992e). Tino rangatiratanga is an over-riding consideration with regard to te ao Maori, not only because Māori have expressed a strong desire to retain control over their domain, but because it is only through this control that the integrity of te reo and tikanga Māori can be maintained. Moana Jackson has written of the pain inflicted by the colonisation of Māori philosophy, and the promise offered by the restoration of tino rangatiratanga:

But the pain will end. Not because Pākehā stop their acquisitive search for understanding of Māori by treating our world as a book which they can strain to read over our shoulders; nor because the alien world will cease in its attempts to colonize the Māori mind and crush it within an ideology that perpetuates Pākehā domination. Rather it will end because as Māori we are now seeking to reclaim the validity of our own institutions, the specifics of our own faith, and the truths of our own history (Jackson, 1992e, p. 9-10).

⁹⁸ Mana whenua refers to having authority within a particular area, as opposed to other Māori who may reside there, but be immigrants from a non-local tribal area.

10.10 Effectiveness of Integrated Models

Although the intention of the “integral theme” of “biculturalism” within the early childhood teacher education programme was that Māori perspectives should be integrated into all courses taught by the Department of Early Childhood Studies, dilemmas exist in terms of the effectiveness of this objective of integration of Māori content. One of the Māori colleagues had observed that many students were not incorporating Māori perspectives in their assignments:

And sometimes in the assignments . . . they don't even reflect on any or acknowledge any bicultural aspects that might have been covered, and they don't always integrate it into their essays or anything like that. I don't know whether you have been finding that [CM3].

This indicates that lecturers need to be more rigorous in stipulating that inclusion of Māori perspectives be a requirement of assignments that they are designing and assessing.

Attempting to maintain the cultural integrity of Māori perspectives requires that they be treated with respect and this distinctiveness inevitably carries a sense of separation. This could also make it easier for students to compartmentalise it into a separate ‘box’, which would enable those uncommitted to bicultural development to easily discard it. This avoidance of the Māori content required by the early childhood curriculum had been observed by students [SWY3P9 and SWY2P2] (see section 8.1).

One of the Māori professional development facilitators spoke of her efforts to make the Māori content visible to the early childhood teachers she worked with. Accompanying such efforts within the teacher education programme, must be the engendering of respect for Māori knowledge, and a recognition that Pākehā should seek Māori guidance in working out what and how to incorporate it within early childhood centres.

10.11 Frameworks for Understanding, or Trapdoors to Essentialising?

Lacking authentic grounding in tikanga Māori, Pākehā need to be wary of the tendency to essentialise Māori knowledge, to neatly pigeon-hole Māori perspectives into a category of 'indigenous peoples' automatically associated with having a deep sense of spirituality, a connectedness to nature, social and environmental harmony and a collective orientation. Romantic notions of a 'golden era' of traditional Māori values, may be positioned as some kind of utopian indigenous ideal, obscuring and ignoring the complexities and subtleties contained within te ao Māori (after Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997, p. 20). This essentialising provides a mechanism whereby these indigenous qualities are associated with the past, a conveniently comfortable distancing which removes Pākehā from confronting the realities of the disturbances to Māori traditional belief systems that have occurred due to the interim period of two centuries of colonisation. As Wetherell and Potter (1992) write:

Culture defined as heritage becomes traditional and unchanging. It refers back to some golden and unsullied time of the constant re-enactment of rituals and values. Culture is seen as ancient, it is the past, not the present or the future...(Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p. 129).

Essentialising is pedagogically problematic in that it relies on over-simplification. It can also lead to polarisations when dichotomised views of culture polarise into extremes of 'us' and 'them' (Said, 1993, p. 35). Such dichotomisations as 'us' as 'normal' and 'other' as 'culturally different' or romantically culturally 'authentic' are a potential pitfall that can befall Pākehā educators seeking to demystify historical constructions that have led to the current positionings of Pākehā and Māori. On the other hand, Pihama (1997) has alerted us to be wary of a post-modernist extremist rejection of generics or universalisms which would deny the validity of the term 'Māori' as an appropriate and meaningful label for a conception of a collective Māori world view. An anti-essentialist stance is meaningful, according to Henry Giroux, only when it posits "a view of cultural experience that is nuanced, anti-

assimilationist, and lived out through a self-conscious presentation and recognition of its strengths and partiality” (Giroux, 1995a, p. x).

Māori participants in this study considered it imperative that Pākehā be supported to understand Māori as different, in order to counter the normalising power of the dominant culture, and the situation whereby the denial of difference prevents Māori children being supported as Māori (Simon, 1996). Recognising the ways in which Māori children are Māori validates and affirms their Māori identity and counters the inequitable alternative of forcing them to fit within Pākehā-determined criteria. Recognising these cultural differences is a key pedagogical framework, as illustrated by the Māori graduate [GM2] who demonstrated the sensory exploration of Māori children to her classmates. A dilemma remains, however, in that difference is being defined and understood through Pākehā cultural filters, along with our Western tendency to seek simple clear-cut categories and boundaries with which to frame our understandings. My own language reflects such tendencies, when I talk about the Tiriti workshops ‘offering frameworks’ to participants with which they may re-frame their historical understandings.

Cornel West has proposed that we deconstruct all such constructions, through a process of “demystification” which in acknowledging how such categories have come to exist, moves away from simplistic explanations to more complex social structural analyses of empire, class, race, gender, nature, age, sexual determination, nation, and regional differences (West, 1993a) and of course, culture. Stephen May sees the way forward in a “dynamic conception of culture – one that recognizes and incorporates the ongoing fluidity and constant change that attends its articulation” (May, 1999, p. 33). The central issue remains that it must be Māori who [re]define their cultural values, and Pākehā who must be accountable to Māori in their employing of te reo me ōna tikanga, if we are to avoid the situation of misappropriation and recolonisation by however well-meaning Pākehā.

10.12 Maintaining the Wellbeing of Māori Staff within a Pākehā Institution

It is clear from the comments of Pākehā colleagues that they not only highly value, but are dependent upon their Māori colleagues in order to deliver on the bicultural commitment of the programme (see section 10.4). However, there is evidence that Maori academics are very pressured (Smith, G. H. cited in Hotere, 1997). They are under-represented numerically, not only in proportion to their demographic representation within the wider community, but must grapple with working within a very monocultural Pākehā institutional infrastructure (Mikaere, 1998), whilst still meeting the very real demands of their whānau, hapū and the wider Māori community (Smith, G. H., in Hotere, 1997). This “dual accountability” carries inherent contradictions and tensions, such as the need to make frequent switches between the two very different values systems, codes of expectations, and modes of operating. For example, academic institutions emphasise individualistic pursuits whilst for Māori, co-operative endeavour is the preferred mode.

During the co-theorising hui, Māori participants made it clear that their primary agenda was one of commitment to tamariki and whānau Māori, and that they saw this being achieved through tino rangatiratanga primarily:

Given the space Māori will create Māori-centred pathways. . . [MPH5].

However they saw this process as being constrained by Pākehā in positions of authority:

Yeah but that support too is still not allowing Māori to determine, they're still not handing over, they still want to have the control. They see the support as the controlling still. ... they are not endeavouring to bring Māori forward and put Māori into those positions to actually determine their own pathway collaboratively [MPH1].

These conflicts of core values and perspectives and the power dynamics within the institution place Māori lecturers in situations, where, as Ani Mikaere (1998) has written:

we are forced to compromise our positions on a daily basis. There comes a point where it is extraordinarily difficult to maintain any degree of integrity as an indigenous person within an institution which requires such daily compromise. We are obliged to make do with miniscule advances forward, when we know that they are insufficient to further the bicultural commitment. Every little gain comes at an enormous cost in terms of the energy that we are required to put into achieving it (Mikaere, 1998, p.13).

It is apparent that for the early childhood teacher education programme to successfully deliver on its bicultural commitment, identifying and prioritising practical measures to support the well-being of Māori colleagues is a key element for ongoing consideration.

10.13 Implications of these Dilemmas

The dilemmas identified in this chapter highlight the essential inequity that exists for Māori within a mainstream Pākehā institution whereby tino rangatiratanga can only be exercised at the discretion of, and therefore becomes a concession of the power-holders, those Pākehā in positions of authority within that hierarchy. Delivering on a Tiriti-based commitment to bicultural development with a social justice agenda requires more than rhetoric, and is highly dependent on Māori lecturers who hold the key to supplying authenticity of Māori content within the teacher education programme. It is also essential that in honouring its Tiriti-based obligations to iwi Māori, the university strive to ensure the wellbeing not only of Māori employees, but of its Māori students through maintaining the provision and resourcing of kaupapa Māori education models.

Chapter Eleven: Summary of Findings

11.0 Introduction to Chapter Eleven

The challenge for teacher educators committed to genuinely delivering on the intent of the early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b), with its foundation recognition of the obligations contained within Te Tiriti o Waitangi, is the extent to which we can prepare our graduates to deliver these bicultural expectations. This is particularly difficult since most of the students within the mainstream early childhood teacher education degree programme at the University of Waikato, like most other non-Māori New Zealanders, lack bicultural experiences and understandings. In order to explore the preparation of pre-service early childhood teachers with regard to the issue of bicultural requirements, a range of views were obtained from both Māori and Pākehā participants, who included: lecturing colleagues within the early childhood teacher education degree programme at the University of Waikato; graduates of the programme; and colleagues who work in the area of providing professional development to early childhood teachers regarding implementation of Te Whāriki.

This chapter outlines key findings related to the concept of bicultural development as a social change process in line with obligations contained within Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and then considers key aspects of processes of bicultural development in two related settings, that of early childhood care and education centres, and early childhood teacher education. A central feature of bicultural development identified in this study was the partnership between Māori and Pākehā, which in early childhood centres needs to be initiated by early childhood teachers. This partnership model, involving teachers building relationships with whānau Māori within the early childhood centre and community, was termed a “whanaungatanga” approach by a Māori participant [MPH6]. Identifying and engendering or enhancing the qualities required to implement this process are an important consideration for the early childhood teacher education programme. It is essential also that graduates gain an orientation of ongoing commitment to the personal and professional development that

will sustain their delivery of bicultural development within their teaching career. Lastly, this chapter outlines the recursive nature of teacher education, pointing to collaboration between teacher educators and early childhood teachers as the crucial link in strengthening and sustaining bicultural development in early childhood education.

11.1 Bicultural Development, a Tiriti-based Social Change Process

This study utilises the concept of ‘bicultural development’ (Metge, 1990, p.18), to describe the process whereby mainstream settings might endeavour to deliver on a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Māori aspirations for kaupapa Māori content in their children’s education (Metge, 1990, p. 18). This concept of bicultural development is derived from the partnership between Māori and Pākehā implicit within Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and “has been proffered as an important element of any programme which has as its objective the advancement of the social and economic status of Māori people” (Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1987, p. 14).

Bicultural development has a dual focus within this study, since the primary research setting, a university early childhood teacher education programme, has undergone a bicultural development process which is in line with that required by early childhood centres to meet recent government obligations. In both settings, tertiary and early childhood, the need for bicultural development is based in an acknowledgment of Te Tiriti o Waitangi as an enduring compact. This is despite the reality of over 160 years of colonialistic education and other policies which have not only seriously breached the Tiriti, but also undermined the positioning of iwi Māori within their own country to one where they now form a disadvantaged underclass, with their language and culture threatened by the dominance of mainstream Western discourses.

Both tertiary education providers and early childhood centres receiving Government funding are operating as Crown agents and therefore have a reciprocal Tiriti-based obligation which implies a commitment to the Tiriti obligations of tino

rangatiratanga, taonga, and ritenga Māori. This requires Māori-controlled, and government supported protection of te reo and tikanga. The Tiriti-based paradigm for bicultural development identified in this study is one which is inclusive of the cultural diversity on both Māori and Pākehā/Tauīwi sides of the ‘partnership’ necessitated by the treaty.

Bicultural development involves a social change agenda requiring people to actively take on the role of ‘change agents’. Māori in this study saw this as one of their roles as they worked within mainstream settings with the ultimate goal of improving educational provision and outcomes for Māori. Due to the legacy of colonisation, Pākehā and Tauīwi need to address issues of colonisation and racism as preliminaries to generating a commitment to supporting Māori aspirations for tino rangatiratanga. Power and resource redistribution will be required, including on-going governmental commitment to social policy and funding support.

11.2 Early Childhood Centres and Bicultural Development.

Visiting centres and talking with graduates and professional development facilitators increased my understanding of what may be possible in mainstream centres, where there are often no Māori staff to lead a bicultural development process. Many early childhood teachers were genuine in their willingness and efforts to implement bicultural development within their early childhood centres. Māori participants pointed out that there are, however, few “benchmarks” [MPH3] of what should be happening in terms of bicultural practice. The lack of knowledge on the part of most non-Māori teachers of how to implement bicultural practices placed a huge burden on those Māori early childhood teachers working in mainstream.

Despite an awareness of the undesirability of creating some kind of ‘normative’ checklist, there were some areas identified by this study which indicated progress with bicultural development in early childhood settings. These included the presence of visually obvious aspects - Māori symbols, such as art, waiata charts, and written

phrases displayed prominently in the early childhood centre environment. In terms of resourcing the centre programme, it was considered important that teachers maximise their use of available materials in te reo, and also those resources that portray Māori children and their whānau engaged in Māori activities that would affirm Māori children's identities and experiences. It was seen as useful for the individual early childhood centre to clearly state its policy level commitment to bicultural development, so that prospective parents were informed from the outset that the centre complied with Ministry of Education requirements in this regard. It was also considered that having management offering leadership and support in the area of bicultural development was an important factor in assisting the progress of bicultural development within individual early childhood centres. With this leadership expectation, a related factor was that of having a shared commitment and collaborative approach amongst the teaching team.

A fundamental responsibility for early childhood teachers is that of initiating warm, respectful relationships with whānau Māori, and that individual teachers view this aspect as a pedagogical responsibility and key requirement of their role. In order to initiate and sustain relationships with whānau Māori in early childhood centres, graduates of the early childhood teacher education programme need to develop qualities of respect and caring consistent with the "relational ethics" described by Nel Noddings (Noddings, 1994, p. 173). The ensuing involvement of Māori adults in the programme will then serve to support non-Māori teachers in ensuring the delivery of accurate and authentic te reo me ōna tikanga, integrated holistically throughout the programme, with the participation and guidance from Māori whānau. Participants described how, with these steps in progress in some early childhood centres, te reo me ōna tikanga are "becoming part of the knowing" [MPH3] of all those involved in the centre, adults and children, Māori and non-Māori.

11.3 Teacher Education Goals and Strategies

Part of becoming an early childhood teacher able to deliver a bicultural curriculum necessitates gaining an understanding of the rationale for bicultural development, and its basis in the history of this country. After laying this foundation, a further key task of the early childhood teacher education programme is that of generating a commitment to implementing this bicultural paradigm, which is framed as being inclusive of the diversity on both Māori and non-Māori sides of the treaty partnership. Pedagogical strategies which enable students to develop a critical and reflective analysis of social, cultural, historical and political issues are employed, along with a recognition of the need to support students through the emotional journey that may accompany addressing these learnings. Partnership models within teaching teams between Māori and Pākehā lecturers enable Māori perspectives to be integrated throughout all courses, paralleling “the academia in Māori ways of knowing and being” [MPH5] with Western knowledge paradigms.

The university early childhood teacher education programme can ensure that students gain adequate preparation in a range of key knowledge bases which have as the foundation a detailed understanding of the context for early childhood education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, based in study of the history of colonisation and Te Tiriti o Waitangi. Students also need to gain a wide-ranging understanding of tikanga Māori and a working knowledge of te reo. Specialist early childhood education knowledge bases include mātauranga Māori as well as Western early childhood pedagogy, and a sound grasp of Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b), including appreciating the Māori content of the document. Issues related to culture and racism in education are an important area of study. Addressing these includes a focus on the practical steps involved in proactively implementing counter-racism, anti-bias approaches (Derman-Sparks & A. B. C. Task Force, 1989; Stonehouse, 1991). Since an aspiration of Māori is the sustenance of their language, a further area to be covered is that of research into issues of second language acquisition and bilingualism which will

enhance students' understanding of and ability to effectively support children's acquisition of authentic models of te reo .

Since many graduates will be employed in centres where there is little expertise in the area of bicultural development, it was recognised that although they will be beginning teachers, they also need to be ready to be initiators of bicultural development and offer leadership in this area as well as being committed to maintaining their professionalism through undertaking regular courses to update their knowledge, and strengthen their capacity to further bicultural development.

The overall goal of the early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato might be considered to be one of providing opportunities for students to gain the commitment, knowledge, competence, confidence, and receptivity that will enable them to facilitate bicultural development in early childhood centres.

11.4 Whanaungatanga as the Key to Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Centres

A finding of the study that was particularly exciting was that of a “whanaungatanga approach” as a model for involving whānau Māori in early childhood centres. Enlisting Māori support in determining and delivering the programme is consistent with Article Two of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, in that it supports Māori self-determination regarding their children's education, and in overseeing the protection of the taonga of te reo. This means that the early childhood teacher education programme can aim to equip graduates to facilitate this “whanaungatanga”, or partnership with whānau within their early childhood centres. This concept of whanaungatanga recognises the centrality of whānau and relationships to Māori early childhood care and education. It is also consistent with the Te Whāriki principle of Family and Community/ Whānau Tangata (Ministry of Education, 1996a), with Rose Pere's Wheke model of Māori values (Pere, 1991) and with research which indicates that whānau

involvement is centrally important in kaupapa Māori education (G. H. Smith, 1995; G. H. Smith, 1997).

Several Māori academics and educationalists have discussed key aspects of whanaungatanga (M. H. Durie, 1997; Pere, 1982; G. H. Smith, 1995). In her model of traditional Tuhoe⁹⁹ whanaungatanga, Pere emphasises: aroha, which she defines as the commitment of people related through common ancestry; loyalty; obligation; commitment; an inbuilt support system; stability; self-sufficiency; and spiritual protection (Pere, 1982, p. 23). Graham Smith has observed that contemporary Māori constructions of whānau, such as those found in Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa, although not necessarily kinship-based, retain traditional values such as; manaakitanga (sharing and caring); aroha (respect); whakaiti (humility); and tuakana/teina (older children caring for younger) (G. H. Smith, 1995, p. 33). The question then arises as to how effectively Pākehā and Tauīwi early childhood educators can be supported to develop an understanding of these key Māori concepts which are integral to whanaungatanga, in order to apply them within their early childhood education settings.

“Responsiveness, respectfulness, and reciprocity” are words used in the early childhood literature to describe characteristics of effective teacher interactions with children (Podmore and May, cited in Brown et al., 1998, p. 9). These qualities could equally be applied to building relationships with whānau Māori and other adults in early childhood centres. The early childhood curriculum Te Whāriki is considered by one of its key contributors, Tilly Reedy, to emphasise respect as a central quality for the early childhood curriculum:

Te Whariki a theoretical framework which is appropriate for all.... A whariki woven by loving hands that can cross cultures with respect, that can weave people and nations together. Te Whariki is about providing a base that teaches one to respect oneself and ultimately others (Reedy, 1995, p.17).

⁹⁹ Tuhoe are an iwi, a tribe, of the Urewera area in the North Island.

The whanaungatanga approach also requires a reconceptualising of the construct of teacher as 'expert', since we cannot be experts in another person's culture if we do not share that cultural background. Teachers from the dominant Pākehā culture require humility and openness, so that in remaining vigilant as to the limitations of the role of a Pākehā facilitator of bicultural development they can avoid pitfalls which can easily befall those who come from an uncritiqued paradigm of 'expert' or 'person responsible'. Adopting this respectful orientation, may enable them to avoid misrepresenting Māori cultural symbols and meanings whilst also being sensitive to the feelings that may be aroused in Māori parents and grandparents who have been denied opportunities to learn to speak their own language (Henry, 1995, p. 16).

This devolution of 'expertise' requires demonstrating respectful validation of te ao Māori, and its expression in the ways of knowing and habits of being (hooks, 1994, p. 43) of whānau Māori. This involves creating opportunities for Māori to voice their perceptions, listening and responding to these. Furthermore, there should be recognition that non-Māori cannot speak for Māori. This whanaungatanga approach involves facilitating a climate of collaboration and genuine power-sharing, with the goal of whānau involvement in all aspects of the programme including planning, implementation, and evaluation.

11.5 Bicultural Development as an Ongoing Personal and Professional Commitment

Participants in the project were aware that the wider project of bicultural development in New Zealand society is a long term, ongoing commitment, and considered early childhood education plays an important role. They were committed to bicultural development personally as well as professionally, and saw that the benefits were not just for Māori children and their whānau, but contributed to greater respect and understanding between all members of the community. Although strongly committed to kaupapa Māori education, Māori participants were prepared to support bicultural development within mainstream educational settings, since they realised that this

would benefit the many Māori tamariki and whānau that attended these. They were also aware that a potential outcome of bicultural development is increased support for the sustenance of te reo me ōna tikanga.

Participants in this study shared a commitment to a Tiriti-based bicultural paradigm for early childhood care and education which resonates with the expectations of Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b). Collaborative processes consistent with the notion of treaty partnership hold promise for future bicultural development both within early childhood education and beyond. Teacher education providers can offer vision and leadership in preparing future teachers to facilitate this process as an intrinsic part of their professional role.

11.6 Collaboration as an Overarching Theme

Collaboration was a central organising process which was both utilised methodologically and salient within the findings of this study. This research project was dependent on the collaboration of colleagues and graduates. The data came from participants with their support, draft interpretations were shared with them, findings with discussed colleagues during regular Early Childhood Department hui, and Māori participants gathered together at the co-theorising hui to share in a collaborative meaning-making process that was invaluable in the richness of the analysis which emerged. From this hui emerged another example of the theme of collaboration, that of the whanaungatanga approach for implementing bicultural development in early childhood centres, in which teachers recruit whānau Māori to guide this collaborative process.

A second area of collaboration central to this project was that involved in the relationships between a university researcher and practicing early childhood teachers in the field. Teacher education is informed by as well as informing of educational practice, and as the study progressed I became very aware of this recursive relationship between teacher educator providers and the field. Inevitably, providers

such as universities are seen as having specialist expertise that can offer leadership to the field. This expertise will only have credibility if it is informed by the realities of practitioners and their everyday challenges. The importance of collaborative relationships between teacher education providers and early childhood teachers was reinforced for me during this project (Ritchie, 2001a).

The third and most significant area of collaboration relevant in this study was the finding that partnerships between Māori and Pākehā were the essential means for facilitating bicultural development in the two research domains of early childhood care and education settings, and early childhood teacher education. In both situations Pākehā are dominant, but are required to work in collaboration with Māori in order to ensure that delivery of Māori content is consistent with the Article Two Tiriti requirement of tino rangatiratanga. This collaboration means that Māori are able to control the content and delivery of te reo me ōna tikanga within both settings. Teacher education providers can prioritise the employment of Māori lecturers to fulfill this obligation within teacher education settings. Since there are very few Māori early childhood teachers working in mainstream settings, early childhood teachers will need to build partnerships with whānau Māori in the centres and communities in order to deliver this capacity. There are also implications here which point for a need to focus on recruiting and supporting more Māori early childhood teachers.

11.7 Overview of Key Findings of the Study

This study explored the application of bicultural development in two New Zealand early childhood care and education contexts: primarily within a university early childhood teacher education programme, and secondarily, within early childhood education settings. Central to bicultural development in both settings was the involvement of Māori to guide the process, and ensure that Māori aspirations for their language and culture are given due respect. In the teacher education context, partnerships between Māori and Pākehā lecturers enabled the paralleling of Māori

perspectives alongside Western research and theory. Crucial to the preparation of Pākehā and Tauīwi early childhood teachers was a thorough grounding in the contextual domains of colonisation and its impact on Māori, and a focus on developing awareness of racism, and strategies for countering its effects. The key focus was to generate a background understanding of and commitment to ongoing bicultural development at personal and professional levels.

In order to pursue a kaupapa of bicultural development in early childhood centres, graduates also need to have a working knowledge of te reo Māori me ōna tikanga, which will enable them to incorporate te reo accurately and authentically throughout the programme, maximising usage of the wide range of relevant Māori resources now available. The study also identified the possibility of implementing what has been termed a whanaungatanga approach to bicultural development in early childhood settings. This approach requires that early childhood teachers consider it to be a professional responsibility that they initiate and establish warm, respectful, reciprocal relationships with whānau Māori, in order that they will be comfortable in their sense of belonging within that early childhood education setting, and hence willingly contribute to the early childhood programme. This requires that the early childhood teachers have developed a critical, reflexive and respectful orientation from their position as Pākehā or Tauīwi educators, in terms of facilitating these partnerships with whānau Māori.

Chapter Twelve: Reflection on the Study

12.0 Introduction to Chapter Twelve

Racism, like power, is usually an invisible sub-text to institutional interactions in countries with a history of colonisation such as Aotearoa/New Zealand. The influences of racism are a form of negative power effect which can be simultaneously subtle and debilitating. This chapter reflects on some of the voices from this study, and the wider issue of the pervasiveness of institutional racism and its association with the maintenance of Pākehā dominance. Finding ways to assist Pākehā to be comfortable with letting go of the power that is ascribed to them as ‘administrators’, ‘lecturers’, and ‘teachers’ within mainstream settings is essential in order to enable the genuine partnerships with Māori that will ensure effective bicultural development processes.

Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b) was considered by most participants to be a valuable document in assisting the implementation of bicultural development. The bicultural development processes documented here have possible wider applications in terms of Tiriti-based partnerships in which Pākehā are committed to supporting Māori aspirations. These wider implications are also considered in this chapter.

12.1 Racism and Partnership

The following four sections (12.1.1 to 12.1.4) explore the sub-text of racism as identified by participants in this study, focusing on individual and institutional levels, gender issues, and the potential for moving beyond the barriers created by racist power effects.

12.1.1 Different Positionings: “I Find it Quite Hard at Times”

Early impressions of the data did not highlight racism as a key consideration, yet a later, more careful analysis of the interviews revealed that in fact, nine of the participants had raised the topic of racism (and I had been the one who introduced it

in two further interviews). For Māori participants, this was often in reference to negative experiences of their own or of other Māori children. For example, two of them attributed to racism the discomfort they had felt when involved with their children within the Playcentre movement. Another had been upset by the subtle racism exhibited by teachers towards Māori children, when she had been working as a teacher aide in a new entrants' class. As Ngahuia Te Awekotuku has pointed out, being visibly Māori in Aotearoa/New Zealand, means being exposed to racism on a daily basis (Te Awekotuku, 1984, p. 244). Racism is part of the fabric of our society:

Racism: a reality that leaks into the consciousness of every inhabitant of Aotearoa, as victim, or antagonist, acquiescent or aggressive (Te Awekotuku, 1984, p. 244).

Despite its impact, racism has not been positioned at the centre of educational research epistemologies and paradigms, since this would be considered too controversial, situated or biased (Lopez, 2001, p. 32).

Pākehā participants discussed racism as a societal syndrome, as negative attitudes rather than felt effects. A Pākehā graduate [GP1] described her shock at realising, as she began to implement bicultural development in early childhood centres, that it was not only “redneck” parents, but “educated people” who exhibited racist attitudes. One Pākehā lecturer [CP4] related that when she had previously been appointed as the supervisor of an early childhood centre, racism had become more covert, rather than overt, as staff hid their racist jokes, knowing that she disapproved. This covert racism is characteristic of the ways in which Pākehā have historically enacted their beliefs in white racial superiority (Belich, 2001, p. 224).

Two of the Pākehā participants [CP2, PDFP1], a lecturer and a professional development facilitator, related their extensive involvement in anti-racism education. One of the Pākehā lecturers considered that her growing understanding of Māori culture had moderated her racist attitudes in general [CP4]. A Pākehā lecturer [CP2],

had identified racism as a possible barrier in her failure to integrate more te reo into her teaching.

Both Ellsworth (1989) and hooks (1994) emphasise the project of “unlearning racism”. Glenda MacNaughton has pointed out that the power of dominant discourses makes it hard to acknowledge one’s complicity and positionality (MacNaughton, 1998). Our beliefs and values are not only culturally derived, but are inextricably caught up in networks of power and desire and resistance (Gee, 1990, p. 9), and reflect our history of colonisation. Racism in this country has received little scrutiny, since it was easier to leave it buried below the ideologies of colonisation, which included egalitarian ideals and views that the status quo reflected a ‘natural’ order (Te Awekotuku, 1984).

Comments from Pākehā participants in this study indicated that they had made some (various) efforts at ‘unlearning’ their racism. The concern and respect expressed by the Pākehā lecturers for their Māori colleagues’ aspirations and support for the Ki Taiao programme indicate that at this level of interpersonal relationships, racism was not a major impediment to actualising Tiriti-based partnership. hooks, interested in friendships between white and black women colleagues, cites a white woman, who suggested that:

...the degree to which a white woman can accept the truth of racist oppression – of white female complicity, of the privileges white women receive in a racist structure – determines the extent to which they can be empathic with women of color (hooks, 1994, p. 106).

The different applications of the term ‘racism’ point to the different experiences of Māori and Pākehā participants. For Māori, racism was linked to unpleasant experiences, such as feelings of discomfort which had led them to withdraw their children from an early childhood centre, for example. Racism in these situations is clearly a major factor in the powerlessness and frustration experienced by Māori. Being sited within kaupapa Māori settings affords the safety of a milieu in which they

are less likely to experience these negative racist and power effects. Commitment to bicultural development is motivated from an aspiration for justice and freedom from oppression, as much as from adherence to a Tiriti promise.

Pākehā lecturers were able to exercise choice as to the extent to which they included te reo me ngā tikanga Māori. This authority arises from their institutional positioning as university lecturers, exercising the power and privilege and, to a certain extent, 'academic freedom' of that positioning. As Pākehā staff, they operate within a Pākehā dominated institution, where Pākehā/Western constructions are 'normal'. These existing power relations may make it more difficult for Pākehā to move beyond this paradigm and imagine a different way of operating (Bell, 1992, p. 152). Inadvertently, the re-location of the Māori lecturers to operate predominately within Ki Taiao, meant that they were not as involved at the decision-making course co-ordination level, within the mainstream programme. Their reduction of involvement may also have meant that they were also exercising less influence over course content. Although valuing the support and input of Māori colleagues regarding inclusion of te reo me ngā tikanga Māori, Pākehā lecturers were conscious that their Māori colleagues were absorbed in developing the new courses of Ki Taiao and respected this prioritisation.

Māori lecturers in the Department of Early Childhood Studies were bilingual and bicultural. Including Māori perspectives was considered a 'normal' responsibility for them. Bicultural development involves validation of te reo me ngā tikanga Māori, an inclusion of parallel Māori perspectives. For monolingual monocultural Pākehā lecturers, Māori ways of being and knowing were not a 'normal' facility. It appeared to be a struggle for them to make 'normal' the inclusion of te reo me ōna tikanga within their teaching, aside from a reliance on collaborative teaching partnerships with Māori colleagues.

Racism has served historically to normalise and legitimise Eurocentric dominance (Davies et al., 1993). In focusing this study on exploring the concept of bicultural development, which emphasises the validation of Māori perspectives, *te reo me ōna tikanga*, this discourse of cultural empowerment could have obscured the underlying power dynamics of which racism is a feature. The fact that the issue of racism was raised by so many participants indicates its salience as a consideration in any discussion of bicultural development processes.

Racism and other negative power effects were experienced by participants as in the “racism in action” described by a Māori colleague [CM2], or through the ways in which their voices have been marginalised by the dominant discourses: “You can do all the fancy words, and I’m aware in the course programme that they have sections or whatever, but the rest of it Jenny, and that’s what I find quite hard at times” [CM1].

This study did not thoroughly explore the ways in which these negative power effects may have been experienced. It is clear that language is powerful (Lakoff, 1990), and that those in more powerful positions may be less motivated to examine their employment of language as an instrument of power, but power is expressed in other ways as well. People may be unaware of the subtle ways in which they exert power, such as the symbolic power described by Pierre Bourdieu as being exhibited in ways of looking, sitting, standing, and even keeping silent (for example ‘reproachful looks’ or ‘tones’, ‘disapproving glances’) (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 24) and the ways these messages are utilised by the powerful to reinforce power dynamics.

A Māori colleague revealed that she had experienced some “bizarre coping strategies” and “panic-stricken reactions” from Pākehā colleagues in response to their “feeling of loss of control” [CM2]. Interactions are sites of contestation, in which some voices are dominant, and others marginalised, and where effects may be felt but not voiced (Gale & Kogan, 1996-7). People can disassociate from their actions, and actions can be contradictory to espoused discourse. As Jerry Gale and Steve Kogan

have written, “A person can point to his/her intention and say, ‘I’m not a racist’ but in an interactional encounter, perform an act that has a demeaning effect” (Gale & Kogan, 1996-7, p. 5). Pākehā, who have not often been victims of the power effects of racism, may be unaware of the extent to which they are perpetrating racist effects towards Māori colleagues.

12.1.2 Gender Matters

Gender dynamics are an interesting consideration within the arena of racism and power dynamics. At the time of the study apart from one male lecturer, all staff working within the early childhood programme were women, including those in leadership positions, and the Dean of the School of Education was also female. hooks has suggested that:

Perhaps we need to examine the degree to which white women (and all women) who assume powerful positions rely on conventional paradigms of domination to reinforce and maintain that power (hooks, 1994, p. 105).

The project of bicultural development within early childhood teacher education, and within early childhood care and education, is unique in that the early childhood sector is one dominated by women. Women, in general, may have less vested interest in maintaining the status quo, and this could be one of the factors explaining the ongoing tradition of progressivism in the early childhood field. Helen May considers that early childhood care and education has been a site which has pursued equity issues through feminist activism (May, 2001, p. 123). Women have also been identified as having a commitment to an ethic of care (Daloz, 1990; Gilligan, 1982; Noddings, 1995). This implies connectedness and a genuine concern for the wellbeing of others. bell hooks (1994) advocates a progressive, holistic, “engaged” pedagogy which emphasises wellbeing. She considers that:

teachers must be actively committed to a process of self-actualization that promotes their own well-being if they are to teach in a manner that empowers students (hooks, 1994, p. 15).

It appears however, that despite early childhood aspirations associated with an ethic of care, progressivism, equity, feminism, and wellbeing, the reality of dysconscious racism (King, 1994) remains a barrier to even well-intentioned (Simon, 1996) Pākehā women early childhood educators. Even though some of the Pākehā lecturers were aware of their racism, this did not necessarily mean that they were able to overcome it. One Pākehā [CP1] colleague stated that “I know it’s laziness on my part or prioritising, but I think there is an element of laziness and that’s the basic racism. I think that we can espouse one thing. . .”. This statement acknowledges a mismatch between rhetoric and practice which might be attributed to an inertia or reluctance to make the effort required to deliver the necessary changes.

12.1.3 Institutional “Racism in Action”: “It’s the Controlling Still”

Change at the individual level is always tempered by the constraints of the wider society. As Kathy Irwin has stated, “Without major structural change, initiated and funded by the state, the efforts of the dedicated few will remain isolated gems in the education system” (Irwin, 1988, p. 59). Concerns were expressed, particularly by Māori participants, regarding racism that they perceived to be operating at leadership levels within the institution. One of the Māori colleagues considered the problems she was experiencing in attempting to realise autonomy for the Ki Taiao programme to be evidence of entrenched racism [CM2]. She was concerned that the imposition of monocultural standards prevented autonomy of kaupapa Māori, since doing things differently was seen as jeopardising the ‘quality’ of the programme. Another Māori participant [CM1] had also identified gatekeeping and obstruction from leadership within the institution. One Pākehā lecturer [CP2] was concerned that bicultural development in the teacher education programme held only a tenuous status in the face of the prevailing new right free market ideology of the era, which was also indicated in its decreased emphasis in the School of Education’s Academic Plans over the past ten years. Although institutional racism is implemented by individuals, consideration of racism and power effects needs to be grounded in the wider context

of political economic, and social power relationships, according to Kum-Kum Bhavnani, since:

...it is only as power is deconstructed, and the ways in which the inscriptions of the different elements are analysed, that it can be possible . . . to suggest the possibility of the alteration of reality (Bhavnani, 1990, p. 152).

At the level of School of Education policy, the commitment to bicultural development appears to have decreased over the course of this study. A comparison of the 1993-5 and 2001-3 academic goals statements of the School of Education is revealing. The most obvious difference is the reduction from 18 objectives related to bicultural issues listed in the 1993 – 1995 Academic and Administrative Plan, to only two for 2001-3. The earlier document had the goal of “A strengthened commitment to the text of the Treaty of Waitangi and bicultural education”, which included amongst the 18 objectives to:

- Encourage non-Māori students to address bicultural issues , and
- Ensure that all courses have bicultural content where appropriate. (School of Education, 1993, p. 1).

In the Academic Goals document for 2001-2003, listed as the first of the School’s “Values”, is the statement that the School’s activities will “Be consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi and with the policies of non-discrimination enunciated by the University’s Equal Opportunities Policy” (School of Education, 2001, p. 1). This is significantly different, in that it no longer focuses on bicultural education, but on “non-discrimination”. This emphasis appears to have changed from one of ensuring culturally responsive educational provision to one of avoidance of discrimination. This can be interpreted as being a retrenchment from the previous commitment towards creating educational programmes which reflect Tiriti-based ideals of partnership and tino rangatiratanga to return to a status quo of traditional mainstream provision which is, at least, non-discriminatory.

Under the heading of “Applying the Treaty of Waitangi”, the Strategic Objective is to “Enhance programmes in Māori education, including bilingual and immersion

programmes, and to make these more responsive to the needs of Māori”. Under this objective the only specific objectives listed for 2001 were:

- Sustain the increased Māori participation in postgraduate programmes
- Ensure the Māori education advisory committee meets regularly and seeks community input (School of Education, 2001, p. 2).

Again, neither of these two objectives contains reference to bicultural education. Gone are the expectations that teacher education programmes should encourage non-Māori students to address bicultural issues, and ensure that all courses have bicultural content where appropriate. The implication here is that “consistency” with the Treaty of Waitangi means providing Māori programmes to meet Māori needs. This may reflect the growth of the Kura Kaupapa movement, in that there is a greater demand for teachers for this domain, which is an embodiment of tino rangatiratanga. However, it abdicates responsibility for preparing teachers within the mainstream programmes to meet the needs of the overwhelming majority of Māori children and whānau who remain in that sector. Whilst there may be some “consistency” with the tino rangatiratanga guarantee contained within Article Two of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, this stance ignores the Article Three responsibility of Crown agencies to ensure equal rights and equitable outcomes for Māori, as expressed in the Tiriti principle of “equity” identified by the Waitangi Tribunal (Waitangi Tribunal, 2001, p. xxvii). These changes which have diluted and dissipated what was apparently a strong commitment to bicultural development within School of Education policy at the start of the study have seemingly crept into the documentation with little comment, an example perhaps of the “discreet” nature of hierarchical institutional power effects described by Foucault (Foucault, 1991, p. 192-3).

Helen May writes of the 1980s responses by Pākehā to Māori challenges for biculturalism, that “Few Pākehā, however, were prepared to engage in the bicultural sharing of the institutions they had created” (May, 2001, p. 180). If it is true that the powerful seldom contemplate sharing their world with the powerless until the case for change has become an unavoidable practical necessity (Davies et al., 1993, p. 92 –

93), then Pākehā may need pragmatic incentives to motivate them to share power more equally with Māori and validate Māori discourses. Te Whāriki, the early childhood curriculum, provides a policy level lever which serves as one such motivating factor. It is unequivocal that “In early childhood settings, all children should be given the opportunity to develop knowledge and an understanding of the cultural heritages of both partners to Te Tiriti o Waitangi” (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 9).

Details of the curriculum of the early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato are not laid out in any specific document, beyond the basic degree requirements listed in the University Calendar each year. However, the requirements of the New Zealand Teacher Registration Board (now Teachers’ Council), the body responsible for the professional registration of teachers, lists “The Treaty of Waitangi and te reo Māori me ōna tikanga” under the category, “Professional Knowledge” of their requirements for “satisfactory” teachers (Teacher Registration Board, 2001). These competencies also apply to teacher educators who seek teacher registration. Within the School of Education at the University of Waikato, bilingual/bicultural competence is a requirement only for certain positions, those tagged for delivery of Māori content, and there is no minimum requirement for all staff. Staff are not required to attend workshops on Tiriti issues, although these are offered by the Human Resources Section of the University of Waikato on a voluntary basis.

Michael O’Loughlin has written powerfully about his frustration with the institutional intransigence which perpetuates racism in academia and education (O’Loughlin, 1997). He identifies embedded white supremacist notions, bureaucratic and regulative overload, contingent tenure and awards, and internalised surveillance as factors contributing to the passivity he perceives within academia towards racial oppression. He asks:

Are words such as *multiculturalism*, *tolerance*, and *diversity* mere well-intentioned fig leaves that allow us to leave oppressive racial structures and practices unexamined and hence unchanged? Can we continue to avert our eyes? (O'Loughlin, 1997, p. 11).

This comment points to the discrepancy between the rhetoric espoused by institutions and the actual steps taken to eliminate racism within them.

12.1.4 The Racist Impact of New Right Ideology

The decade of the 1990s was characterised by governmental adherence to new right free market ideology, which emphasised “individual rights and freedoms”, and “efficiency and accountability” (Smith & Smith, 1996, p. 225). Inequities within Aotearoa/New Zealand were exacerbated by this ideology which dismantled previous social benefits. This ideology makes the unfortunate and inaccurate assumption that growth and efficiency are incompatible with justice and equity (Tomlinson, 1995, p. 17). As a result, poverty and unemployment have been experienced disproportionately by Māori (Ballard, 2000) and in early childhood education, the disparities in attendance between Māori and non-Māori worsened (Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development, 1998c, 2000). This political context of new right ideology impacted on the education sector, by:

forcing teachers more into a mould of acceptance, limited behavioural skills, and standardisation in order to fit in with the dominant social-market perspective... the ‘greed is good’ governmental philosophy of the 1980s and...1990s has soured millions of people across generations and greatly diminished the scope for educators at any level to teach effectively the values of respect for oneself, respect for others, and respect for society at large on which democracy depends (Edge, 1996, p. 14).

This ideological stance enabled government and public institutions during the decade of the 1990s, to distance themselves from the social and moral responsibilities required by Tiriti commitments. Furthermore, the individualistic emphasis of the new right is antithetical to Māori values such as collectivity and cooperation (Smith, 1992a; Smith & Smith, 1996) engendering in effect, a recolonisation of Māori values as Māori have been increasingly forced into this individualistic paradigm in order to

survive (Nepe, 1992, p. 19). John Shotter has offered the following critique of the new right ideology on those who, like Māori, favour collective endeavour:

Thus those who see a danger in [the new right's] contempt for communal enterprises . . . and who are worried by its reshaping of education as a commodity for sale in a market of possessive individuals, have cause for more than just humanitarian concern: it neglects the intricately negotiated, rhetorically developed and culturally transmitted, means and devices by which people sustain their way of life (and the forms of mentality it makes available to them), and by which in turn, they sustain their individuality (Shotter, 1990, p. 169).

In a recent publication (Ritchie, 2001c) I expressed concern regarding the subtle ways in which individualistic new right policies have infiltrated the daily lives of children, teachers, and families within early childhood settings. I gave the seemingly mundane example of a policy change which effectively banned the longstanding kindergarten ritual of providing a collective fruit-sharing and story time, which was now required to be replaced by an individual free choice of when to eat snacks brought from home. Teachers and parents had enjoyed the sense of community and sharing that the previous arrangement had provided. The shared time for eating is also consistent with tikanga Māori, and with the New Zealand early childhood curriculum strand of 'Belonging'. I wrote that perhaps this could be seen as "an example of an insidious form of New Right individualism that was being instituted in the pedagogical guise of 'free choice'" (Ritchie, 2001c, p. 134), noting that Henry Giroux has described the impact of the New Right as redefining education "through a corporate ideology that stresses the primacy of choice over community, competition over cooperation, and excellence over equity" (Giroux, 1995b, p. ix). I considered that examples such as this kindergarten policy change could be interpreted as "yet another manifestation of

colonisation, imposing such a blatantly contradictory social ethic onto an indigenous people for whom collectivity is fundamental to their wellbeing” (Ritchie, 2001c, p. 134).

12.1.5 Transformative Processes

There is a clear connection between knowledge and power (Noddings, 1995; O’Loughlin, 1992b). A component of the project of bicultural development which features in this study is that of a repositioning or empowerment of Māori knowledge, from the margins to the centre (hooks, 1984), of early childhood pedagogy. This applies both in the university and in early childhood centres, where the goal is to validate *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*, thus “making Māori things real” [MPH3] for Pākehā and Tauīwi [acknowledging that for those who identify as Māori, “Māori things” are already real]. This requires Māori educators themselves to be positioned at the centre of this process to define and control the selection and delivery of *te reo me ngā tikanga Māori*. For Pākehā this means we need to be prepared to “let go” of that power [CM4], and move beyond a perspective which still sees support for Māori as tied to retaining the “controlling” role [MPH1]. The bicultural development process is one which is operating not just at the level of individual cultural identities and differences, but also requires transformation of the structures of power within educational institutions which reflect the hierarchy of monocultural Pākehā dominance of our colonialist heritage (Giroux, 1995a, p. x).

A Māori participant described as “powerful” her experiences of seeing “the teachers, the kids, the families, all awihiing the kaupapa” of bicultural development in early childhood centres [PDFM1]. Māori participants also described themselves as change agents [MPH3, MPH5] working to shift people’s attitudes to enable more respectful Tiriti-based partnerships. The transformation of pedagogy demanded by the bicultural focus of Te Whāriki, requires a concomitant reconceptualisation of our

teacher education pedagogy, a process which has been described by Mohanty (1994) as a transformative decolonisation of our understandings of cultures and knowledges:

Decolonizing pedagogical practices requires taking seriously the different logics of cultures as they are located within asymmetrical power relations. It involves understanding that culture, especially academic culture, is a terrain of struggle (rather than an amalgam of discrete consumable entities) (Mohanty, 1994, p. 155).

Decolonising pedagogy also requires that teachers and students recognise their role as pro-active agents within this struggle. The role of the teacher education programme can be seen as being to equip our graduates for their future role as change agents (Zeichner et al., 1998) in leading a transformation of early childhood provision to one which recognises the bicultural intent of Te Whāriki. This requires a reflexive orientation to people, processes, practices, policies, power and philosophy (Loucks-Horsley & Stiegelbauer, 1991, p. 34) not only on the part of lecturers, and our graduates, but of those in institutional leadership positions as well. Pedagogical strategies involve supporting students to move from positions of resistance and passivity utilising dialogical processes which affirm their positionings and extend their interpretative frameworks, generating a commitment to create new possibilities. This movement was expressed in the Pākehā student's comment to her Māori lecturer [MPH3]: "It's easy not to try. I could leave it out there. I don't have to. It makes my life so simple. But, I will never know how successful I am until I try". Processes involved in generating this movement are consistent with Freirean education for the practice of freedom (Glass, 2001, p. 18). In this paradigm:

Knowledge becomes founded on dialogue characterized by participatory, open communication focused around critical inquiry and analysis, linked to intentional action seeking to reconstruct the situation (including the self) and to evaluated consequences. The dialogue that distinguishes critical knowledge and cultural action for freedom is not some kind of conversation, it is a social praxis (Glass, 2001, p.19).

Traditional views of 'teacher as expert' are part of the transformation engendered through this dialogical process of critique. Teachers, in recognising the limitations of their knowledge of others' cultures, can develop partnerships with whānau which

move beyond conventional models of delivering ‘culturally appropriate’ practice as defined by teachers/researchers as experts (Hewitt, 1996), to a repositioning of the cultural knowledges held by whānau as being central to the educational processes.

Bicultural development involves a transformation of both process and content of the educational ‘package’. As the delivery of the early childhood centre or teacher education programme models partnership between Māori and Pākehā, so does the content model a respectful coexistence, where both worldviews are afforded equal validation, and adults (and children) are supported to move beyond the tendency for over-simplified dichotomisation whereby one idea/worldview is seen to be right and hence another (the ‘other’) must be wrong. Stephen Gould (1999), in his discussion of the ‘opposing’ world views (magisterium) of science and religion, posited the application of a principle of respectful non-interference which never-the-less allows for intense dialogue between the two distinct subjects (or worldviews). His writing, once applied to this study of bicultural development, suggests an alternative to the ‘melting-pot’ ideology that underlies many multicultural approaches, whereby the desired outcome is a merger of any ‘minority’ into a large and pliant ‘dominant’ culture, blurring the distinctions between the different cultural paradigms. Instead the aim should be for a paralleling of different perspectives that grants dignity and distinction to each (Gould, 1999, p. 51), opening children’s (and adults’) minds to the range of possibilities both existing and yet to be explored that can inform their own processes of making sense of the world (Shotter, 1990, p. 164), and which will be enriched through having access to multiple cultural narratives, rather than being limited by a monocultural lens. The bicultural development project of pedagogical, social and cultural transformation involving decolonisation and a recognition of multiple discourses (O’Loughlin, 1995a, p. 111) cannot be confined to the educational sphere (Mohanty, 1994, p. 152). Instead, as a Māori participant pointed out, a much wider emphasis involving media exposure at the national level is required [MPH1].

12.2 Weaving the Whāriki

When I first conceptualised this study, it was to be about how the teacher education programme prepared students to deliver bicultural content in early childhood centres, consistent with the concept of “culturally appropriate” experiences used in the draft curriculum document (Ministry of Education, 1993), and later a requirement of the Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices for Chartered Early Childhood Services in New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 1996a). Te Whāriki was not a particular focus of the proposed research. This initial view of Te Whāriki as somewhat incidental to the project of bicultural development within the early childhood teacher education programme was shared by two of the Pākehā lecturers, who did not see the advent of Te Whāriki as particularly significant, since they considered we were already implementing a commitment to biculturalism [CP3, CP4].

As I proceeded with the study, however, it became clear that the Pākehā graduates and Māori participants all valued Te Whāriki in terms of its mandating of bicultural development. As a Māori colleague said, “Te Whāriki makes . . . the Māori things you do real” [CM4]. Interestingly, 52% of early childhood practitioners commenting on the draft document of Te Whāriki, had taken “the opportunity to comment on the usefulness of the reminders of bicultural issues” (Murrow, 1995, p. 20).

Te Whāriki had permeated the discourse of one of the Māori professional development facilitators to the extent that she described her process of facilitating bicultural development in early childhood centres as supporting whānau to weave their own whāriki [PDFM1]. One of the Pākehā graduates [GP1] described her two key planning tools as Te Whāriki and her Māori dictionary, and for another, Te Whāriki provided the guiding principles and basis for all their kindergarten programme planning [GP3]

These favourable perspectives of Te Whāriki are in contrast to the negative views expressed in a 1998 report from the Education Review Office (ERO) on the “Use of Te Whāriki”, which had criticised the document for failing “to give clear direction or guidance about what early childhood providers need to do to ensure that they are contributing positively to young children’s educational development” (Education Review Office, 1998, p. 3). It had also reported that only 40% of centres surveyed were delivering programmes consistent with Te Whāriki, as required by the Ministry of Education’s Desirable Objectives and Practices. This was not such a disappointing result when it is taken into account that these expectations had only been a requirement since August of that year (1998). Interestingly, in the ERO report, kindergartens had the highest percentage of effective curriculum implementation utilising Te Whāriki, 58%. The kindergarten requirement of a minimum diploma level qualification for all staff is obviously a factor in this result (Education Review Office, 1998, p. 9). Helen May, one of the Te Whāriki Project Directors, has stated that the philosophy of the curriculum is one which “resisted telling staff what to do, by ‘forcing’ each programme to ‘weave’ its own curriculum pattern” (May, 2001, p. 246). The challenges inherent in the holistic, bicultural Te Whāriki approach are compounded by the fact that the government does not require all teachers to be qualified, merely the “person in charge”. Recent government initiatives are more encouraging, in that the recently released Strategic Plan for Early Childhood states the aim that by 2012 “all regulated staff in every teacher-led¹⁰⁰ service are required to be registered teachers” (Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 14). The same document also states the government’s intention to “Legislate Te Whāriki as the curriculum for all ECE [Early Childhood Care and Education] services (p. 15). Encouragingly, the Strategic Plan recognises that since “many Māori children attend mainstream ECE services, ensuring these services are responsive to their needs and those of their whānau is also a priority” which will require “working with both ECE services and teacher education providers to improve ECE teachers’ understanding of and

¹⁰⁰ As opposed to parent cooperatives such as Playcentre or whānau-based settings such as Kohanga Reo.

appreciation of the Treaty of Waitangi, bi-culturalism, Te Reo and Tikanga Māori so that they can support and encourage the learning of Māori children and the involvement of Māori parents” (Ministry of Education, 2002, p. 10).

Participants in this study [GP1; CP1; SWY3PP; SWY2PS] were critical that some in the early childhood field attempt to implement Te Whāriki without regard for the bicultural expectations made explicit within the document. Whilst all twelve of the year 2000 graduates surveyed valued their preparation in terms of the Te Whāriki curriculum document, ten of them also requested more preparation in terms of te reo and/or Māori culture. The effectiveness of the early childhood teacher education programme in terms of incorporating Te Whāriki within courses is tempered by the perceived inadequacy in delivering a level of bilingual/bicultural competency sufficient to enable effective delivery of this core commitment of the curriculum.

12.3 Wider Implications

This study has not intended to deliver a blueprint or recipe for bicultural development in early childhood teacher education, since that would be antithetical to the bicultural development process itself, which can only be an organic localised partnership between Māori and Pākehā, based in ongoing reflection and dialogue. This stance is consistent with Foucault’s conception of theory as liberatory practice: "A 'theory' is a regional system of this struggle" (Foucault, 1977, p. 208). In this case the struggle of bicultural development is one towards cultural and political re-empowerment of Māori, led by Māori and supported by Pākehā and Tauwiwi.

Key elements to the success of bicultural development appear to be a partnership relationship between Māori and Pākehā which invokes mutual respect and understanding, and that Pākehā are open to Māori leadership of the bicultural development process, and responsive to Māori aspirations for te reo me ōna tikanga, and whānau models. It does require from Pākehā a commitment to change, to relinquish control, and to share and modify the institutions they have created (May,

2001, p. 180). This may be more achievable within early childhood centres, run by small teams of staff, than in larger institutions such as universities. As Michel Foucault has written, "The university stands for the institutional apparatus through which society ensures its uneventful reproduction, at the least cost to itself" (1977, p. 224). Universities and academics do, however, have potential to serve as "exchanges", or "privileged points of intersection" of different forms of knowledge (Foucault, 1980, p. 97). Universities can influence the dominant "regime of truth" (1980, p. 133) and the economic and political role it plays (1980, p. 132). It is possible that, through measures instigated and monitored by a committed leadership, Tiriti-based changes can be implemented within tertiary institutions (Paki-Slater, 1998). This kind of social change is described by Foucault as "revolutionary action", "the simultaneous agitation of consciousness and institutions", which focuses on transforming the "relationships of power through the notions and institutions that function as their instruments" (Foucault, 1977, p. 228).

A societal commitment to the implementation of bicultural development which transforms the current siege-like state of entrenched institutional monoculturalism, will not only affect Māori. Restoring the guarantees of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi, and having Maori aspirations for tino rangatiratanga and te reo me ngā tikanga Māori validated and enacted through Māori-led and defined processes will be a hard-won achievement. Pākehā, in this reframing, have been repositioned as those with a 'deficit' (Sheets, 2000, p. 19), since they are "truly disabled [in being] deprived of the knowledge of other ways of seeing the world" (Metge, 1990, p. 4). However, by acknowledging the limitations of their monoculturalism and monolingualism, and putting aside the historical legacy of racist ideology, Pākehā will be able to adopt an alternative stance of receptive humility through which they may earn the privilege of access, on Māori terms, to a much richer bicultural worldview.

The bicultural development project for early childhood education identified here is consistent with challenges being posed internationally to education, to reconsider the ways that knowledge is used as a tool of recolonisation (Foley, Levinson, & Hurtig, 2001; Smith, 1999; Wideen et al., 1998). It is an example of an early childhood pedagogy “that constantly questions the categories and assumptions of colonial/imperial forms of knowledge, that reinvents itself on the basis of the many subjugated knowledges that the children in our classrooms [and their whānau] bring with them” (Viruru, 2000, p. 218). Bicultural development in early childhood education represents a potential for praxis that may achieve a sea-change (Fullan, 1995, p. 5) in the way future generations of non-Māori New Zealanders conceptualise themselves and represent themselves culturally. By positioning themselves as social change agents (Fullan, 1995, p. 8; Murphy, 1995, p. 311), early childhood teachers who are committed to bicultural development and have the skills to work with whānau Māori can collaborate in the creation of whāriki representing a shared vision for their tamariki whereby both processes and content (Sergiovanni, 1995, p. xi) of the early childhood programme are constantly being reconceptualised in response to changing whānau contributions and interests.

This decolonising process is dependent on the leadership within mainstream teacher education (and other) institutions having a commitment to moving beyond the rhetoric of brief concessionary statements in policy documents which make passing reference to the treaty, to concrete policy implementation steps devised by Māori in order to realise their aspirations for tino rangatiratanga, in effect modeling a leadership partnership. Institutional structures are not conducive to change (Glickman, Lunsford, & Szuminski, 1995, p. 21), and unless there is strong support from the leadership levels, individuals can become frustrated and isolated. In addition to this arena of leadership as a genuine partnership, this study has identified the significance of employing and supporting Māori staff at all levels including senior management and administration. The relative numbers of Māori staff has a clear relationship to the salience of the Māori voice, not only expressed, but heard within

an institution. This requires a commitment from the leadership to creating throughout the institution the expectation of genuine partnership whereby Māori voices are validated and their aspirations reflected within the institutional policies and practices. The degree to which this occurs is a reflection of the extent of the ‘partnership’ in evidence.

Māori participants in this study, although committed ultimately to tino rangatiratanga and kaupapa Māori, recognised that they “still have to work in partnership” [MPH1] to achieve these aims. The extent to which a mainstream institution such as a university can deliver tino rangatiratanga, or self-determination for Māori, is uncertain. It seems inevitably constrained by majoritarianism under the guise of democracy (Ritchie, 1992), and has been further shackled by a free market ideology that misguidedly places productivity ahead of people.

Within the early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato, some attempts have been made towards the implementation of a Tiriti-based commitment to bicultural development. These include the appointment of a significant proportion of Māori staff; whānau groupings for Māori students; the Ki Taiao Māori Immersion Programme (Department of Early Childhood Studies, 1994a)¹⁰¹; a commitment to integrating Māori perspectives into all courses; specialist courses in cultural issues and te reo me ngā tikanga Māori; and practicum competency requirements which require students to integrate te reo me ōna tikanga appropriately. Pedagogical strategies follow a commitment to engendering critical inquiry and reflection, involving a respectful interrogation of both Western/Pākehā and Māori paradigms, and a recognition of the Tiriti-based professional responsibility of early childhood educators to exercise agency to further the project of bicultural development in early childhood care and education.

¹⁰¹ Ki Taiao is due to be revived in 2003 in a partnership between Te Wananga o Aotearoa, a Māori tertiary education provider and the University of Waikato.

One of the key challenges posed by a bicultural development process is the re-negotiation of ways things are done. A contrasting value between Māori and Pākehā/Western cultures is seen in the continuum between collectivism and individualism. For Māori, whānau provides a model for a collective sense of wellbeing, reflected in cooperation and sharing (M. H. Durie, 1997). This is in direct contrast with the free market individualism as espoused by the new right (Smith & Smith, 1996).

Whānau models were salient in this study. It was apparent that the support available through enabling Māori students to be grouped together was highly valued. Māori lecturers also worked together as a grouping. A professional development facilitator described her process of working with the 'whānau' of early childhood centres to further the course of bicultural development in their setting. This 'whānau' began with the teachers who sought professional development, but soon grew to include children, and both Māori and Pākehā parents, as they all contributed to collectively weaving their own whāriki.

Pākehā graduates were involving Māori whānau within their early childhood centre programmes in collaborative partnerships which enabled the incorporation of local tikanga, and created for the families who attended a sense of whanaungatanga (Penetito, 1998), and a cultural change in which te reo me ngā tikanga Māori were "becoming part of their knowing" [MPH3]. In this way, "Culture itself is thus redefined as incorporating individual and collective memories, dreams, and history that are contested and transformed through the political praxis of day-to-day living" (Mohanty, 1994, p. 162). The examples in this study are indicative of the potential of Te Whāriki and are consistent with what was envisioned by one of the key developers of the document, Tilly Reedy, who has described the curriculum document as "A whāriki woven by loving hands that can cross cultures with respect, that can weave people and nations together" (Reedy, 1995, p. 17).

The extent to which Pākehā educators can be equipped to support whanaungatanga is a key issue arising from this study. Kathy Irwin has cautioned against Treaty implementation “based in liberalism” which is still fundamentally individualistic (Irwin, 1993, p. 143). She considers that even well meaning Pākehā, such as early childhood teachers, may “not get the cultural overlay about their roles in relation to the *collective*, nor as a set of values tied to the imperatives of the very **survival** of their *descent group*”, as is the case for Māori (Irwin, 1993, p. 143). This highlights the consideration that while whanaungatanga is a survival strategy for Māori, Pākehā educators may consider it to be merely an optional “bicultural” approach. Geraldine McDonald’s (1973) research on Māori involvement in early childhood education found that Māori mothers who had established Playcentres for their tamariki moved away from them as Pākehā mothers moved in and took over. Herein lies the challenge for Pākehā educators to demonstrate that we are able to facilitate conditions which allow Māori to develop their sense of whanaungatanga, whilst resisting the urge to retain control.

12.4 Areas for Further Exploration

This study had as its main focus the preparation of mainstream students to deliver bicultural approaches in early childhood education. As a Pākehā researcher I chose to focus on Pākehā responsibilities in this area. It would be useful for there to be more research, led by Māori, exploring ways in which the university early childhood teacher education programme could better meet the needs of Māori students and address the poor recruitment and retention statistics for Māori.

Graduates indicated that the programme had not prepared them sufficiently in terms of their competence in te reo. It would therefore be useful to canvass the most effective means of utilising the time available within the three-year degree programme, to enhance students’ uptake in this crucial area. This could be a focus for future programme review and restructuring.

Practicum experiences were not a particular focus of this study. Research in the U.S.A. has indicated the need for “carefully planned and varied field experiences that explore sociocultural diversity”, which include preparation and monitoring of students, placement in settings which are in the process of developing culturally responsive approaches, and opportunities for reflection facilitated by teacher educators who have successfully implemented culturally responsive programmes (Zeichner et al., 1998, p. 168). A further study focusing on strengthening these aspects of the teacher education programme would be valuable.

During this study I became more aware of the recursive cycle that exists between early childhood teacher educators and the field of early childhood care and education. As teacher educators we are inevitably seen as ‘experts’ in ‘best practice’. We cannot shy away from our responsibility to share our vision with those whom we teach. This vision, though, will only have credibility if it is informed by the everyday realities of early childhood teaching. It seems that as teacher educators, it is important to maintain and strengthen our relationships with teachers, and ensure regular ongoing purposeful dialogue, with a particular focus on bicultural development issues. Future collaborative research projects will serve to inform both teacher educators and the field.

Racism emerged as an undercurrent of this study. Exposing racism and its effects not only serves to keep social justice issues on the agenda, but “provides a cogent foundation of the urgent need for substantive social change” (Lopez, 2001, p. 30). Further research could be mindful of the call to reposition issues of racism at the centre of educational research epistemologies and paradigms (Scheurich & Young, 1997).

12.5 Conclusion

Bicultural development can be seen as an ongoing social change process, a response to Tiriti o Waitangi obligations, a pragmatic process for restoring to Māori the equity and social justice that has been eroded by the past 162 years of colonisation. This study has highlighted that the early childhood field has a prominent role in the restorative process of bicultural development. Early childhood centres are pivotal in several ways. Firstly, an early childhood centre is a small nucleus within the surrounding community, small enough that change may be achievable in a pragmatic sense. Furthermore, within early childhood education, the opportunities to influence people's lives can be profound. An early childhood teacher is in the position to facilitate learning, not only with the children, but through relationships with parents/whānau, and to have that child's learning reinforced as adults in the child's home respond as well. As one of the Māori colleagues said, "It also goes not only to the tamariki but to the mātua as well, and whānau. That's why it is important as well, because it reaches not only directly the children but indirectly the results and repercussions from it" [CM4].

The implications of bicultural development in early childhood education are profound for teacher education providers, since it requires a transformation from a traditional transmissive monocultural pedagogy to a transactional model, one which embraces multiple perspectives and validates kaupapa Māori as a parallel paradigm alongside the Pākehā/Western canon. In addressing the bicultural mandate contained within Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b) "we have an opportunity to create an educational system like none that has previously existed, one that genuinely serves the educational needs of children who come from vastly different cultures" (Kendall, 1996, p. 135). Celebrating and validating te reo me ngā tikanga Māori does not exclude other ethnic groups, but can enhance appreciation of cultural diversity and differences in general. It creates an opportunity for many voices to be heard. Although, as Sally Lubeck has said, "When everyone is able to speak, we may find that our differences are greater than we realized" (Lubeck, 1996, p. 163), it is only

through creating the spaces for these voices to feel safe enough to be expressed, that equitable conditions will be realised, and these differences in ways of being and knowing validated and enacted in tangible manifestations that reach beyond meaningless rhetoric.

The bicultural development process identified here is fluid and amorphous, beyond its grounding in Te Tiriti o Waitangi and an ethical commitment to social justice and educational equity. What is proposed is consistent with Te Whāriki, an emergent process, in which “the whānau can...weave their own” [PDFM1] bicultural programme. In each centre, the teachers can become facilitators of this process, and in each centre, it will be different. Bicultural development in early childhood centres is, therefore, localised, and evolving.

Once whānau Māori become involved in the centre, there is less chance of (well-intentioned) teachers essentialising or misappropriating Māori content within the programme. ‘Māori’ itself is a construct of colonisation (Mead, 1996), which has homogenised particular whānau, hapū, and iwi “under one totalising label” (p. 107). As the process of bicultural development proceeds, each centre will be creating its own Te Whāriki-based programme, reflecting the values and world views of attending Māori children and their whānau, as well as those of other families present. The bicultural modalities that are being created may not constitute a dialectic of two opposing cultures, Māori and Pākehā, but instead are blossoming as new entities of their own, which have been termed “te whai ao”¹⁰² by Huata Holmes (in Bishop, 1996, p. 102).

Exploration and validation of the subtleties of cultural differences allows for a re-visioning of our individual and collective ways of being, knowing, and engaging as part of the collaborative process of bicultural development.

¹⁰² Whaiaio is a poetic term for ‘daylight’.

According to Homi Bhabha (1994):

What is theoretically innovative, and politically crucial, is the need to think beyond narratives of ordinary and initial subjectivities and to focus on those moments or processes that are produced in the articulation of cultural differences. These 'in-between' spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood - singular or communal - that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself (Bhabha, 1994, p. 1)

Instances of bicultural development in early childhood centres, where whānau Māori are actively participating in the early childhood programme, enabling their local reo and tikanga to be included in ways that they define and control, are examples of such innovative sites.

Whanaungatanga is a strength of kaupapa Māori education. Graham Smith considers whānau to be a key intervention element within kaupapa Māori that is likely to contribute to the reversal of Māori educational underachievement, as well as the revitalisation of te reo me ōna tikanga (G. H. Smith, 1995). Kath Irwin and Lisa Davies also consider collective whānau endeavour within kaupapa Māori education to be a "most effective" strategy (Irwin & Davies, 1994, p. 103). The collectivism, cooperation, sharing and altruism of whānau structures, although anathema to the extreme individualism of new right ideology, offer a paradigm which considers Māori wellbeing to be of paramount concern. Whanaungatanga as a core component of bicultural development is not only a fundamental mechanism for wellbeing and survival for Māori (Irwin, 1993, p. 143), but is consistent with the Te Whāriki principles of Whakamana/Empowerment, Kotahitanga/Holistic Development, Whānau Tangata/ Family and Community, and Ngā Hononga/Relationships as well as the strands of Mana Atua/Wellbeing, Mana Whenua/Belonging and Mana Tangata/Contribution (Ministry of Education, 1996b). More than this, a whanaungatanga approach to bicultural development is a means to realise the potentials contained within Te Whāriki whereby the early childhood setting should provide opportunities for children to reflect on alternative ways of doing things,

establish different kinds of relationships, and encounter different points of view whilst gaining knowledge and understanding of the cultural heritages of both partners to Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 9). These are likely outcomes of an early childhood programme in which whānau Māori have become centrally involved in facilitating their (and other) children's early childhood centre experiences. This process corresponds to Barbara Rogoff's "Transformation of Participation" theory in which:

The central question becomes: How do people participate in sociocultural activity and how does their participation change from being relatively peripheral participants . . . observing and carrying out secondary roles, to assuming various responsible roles in the management or transformation of such activities? (Rogoff, 1998, p. 695).

The challenge for mainstream early childhood education is, therefore, to ensure that through establishing a sense of whanaungatanga, Māori do assume roles which enable their full participation in bicultural development processes, both in teacher education institutions, and early childhood centres. Endorsement of whanaungatanga models has implications for mainstream institutions, as Mason Durie explains:

Whanaungatanga, the process by which whānau are empowered, depends on active leadership, an economic base, effective communication, the creation of new resources and facilities to meet changing whānau needs, and legislation that is compatible with whānau values and aspirations (M. H. Durie, 1997, p. 22).

Mainstream institutions are historically ill-prepared to establish processes that enable their responsiveness to whānau values, coming as they do from an individualistic, hierarchical, authoritarian, and often paternalistic paradigm.

Our role as teacher educators is to prepare and equip our students to be facilitators of bicultural development, which requires them to be responsive, reciprocal and respectful in building relationships with whānau Māori. Whilst graduates need a certain confidence that they have developed the relevant competencies, in order to incorporate te reo me ngā Māori respectfully and without causing offence, they

paradoxically require a reflexive humble orientation that enables them to be sensitive to the cultural politics and nuances of working as representatives of the dominant mainstream culture with those who have been marginalised by that monolith.

A key strategy identified in the study is the process of leading early childhood teacher education students to develop these competencies through our relationships, mentoring, and modeling of the understandings and qualities that we seek to enhance in our students. Central to all these relationships are respect and humility, and dialogue. Collaboration whereby Māori are responsible for determining the content and delivery of Māori perspectives, is vital. Māori perspectives can be presented in tandem with those from western paradigms, enabling a critical stance that privileges neither standpoint, but validates the diversity in human understandings. Barriers in our work are the institutional constraints, particularly that of leadership uncommitted to the kaupapa. In the ongoing contestation of institutional priorities such as funding, resourcing, and course content, it is important that Pākehā act as advocates in support of Māori aspirations as articulated by Māori.

Appendices

Appendix One: Details of Degree Programme and Course Content

Appendix 1.1 Degree Structure

BACHELOR OF TEACHING DEGREE STRUCTURE [1999]

AURAKI

The diagram below shows the degree structure for the BTch (Early Childhood) degree by level and course title and number.

Professional Education

300 Level	Developing Early Childhood Programmes 1058313B 300 level	The Professional Educator 1058310Bm Professional Practice 3: 1050311Cm 300 level	Belonging and Contribution 1058311A 300 level	Inclusive Programmes in the Early Years 1058312B 300 level			
	200 Level	International Issues in Early Childhood Education 1058211B 200 level	The Reflect' Practitioner 1058210Bm 200 level Professional Practice 2: 1050211Bm 200 level	Cultural Studies 2 1058213A 200 level	Making Sense of the World 1058212B 200 level	Children's Language and Communication 1058214A 200 level	Family and Community 1058218B 200 level
100 Level		Historical Perspectives in ECCE 1058112A 100 level	The E.C. Educator 1058110Bm 100 level Professional Practice 1: 1050111Cm 100 level	Cultural Studies 1 1058113A 100 level	Lifespan: From Birth to Death 1058111B 100 level	Exploration and Play 1058114B 100 level	Children's Wellbeing 1058115A 100 level

Options

Option 200 level	Option 200 or 300 level
Option 100 level	Option 100 level

Appendix 1.2 Cultural Studies Two 1058.113:

Course Rationale, Objectives and Weekly Topics, 1999.

This appendix contains excerpts from a course outline, which includes the course rationale, objectives, topics, readings, and a sample of the reading guides for classes in 1999.

Course Rationale:

Cultural Studies II is the second course within the Bachelor of Teaching (Early Childhood) programme, which explores issues of culture for all New Zealanders. These courses aim to equip students with the awareness, skills and resources that will enable them to design and implement culturally appropriate early childhood care and education programmes, in accordance with the requirements of the early childhood curriculum, Te Whāriki, and the Desirable Objectives and Practices required by the Ministry of Education.

Te Whāriki, the first bicultural curriculum developed in Aotearoa/New Zealand, recognises that there “is a growing understanding of the links between culture, language, and learning, and an increasing commitment to addressing the issues faced by children growing up in a society with more than one cultural heritage” (1996: 17). Implementation of the curriculum requires teachers to ensure that all children within their care will develop knowledge and understanding “of the cultural heritages of both partners to Te Tiriti o Waitangi” (1996: 9). “The early childhood curriculum supports the cultural identity of all children, affirms and celebrates cultural differences, and aims to help children gain a positive awareness of their own and other cultures” (1996: 18).

Te Whāriki acknowledges that “The expectations of adults are powerful influences on children’s lives. If adults are to make informed observations of children, they should recognise their own beliefs, assumptions, and attitudes and the influence these will

have on the children” (1996: 30). Therefore, implementing Te Whāriki involves teachers actively working towards countering racism and other forms of prejudice” (1996: 18).

The role of the teacher also includes recognition of their responsibility regarding empowerment:

“Particular care should be given to bicultural issues in relation to empowerment. Adults working with children should understand and be willing to discuss bicultural issues, actively seek Māori contributions to decision making, and ensure that Māori children develop a strong sense of self-worth” (1996: 40).

The recently revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices for chartered early childhood services (New Zealand Gazette, 3 October 1996) requires management and educators to implement policies, objectives and practices which:

- i) reflect the service’s philosophy, quality curriculum, current theories of learning and development, the requirements of the DOPs and legislation;
- ii) acknowledge parents/guardians and whānau needs and aspirations for their child;
- ii) reflect the unique place of Māori as tangata whenua and the principle of partnership inherent in Te Tiriti o Waitangi; and
- iii) are inclusive, equitable and culturally appropriate.

Course Objectives:

Students will:

- (a) further develop the knowledge, skills, resources and confidence to implement early childhood care and education programmes which recognise, affirm and support the cultural identity of Māori children and their families and which show Māori culture as visible and of value to children and families from other cultural backgrounds.

- (b) develop their knowledge and skills in Te Reo Māori to a communicative and practical level.
- (c) continue to develop their knowledge of tikanga Māori.
- (d) develop an awareness of the wider issues of cultural diversity in New Zealand society.
- (e) develop their understanding of the needs of children from culturally diverse backgrounds, and the role of early childhood programmes in supporting these children and their families.

Course Content:

Content of this course will include:

- (a) an examination of the concept of bicultural development and the responsibilities of early childhood educators in this area
- (b) an exploration of the implications of racism for early childhood care and education professionals.
- (c) an inquiry into cultural diversity in New Zealand society and the significance for early childhood education.
- (d) identification of ways in which early childhood educators can be responsive to the needs of different cultural groups.
- (e) opportunities to explore the concept of cultural difference and to develop a deeper understanding of their own attitudes and values.
- (f) examination of some of the concepts of the Māori world with relation to planning activities suitable for tamariki in early childhood care and education programmes.
- (g) opportunities to develop and apply learning strategies through the medium of Te Reo with relevance to early childhood programmes and with a focus on waiata, games, activities, art and kori tinana.
- (h) application of theory to practice and to the mandated documents, Te Whāriki, and the Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices.

Course Structure:

The course has two strands running simultaneously - this will allow students to focus on te reo Māori me ōna tikanga for two class hours each week, whilst the other two-hour class focuses on cultural issues in early childhood education. All classes will be interactive, involving class discussion and a high degree of participation is expected.

Topics and Readings for Cultural Studies Two, 1999:

1. Introduction to course, culture and difference and the requirements of the Desirable Objectives and Practices:

Carr, M. (1993). Biculturalism Position Paper. In M. Carr & H. May (Eds.), *Te Whāriki: Curriculum Papers*. (pp. 107-116). Hamilton: University of Waikato: Early Childhood Curriculum Project.

Clark, P. (1995). Culturally Appropriate Practices in Early Childhood Education: Families as the Resource. *Contemporary Education*, 66(3), 154 - 157.

Metge, J. (1990). *Te Kohao o Te Ngira, Culture and Learning*. Wellington: Learning Media, p. 3-19.

Ministry of Education (1998) Quality in Action. Te Mahi Whai Hua. Wellington: Learning Media, p. 64-74.

2. Te Tiriti as a framework.

Sullivan, K. (1993). Bicultural Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Establishing a Tauwi Side to the Partnership. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 3, 191-221.

Ritchie, J. E. (1992). *Becoming Bicultural*. Wellington: Huia Publications. Chapter 10, 'Hobson's Choice'.

3. Values as a core component of culture.
Ritchie, J. E. (1992). *Becoming Bicultural*. Wellington: Huia Publications. Chapter 6, 'Values'.
4. Comparative world views, indigenous education and cultural survival.
Harris, T. (1990). *Aboriginal World View, Two-way Aboriginal Schooling: Education and Cultural Survival*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
Walker, R. (c1987). *The Meaning of Biculturalism*. Auckland: Maori Studies Section, Anthropology Department, Auckland University
5. Culturally preferred learning styles: A critique.
Ryan, J. (1992). *Aboriginal Learning Styles: A Critical Review*. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 5(3), 161-183.
6. A Culturally Responsive Model: The Kamehameha Early Education Programme
Au, K., & Jordan, C. (1981). *Teaching to Hawaiian Children: Finding a Culturally Appropriate Solution*. In H. T. Trueba & G. P. Guthrie (Eds.), *Culture and the Bilingual Classroom* (pp. 139-152). Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
Jordan, C. (1995). *Creating Cultures of Schooling: Historical and conceptual background of the KEEP/Rough Rock Collaboration*. *The Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(1), 83-100.
Mangione, P. L., Lally, J. R., & Singer, S. (1993). *Essential Connections: Ten Keys to Culturally Sensitive Child Care*. Sacramento, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
7. Language Issues: The state of te reo Māori.

Waite, J. (1992). *Aotearoa: Speaking for Ourselves. A Discussion on the Development of a New Zealand Languages Policy*. Wellington: Learning Media, pp. 15-20, 30-43, 50.

Te Puni Kōkiri (1998) *The National Māori Language Survey Summary Report*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri.

Te Puni Kōkiri (1998) *The National Māori Language Survey* Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri [excerpts].

8. Mother tongue: Supporting children who have a preferred language other than English.

Bowman, B. (1991). *Educating Language Minority Children: Challenges and Opportunities*. In S. L. Kagan (Ed.), *The Care and Education of America's Young Children: Obstacles and Opportunities*. (pp. 17-29). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Garcia, E. (1993) *The Education of Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Children*. In: B. Spodek (Ed) *Handbook of Research on the Education of Young Children*. (pp. 372-384). N. Y.: McMillan.

Genishi, C., Anne Haas Dyson, Rebekah Fassler. (1994). *Language and Diversity in Early Childhood: Whose Voice is Appropriate?* In B. Mallory & R. New (Eds.), *Diversity and Developmentally Appropriate Practice*. (pp. 250-268). New York: Teachers College Press.

Stonehouse, A (1991) *Opening the Doors*. Watson, ACT: AECA. Chapter 6 'Language and Communication'.

9. Recognising racism: the insidious barrier.

Ritchie, J. E. (1992). *Becoming Bicultural*. Wellington: Huia Publications. Chapter 14, 'Pākehā Prejudice'.

Simon, J. (1996). *Good Intentions, but . . .* In R. Steele (Ed.), *Whakamana Tangata* (3rd ed., pp. 38-42). Wellington: Quest Rapuara.

Ballara, Angela (1986) *Proud to be White? A survey of Pakeha Prejudice in New Zealand*. Auckland: Heinemann, p. 147-150.

10. Identifying strategies to counter racism.

Stonehouse, A (1991) *Opening the Doors*. Watson, ACT: AECA. Chapter 12 'Getting Started'.

Derman-Sparks, Louise (1989) *Anti-Bias Curriculum*, Washington, D. C.: NAEYC. Chapter 8, 'Learning to Resist Stereotyping and Discriminatory Behaviour'.

11. Culturally appropriate practice in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Metge, Joan. (1990) *Te Kohao o te Ngira : culture and learning*. Wellington: Learning Media, p. 20-47.

Ministry of Education (1996) *Te Whāriki: He Whāriki Mātauranga mō ngā Mokopuna o Aotearoa: Early Childhood Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Ritchie, J. E. (1992). *Becoming Bicultural*. Wellington: Huia Publications. Chapter 5. 'Principles of Action: A Credo for Working in the Māori World'.

Ritchie, Jenny (1996) *Tino Rangatiratanga and the Implementation of Te Whāriki*. In H. May & M. Carr (Eds) *Implementing Te Whāriki*, Te Whāriki Papers 2, Institute for Early Childhood Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, and Department of Early Childhood Studies, University of Waikato, p. 77-88.

12. Tino Rangatiratanga, tribal development, empowerment and self-determination .

Cummins, J. (1986). *Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention*. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18-36.

Durie, M. (1995). *Tino Rangatiratanga: Māori Self Determination*. *He Pukenga Kōrero: A Journal of Māori Studies*, 1(1), 44-53.

Ritchie, J. E. (1992). *Becoming Bicultural*. Wellington: Huia Publications. Chapter 11. The Challenge of Tribal Development.

Samples of Reading Guides from Cultural Studies Two, 1999.

Explanation from introduction to Readings Guides, 1999:

Each week there will be a selection of readings. In order to support students' learning, students are required to complete the following reading guides in preparation for class discussions. Extracts from Te Whāriki are provided as another focus for understanding these texts.

1. Intro to course, culture and difference, and the requirements of the DOPs

Focus points from Te Whāriki:

"In early childhood settings, all children should be given the opportunity to develop knowledge and an understanding of the cultural heritages of both partners to Te Tiriti o Waitangi." (p9 introduction)

"There is a growing understanding of the links between culture, language, and learning, and an increasing commitment to addressing the issues faced by children growing up in a society with more than one cultural heritage." (p17)

"The early childhood curriculum supports the cultural identity of all children, affirms and celebrates cultural differences, and aims to help children gain a positive awareness of their own and other cultures." (p18)

Clark, P. (1995) Culturally appropriate Practices in ECCE, Contemporary Education, Vol 66, No 3, Spring, 154-157

Exercise: read Clark, and then in pairs identify:

- a) some useful principles:
- b) a series of practical steps which will enable the early childhood educator to deliver culturally appropriate practice

Metge, J. (1990) Te Kohao o te Ngira : culture and learning : education for a multicultural society. Learning Media, p3-19.

Questions:

1. How, according to Metge, do we learn the value of our culture?
2. What insights have you gained with regard to your understanding of Māori culture from Metge's writing?
3. Give some of your own examples to illustrate Metge's claim that "individuals can be said to be directed and constrained by their culture" (p10).
4. Why is Metge uncomfortable with the term "race"?
5. What do you understand by the term "ethnocentrism"? How the pitfalls of ethnocentrism be avoided by early childhood teachers?
6. Read page 20 of Metge. What can you say about the relationship between culture and education?

Appendix Two: Details of Methodological Process

Appendix 2.1 Chronology of Data Collection

I obtained approval for my proposal and ethical processes in May 1996. During study leave March-June 1997 I conducted the following interviews:

Table of Interviews:

	Code	Interview date
1.	CP1	2 April, 1997
2.	PDFM1	10 April, 1997
3.	GM1	11 April, 1997
4.	GP1	17 April, 1997
5.	GP2	23 April, 1997
6.	CP2	23 April, 1997
7.	GP3	25 April, 1997
8.	CP3	28 April, 1997
9.	CP4	28 April, 1997
10.	CM1*	15 May, 1997
11.	PDFM3	23 May, 1997
12.	CM2	April, 1997

13.	PDFP1	27 May, 1997
14.	GM2	9 June, 1997
15.	CM3	13 June, 1997
16.	CM4*	13 June, 1997

*Indicates that data from this individual applies in two categories, but second code not listed to prevent identifiability.

The following table provides an overview of the duration of the project, indicating the phases of data collection, and the publications that were the result of interim analysis and reflection.

Table of data gathering and processing:

Year				
1996	Initial Approvals, Preliminary Literature.			Paper: Early Childhood Education as Critical Pedagogy (Ritchie, 1996b)
1997	Study leave, Interviews,	Taped Classes	Samples of Student Assignments	
1998	Further Ethical Approval, Centre Observations	Taped Classes	Samples of Student Assignments	Paper: Pākehā Colleagues (Ritchie, 2000b)

1999			Samples of Student Assignments	Paper: Pākehā Graduates (Ritchie, 1999c). Paper: Te Reo in Centres (Ritchie, 1999b)
2000	Graduate Survey		Samples of Student Assignments	Paper: Commitment, Confidence, Competence, Collegiality and Critical Analysis (Ritchie, 2000a).
2001	Study leave, writing first draft Hui with Māori Participants			Paper: Implementing a bicultural curriculum: Some considerations. Early Childhood Folio 5: 2001, Wellington, NZCER, 23-26 (Ritchie, 2001b) Paper: Collaborative Research in Early Childhood Care and Education, NZ Research in Early Childhood Education, 4, p133-138 (Ritchie, 2001a)

The first set of data analysed came from the interviews with Pākehā colleagues. This was presented as a paper at the Australian Research in Early Childhood Education Conference, in Canberra, 1998 (Ritchie, 2000b). In 1997 and 1998 I taped discussions from the course, Cultural Studies Two. In 1998 I collected data from centre observations. A paper focusing on the use of te reo in the centres was subsequently published (Ritchie, 1999b). In January 1999 I presented data from the interviews with Pākehā graduates, again at the Australian Research in Early Childhood Education Conference, in Canberra [in press]. From 1997- 2000 I collected samples of student assignments.

In 2000 I conducted the graduate survey, on behalf of the Department of Education Studies which provided further data. I presented a paper at the 4th New Zealand Early Childhood Research Symposium reflecting on collaboration in early childhood research, and a second paper based on my interim analysis of data, “Commitment, Confidence, Competence, Collegiality and Critical Analysis. Dilemmas in preparing preservice teachers to deliver bicultural early childhood programmes in Aotearoa/New Zealand” at NZARE, University of Waikato, December, 2000.

In 2001, during a second period of study leave, I processed the data from the interviews with Māori participants and facilitated a hui to collaborate on the theorising of their data. I also processed data from the taped classes, student assignments and the graduate survey. These data and previously written material was then utilised in a first draft of the thesis.

In 2002 I completed revisions of the thesis, as well as preparing three journal articles and a chapter for a book.

Appendix 2.2 Notes for co-theorising hui participants, May 18th 2001

The notes which follow were prepared after I had completed my initial coding and writing up of the interview data. They were sent out to the Māori interview participants in advance to inform them of the progress of the research, and in order that they could provide a basis for the discussion at the co-theorising hui.

Ngā mihi nui ki a koutou, ngā hoamahi e tautoko ana i te kaupapa nei, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou katoa. Ko te tumanako kei te tino ora tātou katoa!

As you already know, this research project is about bicultural development within the mainstream early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato. At this hui I want to check my understandings with you, the research participants, as to the following issues:

Why bicultural development in a mainstream setting?

The project is sourced in Te Tiriti o Waitangi

- Article One: Crown presence and responsibility to govern
- Article Two: Tino Rangatiratanga, kainga, whenua, taonga katoa
- Article Three: Ka tiakina: equity
- Article Four: Ritenga Māori, eg wairua

What are the goals of bicultural development in early childhood education?

- Tino Rangatiratanga: Māori self-determination, Māori control over Māori domain
- Taonga Katoa: language revitalisation, tikanga, Māori determine what is made available to mainstream in “public domain”
- Responsibility of Crown agents, eg early childhood teachers to: support and work towards tino rangatiratanga, respect and protect taonga, value ritenga Māori

[CM2] : Goal of bicultural development “To empower Māori to take control and to empower Pakeha to 'let go' of that power and work collaboratively towards equity. In many cases this process should be worked out cooperatively between both parties.”

What are the indicators that bicultural development is happening within a particular early childhood centre?

- Staff build positive responsive relationships with Māori children and families to enable a collaborative process “the whānau can weave their own” [PDFM1]
- Encouraging not only Māori families but Pākehā families to support their children’s involvement in bicultural practices
- Facilitating Pākehā families’ understanding and support of bicultural philosophy and practices.
- Respectful partnerships with Māori colleagues (if they are present)
- What else? Authentic holistic integration of te reo and tikanga, eg tuakana/teina¹⁰³ age-groupings, karakia, pakiwaitara, local knowledge, kaumātua¹⁰⁴ support

How best to achieve these goals? ie, What are the most important things we need to do to help prepare our Pākehā and Tauwi students to implement bicultural development in early childhood centres?

- Model and encourage them to develop qualities of humility, respectfulness, openness, responsiveness
- Develop respect for taonga of te reo and tikanga, commitment to tino rangatiratanga based in knowledge of Tiriti and colonisation
- Understanding of tikanga needs to be deeper, beyond token and superficial, “making Māori things real” [CM4]

¹⁰³ Tuakana are older and teina are younger siblings.

¹⁰⁴ Kaumātua are elders.

- What are the key Māori values they should understand? (whānau, wairua, authentic reo, involving kaumātua, mana whenua . . .???)
- Applying critical analysis, awareness of Western and personal values eg individualism/collectivism, spiritual/secular

Barriers

- Lack of clout in terms of decision-making impedes implementation
- Racism, ignorance, lack of commitment, lack of consultation from colleagues in positions of authority
- Hard for Māori staff to deal with Pākehā students racism – need structures to reduce this situation (Tiriti and anti-racism workshop at start, Pākehā lecturers to run sessions on racism).

Other questions:

- Who do you see benefiting from bicultural development in ecce?
- What is our main motivation for our work in ecce?
- What are the best strategies for us at the University of Waikato to achieve the goals of bicultural development?

Appendix 2.3 Preparation sheet for observation in early childhood centres, 1998

From Te Whāriki:

- **“In what ways do the environment and programme reflect the values embodied in Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and what impact does this have on adults and children?”**
 - *tino rangatiratanga?*
 - *taonga: ngā tikanga Māori visible and affirmed*
 - *equity (Article III)*

- **recognition of Māori ways of knowing and making sense of the world**
 - *eg Māori ways of respecting and appreciating the natural environment*

- **Māori cultural heritage:**
 - *activities, stories, and events, Māori people, places, and artifacts that have connections with Māori children’s lives*

- **supports the cultural identity of Māori, Māori children develop a strong sense of self-worth**

•“In what ways is Māori language included in the programme?”

•“What opportunities are there for children to experience Māori creative arts in an appropriate way and at an appropriate level?”

• **expectations of adults, their own beliefs, assumptions, and attitudes**

-understanding of the links between culture, language, and learning [ie centrality of culture, expressed through the language, to children's identity and learning enhanced by cultural congruence]

-affirming and celebrating cultural differences

-countering racism and other forms of prejudice

Appendix 2.4 Coverage of Participants within text

In March 2002, when I had completed a first draft of the thesis, I prepared a separate document for each interview participant, which comprised all the sections within the draft thesis in which their material had been quoted or referred to. This was done using the codes that were allocated to each person (see table below). Some participants had several “hats” and appeared under two or three different codes. Once each document had been printed, I again referred to this table to identify with a highlighter pen on the document prepared for each participant, that person’s contributions to enable them to quickly find the relevant pieces. I accompanied this with a letter that again thanked them for their participation and explained the enclosed document and its purpose in terms of accountability and a request that they check the use of their material.

I have included this table in order to demonstrate the extent to which all the interview participant’s contributions have informed the study.

Participant	Codes	Chapters	Sections
1.	CP1	6,7,9,10,11	6.1 6.5 7.1.1 7.2.1 7.2.2 7.5 7.5.1 7.5.3 7.6 7.6.1 9.1 10.7.2 11.1.1 11.2

2.	PDFM1 MPH5	5,6, 8,9,10,11	5.1.5 6.2.1 6.4 7.3.1 8.4 8.5 8.7 9.2 9.5 10.5 11.1.4 11.2 11.5
3.	GM1	5,8,10	5.1.5 8.4 10.5 10.7.3 10.8
4.	GP1	5,7,8,11	5.1.5 7.1.1 7.6.1 8.3 8.5 11.2
5.	GP2	7,9	7.8 9.5

6.	CP2	5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11	5.1.5 5.1.8 5.3.5 6.1 7.1.1 7.2.1 7.2.3 7.3.1 7.5.1 9.1 10.2 10.4 10.6 11.1.1 11.1.2
7.	GP3	5,7,8,10,11	5.1.8 7.1.1 7.2.1 7.2.3 8.5 8.7 10.5 11.2
8.	CP3	5, 6, 7, 11	5.1.8 6.5 7.5.1 11.2
9.	CP4	5, 6, 7, 11	5.1.11 6.5 7.2.1 7.4.2 7.5.1 10.4 11.1.1 11.2

10.	CM1 PDFM2 MPH2	5,6,7,10, 11	5.1.5 6.4 7.5 7.6 7.8 8.2 8.5 9.3 10.2 10.7.1 11.1.1 11.1.2
11	PDFM3 MPH1	5,6,10, 11	5.1.8 6.1 6.2.1 6.3.1 6.3.2 6.5 10.8 11.1.4 11.3
12.	CM2	6, 7, 9, 10, 11	6.1 6.2 6.2.1 7.1.2 7.2.2 9.1 10.1 10.2 10.3 10.4 10.6 11.1.1 11.1.2

13.	PDFP1	6, 7	6.5 7.2.1 7.4.2
14.	GM2 MPH6	5, 7,9,10	5.3.5 7.4.1 7.4.2 9.5 10.7.1 10.10
15.	CM3	6,7,10	6.4 7.1.2 7.2.2 7.3.2 7.4.1 7.5 7.5.2 10.5 10.9
16.	MPH3	6,7,10	6.2.1 6.3.1 6.5 7.2.3 8.0 10.6 11.1.4 11.3

17.	CM4/GM3 MPH4	5,6,7,9,10,11	5.3.5 6.4 7.2.3 7.5.2 7.6 9.2 9.5 10.3 10.5 10.7.1 10.8 11.1.4 11.2 11.5
-----	-----------------	---------------	---

Appendix Three: Data Sections

This appendix contains “chunks” of data organised into groupings. The interviews form the first section, followed by secondary supporting data, and finally the group interview from the co-theorising hui with Māori participants. The data sections have been organised thematically in response to the coding, but quotations are only minimally edited in order to allow the voices of participants to be heard. The groupings are as follows:

- 3.1 Stage One Data: Initial Interviews
 - 3.1.1 Māori Colleagues
 - 3.1.2 Māori Graduates
 - 3.1.3 Pākehā colleagues.
 - 3.1.4 Pākehā graduates
 - 3.1.5 Professional Development Facilitators

- 3.2 Stage Two Data: Further Sources
 - 3.2.1 Bicultural development in centres
 - 3.2.2 Class Discussions
 - 3.2.3 Students’ writing
 - 3.2.4 Graduate Review
- 3.3 Co-Theorising Hui

Appendix 3.1 Stage One Data: Initial Interviews

Each data section was developed from coding the transcripts of a related group of interviews. In all cases, the participants were sent copies of their own interview transcript, and of the relevant data section in draft form. This was to enable them to correct any errors, or make any changes to the transcript, and to my preliminary interpretation of selected pieces of the data.

Appendix 3.1.1 Māori Colleagues

This section contains data from four Māori colleagues who have worked in the Department of Early Childhood Studies, at the University of Waikato. These data was gathered in 1997. As a confidentiality measure, no specific background information has been included here in recognition of the need to avoid material that could be identifiable. These participants draw upon a wide and diverse range of experiences in early childhood education in Aotearoa, including Kōhanga Reo, Playcentre, childcare, kindergarten, and support services.

Understandings of Bicultural Education

One of the participants distinguished between the application of a bicultural framework within an educational context, and the capacity for individuals to be biculturally competent:

'Bicultural' is a really interesting word to me. I believe the definition within an educational context is where two bodies of knowledge (Māori and Pakeha) are taught side by side. I guess the metaphor of the railroad track explains my concept of 'bicultural education'. Parallel development with a coming together at certain negotiated points to share information and through all this the tracks keep on task to its destination. The ultimate bicultural person to me is someone who is bilingual and bimondial (to quote Margaret Carr's flash word), this being someone who has a good grasp of both te reo Māori and English and has a working knowledge of both systems . . . It's an interesting concept [CM2].

She considers bicultural development to be a political process which aims to contribute to tino rangatiratanga. Roles are differentiated for Māori and non-Māori in this paradigm:

Bicultural education should ideally contribute to tino rangatiratanga. Bicultural education should have a political agenda. I'm talking specifically of the sharing of Māori knowledge with Tauīwi. How and what is to be shared should be determined by Māori and to what extent. The process of bicultural education should enable Tauīwi to be clear about their role in supporting tino rangatiratanga. I don't see Pakeha/Tauīwi roles as directly teaching te reo or tikanga Māori. I would view them more as advocates for the political and social rights of Māori. This is not to say that they should not know te reo or be informed of tikanga, these are important tools when working at a certain level such as with tamariki and parents. At another level I view Pakeha advocates as supporting Māori aspirations more at the management level, right at the power base [CM2].

In this paradigm for bicultural education, Māori knowledge is a privilege that Pākehā and Tauīwi can have access to, only under Māori guidance and authority. An outcome for Pākehā is to become committed to supporting Māori aspirations and to advocate for these. This participant sees bicultural education as a political social change process involving redistribution of power:

For Māori bicultural education . . . should provide Māori not only with knowledge but with strategies to reclaim their rights. Strategic planning is part of bicultural education. I believe information is useless if you don't do anything with it.

In a nutshell, for me bicultural education is about equity and empowerment for both Māori and Pakeha. To empower Māori to take control and to empower Pakeha to 'let go' of that power and work collaboratively towards equity. In many cases this process should be worked out cooperatively between both parties [CM2].

Tino rangatiratanga is integral to this paradigm:

Tino rangatiratanga for me is about Māori rights which is linked directly to the social, political, economical and cultural wellbeing of Māori people. It is about being able to determine processes which ensure that all of the above produces positive outcomes for the Māori nation. To me the key word is 'tira' which indicates to me the collective wellbeing, so whatever people do as individuals within kaupapa Māori, the connotation is that it will benefit or contribute to the wider social scene [CM2].

In addition to a focus on Māori autonomy and collectivism, equity and empowerment are key principles in this colleague's conceptualisation.

Bicultural development within our early childhood degree programme, and in early childhood centres, was seen by all four Māori colleagues as contributing to the empowerment of Māori children and whānau:

At the beginning of each early childhood intake I constantly remind myself that only 51% of Māori children are in Te Kōhanga Reo and that at least 45% will be taking part in auraki [mainstream] early childhood educational programmes. Within my psyche many of the new students in the auraki intake pose a possible threat to these children and their whānau not to mention non-Māori. If this is my criticism of these students I also believe it is our duty to make sure that these people are safe by time they are ready to leave us. Māori content in courses is one strategy of breaking down these barriers [CM2].

These are people who are going to go out into a teaching position and they are going to be in the front line of groups of children of whom many will be Māori. But not only is it important to me for Māori children to know and to see that they are being acknowledged in the way that programmes have been designed by their teachers, take account of what's important to them, but it is also important for the other children in other families who are in those centres as well, because it is kiwi land, New Zealand, and we are here, Māori are here. And if we were to go elsewhere, to another country, I would think that it would be very important for us to learn about the other groups in that country as well. So starting from the two major groups in this country I think that is one of the reasons why I think it is important that we do something to meet that [CM3].

It also goes not only to the tamariki but to the mātua as well, and whānau. That's why it is important as well, because it reaches not only directly the children but indirectly the results and repercussions from it [CM4].

It was recognised that the early childhood years are important for developing cultural awareness and establishing positive attitudes about cultural differences:

If we are trying to look at harmonious relationships we are not going to be able to do that unless we have a good understanding of each other. And it starts really early. And children, as we know it, at a young age, they don't have any hang-ups. But if they are not sort of grounded in this sort of thing it is only about three or four years later that they are going to be subjected to all the other kinds of views about how valuable this is, and they are not going to be able to stand up to that [CM3].

Te Whāriki, the early childhood curriculum, was seen as validating the inclusion of Māori content:

The other thing for Pākehā students is Te Whāriki makes what you do, or the Māori things you do, real. Whatever you're doing in class and when you do link it to Te Whāriki, "Oh okay it's real then" [CM4].

Participants considered the document to give substance and direction to the bicultural focus of early childhood education in Aotearoa,

CM3: See, imagine where we would be without that document, the bicultural things would be all the more difficult.

CM4: It would be, it would still be that wishy washy, you know, oh we've got to take that Māori thing.

CM3: Because that's what it is as you say, having that there to say that's why we are doing it, because we took away the Treaty of Waitangi in the Education Act, so you don't have to do it. But you've got this and it's still holding.

CM4: And these are the reasons why because when you got out this is why - so this is relevant

CM3: In every centre.

Bicultural Development within the Department of Early Childhood Studies

Specific bicultural development achievements by the Department of Early Childhood Studies identified by these Māori colleagues included initiatives such as:

- employing Māori lecturers
- the whānau group (which was a Māori student class grouping which preceded the Ki Taiao programme)
- the commitment to Tino Rangatiratanga made in the 1994 Department Vision Statement
- the development and implementation of the Ki Taiao programme
- the 'biculturalism' integral theme review in 1994
- Te Hunga Māori auditing of Department course outlines, and
- positive efforts by staff including secretaries.

A Māori colleague appreciated that Pākehā lecturers checked out possible Māori material and its usage in their classes:

Between staff and all of that, they were conscious about this and they will ask and say who would be good in this and readings and so on, there's been a bit of that going on for the content of different courses [CM3].

They were critical of insufficient efforts in some areas. One participant considered that she had been relied on as a 'generalist' being expected to deliver Māori perspectives on anything and everything. "It seemed as though I was viewed by many, not only those in our Department as the 'Māori expert' and in a way had to become a generalist" [CM2].

The compartmentalising of Māori content was an issue raised by three of the Māori colleagues. Māori sections within courses were criticised as an inadequate model:

You can do all the fancy words, and I'm aware in the course programme that they have sections or whatever, but the rest of it Jenny, and that's what I find quite hard at times.

[later] I have been involved with [a particular course], I did [a particular] section within that, and I couldn't see where that integral theme was within that programme. I mean within the [particular] section I talked about the accountability and all the concepts that happen for kōhanga and tried to talk about looking at [the topic] from both Pākehā and Māori perspectives and what it means in the actual centres. But in the rest of the course programme . . . , I couldn't see how that was being covered. I tried to talk to [the course coordinator] and ask, but then I thought well perhaps I should have been pushing it but I was there to do the [particular] section not the total. I wasn't there for the total things [CM1].

This excerpt also raises the issue of the Māori lecturer being brought in to cover a specialty 'section' but not feeling included in the course as a whole.

Another perception was that there was too much reliance on the two Cultural Studies courses to cover Māori perspectives and also provide students with opportunities to learn te reo:

And because people tend to put Māori into a little box, like such as Cultural Studies, everything Māori goes into Cultural Studies. It needs to be really well defined too as to what that one particular course is about, not everything Māori is there, because you can't do it. And it gets too confusing and mind-boggling [CM4].

This issue was linked to the perception that students were not using te reo effectively on practicum.

A part of that could be because, like in first year, the only class where they have any Māori is in Cultural Studies. It's that little square again. . . it should just be there, a natural, it should be just naturally integrated [CM4].

[Te reo is] not prominent enough in the other courses [CM3].

The compartmentalising of Māori content, as opposed to an integrated model, was also reflected in students assignments:

And sometimes in the assignments, it's a couple of years since I was in the other group [Auraki programme], they don't even reflect on any or acknowledge any bicultural aspects that might have been covered, and they don't always integrate it into their essays or anything like that. I don't know whether you have been finding that [CM3].

There was a perception that the early childhood teacher education programme may have been more effective in generating in our students a commitment to bicultural development, but not accompanying this with sufficient practical competence in te reo:

I remember with [the] 3rd years that went out at the end of 1993, and they were a committed group, but they were lacking in competence in te reo they really were. And were really shy. Because they hadn't had a lot of practice here, and I know that at one stage just simple greetings, as I saw them and they saw me, but to go out into a centre and use te reo they were really nervous too because there weren't others in the centre that were using the language as well. There was a group of them that pushed about that, the practical side and actually using the language [CM1].

This is a reference to a petition that was presented by third year students of this intake requesting the programme to provide more te reo Māori tuition.

One participant suggested that the Department commitment to tino rangatiratanga needed to be monitored. She considered that there was a mismatch between the stated commitment to tino rangatiratanga and its implementation:

Taking a stand on issues to do with tino rangatiratanga have been pretty pathetic. On entering into this debate I have found the persons really uninformed on the issue, a huge time waster. My attitude to this sort of ignorance is 'go away, get informed and let's discuss this later'. I feel my time is too valuable to waste on this nonsense. Interestingly enough, I do not find many challenges on the issue of tino rangatiratanga as long as it remains rhetoric. I find the challenges come at the level of implementation. This is when I have experienced a mismatch of theory into practice. In reference to the Ki Taiao programme, course content and programme structure have generated many debates. I believe the conflict comes with the introduction of different knowledge codes, creating a panic-stricken reaction and a feeling of loss of control. The loss of control comes from lack of knowledge which puts the whole saying of 'knowledge is power' into reality for me. I have witnessed some bizarre coping strategies and weak arguments such as 'the quality has to be the same as..' and 'assessment has to be the same as..' and 'Ki Taiao courses have to be the same as...'. What I see through these 'same as..' statements is the lack of acknowledging that there are genuine cultural differences that need to be addressed and validated and the insinuation that anything different can be doubted from a definition of quality by monocultural standards . . . I guess in a nutshell, this is racism in action [CM2].

This idea of Tiriti remaining as rhetoric, lead to me to the metaphor of 'deframing Te Tiriti', taking it down off the walls and out of vision statements, and making it happen in real life situations.

The Ki Taiao programme, a potential model of tino rangatiratanga, created some specific tensions:

Somewhere within the centre of early childhood there is a tendency not to want to challenge or rock the boat within the wider university context. In reference to the Ki Taiao programme, course content and programme structure have generated many debates. I believe the conflict comes with the introduction of different knowledge codes, creating a panic-stricken reaction and a feeling of loss of control. The loss of control comes from lack of knowledge which puts the whole saying of 'knowledge is power' into reality for me. I have witnessed some bizarre coping strategies and weak arguments such as 'the quality has to be the same as...' and 'assessment has to be the same as...' And 'Ki Taiao courses have to be the same as...' What I see through these 'same as...' statements is the lack of acknowledging that there are genuine cultural differences that need to be addressed and validated and the insinuation that anything different can be doubted from a definition of quality by monocultural standards. Pihama would have a ball with this lot. I guess in a nutshell, this is racism in action. As a Māori staff member, having

to cope with these issues can be tough, however there are two things I call on at times like this. My Pakeha colleagues to advocate for Māori rights, and for me to go ahead and do what I believe is right in terms of the kaupapa of Ki Taiao and the idealism of tino rangatiratanga. I have to work on the proviso that if they don't like it, well fire me. It's about putting one's neck on the line. How's that for heroism? [CM2].

A number of issues are salient in this quotation. Links have been made between knowledge, power and control. She has also indicated that racism is an underlying factor in the unwillingness of those in power to relinquish control. This gate-keeping is seen as preventing the Ki Taiao programme from having the genuine autonomy to address Māori needs through kaupapa Māori approaches. This colleague also emphasises the important role of Pākehā allies in support Māori issues and the strength of her own personal commitment.

Another participant made similar comments about those in leadership being obstructive to bicultural development:

Yep, and we don't get led from above. More so you get these things put up so that they can't happen. I mean even senior positions above us put in these gate-keeping things so that you can't truly work along a model line. The Early Childhood Department's got really really committed people, but they have blocks all the time [CM1].

A specific example mentioned was the refusal by the Dean of the School of Education to respond to a formal written request from a large group of Māori early childhood people from Ōpōtiki the Ki Taiao programme to be offered in an off-campus model for them.

One of the participants expressed concern about the lack of supports for Māori students:

So rather than, even this structure, they go on about bicultural and you know the Māori is an important theme to our programme etc., they don't put the rest of the systems in place to help . . . Those are the little things that to me show whether you are bicultural or not. You can do all the fancy words, and I'm aware in the course programme that they have sections or whatever, but the rest of it Jenny, and that's what I find quite hard at times [CM1].

There was a perception, from three of these colleagues, that Māori staff were stretched because of their dual roles in the Ki Taiao and Auraki programmes – “It has been a drain on Māori staff trying to service both Ki Taiao and the Auraki programmes” [CM2].

Competence in te reo is an issue for the competencies with which we assess students on practicum. I was interested that the participants considered that we were not expecting high enough standards from our students.

JR: Well what do you think about competencies in that regard at the moment. I think they say . . . ; first year it's just simple Māori phrases. Second year is starting to use it in a range of the curriculum, and the third year is integrating it throughout the curriculum, is that too much for them?

CM3: I think that the first year the competencies are not strong enough.

JR: Yeah?

CM3: Yeah, especially as I say we get a good loading from Cultural Studies and because I wouldn't have, even that class that we had, have known just how much or would have believed that they knew as much as they said they hadn't been able to extended on you know. Because they were not forthcoming with it in the short time that I had them. And so it was an assumption on my part that the reason why they were silent is they were uncertain or didn't have much there at all, whereas it was the other way around. So some where along the first year the competencies should be able to draw them out so they are actually saying and doing things by second year

. . .

CM4: Getting confidence . . .

CM3: Yeah, doing that up. I don't know if you've noticed when we go out, when we go to do the...

JR: Visits?

CM3: Practicum - how little!

JR: It's tragic!

CM3: It's terrible! In fact we'd have to change those competencies . . . We don't even hear any phrases even.

This raises issues of assessing students' progress in te reo, and our assumptions about their competence, as well as the rationale for setting standards to be required on practicum.

Pedagogical Issues

Māori educational failure was linked to inappropriate pedagogy, by one of the participants:

I believe the lack of appropriate pedagogy, lack of Māori knowledge, and culturally insensitive environments have contributed immensely to these negative outcomes [CM2].

She therefore considered our role in the University of Waikato degree programme to prepare graduates to deliver programmes in early childhood centres that were biculturally responsive and safe for Māori children and whānau. Appropriate Māori content was part of this process:

Māori content in courses is one strategy of breaking down these barriers. Delivery of such knowledge in a non threatening way is important to develop allies in the field [CM2].

In a previous excerpt this colleague [CM2] had made it clear that in terms of incorporating Māori content into the degree programme, Māori lecturers should determine what was appropriate, and also be responsible for teaching Māori content. She saw generating in Pākehā and Tauīwi a commitment to advocacy for Māori aspirations as a key goal of bicultural education. However, she also considered it appropriate for Pākehā and Tauīwi to access te reo and tikanga, since, “these are important tools when working at a certain level such as with tamariki and parents”. Despite her primary commitment to the Ki Taiao programme, she was aware of “the need to maintain and sustain Māori knowledge” within the Auraki programme.

This colleague outlined her teaching approach as one of facilitating a process in which students were responsible for their own learning:

Generally, I like the students to find information for themselves. . . My job is also to have a sound knowledge of the content and to provide a clear indication of what information needs to be sought when working together on readings, viewing a video or listening to speakers. Provision of newsprint and pens is important also as students like the idea of summarising their ideas by mind-mapping. Feeding back to the group enables free discussion. My job is also to pose questions in order to generate critical thinking and to keep everyone on the kaupapa. Many times clarification is sought from students,

so knowing the content is really important when students find themselves in a tight spot. Preparation and planning are fundamental to effective delivery. If lecturers are not prepared, students detect this. Students pay a lot of money to come here so they should expect quality. Money issues aside, I think the kaupapa deserves more attention and shonkiness should be viewed as a personal attribute and not part of the kaupapa [CM2].

This process demonstrates Freirean principles of problem posing and critical analysis. The participant also placed a high emphasis on rigour on the part of the facilitator to be well informed, clearly focused, well prepared, and attentive to the group process. She considered that research she had conducted into Māori preferred pedagogy had informed her understandings of key pedagogical components:

These being teaching and learning approaches, knowledge base and the environment. The major principle underlying all of the above is the concept of whakamana. This research has influenced my teaching approaches drastically and has really affirmed the view of my job as a facilitator of learning, not a teacher. This term teacher is a bit too heavy for me as it indicates a position of power . . . Our jobs as Māori educators are to control and implement as many of the changes as we possibly can within the confines of a monocultural structure. We can do this at the students' level. In the end, what has evolved is the whole issue of being an effective facilitator. Hell, the research reveals certain things need to be addressed, so as far as I am concerned do it! [CM2].

The idea of a Māori lecturer, responsible for including te reo and Māori perspectives, working in partnership with Pākehā colleagues within each course was one model suggested:

For me I quite often had thought that it would be really neat that if there could always be two people doing a course and it goes parallel for anything that you are doing, but then there would be all the constraints of money to be able to do that. I mean Māori people are just such a precious resource now [CM1].

During the time of these interviews, Māori lecturers were primarily committed to the Ki Taiao programme, which raised issues for Pākehā lecturers when this partnership model was not always available. Consultation had occurred as Pākehā staff sought advice as to ways in which Māori content could be addressed:

Between staff and all of that, they were conscious about this and they will ask and say who would be good in this and readings and so on, there's been a bit of that going on for the content of different courses [CM3].

The issue of raising Pākehā students' awareness of cultural differences was discussed in one interview:

CM3: How do we get people to acknowledge that we are different?

JR: Yeah. Because to me this is a core problem.

CM3: Yes because you get back on that old theme about, like Peter Sharples used to use it a lot, it is important they know what those differences are and to accept those differences and to also know that there are similarities.

One colleague described the emotional component of the bicultural learning process:

CM4: I think a lot of Pākehā students really want to know, but a lot of them are scared. They are afraid of saying or doing the wrong thing, because you know we have got all this hōhā new stuff of te reo Māori.

JR: Yes, and they don't want to make a fool of themselves.

CM4: And it is also that confidence stuff. And I think that if Pākehā students, people, were put in a room with a Māori person who is easy going, approachable. Someone who would let them take the risk to have a go to korero. Someone who will uplift them. That's the scariest part.

JR: And not make them feel bad.

CM4: And also by being so kind of approachable and easy going that they will have a go at saying it and in front of their peers as well. Adults are the same as kids.

Confidence is considered a key factor here, on the part of the student, while the lecturer needs to be aware of the fears that prevent students gaining this confidence.

We continued discussing strategies for effective facilitation of Pākehā students:

CM4: And also, I think that the tutor needs to be someone who is able to handle all the negative korero that the Pākehā students do put across with their pathway. Without getting offended and realising that it is just like ignorance or fear or maybe they really are negative and it doesn't matter. But the tutor needs to be able to handle all, because it's really negative and it gets really draining.

JR: That's right, and not to take it as a personal thing. That's where they are coming from.

CM4: And to give it back positive, like to take the negative turn it around and take it back out there in positive, and say hey well that's fair enough but...

Similarly, another colleague has previously been quoted recommending that delivery of Māori knowledge be conducted in a non-threatening way [CM2].

Three of the participants raised issues of resistance from Pākehā students to Māori content:

As I say there are a good crowd out there who do want to know and just don't know where to begin. It is draining for one person to cover that. I quite often find that when there is only resistance or the negative stuff comes about I think they pour it out on the Māori tutor and it is often at that time that they actually have to hear a non Māori saying the same things and they accept them. Just leaving it to Māori just to get those messages - they need to hear it coming from other sources to reinforce that and confirm for them, "Yes this is the way" [CM3].

In her view, students were not well-informed about wider cultural issues:

You see what is very difficult is that you can actually transmit this knowledge here without people getting to understand the wider issues that are happening out in the community, like the news media and so on. And that's the hard part because people don't know the background to all those issues and sometimes the resistance is related to that outside influence [CM3].

This raises the question of the extent to which the teacher education programme should address these wider contemporary issues, for example, informing students as to the reasons for current Māori activism, or offering opportunities to critique Government social policy concerning Māori. These are not direct 'educational' concerns, but they certainly have an indirect bearing on students' orientations to the community they will be working within.

The bicultural paradigm is often challenged by those who consider that we are a multicultural nation, and that this prevents any special attention being given to Māori interests. I asked the participants about their views on this issue:

CM3: I will just use the last examples I had, is that when I was doing supporting bicultural programmes, Partnership With Parents, I started off saying when I talk about bicultural programmes I'm really referring to Pākehā and Māori. Those are the two groups that we will be talking about in this course. But they were constantly coming back and saying "I want to do so much language with all the groups with these children represented in centres". And I would say, "This would be very difficult, that's why we just

limit it to just you looking at it realistically - how you would go about doing it for two groups". So that was my attempt to . . . deal with bicultural issues rather than...

JR: And Māori comes first, it's not to rule out the others?

CM3: The truth is that once you have got that one right for the two groups it is only a simple matter to implement the same ideas for others.

CM4: It is better to get a good grounding in Māori and Pākehā, the two groups, than it is to get a little bit of everything, otherwise...

JR: It's just a whole lot of tokenism and it's confusing.

CM4: Yeah right, yeah just a greeting of Tongan, Samoan, whatever, then it's just a waste of time.

CM3: That is inclined to sound insincere again.

Another pedagogical issue is the integration of theory and practice, an espoused goal of our degree programme. In relation to bicultural development, the 'theory' could be considered to be understandings related to Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the history of colonisation, and the commitment to bicultural development in early childhood education. The 'practice' might be the ways of implementing this into centre programmes. The following excerpts indicate a possible tension in the assumption of 'integration' of theory and practice:

Our programme has got quite a bit of theory in it and then there are parts that they can actually take and put into centres. . . On the other hand there are still some that haven't perhaps aren't strong enough to actually take it out and do the practical side. Like it's really really good to have the theory and to understand why and I mean that's what the people found the other day with the regulations, to know the meaning what's behind it for them to be strong enough, but they haven't got enough of the practical or being able to implement. They not only need to be aware of bicultural and how to be that, but they also need to be strong to bring others on board out there, so they are having to do two things at once. There are some people out there that just want to be a block wall and put people down that even don't want to think about it [CM1].

This raises issues about the 'balance' of the emphasis of the programme, between theoretical and practical content. I shared with this colleague a sentiment that had been expressed in previous interviews:

JR: I am getting this thing, it's got to be in the heart, it has got to be right there, and it's coming from not just you - it's coming from other interviewees

and I'm thinking "How is it that we are going to get it in there?" I don't believe that you've got it or you haven't, I think you can learn these things and so...

CMI: And some of the graduates that have gone out from here, have...

JR: Absolutely.

CMI: Have really really got it in here. But it is getting it in there!

Perceptions of Our Graduates' Role

As graduates from the new programme have entered the field, they have often been expected by colleagues to demonstrate leadership in terms of implementing bicultural development in centres, since those who trained prior to the new three year programme did not receive a strong bicultural preparation. The following excerpt illustrates that there is a new generation of early childhood teachers beginning to change the face of early childhood care and education in terms of its bicultural commitment:

And I have been aware over the times that once the students are on board, and they can really feel they are being strong to go out and do something in the centre, I know, 1992 and 1993 some of the students went through a real rough time and a percentage of them would have just given up because the centres didn't want anything, but then there were others that really took that challenge on board and followed it through. And even if it's a small percentage of the students we've put out there, each small percentage is going to effect the rest that who are strong enough to do a change. Today I catch up with quite a lot of them and you can see the things that they are doing in their centres that are really strengthening the bicultural component ... [CMI].

This seems encouraging, in that a generational change may be occurring, towards biculturally committed and competent early childhood practitioners.

Appendix 3.1.2 Māori Graduates

Data from this section were obtained from interviews with three graduates of the early childhood programme. One was from the first intake, 1989-1991, another was 1990-1992, and the third was 1991-1993 and had been part of the first “whānau” class.

Wanting Appropriate Early Childhood Education for Māori Children

An underlying motivation that seemed to be a factor in Māori participants’ choice of early childhood education as a career and to have been related to their experiences as parents, was a concern for early childhood provision that was responsive to Māori children and whānau. One participant described why she had not pursued kindergarten for her first children:

GM2: My older children I sent them to kindergarten for one day and I wasn’t happy with the routine and the programme that they had at the time and I also wasn’t happy with the way they worked with my children especially.

JR: What were you sensing then?

GM2: That was probably due to my children being Māori so they were treated as Māori children and there were a lot of inherent, I don’t know, I suppose they’d be values that were going on which you couldn’t actually pin-point but I think that because I’m a Māori women you could see the way they were treated. It was a little bit different to how their friends were treated and they were Pākehā children. So those sort of issues turned me off kindergarten without even having a look at what they were offered for my children, so we lasted one day.

She described Playcentre as a warmer experience, but nevertheless had concerns:

GM2: I also was confronted with issues of, I don’t like the word, but I’ll have to use it, racism during my years in Playcentre and I guess it hurt me quite a lot. Not so much for myself but for other families that I saw, other Māori families that I saw coming to Playcentre, how they struggled with trying to fit into the system that we had going. I think because I was maybe a little bit more, or I had had experience of being in Pākehā communities, it didn’t bother me too much so I really felt for other Māori families who couldn’t have those same choices.

This led her to Kōhanga Reo where she experienced what she described as a whānau concept:

GM2: What I saw for them was a whānau concept and that was quite strong. . . . and my drive to have a whānau concept for them was really strong so I went out of my way to get what I thought was an ideal person who could give that to my children. I think the whānau concept came from being in a city, being unsupported of family, of friends, stuff like that, so I guess seeing my older children and maybe my third child not have that whānau concept, although they had different experiences, I felt I needed to go down that road and I think I was right in doing so.

I asked her to explain the term “whānau concept”:

GM2: I guess for me I had to really work hard at being involved in things. Getting alongside ... and I wasn't even involved in kōhanga with them at that stage. Just ... what is this whānau concept. Giving permission I suppose, I'm not sure if it's permission but giving acknowledgment that another adult could take my child and could give my child the same needs as I could and feel comfortable about it. That was a really big learning for me because I'd been so protective with my children and I think too society contributed in making me think that way because you are responsible for your children and stuff like that. For me that was the biggest influence, that was why I needed to have that whānau concept because even though I had family and friends my children were still my responsibility. So when it came to reprimanding my children I felt about this aunty being able to reprimand them rather than me take on board all that stuff. And I think it helped them, helped my children in understanding where their boundaries were. So they were reinforced with what I was saying and it didn't always come from me so that took a lot of pressure off me as far as the child perceiving that I am the 'baddie'.

JR: They were getting the same messages from other adults.

GM2: Yeah, they're getting the same messages. That's how I perceive whānau concept being of benefit to not only my children but to me as well.

This again raises the point that a whānau-based early childhood model is one which is of benefit to not only tamariki, but mātua and the wider whānau.

Bicultural Commitment is from the Heart

Another participant described how her upbringing had instilled a bicultural perspective:

GM1: . . . probably biculturalism to me has always been a part of my life always, right from early, from primary school because I used to have a

teacher who was a Māori woman who took me in basically . . . and I was probably really privileged to have that person and it was always a part of my schooling life and from primary school we did kapahaka¹⁰⁵ from an early age and I guess it's sort of like the rural town . . . it was a part of our . . . and so it was very much the culture that I was brought up in. It was bicultural the whole time, my education was bicultural. And then coming, like the kids . . . going to kindergarten we had a bicultural centre and it's just always been a part of my education and my children and the centres that I've been in.

JR: And is it a part of what you do in your early childhood practice.

GMI: Yes, and also in my life too. I mean it comes from the heart not because you've been told.

This participant was one of several to suggest that bicultural commitment was something that was generated from a heartfelt conviction. I wondered about the effectiveness of the University programme in terms of generating this bicultural commitment.

JR: Can I ask have you noticed anything about the people that have been through the training programme such as you have done, our programme, have they shown any more interest or commitment than perhaps people that haven't done that programme or have done other training, have you noticed that?

GMI: Some students do. I think if they feel comfortable they do, it's very much a personal thing.

JR: To do with a personal commitment.

GMI: Yeah, because some students have come through and have picked up wonderfully but then because as an Associate [Teacher] I see like some students will use it when they have to and they take it out when they have to and they put it away when they have to or when they feel like they want to. But I think that . . .

JR: Like the guitar, they do it just to pass a course and then it's put away forever.

GMI: Yeah, and that's really unfortunate. I think some people have that commitment to it but the majority don't.

Bicultural and Multicultural: "we need to acknowledge each other's cultures first"
University studies had enabled this participant to clarify her primary commitment to a bicultural paradigm:

. . . when I went to university I realised . . . like even though biculturalism had been a part of my life right through I just thought that was normal and I

thought it was normal for everybody but I realised then that when we talked about, when we got into history and just when you look at it realistically, like people with a multicultural background they have always got their country to go back to, but this is it for us, this is the Māori and Pākehā here and that was what really hit home to me. It was like this is the tangata whenua is right here and I guess it's roots and I guess it's ... I feel really strongly about it. That made me really realise that that's right . . . People say "Well you need to be multicultural" and I say "Well we need to be bicultural first, because we have two cultures living in New Zealand basically and we need to acknowledge each other's cultures first" [GM1].

Implementing Bicultural Development in Early Childhood Centres: Beyond Basic Phrases

This participant, who was a supervisor in a childcare centre, described how she used her initiative to inspire and support colleagues in the centre:

Just a gentle push and we decided that, okay, for some people it was really hard to step into that speaking a language that they had never spoken before. And so we said "What about just greetings, let's just greet parents in the mornings, 'Kia ora' or 'Morena'". And the first few mornings like we were just doing it and we'd greet each other and we said well we can greet each other first and when you come in "Morena" or "Kia ora". And then we started with parents and parents were giving us the "Oh, what?" And then we'd say "Morena, morning how are you today?" and that was just following it through to make them feel comfortable. And they started reciprocating it and they were saying "Morena" and so it was a really good thing to do and people are quite comfortable with that [GM1].

Seeking Support of Kaumātua

Despite the progress she described in implementing te reo, this participant felt constrained by being outside of her tribal area and lacking support of kaumātua:

But I find personally I believe that if I am going to implement a real bicultural programme, what I call really genuine I need support from an elder. And I don't have that here because I am not from here and I just feel like it's a cultural part of me that says ... [Name] and I have had discussions about it and I have said to her you tread softly [Name] because I feel like sometimes you push the limit and it will be .. I think it's a spiritual thing where I feel like you are given so much and if you take too much it's ... It's hard for me to explain because it's in here and I just think that you have got to be really careful [GM1].

She was aware of a spiritual constraint that caused her to be wary of trespassing into an inappropriate domain. It is interesting that she had discussed this issue with a close friend who is one of the Pākehā graduates that also participated in this study.

Authenticity

A related issue in terms of cultural authenticity was that of correct pronunciation:

I think if people are going to learn Māori they need to learn it properly. I find it offensive if people are using it inappropriately or incorrectly . . . to me it's offensive if it's not right and it's hard, you know you don't want to stop them, but you want to say "It's said like this". We had quite a discussion because people said "Well how are we supposed to learn if we can't try?", and I said "Well you need to find somebody, and I know that it's hard" because I know it's hard here to find somebody to support you in it. Whether it's a family that attends your centre or somebody that you know or a local marae [GM1].

GM1 had relationships with colleagues where they were comfortable with her correcting them:

I know that's not sensitive to her but it's something to me, if you are going to use, you use it right. And because we are role modeling for children they are going to get the wrong pronunciation . . . and she doesn't mind because she wants to learn..[GM1].

She described positive leadership strategies of role-modeling, patience, support and perseverance:

And just role modeling I think is really important. Working within people's comfort zones and not pushing that. I know like when you come on really strong, people pull back and then they say I can't do it, I can't do it. I think it's probably just the gradual push push push and then it becomes normal to [GM1].

Whānau Grouping an Important Model for the Degree Programme

One of the participants was concerned about the poor retention of Māori students from her intake:

I think when I started there were eleven Māori students but there were only two of us who graduated so that was really sad. [Later] . . . and only two Māori students graduated, I think that's going back to me talking about the whānau concept that's a valid reason as to why that needed to be set up - that whānau group. Because whānau concept in that institutional environment is very important, or it's very determining on whether you achieve or don't achieve [GM2].

Another participant had been a student within the whānau option that preceded the Ki Taiao programme. She contrasted this with her previous experience in the mainstream primary programme:

GM3: And it was really individual and real Pākehā and real scary. I dropped out. In fact a lot of my friends and I went, you know the typical scenario, Māori sit at the back of the class and don't understand and don't say anything, and then leave. That's what we did. And then later on when we came back in the early 1990s when suddenly we had Rūmaki and Whānau.

JR: Now we've got Ki Taiao.

GM3: And now it's getting better and better. And a lot of my friends came back when I came back to do early childhood. And we've all passed and gone on to bigger and better things. Whereas in the 1980's it was...

JR: a foreign world.

GM3: Yeah, it was really individual and really scary. Whānau for me was, and for a lot of Māori students, the best thing ever that's happened.

This experience supports that of the previous participant from the first intake, who had described how she and other Māori students from that intake had lobbied for a whānau model.

Lack of Depth to Māori Content

One of the participants confirmed that there was little te reo Māori utilised by Pākehā lecturers in the programme.

JR: When you were being taught by Pākehā lecturers did you get much from them in terms of te reo, you can't remember?

GM3: Well no. Apart from the odd Māori word, that Māori come and do the Māori part in, no no.

JR: Right.

GM3: In fact no definitely we didn't. I don't think so.

It appears that Pākehā lecturers may have been relying on Māori colleagues for the Māori content of courses.

Māori students supporting Pākehā

One of the participants described how she along with other Māori student colleagues had consciously supported their Pākehā student colleagues to become more aware of Māori issues:

GM2: So we saw our role as being to coax them through the process or help them understand and we did that as much as possible.

JR: How would you do that? Just by talking with them?

GM2: By talking about the issues. Also taking on board the issues like respecting what they had to say and probably advising them to come from their perspective rather than try and come from a Māori perspective. So I think that bonding that we had [within the Māori issues course] was helpful not only to us but also to our Pākehā colleagues.

It is significant that she encouraged the Pākehā students to recognise the validity of their Pākehā cultural perspective. It indicates that Māori have no difficulty understanding “Pākehā” culture as entity, and seeing it as the appropriate identity framework for Pākehā.

Understanding that Māori Pedagogy is Necessary Because Māori Children are Different

This participant explained that she would encourage Pākehā students to recognise that they needed to learn about tikanga Māori early childhood content because Māori children were different.

GM2: Because I do believe, and I did believe at that time that Māori children are sensory children and that's why they are so different to Pākehā children so coming from that line of thought, I use that quite a lot. And it was quite a learning for my Pākehā colleagues I think because they hadn't seen a child from that, or hadn't seen a Māori child from that perspective that they are sensory children. So I'd role-play what a Māori child was like. They'd have to touch and look under there and those types of things and then my Pākehā colleagues would say, "Oh yeah they do!" and I didn't realise at that time, but I did later that we misinterpret those touching and those looking type things in both cultures as being naughty or being ... So it wasn't until the end of my training "Ah hah! this is why!"

JR: That's fascinating. That is something that is really interesting to me in what you are saying is that one of the things I feel we struggle with, we as Pākehā struggle with and when I am working with Pākehā, I struggle with is to get them to realise that Māori and Pākehā are really different. They don't really want to accept that because they can't understand that. If Māori are different then they don't know enough about it so their brain is constantly saying, "No they are not really different because then I can understand them and then I know what is happening." It's the fear of the unknown. That I don't want to be in a situation where I don't understand that child so therefore ... do you think that's right?

GM2: I definitely believe that of my colleagues. The students, all of us that were going through because rather than it being a 'power-over' type issue it was more them not knowing or them not having the opportunity to be told really.

JR: Do you think they got that message in the programme?

GM2: I feel they did. I think by the end.

Understanding that Māori are different and therefore need different educational approaches seems to be a key idea of bicultural development. Also useful here is the recognition that many Pākehā may not be deliberately abusing their power, but merely lack awareness and opportunities to become more knowledgeable. In this participant's opinion, the teacher education programme had gone some way to meeting these needs.

Bicultural Early Childhood Programme Indicators

Discussing her observations of effective bicultural development in early childhood centres, I asked if she considered that developing good rapport with the Māori families was something that is important:

GM2: Yeah, I see that as important. Also they have had the luxury of having a Māori teacher with them and from an observing role seeing them not exploiting that Māori teacher but working alongside that Māori teacher to make a difference.

JR: Supporting.

GM2: Yes. Seeing not only Māori families but Pākehā families feel comfortable within the centre. And wanting to or having an interest in what their children are doing as far as bicultural practices are concerned. So those are the things that I perceive as being good.

In addition to involving Māori families, other useful bicultural development strategies identified included respectful partnerships with Māori colleagues, and encouraging Pākehā families to understand and support the bicultural philosophy and practices.

Appendix 3.1.3 Pākehā Colleagues.

This section contains selections from interviews conducted in 1997 with four Pākehā colleagues in the Department of Early Childhood Studies, University of Waikato. These data were first prepared as a paper presented at the Australian Research in Early Childhood Education Conference, in Canberra, January 1998, which was published in January 2000 (Ritchie, 2000b). Participants were given copies of a draft for comment prior to its presentation.

Participants' backgrounds

Three of the Pākehā lecturers had been extensively involved in the early childhood field before their appointment to teach in the early childhood teacher education programme, two in Playcentre and childcare, and one in kindergarten. The fourth participant has an early intervention and child psychology background, a Diploma of Teaching (Early Childhood), and has worked in childcare.

Bicultural Awareness

For three of these participants, their bicultural awareness had grown out of their experiences in early childhood centres. Their initial awareness of a bicultural dimension was not connected with a sense of personal responsibility:

It was just an awareness that there are differences, but not an acknowledgment that I had to do anything about it [CP4].

Early efforts by these participants in their various roles within early childhood centres from the mid 1970s and during the early 1980s reflected this stance:

I think we were trying to be welcoming of everyone that came along in the best way possible, and that was very much a key thing within Playcentre: the first impressions, the introductory processes that people went through, try and be friendly and welcoming, and talk with people, and...valuing people, those sort of general things, but there weren't any questions raised of "Are we meeting the needs of Māori families?" at that time [CP1].

The recollection of one of the participants, formerly a kindergarten teacher, reminded me of my own early experiences:

Teaching in kindergartens (in the early 1980s)... I realised the tremendous need, and the middle class Pākehā teachers out there, and I was one of them, the inability, my inability, to meet those needs of the Māori children. And all those centres, there was a big Māori population [CP3].

Later, as these people became involved in leadership positions, and the national early childhood organisations began to make policy commitments related to bicultural matters, the participants took on more active roles:

When I became Director of Child Care [of an urban childcare centre] which would have been about 87/88, I felt an enormous responsibility. By that stage I had become quite immersed in NZCA (New Zealand Child-Care Association), and that move meant that I was understanding a lot and had a lot to do with Māori... I felt really responsible when I was Director of Child Care [CP4].

Another colleague stated that her bicultural awareness:

...was a growing thing, definitely, but it was also the emphasis that we put on it nationally within Playcentre at that time, that led me to look more closely at what would it mean to be developing a bicultural programme... [CP1].

The participants had attended various courses during the 1980s which had contributed to their understanding.

I can remember we kind of thought at the end of that workshop, "what should we do"? and I thought it was really important that we develop some relationships with Kōhanga [Māori Immersion EC Centres]. Really naive of me, I don't know what I expected - are we going to bowl up and say "we want to be friends"! But I guess I had no real analysis then of the fact that it meant change at my level, it was kind of like "I'm keen, I'm enthusiastic. We want to make what we do better for you, okay, and so aren't you going to be grateful and you are now going to help us" [CP2].

This participant says that at this stage, she had an analysis of cultural issues but no understanding of the process or strategies for change. There were evidently other people within early childhood who had also developed an analysis of cultural and

equity issues at the time. One of the participants described how she had felt obliged to respond to challenges from a colleague in her childcare centre:

It wasn't until X probably came to work for me and started challenging some of the things I thought, like for instance, I would say things like "I don't think it is very fair that there should be a quota system, my daughter has worked hard to get in to the training college, if she misses out so that Māori can get in I don't think that's very fair. You don't have the same chances." That's the sort of statement I was making, and believing. I got fairly heavily challenged by X and she actually explained to me and I thought about it then... Well she explained to me things like there isn't a level playing field...and that not all children have supportive parents and people ensuring they do their homework, and the schooling system isn't easy because there is not enough food.... All those sorts of things. I mean I would just blame the parents, that sort of stuff you know. Pākehā middle class values...[CP4].

In their role as early childhood educators, these people were beginning to develop an awareness that there were social, cultural, and economic differences between Pākehā and Māori, and that this required something of them. However they seem to have been, at least initially, unsure of what it was that they should be doing in order to implement bicultural practices into their early childhood programmes. One participant described the extent of bicultural content in her child-care centre, around 1987, as follows:

Just the basics: songs, numbers, colours, resources... Books, yes, books, there weren't many around then. We probably did use some Māori greetings, pretty basic stuff I think [CP1].

The group of colleagues participating in this research project had joined the former Hamilton Teachers College during the period 1989-1991 as the new three year integrated early childhood Diploma was being offered for the first time. This new Diploma had a strong commitment to 'biculturalism'. Significant in this design was a strong commitment, articulated in the theoretical framework, to bicultural and multicultural concerns which were to be addressed in each course through a mechanism termed 'integral themes' (Carr, Mitchell & May, 1991, p.386). There were also to be specific courses in 'Cultural Studies' over the three years of the programme (p.388). These intentions notwithstanding, it is clear that these newly

appointed staff did not feel sufficiently equipped themselves to prepare students to deliver biculturally appropriate programmes.

A Commitment to Bicultural Development – “Creating Heart”

Two of the Pākehā colleagues spoke of bicultural development as a key concept. One described bicultural development as a key understanding that was essential for students to obtain early in their teacher education, in order that they be receptive to the Māori content contained within their subsequent courses:

CP2: And that one of the things that I believe very strongly is that if you are going to have bicultural issues as an integral theme that is running right throughout the courses then there are two things: first of all that it's really setting people up for failure and setting that idea up for failure if you don't give people a thorough understanding, because people come with misconceptions about what bicultural development is, they come with fears and hostilities and stuff. They come with ignorance basically, lack of knowledge and misinformation that they have got from all over the place. And, therefore, if you are saying “Okay, now in all these classes we are going to look at Māori content” - Māori perspectives in the music class or whatever, people will switch off from that and will not learn it unless they have a philosophical understanding of why that's important, and also if they don't have an understanding of it being a “win win” situation I guess. I think a lot of, I'm talking about Pakeha not Māori.

JR: So “there is something in it for me”.

CP2: Yes. A lot of Pakeha think that it is either Māori or Pakeha, and if Pakeha give, this is what they come to this issues with, if we give an inch we will lose. Māori will take. And I think that to me it is really important to realise that whole thing of diversity is, you know, there is richness in diversity, that it will be a win win situation while it feels scary when you are in it it's not scary and part of it is because that is what it was like for me. I have this real kind of clear understanding of my own processes and how and I have also talked to enough people who I have seen that be very damaging, that damage is done. Damage is done by, by forcing people in to things that they don't have a heart for yet. You know, if you say to someone you have got to learn a language and you have got to pronounce it right they don't actually believe it themselves, well they won't

JR: So do you see the goal of our Treaty workshop as to create in those students...

CP2: Heart. Yes, I think it is. That's part of it. Part of it is to orient them to being open to this stuff. . . .Umm we had a model, what was our model Jenny? I guess, I can remember, we have talked about this a lot, and it's about the different ways. . . in to people to get that heart right. That the

Treaty workshop that we do and the reason that it is in a block, the reason that it is in the beginning is so that they are open to the stuff that comes after, and if you have it half way through you will have wasted the first courses. But we also wanted it block because that allows them to really focus and to have that getting-in in different levels so that there are some people that you can get in on a very emotive kind of level. That was very much for me, that the injustice of it, the wrongness of it, caused grief and that was terrible and it didn't really matter what the facts were - do you know what I mean. The accurate historical stuff was kind of an irrelevance because people were in pain and that needed to be changed and that was very much I guess what impacted on me. There are other people who the trigger for the knowledge seeking comes from knowledge, so they want the facts. They want ...

JR: To make a rational analysis.

CP2: Yeah, yeah, so you need to provide that as well and I mean in the workshops we have, lecturey bits, we have, role play bits, personal disclosure bits, we have, a range of ways and different people trigger to different things. Some people find the partnership thing very powerful to look at bicultural or Māori/Pakeha relationships in terms of human relationships and how to be respectful. Other people that's a complete red-herring. I think that factual information has to be the basis for it. I think it's more than that because it's moral stuff, it's like we can know the history of this country and say "that's fine, that's life" and yeah I believe very clearly that it's not about, it's about what we want for a society and we can choose, with accurate history . . So it's a morality thing rather than something else I guess. [Later] I think we're trying to develop a professional commitment if not a personal commitment. [A personal commitment] is probably important too [CP2].

This excerpt shows the extent to which this colleague has thought about the most effective ways of generating in students an understanding of and commitment to bicultural development. She is sensitive to the different pathways that may reach different students, the importance of accessing factual information, and the need for care in regard to the emotional impact learning about the injustices of the past. She also clearly regards this commitment to bicultural development as a moral imperative, or “creating heart”.

Another colleague articulated in our interview linked her personal commitment to bicultural development, and the commitment within the teacher education programme to bicultural development:

...and its one of the dilemmas within the programme is we have a commitment to teaching in a way that's fostering people's bicultural development, and enabling people to work towards bicultural development, but how do we check it all out? How do we know what's right and what's okay, what's our domain to teach. And its an on-going dilemma for me, and one of the difficulties that I have is even knowing when to ask, when in fact all of our Māori colleagues are so extremely busy, so, when I do get the okay, when they say, yeah, I make a commitment to following that up, whenever possible. [later] Also part of my commitment to bicultural development within my teaching and for myself, is to do what I can for my own professional development. And one of the things that I did was to attend the Te Whariki course on bicultural perspectives at the beginning of last year [CP1].

One colleague considered that her growing awareness and respect for Māori had engendered increased tolerance for other cultures:

I guess, I think, I can only come from a personal statement - that by understanding Māori and through the commitment to that culture that I have had much more understanding for Asian and far less racist as far as other cultures go. Once I would have you know, you hear people saying terrible things about Asian culture, blah blah blah, where as now I think it's neat to see so many different cultures around you know. What an interesting place it's becoming [CP4].

Bicultural pedagogy within the early childhood teacher education programme

Our students are required to attend a two day workshop on Māori and Pākehā colonisation issues, based in an understanding of the significance of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and with a strong anti-racism focus, during their orientation week before they begin their courses (Ritchie, 1994; Ritchie 1996).

I think that what we do right from the beginning of our programme in terms of the Treaty courses, puts the bicultural stuff in the place which is a very important starting point...so most students from that very point are ready to look at what it means to be working biculturally to start with, and then to be transferring across some of the principles that they're talking about and that they're working with [CP1].

Another colleague pointed out that when the workshops had been staggered over the three years of the programme, rather than [students' understandings were uneven and this inhibited their understanding in later courses:

And I remember [in a year three course on 'Multiculturalism'] having to try and explain about . . . biculturalism that you know, the iwi and all the rest of the cultures would be one side and Māori the other - you know, it was so hard for students because I don't think they were having Treaty at the beginning then [CP4].

As I considered the response from the Pākehā lecturers when I had asked them to give me some examples of ways that they incorporated bicultural dimensions into their teaching generally, I noticed some interesting features. The participants appeared to have a sensitivity to cultural dynamics within the context of their work:

I think I've tried to hold onto the fact that I'm privileged to have, or to be given any information, that is really the right of Māori to have, and tried to be sensitive in what I do with that, even though I probably don't always get it right [CP1].

They are unwilling to deliver Māori content unless they can do it with a degree of authenticity:

Yes you need to do it well, and without offending [CP3].

They appreciated that it was important to check out what they were doing in terms of Māori content, with appropriate Māori:

I think that, um, that there needs to be a commitment to working sensitively in the area, and a commitment to, um, not just going ahead and doing what you think is right without checking it out, and I guess that's where it sort of fits in with tino rangatiratanga, that, um, when working biculturally, I hope this comes through, I've always felt that you're accountable to iwi. That in fact, I shouldn't be doing anything unless its been checked out by iwi [CP1].

Another considered that there was a tension within the Department regarding the difference between delivering a commitment to biculturalism as opposed to tino rangatiratanga

I guess that I think it is a really interesting things because my feeling, as a Department people are quite comfortable with biculturalism, is fine it sounds nice, tino rangatiratanga is much more - if you are talking about a tenuous hold, it's finger tip stuff. . . . I guess that it's a really interesting issue within a Department with this huge hierarchy of the University over it. How much self determination can the Ki Taiao people actually have in reality? I don't think, that we as a department, actually really come to some sort of understanding.

I think there is a general understanding about what we mean by biculturalism about that it is a structural, political level rather than just a little bit of few songs here and there. I think that tino rangatiratanga has such big implications for so much, so much [CP2].

They also indicated that they sensed they could be delivering more in terms of te reo me ngā tikanga Māori:

But I feel sometimes I should know more . . . [Later] I think pronunciation is essential. That's something that we all need to have a kick in the backside for [CP4].

I mean I think I can look at it from my own perspective that I know I could be doing a lot more modeling to students... [Later] I mean I have made a commitment this year to try and make sure that, to say kia ora or morena when I start classes or when I come into classes if there are students there and stuff like that. Now I mean that's pretty pathetic quite frankly, I should actually be doing a lot more than that. And I am not even doing that reliably [CP2].

I mean I'm certainly guilty of you know forgetting or getting too busy and thinking oh you know. . . . [Later] It would take me a long long time, and a lot of work to get on top of that. And I just, well I've been doing my thesis and I just haven't had time, that's the pressure of work [CP3].

This sense of workload pressure was linked to the prevailing ideology within the institution by one colleague:

I do sense that there is a shift in the climate. I don't know whether this is part of this tape really, this thing, but it's that whole market economy, market forces...I mean I just sort of think now if we had a Māori language class, one hour a week, how many staff members can come to it. People wouldn't go. I don't know what's changed but there is something that's changed within our department that says, "if it's not vital you don't do it" . . . EFTs and outputs, and stuff, the market economy. You're going to have to address it because I think yes it is that whole thing [CP2].

This participant did not see her role as teaching Māori content, although she was happy to introduce basic reo:

I feel that I don't think it's appropriate for me to be teaching Māori content. [Later in interview]: I also don't want to teach Māori content, that's the other thing. I don't, I can't [CP2].

Her preferred model was to have Māori colleagues or guest lecturers to teach the Māori content within her courses. She valued the contributions of Māori students, and utilised literature written by Māori to provide parallel Māori perspectives, although this was scarce in her specialist area. She also had ideas about how, with additional funding, it would be valuable to build up resource material for her course:

If I actually had some money I can think of really good things that could happen that I could pay a Māori person to go out and do. Right, if there was money available for that.... Oral histories of parenting of what it's like to parent a child with a disability from a Māori perspective. To pay people to go and interview elders about what they remember of people with disabilities traditionally. It would be kind of easy to do that, I mean I couldn't do that myself exactly, but I could work with Māori to get that [CP2].

Another participant also described a partnership model used in one of the courses, whereby the Māori and Pākehā lecturers co-teach the first four principal lectures of the course, introducing material from both Māori and Western perspectives. This model, whilst acknowledged as ideal, was no longer as readily accessible, since the development of the Kaupapa Māori programme, Ki Taiao, has meant that the Māori lecturers have chosen to concentrate their efforts in these courses. This led one of the participants to identify, as her first priority for future bicultural development, the employment of more Māori staff.

Another colleague described how she was committed to supporting the integration of Māori content delivered by a Māori colleague within her course:

I'm often caught between what is okay to do and what isn't, and like one of the things for me in terms of our programme is that I've always hung out for having Māori lecturers come in to do things in courses such as "Growth and Wellbeing" on Māori health and physical development from a Māori perspective and um, I've had to work hard to keep that in there, and that's at a real cost, I know, that's at a cost to the staff that are having to come in and do that, and I guess for me, its trying to work out ways that I can repay that, I suppose, but that's hard to do. But when it happens, when we do have input from Māori staff in the Auraki programme, one of the things I try to do is to be there as well, so that I can then integrate what they have said when we get to other parts of the programme, so that I can then link back, "Remember what [the Māori colleague] said about that? [CP1].

Published sources of Māori content already in the public domain, were identified as a valuable resource:

Refer to books on the topic, because that's a legitimate form of knowledge that we can use... So I try to refer to readings...where students are able to more appreciate that the way that you interact on a personal basis is not necessarily going to be appropriate in another culture and that there can be huge cultural differences, to try and increase their awareness of that - that's mostly through readings, and discussion of individual experiences. I think for most of the classes that I run I try as much as possible to run things in a reasonably practical interactive way, because I like that way of teaching, anyway Some students who are expecting lectures get a bit sort of hōhā with it I suppose – role-plays . . . [CP1].

The previous excerpt illustrates another important aspect of her teaching, that of an interactive dialogical approach which validates students' own experiences. This can be a particularly valuable source of learning about cultural difference when Māori students are comfortable to share their experiences with the Pākehā students. However, while there was a Māori immersion option, Ki Taiao, available, there were fewer students in the mainstream (Auraki) programme:

I guess one of the realities for me is that since the Ki Taiao programme started, there's been less diversity within the class for people to sort of draw on others' experiences and share their own experiences... Even now there's still quite a number of Māori students in the Auraki group at the third year, but its becoming less and less as they go through, and that wealth of experience, which once [Māori students are] feeling safe enough to share it, which they can share for themselves, and which others are learning about by listening and hearing - that is as important as anything, I think [CP1].

Two of the colleagues did not see Te Whāriki as having had any impact on the bicultural aspects of the early childhood teacher education programme, since a commitment to biculturalism was already being implemented:

JR: . . . I think Te Whāriki has had an influence on how we have been doing cultural things [intonation is questioning]
CP3: I don't think, oh in here, no I don't. I think we would have done that anyway. We were already. This, as a team, we were pretty well already committed to that I think. Te Whāriki is being woven into that, and Te Whāriki is actually being used, but no it was happening before.

CP4: *I don't know if it has influenced us doing things biculturally, no.*

JR: *You think we were doing things anyway?*

CP4: *I don't think it has made a huge difference, Te Whāriki as far as curriculum. I guess, are you talking about here [pause]?*

JR: *Yes. I'm just wondering if you see it as having been a support or having contributed anything to the bicultural generally.*

CP4: *Well I think perhaps within a centre I would find it's actually, you know it's got quite strong directions and that would probably be helpful. I'm not sure if it has made a difference as far as making me think about*

JR: *bicultural matters.*

CP4: *Maybe it should have. I have never even thought about it. . . . I'm just trying to think, I mean how much of it is through the goals apart from the principles and things. How much is actually in there?*

This colleague indicates that she is uncertain as to the extent of the bicultural expectations contained within the curriculum document.

On-going issues

There were clearly some institutional constraints, such as the general pressure on staff, most of whom are engaged in study to upgrade their own qualifications in order to meet the expectations of the University system. This means that these colleagues were juggling their lecturing responsibilities with their personal studies.

Yes, I think we need that Māori support. Okay, I can teach some simple waiata, but that to me is tokenism. So that might be why I'm not very vigilant in doing that because I don't feel comfortable about doing it. And I hate those songs that are half English and half Māori, that I will not use. So I probably could do with making more effort. I certainly could do that, but I don't know where the time comes from [CP3].

Reflecting upon these data, I began to speculate about how effectively we as Pākehā lecturers operate as role models in terms of integrating Māori perspectives and language into our classes. If we are expecting that ultimately our graduates will be competent to deliver the bicultural early childhood curriculum, then we need to be conscious of how well our programme and teaching reflects this bicultural emphasis:

Another interesting example that I've had this year [concerned] the students in the partnership module - we were using Te Whāriki, and they were pronouncing the word in a range of different ways, and at the same time they

were doing te reo Māori in “Supporting Bicultural Programmes”, so I said to them “How about this for a goal, if there’s one thing that you come out of this course with, is an understanding of the correct way of pronouncing Te Whāriki?”, and they said to me “Well, how about you take to the staff, that they do the same”! So, that is very very true! I think it was raised last year, I was very aware of it last year, especially when going to classes that were taught by other staff, or sometimes people avoid using the word at all, they say “The curriculum”! (Laugh) So that’s a really good point, and I think that as staff we need to consider, to be continually looking at our development in that area. We have at times, but it slips away, and if we really have a multitude of different ways of pronouncing that word then there’s something very wrong! A whole range of models, how will they ever get it right? [CP1].

A second Pākehā colleague had made the same observation, criticising “... a Department that trumpets its commitment to bicultural issues when significant proportions of the staff cannot pronounce the name of the National Early Childhood Curriculum that originated from that department adequately” [CP2].

There was also some ambiguity in terms of defining their responsibility to teach Māori content:

I think it makes it difficult because you know we strongly feel that we shouldn’t be speaking or teaching Māori things. So, what do you do?...I suppose there are things you can do, but I’m never sure. Sometimes, as you know, I blunder in and think oh yes that’s okay for that and it’s not. I try to keep my mouth shut. I try to listen [CP4].

This confusion as to what Pākehā may appropriately teach could well be clarified through consultation with Māori colleagues. A dilemma arises here in that these colleagues were extremely busy people, and Pākehā staff were concerned about increasing the demands upon them as mentioned in an earlier excerpt.

During 1997 there were 10 full-time permanent lecturers in the Department of Early Childhood Studies, three of whom were Māori. These three were responsible for delivering the Ki Taiao (Māori Immersion) programme whilst also providing support for the Māori dimensions within the mainstream programme. The Department had made a commitment to employing more Māori staff as positions became available.

One colleague considered that she could be doing more in terms of modeling use of te reo with students in her classes:

I mean I think I can look at it from my own perspective that I know I could be doing a lot more modeling to students . . . I mean I have made a commitment this year to try and make sure that, to say “kia ora” or “morena” when I start classes or when I come into classes if there are students there and stuff like that. Now I mean that’s pretty pathetic quite frankly, I should actually be doing a lot more than that. And I am not even doing that reliably. . . . I know it’s laziness on my part or prioritising, but I think there is an element of laziness and that’s the basic racism I think ,that we can espouse one thing ... [CP1].

This colleague recognised that despite the fact that she had the knowledge to incorporate te reo, she did not consider what she managed to do to be adequate.

If Pākehā staff are to include Māori content, and do it well, there needs to be attention given to ongoing professional development, since these participants did not feel well equipped to deliver Māori content appropriately. In the past, the Department had organised Māori language classes, but few staff were able to maintain the commitment to attend. Two of the participants had completed Māori language courses offered by the University as part of their own degree studies. One of the participants expressed a need for more professional development in the area of bicultural awareness:

I think we should have days when there is no teaching scheduled - I mean there are five weeks in the middle of the year - I think we should have a day on updating about issues for Māori and understanding what’s happening, for example, the fisheries claims... [Later]: I think we need more professional development for all staff members in the areas of knowledge and Māori knowledge and understanding. I’d like to see the School put more money financially into that area [CP4].

Changes in the degree structure seemed to be an issue with the loss of a third year module covering cultural issues:

I think that it's because there is at a really fundamental level a lack of commitment within the organisation. [Later in interview]: Yes, it like, it's all

this tightening up and its the thing that goes very often. [Later]: and I think there is a level of, like.. you know if we blinked it would slip back. I think it's a tenuous - the bicultural issues have a very tenuous hold...[CP2].

In 1998 we took steps to rectify the loss of Māori content in the third year of the programme, by specifically including Māori teaching into two of the remaining courses. It appears that we must constantly advocate to ensure that the progress that the Department has achieved in the past is not eroded by institutional influences.

Appendix 3.1.4 Pākehā Graduates.

This section contains selections from interviews conducted in 1997 with three Pākehā graduates from the University of Waikato early childhood programme. These data was first prepared for a paper presented at the Australian Research in Early Childhood Education Conference, in Canberra, January 1999. Prior to presenting, a draft was sent to the participants for feedback.

Graduates' backgrounds

Two are female and one is male. All came to do the teacher education programme with some experience working in early childhood settings. One began studying in 1990, one in 1991, and the other in the 1993 intake. The one who had graduated earliest was at the time of the interviews a kindergarten head teacher, another was an acting head teacher whilst the other was in a teaching position.

Initial awareness of cultural differences

All reported that like most Pākehā New Zealanders, they had gained only a limited understanding of Māori culture and values throughout their early and schooling years. The experiences within the teacher education programme were not, however, their first taste of Māori culture. All three had some limited previous experience prior to commencing their studies. The initial experience of attending a Māori language course, had provided one participant with quite some insight into Māori ways of being:

. . . I was just taken aback. I learnt so much - not language-wise - but all of a sudden it was like I was seeing this insight into Māori people that I had never really seen before [GP1].

Another's first experience of a bicultural situation, prior to beginning the teacher education programme, was a visit to a childcare centre, where she particularly noticed the sense of belonging which resulted from the inclusion of things Māori:

I went to a really good centre [and] some of the staff were Māori and they brought out specific aspects and incorporated not a great deal of te reo, but some. The environment, the things are on the wall, and you would see it. It

wasn't always spoken throughout the time but you could see it. All the children felt as if they belonged and that was sort of the main thing [GP2].

For the third participant, an initial understanding of Māori cultural values had come from working within a bicultural childcare centre, where he had enjoyed the sense of support and camaraderie engendered by the way that Māori colleagues operated from a whānau model.

Well coming from, with like my past experience in childcare I had a lot of strong unity forming within that childcare centre, and a lot of the women there were Māori women and . . . I thought that a whānau group is a lot better than having just one body of people going in all different directions. Having one body going in the same direction is always better [GP3].

These perceptions indicate that even prior to their teacher education studies, each of these participants were already somewhat receptive to the difference of Māori world views.

Value of Introductory Treaty Workshop

One of the participants reflected on a fellow student's awareness of treaty issues prior to commencing the programme as fairly representative of the lack of awareness of her classmates:

. . . she had no idea that there was any sort of responsibility, commitment, or want, or anything for Māori. She sort of laughs and says "the Treaty of Waitangi was a book she had seen on a bookshelf" sort of thing. That was how much she knew [GP1].

Another commented on perceptions of fellow students' reactions to the workshop:

I mean like the courses that we did in the first introduction blocks about the Treaty of Waitangi and different bicultural issues and things like that, it sort of made a lot of people open their eyes [GP3].

Understandings of bicultural imperative

One participant felt she had come to University with the definite idea of having an open mind to bicultural issues, and valued the learning that was offered through the teacher education programme:

To me it was the learning of why we should value biculturalism. That was the biggest thing for me, why we should actually value it and it is part of who I

am and who every New Zealander is. That was the thing, it let me grasp hold of it and didn't turn me away. Yeah, I think that was the biggest thing [GP2].

She is now applying that learning in a culturally diverse early childhood setting:

Our centre is quite multicultural and I think we have to place importance on all of the children, but our commitment is to the Treaty so we need establish our bicultural relationship first before we can become any good at developing multicultural relations. We should be reflecting all of the children's cultures but our key commitment is to biculturalism first. . . .

[Later] We try to reflect all of the children's cultures and their language in some way or other, but Māori is number one. It is the most important one that we have to focus on first. It's part of who everyone in New Zealand is, and if we don't work on it we could lose it [GP2].

For another, biculturalism is not just a requirement, but something which actually enhances the quality of the programme. She is clear that it is not satisfactory to treat Māori content in a tokenistic way:

I still incorporate and encourage a lot of multiculturalism in the programme, but you can use tokenism and get away with it, you can't with Māori. . . . And if I have got say a Samoan child I will try a bit harder, but I have all sorts of different things around and it is respecting the human race sort of thing. . . . You just sort of have little bits, whereas bicultural is not little bits, it's the whole thing [GP1].

One of the participant's understanding of biculturalism focuses very much on the importance of the Māori language:

I think because the staff at [his kindergarten] are actually dedicated towards te reo Māori and because te reo Māori is New Zealand's second language - well it's New Zealand's first language really isn't it? - then we look at things and we sort of think if we want a society that is based and able to get on with each other and have an understanding of each other's languages and cultures then what we do is we actually will go . . . bicultural first and from there will extend ourselves out to multiculturalism. Probably what I am looking at is that for now you are in New Zealand and there are two languages in New Zealand you know. That's a very strong point of view. I think we are actually flexible enough to actually . . . try to acknowledge everything, but our main focus is actually biculturalism. What actually happens is that we are strong enough to be committed to our biculturalism but also be flexible enough to allow other things to come in [GP3].

Te reo and tikanga are integrated holistically within the centre programme:

For me I look at te reo Māori, tikanga Māori as an inclusive programme. It should be just part of everything that you do. It just comes naturally to [the teacher and his colleagues]. It works really well. We will talk to the children in Māori and we will have mat times We try and have a balance which is not too much emphasis on te reo Māori like it is just a natural thing, it's natural inclusion [GP3].

This approach was positively received by the parents of children at the kindergarten.

And the response we get from parents is that, yeah, kōrero Māori at home, you know, and that's great too, because the parents will, if they are keen parents, will pick up on that and start working with that as well [GP3].

I wondered if there were parents who were not comfortable with the level of Māori content in the kindergarten. When the issue is raised, the teachers explain that:

Part of our kaupapa of our kindergarten is actually to have te reo Māori . . . and if they don't like it, well... Well it is in our management policies, and our management plans. And plus it is also the teaching dynamics that we have got is actually strong enough to do it and strong enough to actually go against people who sort of say "why have you got so much Māori, and why have you got so much of this and that?" [GP3].

Significant here is the existence of a policy level stated commitment that is available to the teachers as a back-up rationale for their everyday practice. This excerpt also indicates the value of having a teaching team who share a commitment to bicultural development within the educational programme.

The perception that a language is intrinsic to the culture is significant. Antonia Darder has written that "It is critical that educators realise the role language plays as one of the most powerful transmitters of culture; as such it is crucial to the survival of a cultural community" (1991, p.37).

According to Joshua Fishman destruction of a language is destruction of identity (1991, p.4), and because of past assimilationist policies, "Māori faces a serious threat to its future as the distinctive vehicle of a distinctive culture"(Waite, 1992, p.30). Most Māori want their language to be revitalised (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998, p.63).

Government policy objectives from the Te Puni Kōkiri, the Ministry of Māori Development include to “foster amongst Māori and non-Māori positive attitudes towards, and accurate beliefs and positive values about, the Māori language so that Māori-English bilingualism becomes a valued part of New Zealand society” (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1998, p.65).

“The heart to do it” - Commitment as central

I enquired during the interviews as to the balance between knowledge and commitment that was required in order to deliver a bicultural programme. For the first participant, the key was heart-felt commitment:

Yes, a lot of it is knowledge I think, but a lot is in your heart sort of thing. It is because I want to understand Māori people and I have been given the knowledge to understand about injustices [GP1].

I asked another participant if he saw commitment and knowledge as equally important:

Definitely, I think it is more commitment. Yeah, sometimes it is more commitment and sometimes it is more knowledge, because with commitment you can still go into a centre and use simple Māori words throughout your programme without actually having a vast knowledge. Like I wouldn't say that I am fluent in Māori or really quite high standard of te reo or tikanga. I think you just go along and learn as you go. You enjoy it. I mean if you enjoy something you are out there to make it better. I think a lot of it is commitment and knowledge, you have got to have both but sometimes your commitment can always go a bit further and your knowledge can get built on later.

JR: Probably without any commitment you could have all the knowledge in the world but not really do much?

GP3: Exactly, I mean what is it really, just a waste of time really. If you haven't got the commitment to actually implement something and feel the, you know, the heart to do it, then it is one of the hardest things to do.

Bicultural content of the Waikato University teacher education programme

The bicultural approach of the early childhood education programme was obvious to these participants from the start of their studies. One participant observed that “Although it was never sort of told to us you must be bicultural to promote quality early childhood education, but just that it was naturally inclusive was good” [GP1]. Another was comfortable with the expectation of biculturalism within the

programme, but felt that for some fellow students it created some defensiveness. He said that, “it was quite a tough subject for a lot of people” [GP3]. However, some of these people overcame their initial reservations:

There were people that you could see who actually started enjoying te reo Māori and you know like doing with the rākau sticks¹⁰⁶, things like that, they started enjoying it because it was not pressured it was not forced upon them, it was actually “Do you want to do this?”, you know, “Come along”. And there were people there building block houses and they were talking about it and that's the kind of thing that should be happening, that it is not thrown in the deep end . . . that you are expected to learn another language totally straight off. I mean it should be an enjoyable experience where students and even adults can just have it at their finger tips when they need it [GP3].

One of the participants was critical of the lack of depth and continuity of the Māori language teaching within the teacher education programme. He felt that the intermittent and superficial exposure was inadequate in terms of developing students' confidence. He recommended “having it in a system where it is just there all the time”. He thought Māori language should be included in all the courses of the teacher education programme:

It should be over everything, and you can use it very freely and it doesn't matter where you use it. I mean the thing is I like to see personally is to see that people coming out have the courage and the ability to go out there and just do it and go out there and just use it. Just keep on going with it. . . . I think if the University, I mean this is just my personal point of view, if the University actually created an environment where it was actually just going very freely as in the creativity side of te reo Māori, using those phrases and just doing simple phrases and things like that then a lot of sort of prejudices would be dropped. I think it should be included into everything [GP3].

He also believes that in addition to this inclusive approach, there should still be specialist intensive Māori language courses going on over the full three years of the programme. He suggested that the lecturers in the programme should be providing role models of bicultural practice, including demonstrating fluency with te reo Māori:

¹⁰⁶ GP3 is referring here to the Ataarangi method of teaching te reo Māori, an oral immersion method which uses Cuisenaire rods (‘rākau’) as props/prompts.

. . . and you are role modeling that, something that should be happening in the centres. Most centres you find that, well the students that come out anyway, they are like oh I got into the arts or music, and that's personal preference. But there should also be that inclusion of te reo Māori and tikanga Māori, that comes through naturally. . . . I mean if you want to provide an environment where you are seeing things and making sure that you want teachers going out there that are comfortable with te reo Māori and tikanga Māori then basically [the lecturers should be modeling it] [GP3].

Another participant shared concerns about the adequacy of the preparation in terms of Māori language, particularly with regard to practicum requirements:

I think there was a big expectation when we were on practicum and things like that, to be speaking te reo a lot of the time and we just didn't have it. We had a lot of support people to help us like, I know, I used the lecturers to get phrases that I wanted to have while I was there, but not as an actual part of the course [GP2].

She also suggested that having a compulsory core course in te reo Māori would be helpful. She found the Ataarangi (immersion) methods useful also. Her perception was that the 'integral theme' of biculturalism was apparent in the early childhood teacher education programme:

I think all the courses had some reflection of the Māori aspect and Māori perspective. Yes, I think that came through in just about all of my courses. Only Education though, not many of my other general studies papers [GP2].

The third participant felt that there could have been more practical bicultural content included in his preparation for teaching:

. . . just having someone coming teaching children about plants, and things like that, or teaching stuff you know, like the nature side of things. I mean I was at a sort of hui during the holidays and I was listening to this Māori chap talk to this boy and he was talking about the leaves and he crushed all these up and was smelling it, and I thought instant learning, and that's what it should be all about too. It's not just from a text book, it's . . . around us, it's all the time you know. And I think even at University having something like that, I mean where it is not a pressured course, you are not there to sit down and you are not there to take notes and think about...you go out and listen to some stories of Tane and Papatuanuku ¹⁰⁷and all those sorts of things, and it's

¹⁰⁷ Tane is the atua (guardian spirit) of the forest. Papatuanuku is the Earth Mother.

there, you are there to grab it . . . I mean like even now you go into a centre, well for me anyway, you make up a story as you go and you relate it to Papatuanuku or the sea, Tangaroa¹⁰⁸, and things like that. Those sorts of things too would have actually, even pretending you are having a hāngi¹⁰⁹ in the sandpit, you know go fishing and things like that. It may be not seen as academic learning but it is still probably the most important part because you are passing on information to our younger generation [GP3].

This extract is interesting also, in the multiple references to aspects of tikanga Māori. In keeping with his practical orientation, this participant also proffered the following as a means of inspiring interest in bicultural content in beginning student teachers:

I think maybe even getting some of the teachers out in the field to come in in say the first week or so and say “hey this is what our jobs about. . . you know you have to do te reo Māori, you have to do this and that. It can be fun, it can be enjoyable!” [GP3].

Te Whāriki as a resource

I was interested as to how much use the participants were making of the new early childhood curriculum. One participant pointed out that many teachers were not addressing the Māori content required by Te Whāriki:

You can use Te Whāriki, it is so open, yes, it is really difficult. I have seen people use Te Whāriki really well, but they are not using the bicultural aspect of it. You know absolutely excellent teachers too... [GP1].

Whenever she sits down to begin planning her teaching programme, she makes sure that she has a copy of Te Whāriki and a Māori dictionary at hand. Another participant's teaching team also relies on Te Whāriki:

Te Whāriki is actually our guiding principles and documents, so all our planning is based on Te Whāriki. We go through at the beginning of the term and we look at the goals that we want to set from Te Whāriki, and during the year we will tick them off as we go through. Like if we have got wellbeing goal 3, or something like that, we will have a bit of list of what we can do for that, and if we do it we tick it, and by the end of the year we should have covered all the area of Te Whāriki [GP3].

¹⁰⁸ Tangaroa is the atua of the sea.

¹⁰⁹ A hāngi is a feast cooked in an earth oven.

One participant had recently been doing a professional development course focusing on the Māori content of Te Whāriki. She appeared to be determined to move beyond a sense of tokenism in the treatment of Māori content within her programme planning. Despite feeling somewhat hindered by administrative requirements, she was beginning to build her programme around the particular context of the Māori families involved in her kindergarten. She mentioned how she was beginning to use the ‘Strands’ from Te Whāriki as a basis for her planning. I asked her to explain how this worked:

GP2: I think looking at their families as individuals. And looking at who they are now and where they have come from and the people that are relevant to them. . . Our big focus is trying to find information about people in the area from the past and important figures in Māori history.

JR: You are talking about very local, specific to your hapū?

GP2: Yes, very local, and we have approached one of our grandparents, and she is sort of our kuia, we don't want to impinge on her too much because she is a very busy lady. . . And yeah, she is sort of helping us . . . to find out about relevant people, relevant events which we can incorporate into stories, books, pictures, whatever we want to do so that it is part of our programme.

This teacher was sensitive to the multiple demands likely to be placed upon the kuia, due to her whānau and other responsibilities, and was wary of imposing further expectations or obligations. She talked about having benefited from a professional development course which had encouraged the participants to focus on identifying material within the early childhood curriculum document relevant to working with Māori families. This locally contextualised programming seems to me to have particularly rich potential. It is consistent with the Te Whāriki statement that “Activities, stories, and events that have connections with Māori children’s lives are an essential and enriching part of the curriculum for all children in early childhood settings” (Ministry of Education, 1996b), p.41). By empowering people such as this grandmother from within the kindergarten community to be resources and supports for her programming, she is also ensuring that “Decisions about the ways in which bicultural goals and practices are developed within each early childhood education

setting should be made in consultation with the appropriate tangata whenua” (Ministry of Education, 1996b), p.11).

Strategies for implementing bicultural programmes in early childhood settings

All three teachers recognised the benefits of bringing in Māori people as resources to support the bicultural content of their programmes. One had Māori friends whom she has invited into her kindergarten:

I have called on Māori friends at times to help me in that too. A couple of times they have come into the class just doing some things like telling some legends, so that I can hear how they tell it, because I still have problems where I'm thinking, "I'm telling the story about Maui and who am I to tell that sort of thing?" So if I have had a Māori person come in and help me with that, and we have all heard the story, we have heard the story together and then I say remember when [her friend told her] story and so I do use that [GP1].

Another pointed out that there are also Pākehā people who can be invited in to support the programme, because they have the skills and knowledge to deliver some aspects of Māori content authentically [GP3]. Other aspects of the bicultural programming mentioned by this teacher were the use of a formal mat-time at the start of the kindergarten session, where they had a karakia and introduced specific Māori phrases. With repetition these phrases are adopted by the children, and new ones are gradually introduced:

And once we start getting into our phrases and things like that, and we are using them all the time, then we don't plan for them and go on to the next one. So we start building up, well the children start building up sort of te reo Māori and things like that. And of course some phrases take longer than others and we go back and keep on going and going, sort of until we feel that the children have got it [GP3].

Utilising Māori Resource Material

The teachers identified the value of having good material resources such as books and jigsaw puzzles that reflect te reo me ōna tikanga. One participant was teaching in a kindergarten which did not have funding to obtain new Māori resources, yet despite this lack she managed to maintain her bicultural commitment by using regular

English language resources accompanied by her own commentary in the Māori language:

. . . but then I see that [her kindergarten] hasn't had much to spend because we are a poorer kindergarten, but people are still coming and saying "oh, you know you run a wonderful bicultural programme" and I have sort of had a waka and a wahine, half a dozen measly little puzzles and there is a lot of kindergartens with you know wonderful looking Māori representation but I still think we are using it better because we're talking and we can use lots of Pākehā stuff and it's being used biculturally because we're just talking about things [GP1].

The second teacher was prioritising the purchasing of more Māori resources for her kindergarten, as well as working at the relationships with Māori families:

GP2: We are looking at a variety of things. And we are budgeting much more in our budget now, for Māori resources totally separate from our bulk resources, but they are going to be in the bulk of resources as well, so...

JR: Ah, so you are sort of targeting?

GP2: Oh definitely. It's reflecting in the resources we have and what we are doing, you know the interaction with parents, whānau.

JR: So your commitment to doing things with the programme means that you're actually prioritising in your planning, in your financial planning?

GP2: Yeah, so we are working really hard on that at the moment. Hopefully it will come to fruition...

Graduates As Role Models

One of the graduates, a head teacher in a kindergarten, was already being acknowledged within the local kindergarten teaching community as demonstrating bicultural expertise:

GP1: ... well we will be talking about rainbows and uenuku sort of thing, but I have to make that effort, and say "Okay uenuku – he uenuku tērā". And get everyone saying it so

JR: So you are very much playing a leadership role?

GP1: Yeah, I have a lot of teachers come and see me at [her kindergarten], to implement biculturalism, and every time that happens, you know to have a good bicultural programme, every time that happens I'm just horrified. I think "Oh I've got so far to go!"

One of the Māori graduates also acknowledged her leadership in terms of introducing Māori content into the programme of her mainstream early childhood centre:

GM1: I guess it's just plugging along and because I often just fall back, I just flick into Maori and I can't help myself and the kids sort of look at me and "Oh, okay, [her name is starting again sort of thing. But it's been really interesting watching our children because they will use...

JR: They are more receptive than perhaps. So your kind of approach is leading by example in some ways.

GM1: Yeah I guess so. Also I think I have an expectation that people will learn and will use Māori.

Ongoing development

During the interviews, it became clear that each of the participants was taking up opportunities to further develop their bicultural competence. One teacher's centre was undertaking professional development offered through the Ministry of Education contracted provider specifically targeting the Māori content of Te Whāriki. Another mentioned attending hui but felt that there should be more bicultural professional development provided:

If there were more courses where they were providing you to go there and learn how to implement Te Reo Māori and do things like that, extend on what you already have got, then it would probably be a lot better [GP3].

For one teacher, her commitment and expertise was such that she was recognised as being able to offer leadership in the area of bicultural development. She had recently run a workshop on 'biculturalism for Pākehā' at an early childhood teachers' refresher course. The focus had been on "where I'm coming from and the problems and difficulties and ideas that we could share . . . We talked a lot about racism and how it was so difficult to get out tongue round the words, and how threatening it is" [GP1].

Conclusion

It was heartening to see the commitment and enthusiasm of these graduates being expressed in such positive, tangible ways. The leadership that they are already demonstrating holds promise for the future of bicultural development in early childhood education settings in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The involvement of whānau in early childhood programmes was a significant indicator of the realisation of the Te Whāriki expectation that "Decisions about the ways in which bicultural goals and

practices are developed within each early childhood setting should be made in consultation with the appropriate tangata whenua” (Ministry of Education, 1996b), p.11).

Appendix 3.1.5 Interviews with Professional Development Facilitators

This section contains data from interviews with four facilitators of Ministry of Education professional development contracts for early childhood centres which have a major focus of supporting early childhood staff to deliver the Te Whāriki curriculum. Three participants are Māori and one is Pākehā.

Bicultural development in early childhood centres

All four participants expressed concerns about progress in terms of bicultural development in early childhood centres.

For the past two and a half years, working as a facilitator for the Professional Development Contract for Te Whāriki and being in a wide variety of early childhood centres, I still see many places which do not appear to see acknowledging the dual cultural heritage of New Zealand as important and none where the programme is truly bicultural, although two Playcentres have been trying hard [PDFP1].

Early childhood is a diverse sector, and issues such as the presence of untrained staff, turnover of families in Playcentre, and unsupportive management in childcare centres were some of the possible reasons identified. One considered that National Government policies were also a significant factor. One commented that she was currently working with two centres who had identified improving their use of te reo Māori as a goal,

But in others where I'm working with Te Whāriki there hasn't been anything. What they do is choose an issue that they want to work on and I'd say the majority have not chosen an issue that directly has anything to do with biculturalism [PDFP1].

Features of bicultural development in early childhood centres that were identified during the interviews included incorporation of te reo and tikanga, and collaboration between staff, children and whānau/families in the bicultural development process.

One of the facilitators considered it her role to support them to implement this process:

Yes, that's my job to support them through a process, in terms of addressing marautanga Māori for all kids [PDFM1].

This participant places a high value on early childhood teachers learning correct pronunciation of Māori names:

So then, once you've got to that part you can pick, just about the day is over by the time you've got through all this, but you can pick on one little, may be pick out an area, and say "Right, if I'm thinking of te reo, what would be really appropriate things in terms of te reo? To say our people's names, to me that's crunch. Children's names, whānau names, places like Waikato, Miropiko, Hukanui, Taupiri, all these local, before you just move anywhere else. To address these things for whānau and give them the honour of having those names said correctly is paramount [PDFM1].

She describes how she has observed te reo being integrated into conversations in English:

. . . using te reo inadvertently like, there is one kindergarten that I go to where the teacher integrates te reo, she doesn't korero Māori i ngā wā katoa, but she is part Māori this facilitator, but there are non-Māori who also do the same, and it will be the summer when you go there, and she'll say "oh, go get your pōtae, where are your kamupūtu"? they integrate that like throughout their te reo. And that's choice! [PDFM1].

Another facilitator considered that bicultural development was evident when tikanga were integrated naturally into the early childhood programme. She had seen some positive examples:

Oh, wonderful, wonderful things. And things that are just everyday. Like, I was down at a centre in Rotorua and it wasn't a big thing, but just the way they were talking to the children, the way they respected the little prayer at morning tea, you know before they started their food. They are not made as big things in the centre, they are just fit there and they flow. That's when I think we are bicultural, when they are a natural part of the programme. They are not a big deal [PDFM2].

Children actively seeking further knowledge of te reo and tikanga is evidence of effective bicultural development

And a really neat thing was the way kids up and ask for te reo Māori, they'll say "What's the Māori name for that bird, cause we were in the bush", and I think that's choice. It's non-Māori asking kaiako for, "Can you find out what that word is in Māori" Powerful depth, it's like saying we want to know, it's valuable [PDFM1].

Participation of Māori whānau in the centre is one indicator of bicultural development. Staff at one kindergarten had built up a relationship with a kuia, who the participant described as a "resident nanny", who would advocate for that centre, encouraging Māori families to bring their children to this centre.

"The whānau can weave their own"

The facilitation process outlined by one of the Māori facilitators is particularly significant. She described her approach as an action research model:

JR: Just tell me a wee bit about that action research approach and facilitating. Could you just explain what your understanding of that process?

PDFM1: That everyone is responsible for some of their own direction. The pace at which they move. My role as a facilitator is to help and support the person in making the links and help them engage in that learning process that they identify. It is always that they own their own process. That's my understanding of a general. I mean if I could put the theoretical models for them. That's where I'm coming from. I think I have applied that through working with children, with adults, with anyone.

JR: Different age groups of children?

PDFM1: Age groups, same process. The same autonomy to move. Make their own connections. Actually I'll tell you what, when we go to Ataarangi, some I just notice, when I first started to work with Ataarangi my kaiako said to me, she said to the whole group, "Everyone has a right to hear their own errors if there are errors to move at their own pace. It is not for us to say that you are wrong, they are allowed to hear that for themselves". So I mean that it very much action research kaupapa. It is honouring the individual's right to learn at a given pace and to hear it.

This facilitator is particularly conscious of initiating respectful relationships with Pākehā early childhood teachers in her professional development modules. She initiates the process by visiting them in their centres:

I think, for this year this is particularly pertinent, I think meeting the people that I am working with in their own service or centre. On their own patch initially because they feel comfortable about hosting me, and it just allows

them to get to know me on their own space. Then we would actually korero to some of the things that I know they quite often ask me is it going to be in te reo Māori only, what are the 'p's and 'q's, they are a bit worried. It's like allaying their fears, and letting them know that I am there to support their process. Yes, that's my job to support them through a process, in terms of addressing marautanga Māori for all kids. Once they have worked through that process with me, they have met me, and when they come in to hui at [location] they are actually a lot more comfortable about coming because they have met me, they can put up you know a name to the face, they have talked with me, they have actually been through a needs analysis process where they have identified some of the things that they are wanting to focus on. They have built up a relationship of me prior to coming. It's a trust process and I think comfort level, and I think actually Jenny one of the things that we do when we run a workshop for our whānau is we tautoko in terms of kai and they are actually blown away by that. They are actually stunned, you know when I say we will awahi you in terms of kai. They just tautoko back. So I think that's being part of our being tangata whenua and manuhiri process, and I notice that at the end of the day when they leave they are just so supportive, in terms that they clean up, they do all that without being asked. So they become part of our [name of Professional Development Contract] whānau in a way. It's that kind of whole concept of once having been to come back [PDFM1].

This excerpt contains several key ideas. The first acknowledges that Pākehā early childhood staff are likely to feel validated and comfortable to have the first contact made in their own centres. Secondly the facilitator makes it clear to the teachers that her philosophy is to support them in their own process of “addressing marautanga Māori for all kids”. She then collaborates with participants encouraging them to identify their own needs from the Contract module, a “needs analysis process”. She mentions trust and comfort levels as significant to the relationship building process. She also incorporates tikanga Māori of manaakitanga into the workshops offered at the Professional Development Contract site, which she considers a valuable learning and participation for the teachers.

In the following excerpt she expands on the idea of her participants owning and controlling their own process:

It's not saying, even though I might think “That's pretty woeful” it's not saying that, its saying “What do you think you know would be appropriate/”,

and they say “Oh I should say it properly”. I say “Why do you think that’s important?” So they come up with all the answers and they have made the decisions themselves, and they have been able to articulate the process, and then we usually document that as well. So, you know, keep questioning sometimes as to help them focus and to articulate what they are doing, and challenge, it’s all of those things. But within a framework that they are open to, you know they’re actually feeling comfortable because if they are not feeling comfortable they won’t engage in the korero and they won’t actually be challenged. They will put up a lot of blocks, but they don’t, so it’s yes, listening and once again just assuring them that I’m there to support them, not to pull them down. Quite often sometimes I say “I might come out and work in session with you”, come out and talk to kids and work alongside them. They say “You’re not going check us are you”? and I say “No that’s not my purpose. It’s to actually work alongside you to see where you are at, so that maybe I can be supportive”. Then they say “Well how can you support us in this and this?” Later on, in terms of part of my key approach is for them to actually own their own learning, identify that there is some learning and own it [PDFM1].

Initial workshop content focus on developing participants’ understanding of the Māori content of Te Whāriki:

Te Whāriki as part of that a very important part for them as an instrument as part of that kete to actually make the connection between what is being said and their practice. To connect that theoretical and practical basis well, and that philosophical base, it’s like not out over there it’s here. It’s not something that we look at that’s overseas, it’s here. So it’s actually siting themselves in terms of Te Whāriki-making, and that it’s part of their own process to weave. Once they start weaving with Te Whāriki themselves then they start to own those threads too. For me the crunch stuff, in terms of utilising Te Whāriki as a support, total support system for themselves, is to weave through Te Whāriki and to identify the whole document tautokos Māori curriculum. To actually look at those specific comments that highlight marautanga Māori. “All our children shall have access to the heritage of both partners of Te Tiriti o Waitangi”. To go right through the document and pull out every principle, you know kaupapa whakahaere. For every one of those there is a key statement to make that visible and 90% of all the whānau who have come through, if not 95%, most of them have not seen those comments. Most of them have not known that they exist [PDFM1].

Making the Māori content of Te Whāriki visible is the key task here, and one that seems to be essential, given the apparent ignorance of the majority of her participants.

Again, she encourages participants to identify for themselves the ways in which they can enhance their knowledge of Māori aspects:

So I make the whānau go through every principle, every strand, and pull out every comment that has a specific Māori focus and it's identified like "Will hear te reo", "Will have some knowledge of the iwi or tangata whenua of this area". And I say right, "Let's put all this up. What do we know about these things? What's our knowledge base? How can we support?" And not only what's our knowledge base, but I actually challenge them in terms of owning some of the processes of learning about these things. They are responsible for their own learning for some of these things. They can action a library, they don't have to action people all the time. There are resources, you can't keep bringing them things and giving, I say "I will give you this, but you know. can you find out about this?" [PDFM1].

An interesting point made in this excerpt is the sense that Pākehā tend to expect Māori people to be their primary resources. This facilitator encourages them to expand on their repertoire, seeking published sources as well which requires more responsibility and agency on their part.

This knowledge base is the foundation for the next stage of the process, which she describes as follows:

So Te Whāriki to me is crucial, as a living document, so that the whānau can start to weave their own, because once they start weaving that information it's choice, it's really neat for them to see that [PDFM1].

Although initial contact is through the teachers, her approach is holistic in that it encourages teachers to involve not just children, but whānau/families in the ongoing bicultural development process. In one kindergarten Māori parents became involved in the process facilitated by the professional development contract. In another kindergarten, staff created their own story in te reo which became a favourite with the children:

I'll just give you a little anecdote, one set I worked with last year . . . with the group, practitioners and the kids. Over that, I would say it was about 8/9 months, over that time. One of the workshops they actually had a follow up session of about 3 hours where they actually worked on te reo, and that was

through an Ataarangi process plus a range of beginners working on te reo, they produced their own very simple pukapuka based on “He Kuri”¹¹⁰, but this little group were a bit more complex they chose one about, they wanted one about a nanny, a kuia growing her carrots and the rabbit pinching the carrots. So it was kind of like a bit of a mystery, you know, nanny gave them 5 plants of carrots, and then would come te pō¹¹¹, then you know e whā ngā kāroti¹¹², and then the rabbit would come out, te pō, all in te reo. Well they took that back to the centre and they read it in te reo. 95% of the kids are Tauwiwi, there are only about 10% Māori. All the kids in that whānau love that korero, they loved it so much that they made another pukapuka on a similar theme. The kids would predict the pages, say the te reo, and one of the choice things was that the kids wouldn’t just go and pick it because you thought they should, they would actually go and get that book when their parents brought them in and take it to their parents, and share the pukapuka with their parents from themselves. So to me that’s like magic. Because that’s kids validating kaupapa Māori because those practitioners they set that ball rolling, so they are very important as change agents. So you had the teachers, the kids, the families, all awihiing the kaupapa. I thought it was just so powerful, awesome [PDFM1].

This excerpt describing the practitioners as “change agents” who have enabled a process involving collaboration with children and whānau/families whereby one of the results is children validating kaupapa Māori, seems central to the bicultural development process.

Documentation and feedback are part of the process employed by this professional development facilitator.

PDFM1: And I always document that information back to them, so they get that feedback back. That’s another thing, providing you know that they own that work, they pulled it together so it’s making sure they get that mahi¹¹³ back and they can engage with it.

JR: So you’re talking about recording all the stuff.

PDFM1: Recording all their stuff. Recording it all. Feed it all back. We make sure it’s typewritten up and goes back to them. And that’s for every part of my process, I actually document everything, every session I have with them, I tabulate and try and get it back to them.

¹¹⁰ “He Kuri” is “A Dog”.

¹¹¹ Te pō is the night.

¹¹² E whā ngā kāroti – four carrots.

¹¹³ Mahi is work.

JR: You also do quite a bit of evaluation of your sessions.

PDFM1: Every session.

JR : What's some examples of feedback where they have said something was useful, you know, what are the things that they have said were great, helped them a lot.

PDFM1: Helping them identify where they are at, in terms of Māori curriculum. Has been helpful to them in terms of focusing on areas they need to work with specifically. It's been helpful in terms of looking at Te Whāriki as a whole document, and knowing what that means, because they haven't actually seen part of it . . . They have been able to recognise change process, and themselves as change agents. They have been able to observe outcomes for children. They have felt that they have become more confident in terms of learning and become more responsible for finding out about their own learning process. All those things they have documented, and I have got those.

Another facilitator shared strategies that she considered effective in her workshops on Tiriti o Waitangi issues. She includes a range of activities, some active, and with a holistic approach. For example:

PDFP1: I indicate an imaginary map on the floor and ask them to place themselves on the map. You probably know some of these, you know there is one where you get them to imagine the map of New Zealand and where they come from and then think about where do you live now. Think back to where you grew up, what's special about it? And get them just to articulate that and you get them to think about this feeling of place and belonging...

JR: connectedness...

PDFP1: and then bring in the feeling of Turangawaewae¹¹⁴ and so on. So that they begin to see something about a place that has a very special meaning for people whatever you are. And the fact that for Māori it seems to be even more special. Then people can just think, and I say well yes I've got a place that really is just so special to my heart, that whenever I think of it, my heart feels good, so it's my Turangawaewae. So they begin to think, well those things that we have got are similar but we look at them from different points of view. That's one exercise that works well.

Informational content is important, and she considers that it is helpful if her participants have had readings in advance in order to prepare. Sessions then allow for workshopping of key ideas, as in the following excerpt where she describes how she

¹¹⁴ Turangawaewae is your place of belonging.

has used the reading by Judith Simon, entitled “Good Intentions, but . . .” (Simon, 1996)

I gave it to students to read before hand, and then we talked about it and then I got them in to pairs and one of them had to make one of the statements and the other person using Judith's refutation and counter arguments to argue back, so they were getting the practice of articulating so that perhaps if they struck it from a parent or another colleague they'd have the confidence and the words to counter such statements. They know how to use them. That worked quite well [PDFP1].

Qualities for Facilitating Cultural Awareness

Two of the facilitators raised issues relating to qualities for effective facilitation. One considered that the ability to share one’s understandings of Māori perspectives was crucial.

I think you have to, it has to come from inside you that a full understanding to really be able to share it across. You have got to truly to be able to not even link it or live it, but acknowledge it to feel comfortable with it. To be able to then share it on, if it is not really inside you it is hard to do that. And times I have noticed facilitators and professional support programmes, while they are trying to be bicultural they really don't sort of awahi it inside and so it doesn't seem to sound right. That's a real good one. That one will get me going! [PDFM2].

The Pākehā facilitator found it useful to be able to empathise with participants about their lack of understanding of the history of colonisation of this country, and found sharing her own background particularly useful when she encountered resistance:

I'm just trying to think if we've ever had anyone feeling very anti about it. That is a valid argument, and I just say well I'm on a very low part of the learning curve. I say how I just lived in ignorance and I believe we were fed things like Captain Hobson came to New Zealand, then the missionaries came and they brought lots of good things. And then, for example, I was taught about "The Māori Wars" where the Māori were the 'baddies' and the Europeans were the 'goodies'. And this is what I grew up with. I just feel cheated that for so long I was completely mis-informed, there were all the things that I didn't know, and I feel cheated that I didn't have the opportunity to learn Māori when I was a child because I've tried now I'm grown up and old and it's so hard. And I say always “I'm just at the beginning of the learning curve but perhaps it is easier for me to convey to you where I am at rather than if I was steeped in the knowledge” [PDFP1].

These comments demonstrate a genuine humility, a recognition of the inaccuracies portrayed through colonialist discourse, and an appreciation of sensitivities required in facilitating monocultural Pākehā to address these issues.

Pākehā Appropriation

One participant raised issues of Pākehā appropriation, citing Pākehā re-interpreting Māori concepts of manaakitanga and mana. She considered that Pākehā were not conveying the holistic genuine Māori understandings and felt angered by this. She gave an example from a television documentary in which a Pākehā reporter had been steering the conversation with a Māori tattooist:

And he was trying to get the tattooist to say "Ok, when you are doing the tattooing something takes over doesn't it"? This is his line of questioning to the Māori tattooist. And he said "yes". And he said "so it is a spirit is it"? And he said "no, I wouldn't say that". And he said "or something takes over doesn't it"? And he said - the Māori guy was being very careful, and I actually admired him because all of a sudden I knew exactly where he was coming from. And he was saying "I'd say it was the mauri". And the guy was saying "so that's a spiritual thing"? And he said "no it's the mauri" and I thought, "You are very clever". He really knew what he was talking about. And he really didn't want Pākehā to interrupt. Because he what was really going to pull out of it was just a whole lot of hocus-pocus, "and so you are tattooing people without - you're totally out of control, because you think the spirits have taken over". It's not that at all. He mentioned wairua, and then the interviewer kept saying "Isn't that spiritual?" And then he said "No, I want to say it's the mauri" [PDFM3].

She has also experienced situations where Pākehā have not shown respect to taonga that she has brought to share with them in workshops:

And I have had to stop and say "Hey – some thing's you can't use in this way" because I noticed I take all my natural resources and do a workshop on them, and all of a sudden Tauwiwi had no respect for them. They were using them for collage and you know Playcentre are actually the worst, sorry I have to say this. The Playcentre mums will say "If you brought them why can't my child use them because he wants to use it"? You know. And I can remember this child, and I took lots of resources along, and these are the ones that the children can use, and these ones are for display, and for talking about. And the little boy was very skilled in wanting. He picked out all the valuable ones, and he wanted them, and his mum couldn't really see why, "Well why did you

bring them then?". And it was a very very tense moment of trying to explain that [PDFM3].

In another instance, this participant related her experience of hostility from a parent in an early childhood centre in which she had worked previously:

PDFM3: I had one father hit me up one morning and say "I don't like my son coming home with this 'whaka' word"? Whakarongo mai¹¹⁵.

[Laughter]

PDFM3: I actually laughed at him and I said "Thank you for telling me that and sharing, because if I tell you what that word actually means - I think there is a moral in it! It's whakarongo - and the word actually means listen! The song he is singing is whakarongo mai listen to me". And he just stormed off.

JR: Didn't want to listen! [Laughter]. That's a lovely example.

PDFM3: Isn't it. I thought it was really ironical, that this child was going home singing the 'whaka' word - whakarongo mai, and it was one that I had taught them, 'Titiro mai'. So there you are. But the children actually liked it and that was the thing to actually get through to the parents, that your children would be so much better for it. But it was really trying to convince the parents that it was okay for their children to learn. Do you realise when they go to school this is probably what they are going to get. I felt like saying you are really cheating them about half the culture of New Zealand if you don't allow them actually learn by this. But I talked to them about all the benefits of, if a Pākehā child has te reo Māori they are so respected in another world.

This also illustrates that children may be more receptive to Māori content than their parents, and that work needs to be done with parents to generate understanding and support for what is happening in the programme in terms of bicultural development. Indicated here also is the lever of showing parents that their child will benefit from having access to a bicultural/bilingual paradigm, cognitively, educationally, and socially. It is unfortunate that Māori teachers have had to deal with this kind of insensitive racist hostility.

¹¹⁵ Whakarongo mai means listen to me.

Te Whāriki

In the following excerpt I explore an issue that had been suggested to me separately by a Māori and a Pākehā colleague, which is the possibility that practitioners could use the curriculum document without referring to the bicultural expectations it contains. In doing so they would be avoiding any of the implications of bicultural development and continuing to deliver a monocultural programme.

JR: One of the things that has been suggested to me in this regard is that you can use Te Whāriki and ignore the Māori content.

PDFP1: I'm sure you could, yes. Especially with the final, official version.

JR: And one of the concerns that this person had was that our students might be doing just that. Might be finding ways to do that already.

PDFP1: I think so.

JR: Which is sort of sad. And you agree with that?

PDFP1: Yes. I think so. And especially I think more in the second version because in the first version the Māori part was woven through without separate sections, therefore now you could just leave that section completely and just go on.

Another participant stated that some of the graduates from our early childhood programme at the University of Waikato demonstrated a lack of awareness of the Māori components of Te Whāriki [PDFM1].

Qualities to Enable Early Childhood Teachers to Facilitate a Bicultural Development Process.

I was interested to see what participants considered would assist teachers in the challenge of bicultural development. In addition to a solid grounding in the bicultural imperative and Māori content of Te Whāriki, some other aspects emerged. One believed that communication skills were essential:

PDFM2: Probably at the moment one of the biggest areas that you need really really good communication skills to get your thoughts, but to bring other people on board is where you're at on the continuum, so that within that communication concept could be a real focus so that they have more of that practical. They have got wonderful ideas and knowledge about being bicultural, but to actually work that with bringing others on board.

JR: To have the competence, and perhaps confidence

PDFM2: Yes, the confidence.

This same facilitator also considered leadership skills to be a useful goal for the teacher education programme:

Because our training is set up in such a way that you are up with the latest developments, the latest thinking and concepts, ideas, leadership has got to be part of that because they are going out into a field where. . . you know the majority of cases, the other people working with children haven't even been through a three year programme. And so it is more and more because those with the diploma of teaching are being put into those leadership requirements for licensing quality etc. So it is a really important part. The bicultural is probably being one of the areas where I feel leadership, they have needed all those skills and support [PDFM2].

The Pākehā facilitator considered it important for early childhood teachers to feel positive about their own cultural identity and to value cultural differences:

Yes, and being able to feel good about your own culture because I think you have to feel good about your own, but also to value diversity. One would hope that would be the outcome if people were well informed and had time to work through a whole lot of hang-ups. Because there is so much racism, you just have to read the papers. The Tuku Morgan stuff is not helping. Māori bashing is just going on all the time at the moment [PDFP1].

This excerpt also raises issues of racism in the wider society. She indicates that teachers need an awareness of the dynamics of racism in this country, and how this impacts on their work.

Bicultural and Multicultural Issues.

There was a perception, expressed by one of the participants, that some early childhood teachers framed their approach as “multicultural” as an alternative to the in-depth process of bicultural development:

PDFM2: I think there is a section of early childhood in the field that are quite comfortable to look at the multicultural, but they don't want to look at the bicultural. I talked to one person about it and she feels that we should be able to greet everybody that is respecting everybody's cultural [identity], and then we talked about that this is Māori place, this is tangata whenua, - “Oh no we are all kiwis”. And so I think that people are accepting of multicultural, there is still a group that is accepting of multicultural because it is just sort of an overview. Whereas . . . for myself personally bicultural comes first.”.

One of the participants and I engaged in a useful exploration of the tension between a commitment to a Tiriti-based need for bicultural development, and the need for recognition of each child's unique cultural identity, and the diversity this generates:

PDFM1: I have to endorse the bicultural kaupapa, and I do totally, because I don't believe it excludes a multicultural perspective, I think it embraces. I just think we are a bicultural community, we have been a bicultural community for a long time. I don't think, we that's our founding tenet, and I just don't think that excludes a multicultural, I would still expect in a bicultural kaupapa that individuals were being supported by hearing their name said correctly. No matter what, to actually tautoko that child in terms of affirming symbols.

JR: In a sense, what you might be saying, correct me if this isn't what you're saying, but some of the things we are saying that are really important in terms of getting Pākehā students to adhere to a principle of say, the principle that you should pronounce the child's name correctly, applies whether you are talking about a Māori child or a child of any ethnicity?

PDFM1: Well I'll go back to my intermediate days of being up in the staff room being given lesson on how to pronounce an European child name that has come from Switzerland correctly. You know, a 15 minute lesson in the staff room just so we get her name right, and you know, I'm thinking, we haven't even addressed our bicultural kaupapa, but we are getting lessons here! So you know, I just find that totally inverted. Te Whāriki as a document is just so powerful in terms of its commitment to Aotearoa.

JR: I really like your concept of it being inclusive.

PDFM1: Oh it's inclusive, it's not, I believe that if we can link to our bicultural heritage we can embrace our multi - if we can't embrace our bicultural how on earth can we be multicultural? - we can't Jenny.

JR: So do you see like one framework that I have used is that on the one hand we have got tangata whenua, absolutely no questions about that, they are here, they have paramountcy; on the other hand the treaty partner which is the Crown and all its descendants, i.e. all of Taiwi include all Pākehā and all the other immigrant groups and they are the other part of that bicultural partnership, so that when we are talking about bicultural we are not talking about just purely Pākehā and Māori?

PDFM1: No, we are talking about all our wider whānau. Because they are descendants of the Crown.

JR: They have come in on the Crown immigration policies.

PDFM1: That's an inclusive model.

JR: Yeah, yeah I like that.

PDFM1: A choice model. So that's my perspective of that. I just think you know, bicultural includes.

The following comment points to the possibility that bicultural understandings can contribute to a respect for other cultural worldviews:

I suppose if you develop the skills of appreciating differences more, that is not so much a skill as an attitude of appreciating things Māori do and the things they hold dear, you must be developing sensitivity to another culture. One would think then that it would open up your way of thinking about other cultures and groups, and the fact that many other cultures, the main ones would be the Pacific Island ones, but of course you have the Asian cultures coming in now, and some European. I guess it means, the skills we really need are anti-bias skills aren't they? Because if you have got those and understand why and go along with it you won't be biased against other groups, whatever they are [PDFP1].

Interim Discussion

These interviews indicated that although it was often a struggle, where teachers were committed to bicultural development, some interesting things were happening. It was clear that I needed to find out more about what was happening in centres. These discussions reinforced my respect for the work of these colleagues in the area of professional development.

Appendix 3.2 Stage Two Data: Further Sources

The following appendices contain data collations from a range of sources which were intended to supplement the original interview material. These sources include the observations within early childhood centres, audiotaped class discussions, students' assignments, and the written survey of graduates of the early childhood teacher education programme.

Appendix 3.2.1 Bicultural development in centres

This section covers the data gathered when in 1998 I visited a range of early childhood centres, thirteen different programmes in total, including a range of kindergarten and childcare centres. I was interested in observing what was actually happening in centres, in terms of inclusion of te reo and tikanga Māori. My preparation for the observations was based on key statements and concepts from Te Whāriki [See Appendix 2.2, Notes for observation in early childhood centres]. My observations covered four key areas: visible signs of bicultural development; verbal (examples of te reo Māori), resources, and activities. I was also interested in ways that Māori ways of being and knowing manifested in the interactions and routines within the session. An example of the latter would be the inclusion of karakia, or encouragement for the children to work in a collective endeavour, perhaps based in a Māori theme, such as one of the Maui stories.¹¹⁶ I will now explore these areas in turn.

Visibility

The first thing I looked for as I approached the centre was a sign of welcome, preferably in both Māori and English. I tried to imagine myself in the place of a Māori parent approaching this centre for the first time, and looking for some sign that this centre might be a good place for my child. Nine of the thirteen centres had some

¹¹⁶ See for example, the books by Peter Gossage.

form of bilingual welcome sign, sometimes accompanied by a kōwhaiwhai border, some less formal, such as the white board outside on the pathway up to the centre which cheerily welcomed people with a "Kia ora parents/whānau..." and then went on to invite them to 'fish n chips for lunch on Friday' for an end of term celebration.

For Māori, "kanohi ki te kanohi", speaking literally face-to-face, is a culturally preferred style of relating. However in busy centres, particularly in kindergartens, it is not always the case that one of the teaching staff is able to leave their pressing responsibilities with the children, to immediately attend to an arriving adult. Many centres are now adhering to policies which require them to post information about teaching staff and their qualifications on a noticeboard for parents. Six of the centres in my study did this, but only two staff members provided a mihi in te reo Māori by way of introduction.

Some of the centres visibly signaled to parents and whānau an invitation for them to be involved, through such means as a particular area devoted to this purpose. A couch and parent library might be situated here, along with various notices intended for parents/whānau. One centre had a notice explaining the value of partnership between teachers and parents framed by a kōwhaiwhai border, prominently displayed.

An indication of bicultural content within an early childhood programme might be signs of Māori content in children's art displays on the centre walls. Two centres were currently displaying large stuffed suns painted with bright dyes, evidently focused around a 'Maui and the Sun' theme. Another centre had a large mural by children labeled "Tainui te waka, Taupiri te maunga, Waikato te awa, He piko he taniwhā, Ngā iwi haere mai". Another centre had been focusing on facilitating children's awareness of the 'koru' shape for several weeks, and were proudly displaying some of the results of this emphasis, in a wide range of different media. At this centre also, some of the waiata contained within the collection of song charts,

had been illustrated by the children, which indicated a deeper level of involvement by children with things Māori.

Several of the centres exhibited creative displays that were in keeping with a bicultural theme. One of these, with “Te Whāriki” as the focus, incorporated paua shells and koru designs, along with red, black and white colours, and was very strikingly arranged on a central wall panel. Another centre had created a display from a collection of photos, greetings and phrases in a range of languages, tapa cloth and including an “honour the Treaty” slogan.

Resources

In the early 1980s when I was teaching, there were very few books that portrayed Māori children and their families, or contained Māori themes, and particularly few that were available in te Māori. Largely due to the output of Learning Media, the and some local publishers, that is fortunately not the case any more, and there is no reason why centres should not have a large range of these books available at all times. For this project I chose to focus not on the books that may have been stored out of eyesight, but on those actually displayed for children and families on the day I visited. In fact, the results of my observations indicate that in some centres, these may be an under-utilised resource.

For example, one well-equipped centre had approximately 250 books available on low shelves in their story corner, which was wonderful in terms of their accessibility to children. However, as I looked through them I was dismayed to find only eight of these were in te reo, another eight had Māori content, and another three I classed as ‘semi-bilingual’ (e.g. the “Ka Pai Kiwi” and the “Pukunui” series). At another centre, 38 books had been carried outside and paced on a mat with cushions. Of these, there was only one in te reo Māori and one bilingual book. Another centre had 30 books out, one of which was in te reo. This pattern was repeated in four further centres.

On the other hand some centres had more Māori books available. A centre in a low socio-economic area managed to provide out of a total of 48 books available on the day, seven books in English but with Māori content, three in Pacific Island languages (from Learning Media’s “Tupu” series), three further bilingual books, and one in te reo Māori. Another centre had 45 books available, of which twelve were about Māori subjects but in the English language, three were in te reo Māori only, and another seven were bilingual books about Māori topics.

Puzzles are another category in which there are now more Māori resources commercially available than there were previously. This area proved more straightforward to assess than that of the books. The proportion of puzzles with Māori content, available on the day I visited, is indicated below (only seven of the centres had puzzles out):

Numbers of puzzles on display with Māori imagery or language:	
1.	7 out of 14
2.	7 out of 16
3.	3 out of 11
4.	12 out of 24
5.	1 out of 17
6.	3 out of 18
7.	3 out of 13

One application of a bicultural commitment in early childhood centres is to make connections for children with te taiao, the environment, from a Māori perspective. This is a reflection of the “recognition of Māori ways of knowing and making sense of the world and of respecting and appreciating the natural environment” advocated in Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996a: 82). Two centres I visited had wonderful native plant gardens around the outsides of the building that would

otherwise have been largely under-utilised because of supervision constraints. Whilst I was visiting one of these centres, one of the teachers was working with several children to weed the garden, encouraging them to identify which were weeds and to uplift these to the wheel-barrow for removal. Several centres also had natural resource displays inside their buildings, with collections of shells, animal bones, leaves, seeds and so on arrayed in baskets of various sizes. One of these had a science focus and included, for example, large pot-plants and harakeke branches, magnifying glasses, large soft-drink bottle egg timers, a map of Aotearoa/New Zealand, and posters of native birds and plants. Other centres had natural resources invitingly provided as resources for collage work.

Te Reo Māori

Te Whāriki explicitly states that early childhood staff should ‘support’ the use of the Māori language (Ministry of Education, 1996a: 55). The vast majority of citizens of Aotearoa/New Zealand are monolingual in English. Early childhood teachers are no exception to this. The expectation created by Te Whāriki of at least some regular te reo Māori content is perhaps one of the more difficult challenges to those working in centres.

Only three of the centres had Māori staff with some fluency in te reo, and in two of these, the Māori staff were there on a temporary basis. For the other centres, it is perhaps a concern that the majority of instances of uses of te reo Māori that were identified in this study were almost all coded in the category of ‘commands’. These included:

- Haere mai ki te kai (come and eat)
- Homai te pōro (give me the ball)
- E tu tamariki (stand up children)
- E noho (sit down)
- Haere mai ki te whāriki (come to the mat)
- Horoi o ringaringa (wash your hands)

Whakarongo mai (listen to me)

- 13 instances in total

Instances of praise in te reo were less frequent, but included:

Ka pai (That's good)

Kia ora, that's really helpful (Kia ora as used here is equivalent to thank you)

Ka pai! Well done! (and in the reverse order)

Tino pai! (Very good)

- 6 instances in total

Another feature of te reo Māori usage was the insertion of a single Māori word within a regular English sentence:

Do you want some fruit? Some panana or some āporo? (banana or apple)

What's your pukapuka about?

Do you like this green one? This kākariki? I like kākariki . . . (kākariki means green)

Did you have a sandwich on your pakahiwi? (shoulder)

Sit down and noho on your bottoms (noho means sit)

Turn on your taringa, zip up your waha (taringa means ears, waha means mouth)

It may be argued that this form of usage is introducing children to Māori terms, but it could also be construed as perpetuating the dominance of English grammatical structures, with token Māori insertions. Whilst colours and numbers (there was one instance of a teacher counting in te reo) are readily useable by teachers, they indicate a reliance on a limited range of vocabulary. There was also some evidence of anglicisation of Māori terms, such as inappropriate pluralising, as in "Sit on your nonos" (nono meaning buttocks). I also observed instances such as when a Māori family were arriving, when an opportunity to use Māori greetings were overlooked.

Overall, aside from the centres mentioned where fluent speakers were utilising complete Māori sentences to varying extents, there was little Māori being used consistently. Discussing these matters, one of the teachers identified confidence as a barrier, “. . . because you feel like a real twit when it comes out wrong.” Another teacher felt that despite having attended a number of courses since completing her university qualification, she is still not comfortable integrating te reo Māori into activities, particularly when there isn't a solid commitment from all the teaching team members, and from the supervising team member in particular. She did suggest that using songs in Māori was easier, since the format and grammar are predetermined.

Waiata

During my one session visit, eight of the thirteen centres sang at least one song in te reo Māori. Four of these used taped songs in the background, whilst three had guitar accompaniment. Three centres utilised poi in these sessions, and one centre (with no Māori staff) did full Māori actions to the song, all teachers and children joining in. There were also several instances of bilingual songs being sung, such as “Ma is white”. Many of the centres had song lists and song charts near the mat area to support staff and children, although the proportion of songs in te reo was not very high, for example, four out of 46 and six out of 32. Several centres had other resources next to the mat area such as tapes of Māori songs, tititorea and poi.

Activities

According to Te Whāriki explicitly early childhood staff should support tikanga Māori (Ministry of Education, 1996a: 55). There were several activities observed that could be construed as examples of offering tikanga Māori experiences. In two centres, harakeke activities were being provided. In one centre an adult was making harakeke musical clackers with the children, and in the other, a teacher was encouraging children to attempt to weave the harakeke, encouraging them to use their own ideas. I later observed some children with the taura harakeke they had created acting out the story of Maui catching the sun by themselves outside: “ I caught the sun now, X you should catch the other sun!”

At another centre, there was a tititorea session at mat-time, where children modeled actions demonstrated by staff, throughout several waiata, and accompanied by instructions such as “Now we’ll try ‘kei runga tō rākau¹¹⁷”.

At four of the centres a story with Māori content was read to children whilst I was observing. Accompanying one of these, the teacher encouraged the children on the mat to move their arms to represent the speed of “Te Rā” as he moved across the sky to in a most effective manner.

In the kindergartens, children were free to choose their own time to take their food brought from home to a set place and eat it. There was no mention of karakia. Despite there being more formal meal-time routines in the child-care centres, karakia were said before kai in only two of the centres.

Depth of te reo and authenticity of tikanga were not a strength within many of the activities that I observed. When there are no Māori adults involved in programme planning and implementation, non-Māori staff who lack a deep understanding of te reo and tikanga and who do not wish to cause offence by misrepresenting things Māori, appear to be limited in their ability to include te reo me ōna tikanga in a holistic way throughout the programme. This may be one of the explanations for the lack of instances of tikanga, such as having karakia before kai, for example. I do not consider all the instances I observed to be condemned as tokenism, which MacNaughton says is characterised as a situation where “superficial recognition that an issue exists but minimum effort is expended in trying to resolve it.” (MacNaughton, 1998), p4).

¹¹⁷ Kei runga tō rākau – [put] your stick up.

Appendix 3.2.2 Class Discussions Data

These data were gathered during classes that I taught over two years (1997 and 1998) of the course, Cultural Studies Two. It comes from audiotapes of discussions that usually took place towards the end of each class. They focused on questions from the weekly reading guides. The reading guides were a booklet of sets of questions for each required reading, which were intended to focus students on key ideas from that reading. Students were expected to have prepared their own responses to the reading guide questions before each class. During each class, there was time for small group discussions of reading guide responses before the final whole group discussion.

Understanding 'Culture'

The first class of the second year course began by revisiting Te Tiriti o Waitangi and explaining the culturally inclusive bicultural paradigm that is used in the course, with particular reference to readings by Carr (1993), Metge (1990), and Sullivan (1993).

One of the initial purposes I had for the course was to focus on understanding culture and difference. The assumption was that if students can become aware of their own culture relative to others, they may be able to respect the differences they perceive in those other cultures. The following discussion, was on the first reading guide question Joan Metge's Kohao o te Ngira (Metge, 1990):

“How, according to Metge, do we learn the value of our culture?”

JR: How does Metge think we learn the value of culture, remember this one, back to this one, this first question on Metge?

Student 1: Culture shock.

JR: Culture shock, yeah?

Student 2: Experience.

JR: Through experiences yeah.

Student 3: Knowing who we are

JR: Knowing who we are. Yeah I think we learn it, often times without even being aware that that's what's happening, do you think that?

Several: Yeah.

JR: *Yeah. Anyone else have anything else on that number one about how we learn about culture.*

Student: *By being exposed.*

JR: *By being exposed from the minute we're conceived basically yeah. Well I do think it's, the interesting thing is that we're not really necessarily aware that this is what is happening not until we sort of start taking a step back kind of trying to be more objective about what it is that we are immersed in because we're so immersed. I think it's when you looking at another culture that you can see the differences.*

[Inaudible]

JR: *That's true definitely. How many people have been overseas? Oh heaps gosh what a well-traveled bunch you are! Very sophisticated of you. Where have you all been?*

Various, calling from around room: America, Canada, States, Europe, Pacific Islands, Fiji

JR : *Well don't feel, I mean this is very unusual to have a group where 99% of people have been all over the place but actually it's probably going to label the ones who haven't had the benefit of all that experience anyway so I wouldn't worry about it. I think it's quite enriching to have experienced groups. Don't feel hard done by whatever you do. Okay so was it your experience which certainly was mine to go over to another country even Australia and notice differences that kind of hit you in the face, did you get that feeling, can you think of any examples?*

Student 1: *One in Spain, 'cause we used to just stay at the beach all day and come home five o'clock and have a meal and then want to go to sleep but their whole, the whole town has been asleep all day and they're just going all night, midnight there was noise, kids and everything.*

JR: *That's right. They have their meal about 9 or 10 o'clock at night.*

Student 1: *:Yeah.[laughter from class] and in the hotel and everything it's just terrible.*

JR: *Totally different yeah well that's a really good example, yeah. Any other examples of housing? Okay give me an example what's so different about housing in one of those places.*

Student 2: *Thatch huts.*

JR: *Thatch huts okay yeah definitely different . . .*

Student 1: *Their way of life is different too like you know in Europe they just eat, cafés are like all over sidewalks and that and they eat you know a lot of people in cafés and just sit for hours, you know. Here we don't really sort of tend to go to a café and just . . .*

JR: *We just bolt our food and out the door*

Student 1: *Yeah*

Student 3: *I'm English and I don't know whether you want this example but even the table, plate thing is really foreign to me still it's like if you invite someone to your home you provide it for them you know.*

JR: *Yes you don't expect people to bring potluck dinners*

Student 4: Well would you want to cook a meal for 20 people? Come on!
Student 3: If you invite 20 people to your home then you should cook it for them!
JR: But we're so egalitarian we just share and share alike! [wk1, 97].

This discussion shows my endeavours to encourage students to draw from their own experiences of different cultures.

Another attempt to encourage students to use their own experiences to enhance their understanding of culture is evident in the following reading guide question:

*Give some of your own examples to illustrate Metge's claim that "individuals can be said to be directed and constrained by their culture".
Here is some discussion of this question:*

JR: Okay what about this quote "Individuals can be said to be directed and constrained by their culture," what did you get for that? What does that mean? "It can be directed and constrained"

Student 1: Can't see past it.

JR: Yeah.

Student 2: Not being open minded

JR: Not being open minded yeah, yeah [wk1,97]=

The next topic explored values from two cultures, the students' own and Māori values as described in chapter six of the course text, James Ritchie's "Becoming Bicultural" (Ritchie, 1992). The in-class small-group exercise for this comparison is as follows:

1. *Identifying our values: What is important to me?*
2. *How do we protect and maintain these values?*
3. *Compare our values with those identified as Māori in the reading:
- i.e., identify similarities and differences.*
4. *Summarise and highlight learnings.*

Here are some excerpts from the 1997 discussion of the comparison between their values and those described as Māori in the reading:

JR: Okay any other sort of examples that you had that

Student 1: Family

JR: Family yeah

Student 2: The honesty and respect for your family and your elders

JR: And that was similar?

Student 1: Yeah

Student 2: Also like in relationships with your, like your community you know you have the tribes and that sort of thing

JR: Right, I think so, I think that you'll probably find just about every culture would have a very strong value on family because it's the only way that that culture is going to survive isn't it, is by having another generation to survive and succeed...

Student 2: But don't the Māori sort of extend more back to their ancestors than we sort of tend to do

JR: Oh I definitely think there's a stronger feeling of them being present all the time you know when I'm with Māori people they often you know have a sense of their tūpuna¹¹⁸ with them, right now looking over their shoulder so to speak which is kind of spooky from my cultural point of view

Student 3: We think more of our immediate family whereas they think of their whole extended family even right up the top of the North Island...

Different World Views

One of the key objectives that I had for students in this course was to gain an understanding of the concept of different world views, and a respect for world views other than their own. For the topic, "Comparative world views, indigenous education and cultural survival", the first reading was Ranginui Walker's 'The Meaning of Biculturalism' (Walker, c1987). The following is an excerpt from discussion of reading guide question four:

"What is your opinion of Walker's concept of the Treaty as a charter for biculturalism?"

JR: What do you think about that, do you think that the Treaty is still relevant as a starting point

Student: I don't think it's much of a bicultural concept anymore

JR: How do you see it

Student 1: I just sort of see that the Māoris been taken over that much, they try to make it all one culture now and not keep the two separate

JR: Yeah

Student 2: They're sort of taking over their culture as well and trying to make them more Pākehā than Māori [wk1, 97]

¹¹⁸ Tūpuna are ancestors.

These students appear to be viewing the impact of colonisation on Māori as a loss of a distinct Māori identity.

The second reading chosen gives a detailed description of the worldviews of Australian aboriginals (Harris, 1990), which are very contrasting to Western views. The reading guide question asked students to “make notes as you read of examples of the different ways of thinking and behaving as described by Harris”. Here is an excerpt from the discussion that took place in week two, 1998:

JR: Ok, some more examples. Are there any more examples that anyone had for that?

Student 1: The way that they won't answer too many questions, they don't like to be seen as being too inquisitive.

Student 2: They feel it's their right not to answer

Student 1: They won't answer something if they know that you know the answer anyway.

JR: So it's not a questioning orientation, you're always enquiring and seeking out to find answers, which is very much the way we see of our education. We see that not so much in early childhood now, we're trying to move away from asking kids questions all the time. . .

Later in this class, following discussion of Aboriginal orientations to money and work, the conversation shifted to generational change within our own culture:

JR: I think I'm more strict on my kids than my parents' generation.

Student: So am I, but it's a different world, and I wouldn't dare put my kids in the clothing that Mum put me in. You know things like that.

JR: Frilly things?

Student: Ugly.

JR: Well, that's just fashion.

Student: Fashion trimmings.

This sort of discussion is a useful opportunity to reinforce the idea that all cultures are changing, that no culture is static, including our own.

Discussion provides opportunities for sharing from personal experiences and this can help students identify with other perceptions. One student was able to connect

Australian aboriginal conceptualisations of living in the present with attitudes of her grandparents:

Student: But what about that time thing. I think in a way we're still trying to come around to their thinking, because I know with my grandparents, I was saying, oh, going to do this at such and such time in the future, and they said "Why don't you just live for today, you might not be here tomorrow".

JR: Oh really.

Student: You know, live for the day.

JR: That's your grandparents?

Student: Yes, my grandparents say that every time, they wake up and say "Right, make the most of the day as if it's your last".[wk2, 1998]

This example also shows the dialectic between cultural commonalities and differences, another theme of the course.

Further on in this same discussion, I attempted to connect the idea of different worldviews with the education system:

JR: So what do you think about that idea? Do you think that every child has a right to having a schooling which recognises their world view, if it happens to be different from the mainstream world view, majority. Do you think that's possible?

Student 1: They have a right.

JR: They have a right to that?

Student 2: I don't know if it's possible.

JR: Is it not possible?

Student 2: I don't realistically, it probably is not possible if you are looking within a school that's got 300 pupils and you've got a classroom of 30.

JR: What about a kindergarten of three teachers and 45?

Student 2: Well, that's even the same, realistically.

JR: But do you think that that should be a goal that we might like to strive towards in recognising every child kind of bicultural rights?

Student 3: Why don't they put that sort of thing in the curriculum?

JR: I think there are statements that children have the right to their own cultural heritage...

Student 2: People don't know their own [wk2, 1998].

One of my goals was to create an environment in which all students feel they can contribute to the discussion, whether they agree with my contributions or not. I try and model a critical analysis that is open-ended and respectful of other

understandings. I find it encouraging when students are prepared to critique during classes. For one thing, it usually means they have read the readings. It means that they are engaged with the topic and my facilitation is being effective for them. It usually also indicates a capacity for critical analysis, as opposed to negative resistance.

Why 'Bicultural'?

Another goal of the course is to provide students with a sound rationale for bicultural development in early childhood education, since they are likely to encounter resistance from some colleagues, and especially parents in centres.

JR: And you also get, this is another one I have heard from a kindergarten teacher in Hamilton, we don't do any Māori stuff - and this is in an area with a lot of Māori kids, this kindergarten, we don't do any Māori content. The Māori parents that come to this kindergarten choose the kindergarten because they want the Pākehā stuff, if they wanted the Māori stuff they would go to kōhanga. Have you heard that one? I have heard that one recently. So what do you think about that one?

*Student: I came across a mother and daughter and she said "Well I want my child to learn about western society".
...[inaudible]*

JR: My first question would be to her would be "How do you know. Have you actually talked with every one of those Māori parents and found out what they really want and how much Māori they would like?" Because research which has asked parents what they want, said that even the Māori parents that choose mainstream . . . say they still want their children to have Māori language and culture even if it's not total immersion, they still want that to part of the child's learning and think it's important.

Student: I know there are a lot of Pākehās that don't want the children to have te reo and stuff but it's still important for them to have it so that they can come to understand that there is another viewpoint in this country. There is not just their only way.

JR: Exactly and if you go to a lot of other countries around the world we wouldn't even have that issue because there is already an understanding that there are several different ethnic religious groups coexisting and therefore it's really important for people to develop respect and tolerance and understanding of different ways of doing and saying and being which is just taken for granted you know some countries have 3 or 4 languages happening and cultures, its perfectly normal for people to be trilingual. NZ is quite unique in lots of ways because they are so isolated down here that we can get away with this real mono cultural paradise, monolingual and its okay . . .

Student: [Talks about newspaper column on different cultures] Each day it's a different place so like one time it was Turkey and you can learn about all the cultures you know.

JR: No I don't think it's that difficult to find out about other cultures if that is what you want to do.

Student: I think another good way to sort of counteract that sort of viewpoint coming to you is to say "Well look we are teaching them about another culture here because we are living in a multicultural global thing so if they can't understand one other culture then they are not going to be able to fit into the wider world"[wk2, 1998].

Culturally Preferred Learning Styles

In the next class, on culturally preferred learning styles we covered a reading which critiques this concept (Ryan, 1992). The first question in this reading guide is:

"Explain how stereotypes of indigenous people's (aboriginal) learning styles can be dangerous".

During the discussion on this question, I raised the issue of the mismatch in codes between home and educational setting experienced by children who are not members of the dominant middle-class:

JR: I have been reading the work of Lisa Delpit, who says if you kind of dumb-down your programme and don't teach black African children in America, these schools. If you do whole language programmes where you don't tell them exactly what they need to know, because they're used to a direct learning style where they are told what they need to know and when to learn it, and so on, then they don't get that, they don't learn it, they're actually disadvantaging them. Because their learning style is to be told what they need to know. Open-ended sort of styles of teaching are not culturally appropriate and these kids are being disadvantaged by that. So what do you think of that idea?

Student: All depends on what the end outcome is you are trying to achieve?

JR: Whose outcome should we be looking for? What if the parents say, I want my child to learn to read and write before they start school, because that's important. My culture wants my child to do well academically, and it's very important that my child start on this academic programme right now at age three.

Student: Then they're taking a western viewpoint aren't they? [wk2,1998].

My initial challenge came from the point of view of Black American children whose code is very different to the middle-class schooling system. I then made a shift to the situation of parents demanding academic programmes. Within early childhood education there is currently a tension created by the growing demand by parents for more academic preparation in early childhood programmes, and the prevailing early childhood education ideologies of 'developmental appropriateness' and 'child-centredness.' There is now also a conflicting ideology of 'partnership with parents'. This issue of responsiveness to parents is philosophically complicated, particularly when within the centre there may be diverse groups with different priorities.

Culturally Responsive Education

Another key concept, also introduced in the third week of the course, is that of 'culturally responsive' education. Discussing the concept of making teaching culturally relevant, with reference to a reading by Au and Jordan (1981) (Au & Jordan, 1981) a student commented, "I think it must be very hard to accomplish because not everyone is the same and not everything will be important to people as well."

The following shows students reflecting on one of the readings from week four, which reported on a survey of the state of te reo Māori usage (Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori/Māori Language Commission, 1995):

Student 1: I just thought it was very contradicting actually the whole survey. Because in one part it said that the elder of the Māori was very fluent and in the next paragraph it said that they weren't so I got kind got a bit lost on it. And I just didn't think it was all that relevant to what we are studying now because I feel as [classmate] said that article represented to her that the language was dying but that's probably not relevant any more. I don't think we should even be looking at that, we should be looking at a more positive attitude, how it is developing and the ways we should be developing it more, like the Kōhanga Reo and things like that and not looking on ... ok it's good to see what it was like but I don't think it should be all that important, it should be like a recent survey now saying exactly how things are going well for the Māori. It's just negative all the time. It's every time you think about the Māori history it's always negative sort of thing. I mean there has been a lot

happening since Kōhanga Reo started up and I think it's about time we had a bit more positive feedback from them.

. . . .

Student 2: And when you read this, you see this, and when I first read it, I skim read it, and then I went back into it, and I actually read it a bit more. When I first skim read it, I thought this can't be happening now, you know, if this is happening now, then what is happening in the kōhanga?

JR: I think one of the problems with the methodology of this survey for some reason they decided to only look at people 16 years and over so if the survey was 1994 I think, 1994-95, that actually cut out of the whole generation of children that started in Kōhanga Reo movement in the early 80s because they didn't bother to go back to ..

Student 2: They could have just gone back to ten year old.

JR: I think you can get a reasonably even younger, six year olds probably, you could get a reasonably good assessment of a child's ability in language like even a 6 year old couldn't you?

Student 2: Oh yeah.

JR: But that's because it's not, I agree with you, that's a big problem, but the other thing that scares me, if you go back to page 35 of Jeffrey Waite's, again this is even more out of date, this is a 1990 thing. But at that time, 16% of Māori under five were in Kōhanga Reo, but only 0.4% were in, if you look at the second table, table 4, only 0.4% were in Kura Kaupapa Māori, so even though we've got kōhanga doing great things with this and it's actually much higher, it's about 46% of Māori children who attend early childhood, which only about half, less than half, 38% Māori children actually have early childhood experience anyway. So it's not as good as it sounds but anyway, of the children who attend early childhood, just under half of the families are choosing Māori immersion Kōhanga Reo experiences but what is there for them when they move on from Kōhanga Reo? Very few Kura Kaupapa there.

Student 2: It's the Government's fault. Ten schools compared to 616 centres – disgusting [wk4,1998].

The student here makes the link between Māori educational provision and government policy.

Revitalisation of te Reo Māori

In this class on te reo Māori, we watched a video from the television programme “Marae” which mentioned that one of the stresses faced by kaupapa Māori teachers was a shortage of resources in te reo. In the subsequent discussion, a student shared her difficulties obtaining resources for assignments:

Student: The other thing with the library I found really hard last year when I was doing Cultural Studies and also I was looking stuff on Tangaroa and I put that into the catalogue - well you can't get anything on Tangaroa in the catalogue.

JR: Is that right?

Student: You've got to go - there are books there but it's not catalogued. Or under Māori legends or anything like that. I went through everything I could possibly think of and I mentioned it to the Librarian "Oh well don't you have Māori". "Oh yeah there is a whole stack just over there, a whole shelf full" [wk4, 1998].

This student has connected with the realities of kaupapa Māori teaching, and also that she is able to critique the library system for its inadequacy in making Māori materials accessible.

Question seven in the reading guide prepared for the reading "Aotearoa: Speaking for Ourselves. A Discussion on the Development of a New Zealand Languages Policy (Waite, 1992), in week four is as follows:

"What are the advantages identified by Waite, of learning Māori as a second language?"

Waite's advantages include support for first language users in widening usage of Te Reo; support for language revitalisation; increasing cross-cultural understanding and social harmony; cognitive benefits of second of second language learning; and national identity. Here is an excerpt from the discussion that arose:

JR: All right..Did you get anything else that we haven't covered already for that one?

Student: It helped the dialogue between the two people really.

JR: Yeah I think so. The understanding. But you are not only just having access to the language you are having access to their culture and their beliefs and their oral traditions and everything like that.

Student: Goes more into depth than just the language. So I can understand where they are coming from and why. I mean like before I even started this course I had no idea about the Treaty of Waitangi and now I can understand exactly how the Māori are feeling. [wk4, 98]

This student indicates that she values the learning she has gained from the bicultural content of the degree programme.

Supporting Children Who Have Other Home Languages

In the following excerpts from the 1997 class “Mother tongue: Supporting children who have a preferred language other than English” students share some of the insights they have gained from small group discussions where each has been responsible for preparing notes on one of four key readings (Bowman, 1991), (Garcia, 1993), (Genishi, 1994), (Stonehouse, 1991). The reading guide required them to have identified from their article key principles in supporting these children, as well as examples of practices that implemented these principles.

Student 1: With the information from the readings that I read said ... one of the things that I got was that given time, like within their different cultures like your Māori-English that even within that ... what can be said to be interpreted different as well so you just have to be clear and then talk to the children like if they don't understand what you're saying . . .

JR: If you're aware of the fact that there are [inaudible] children for instance and that we might have an assumption about something which isn't correct, so always being open to the fact that we might need to re-think things is an important one. And what was the second one? I've forgotten...

Student 2: Well keeping things really simple.

JR: Yeah, that's very good ... sensible.

Student 2: If the child doesn't understand, try a different tactic.

JR: Yeah, good. Right.

Student 3: Just that language can be understood in different ways in different contexts. That sort of ties in with what [a classmate] was saying and just ... you might say something and a child might take it a completely different way, so you just maybe check with the child so you know what they're doing ... that they've understood what you've said

Student 4: Yeah. [inaudible] If a child is working in a language that they don't know and they try to use English, it's easier ... they're steering things because they know what they mean rather than you steering things, and they don't know what you mean. Do you know what I mean?

Student 3: Yeah and it can work the other way too ... if you try and use a different language and you don't know about it.

JR: Exactly, the same principle, yeah.

Student 4: I think the teachers, all the teachers should respect the values of family life and culture that children come from ... whether they come from a poor family and or a different culture, that English is not their first language.

JR: It's a hard thing, just being really aware of our tendency to make something good, to try to avoid that and try to just be really open-minded all the time. That is not being the way we might expect them ... you don't expect it, which is hard . . . Well where haven't we been ... about here. Somewhere.

Student 1: You have to remember that if you've got say a group of Indian children that they're all different as well. You can't class them as the same.

JR: Good point, yeah, that's right. A very good point. Not to have a sort of stereotyped ... the Indian child is ...

Student 1: Because they're all different

JR: Exactly. Great.

Student 2: Yeah and it's more of a challenge for teachers not to just be locked into one modus of operating but to actually be as creative as we can and try a lot of different techniques. It is a challenge. It's quite an exciting challenge.

JR: Yeah, good point. . .

Student 1: I was thinking of another one ... not judging them by their colour, like sometimes you can say, oh, right, now ... all of that culture over there you just sort of assume that it's one culture and think oh, yeah, their beliefs are that ... because they actually can be all totally different.

JR: Good. Good point.

Student 2: Skin colour isn't a very good judge of culture anyway.

JR: That's right. [wk7,97]

In this discussion students were demonstrating valuable learnings from their reading. Particularly salient is the idea of allowing children to lead the conversation, since that way the child has more chance of effective communication, and also that even within a cultural grouping there is diversity, which requires teachers to be wary of stereotyping.

Later in the discussion I asked for further points that hadn't been covered:

Student 1: A centre culture needs to be inclusive and to incorporate all of what children bring?

JR: Right, lovely principle.

Student 2: Lovely to say, harder to do

JR: Yeah, but a lovely objective to have in mind ... to try and have that inclusive of the values every single child, their culture, their values in different ways of being, doing. Yeah, great. [wk7,97]

This exchange shows students coming up against the tension between ideals and realities. My response was to try and uphold the value of the ideal, as something to

strive towards, in the face of more cynical or pragmatic orientations. I invited further contributions:

JR: Do you want to add anything?

Student 1: Just keep to non-verbal communication because all cultures have that non-verbal communication

Student 2: That expressing thing.

Student 1: And just be aware of body language and just, you know ... often just sort of the look of a child tells you more than a thousand words can about what they're feeling and what's going on. [wk7,97]

Students have identified the importance of recognising non-verbal signals, but the cultural differences in these was not emphasised, an opportunity that I could have utilised to highlight the dialectic of cultural commonalities and differences. Instead the implication of this exchange is that there is a universal body language, which I suppose is true to a certain extent, particularly when you are dealing with young infants. The discussion continued:

JR: I think that the key here is often if they're ...

Student 3: Yeah, I was just going to say, you can't delve into other people's cultures unless you have their permission to do that. Quite often you won't get it either.

JR: No, and you've got to be very respectful but a lot of the time those ideas of making those parents feel welcome. Showing them by the visual things that you've got there, that cultural difference is really a part of what you're doing. That inclusive orientation and just working quietly and warmly. The relationship with the parents, so that they feel valued and that there's a sort of mutual respect so that when you say something they respect it and they respond and in the same way, you know, when they say something you respect it and you respond. So having that relationship of trust and respect that you build up over time ... it won't happen instantly, but you can't expect that with any relationship, but just being consistently open and accepting and positive, I think, is really important. [wk7,97]

The student's contribution about permission enabled me to respond with an explanation of an important concept, that of respectful relationships.

Interim Conclusion

Compiling this section I noticed that over the duration of the course, student responses lengthen, and they are less hesitant, more confident in their articulations. I also noticed that I am the strongest voice on all the tapes, which is not surprising,

since I am the 'expert' the facilitator. It is encouraging to see that students are beginning to counter some of my arguments and critique the readings.

Appendix 3.2.3 Students' Writing

This section contains data from twelve student assignments collected from a range of courses between 1996 and 2000. All students are Pākehā, since during this time Māori students were taught through the parallel Ki Taiao programme. Two are students' reflections on practicum experiences of implementing te reo and tikanga. Five are year three essays on self-chosen topics relevant to this project. Three are compulsory essays from the year two course, Cultural Studies Two. One is a Vision Statement from a year three course which is no longer taught, Partnership with Parents. And one is an essay on socio-cultural theory from the year three course, Belonging and Contribution. All except the Vision Statement were from assignments that I designed and for which I had taught the relevant coursework.

Understandings of Te Tiriti and Colonisation

A year three student offered the following explanation of the treaty-basis for bicultural development in early childhood education:

Whist all of these multicultural factors are true in Aotearoa New Zealand's culturally diverse setting, there is also a unique situation of a bicultural partnership that must be recognised. During the colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand by the Europeans there was an accord signed called the Treaty of Waitangi or Te Tiriti O Waitangi. This was signed between the crown, lead by the English governor, Hobson and an over 500 Māori (indigenous people of Aotearoa) chiefs in 1840. This has been seen as the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand as suggested in Ritchie (1996). The treaty consisted of both an English and Māori version and discrepancies in the translation of these have been identified as major issues of concern in terms of upholding of this agreement. The Māori version of the treaty promised to protect Māori Tino rangatiratanga (Authenticity and self determination) and Taonga (treasures including land, language and culture) in return for European settlement, (Ritchie 1996). For a number of reasons, primarily institutional racism by the Pakeha dominated New Zealand government, this treaty has not always been honoured by the Pakeha side. This has lead to injustice and disempowerment of the Māori People that is still needing to be addressed and equated today, (Ritchie 1996) [SWYP31].

The following assignment also recognised the importance of the Article Two guarantee of tino rangatiratanga, but also highlighted the protection of ritenga Māori and the responsibility of the education system to rectify past injustices:

In 1840 the treaty of Waitangi was signed between the tangata whenua, or Māori people and the British Crown recognising each as having the rights to live and govern their own people in Aotearoa, New Zealand. The treaty in article 2 gave Māori the right of tino rangatiratanga or self sovereignty and protection of taonga or treasures. It also promised the protection of Māori customs or te ritenga Māori, (Carr, 1992, p2). Until recently the Crown has denied these rights by embarking on a campaign of assimilation and then integration of the Māori people in European culture. One area the Crown has implemented this policy had been through the education system, disempowering and undermining Māori culture and mana at its most vulnerable link, its children. The Māori voice had not always been heard but now it is demanding louder and clearer than tino rangatiratanga be reinstated as agreed to by the treaty, (Sullivan, 1993, p193). One way to do this is to look at the education system and re-evaluate it to make it not a tool of discrimination but to fairly uphold the intentions and principles of the treaty for all New Zealanders [SWY2P2].

Another writer criticised the role of government in creating inequitable education policies:

The government has for a long time taken on the attitude that one system is good for everyone, and has provided a European focused curriculum in which Māori have been assimilated into (Cram, 1996). Government have justified this by insinuating that through an English focused education system, Māori would become "successful" (Cooper and Tangaere, 1994). In order for this to work Māori have been required to give up their language, their cultural beliefs and values. Statistics show this has not worked for Māori children in Aotearoa], as Māori are currently at the bottom of the scale in regards to education (Hunn Report, 1961, cited in Cooper and Tangaere, 1994) [SWY3P3].

One student explained how she believed tino rangatiratanga to be intrinsic to implementing a bicultural commitment, utilising a framework from Mason Durie (Durie, 1995), which is not dissimilar to the Māori goals of Te Whāriki. This was a course reading in Cultural Studies Two.

There are four fundamental foundations of Tino Rangatiratanga, all of which can be easily incorporated into the early childhood curriculum provided educators are willing to do so. The first is Mana Wairua which incorporates

the spiritual dimension relevant to all aspects of Māori life and organisation (Durie, 1995). This can be included in the curriculum through the use of karakia, and through informing all children of the relevant of Rangi and Papa etc., and how they link to each child. Mana whenua incorporates the security of relationships with land and other physical resources (Durie, 1995). This can be incorporated into the curriculum through the teaching of Papatuanuku, conservation and bringing in concepts relating to Tane Mahuta and Tangaroa. Mana Tangata incorporates the individual's wellbeing and citizenship rights (Durie, 1995). This should be evident in the curriculum by all, respecting and acknowledging Māori culture, and appreciating its place in the early childhood curriculum of Aotearoa. Mana Ariki involves leading their own and other peoples (Durie, 1995). This can be incorporated throughout the curriculum by sharing knowledge and understanding of cultural values. Once the early childhood educator has an understanding of what Tino Rangatiratanga is, it is then important to establish the responsibility one has in nurturing or upholding Tino Rangatiratanga within the early childhood centre [SWY3P3].

Another student saw tino rangatiratanga as a working principle for involvement of whānau Māori in early childhood centres that would in turn enhance cultural authenticity:

Parents and whānau are a wonderful resource that need to be used. Ramsden, (1989, cited Ritchie, J. 1996, p85), states that "the over riding principle of tino rangatiratanga requires that any changes intended to support Māori aspirations must be made in consultation with Māori". This is also true of other cultures. We should not assume that our perception of another culture is correct as we may be passing on wrong messages or our own stereotypes. Developing close links with Māori and other cultural groups is the only way we can be sure of representing these cultures in a positive and appropriate way throughout the curriculum [SWY2P2].

Bicultural Development as Teacher Responsibility

Students identified a range of specific responsibilities, competencies and qualities of teachers committed to bicultural development. These included to recognise the implications of the legacy of colonisation in their programming; revitalisation of te reo; advocacy for bicultural development and cultural equity; awareness of personal and cultural values and assumptions; developing bicultural competence; a commitment to countering racism; and the qualities of humility and resilience.

In ten of the assignments, students recognised that as agents of the education system, they carry a professional responsibility to address past injustices by creating programmes which are equitable and responsive to Māori aspirations, for example:

Acknowledging cultural diversity in a positive manner provides children with an understanding of who they are and allows children to accept and affirm differences (Clark, 1995). Throughout New Zealand's history Māori have been denied their right to cultural diversity. Colonisation brought with it the need for a Treaty, but the good intentions of this treaty were not upheld thus creating a grave injustice against the Māori people (Walker, 1987). As educators we have a responsibility to rectify these injustices and provide the children of today the understanding and ability to create a society which addresses the needs and accepts the view and beliefs of Māori (Ritchie, 1992) [SWY2P10].

Te reo Māori was referred to in eleven of the twelve assignments. Four students acknowledged that te reo is a taonga that should have been protected under Te Tiriti o Waitangi. In addition to recognising the professional responsibility of early childhood educators, according to the mandated documents, to include te reo within the programme, they pointed out the benefits to children of bilingualism, and the link between language and cultural knowledge:

Learning another language enriches the learner, both culturally and intellectually and the learner can gain a greater insight into the value system of another culture, its knowledge base and its lifestyle thus creating a better understanding of others and [an awareness of self [SWY2P10].

One student, in the level three course, The Professional Educator, 1058310, chose to write an essay on the role of early childhood educators in revitalisation of te reo. In this, she considered the responsibility to be one shared with Māori:

When the Māori signed the Treaty of Waitangi, Article Two guaranteed the Māori their Tino Rangatiratanga, the Taonga Katoa and under this came te reo Māori (Cultural Studies 2 Lecture Notes 14.07.97). When I read that I felt that it should be up to the government to provide funding for resourcing the Māori language revitalisation since they did not keep to their side of Treaty of Waitangi deal. But after further readings I realised that it is also up to the Māori. "The Māori have to make a decision. Do we want this language to survive or not? And having made that decision, we have to commit ourselves to it (Hubbard 1997 p2). I also feel that the non-Māori also play a part in the revitalisation of the Māori language. We all have our part to play in the revitalisation of the Māori language, but the hardest part is

having the funding and resources (which go hand in hand) to support the revitalisation of the Māori language [SWY3P7].

Later in the essay, this student addressed strategies for adults to learn te reo Māori:

Even though we have all of these policies to make us use te reo Māori, if you cannot speak the language then you have problems. One solution to that problem is to go to night classes and learn the language. Get the whānau of the children involved in the centre they are valuable resources. Go out into the community; consult local iwi, the local marae, Māori friends or other adults and children (Bradley 1996 p19). They will be of great help in teaching you the language and culture. In centres use music to teach the language (Bradley 1996 p18). Use echo songs of Māori and English. Also use stories, dance, poi etc. (Bradley 1996 p18). Start off with basics of little phrases and greetings to implement the language and after a while you will be able to move onto bigger sentences. One thing to remember is that it takes time but I believe that it can be done [SWY3P7].

Advocacy is one of the themes of the year three course, The Professional Educator, 1058.310. In her essay on a self-chosen topic one student wrote of the need for early childhood teachers to advocate on behalf of bicultural development issues:

I believe that educators need to be advocates for this cause within New Zealand. The early childhood education sector is very proud of the progress made toward valuing biculturalism and embracing multiculturalism within our early childhood education curriculum, Te Whāriki, (Ministry of Education 1996). This has begun the advocacy struggle to re-educate Aotearoa New Zealand about the rights of its indigenous people, the Māori, the roles of the intrinsic second culture, the Pakeha and the inclusion of the valued immigrant society. However it is vital that early childhood professional vindicate these values through implementing culturally appropriate programmes, attending professional development courses, seminars and workshops on cultural diversity and sharing this information with other professionals as well as reflecting these values in policy and practice. By becoming intolerant of any form of racism, prejudice or discrimination professionals actively advocate for diversity and acceptance. Educators need to respond to any such incidents to ensure that children develop positive attitudes towards difference [SWY3P1].

Issues related to Pākehā responsibility and advocacy are seen by a student as central, particularly when the commitment to bicultural development is met with resistance:

As advocates for children this type of risk is inevitable, but the positive outcomes will surely far outweigh the personal uncertainty we may face and

the humility we must have, given the mistakes that may occur throughout the ongoing process of our careers [SWY3P9].

Being aware of one's own values, cultural identity and assumptions was an issue raised by four writers. "It is essential for staff to have a strong philosophy and ability to critically reflect on their practice, and their own values, attitudes and beliefs." [SWY3P9]. Another considers exploration of these issues to be an important initial process for teachers:

Firstly we must look to ourselves to see where our own beliefs, values and prejudices lie. As educators we have a great deal of influence over the children in our care who easily perceive our attitudes good and bad. In her research on Pākehā teachers view of Māori children Judith Simon (1996) found that many teachers "automatically link Māoriness to educational problems". She continued by saying that this in turned "negatively influenced the educational performance of the Māori pupils through their, (teachers), low expectation of them". Staff need to be encouraged to be honest with themselves and to understand their own culture, how they think and how they perceive others, (Stonehouse, 1991, p91) [SWY2P2].

This student effectively used one of the key course readings, Joan Metge's Te Kohao o te Ngira (Metge, 1990) to background her discussion on these issues:

Most teachers being from the dominant Pākehā culture explains Metge, (1990, p15), "find it more difficult than most to see their own culture. ...Pākehā people take theirs for granted as the norm". By looking at their own culture and becoming proud of their own cultural identity Metge argues that they will be more likely to develop respect for other cultures. Being strong in our own identity will also help stop us from being threatened by what other cultures have to teach us. It is not a matter of which way is best but a realising that there are different ways to look at the same thing [SWY2P2].

One writer saw the solution to bicultural development to lie in individual teachers becoming biculturally competent, and through utilisation of Te Whāriki:

To have a bicultural curriculum, early childhood educators first, must become bicultural (Cramm, 1996). Māori already are bicultural because they live in two systems. When we all become bicultural we will all know our own ethnic identity, but will be "motivated to learn about and respect other groups culture" (Cramm, 1996). It is therefore the responsibility of Pākehā early childhood educators to move the curriculum away from an assimilation focus, as government tend to view it, to a more bicultural focus (Cramm, 1996).

Early childhood educators can achieve this through consultation with the guidelines in place for the early childhood curriculum of Aotearoa, "Te Whāriki" [SWY3P3].

She explains the components of this bicultural competence as follows:

In educating oneself the focus should be on the cultural values and beliefs of Māori and why these are important to young Māori development. Early childhood educators should also extend their knowledge, learning to reo and if possible learn to make resources that reflect Māori culture, in order to provide a rich cultural environment for the children to which they serve (Kia Hiwa Ra, 1995). To have a true bicultural curriculum educators need to focus on the Māori view and build the curriculum around this, instead of having a curriculum, and then adding on a Māori view (Durie, 1995) [SWY3P3].

Six of the twelve documents raised issues of racism. In the following excerpt the student makes it clear that she views countering racism as a professional responsibility:

Any prejudice or discrimination must be dealt with straight away. Active intervention of situations where discrimination is taking place, is best. Then as teachers we are able to address the reasons behind the discrimination. Derman-Sparks, (1989, p70), suggests that the child who is doing the discriminating needs to understand why he or she feels uncomfortable about an aspect of another's culture. It may be the language is new, unfamiliar and sounds funny, or misleading stereotypes picked up from outside the centre. Derman-Sparks also feels that it is important to explain why what the children said or did was hurtful and help them find "alternative responses". By stepping in you help the child who is discriminating understand what they are doing and how to make change. Seeing you taking a stand reinforces the positive cultural identity of the discriminated child affirming them as individuals, (Ministry of Education, 1996, p64). It tells them that they are important and so is their culture. It also gives them the strength to stand up for themselves knowing that their identity is validated [SWY2P2].

Significant questions of "who benefits?" identified by Graham Smith, which had not been part of course readings were also a concern to one writer:

Taha Māori was introduced to schools and served primarily the interests of the Pakeha society (Smith, 1986). Smith's article provides essential questions for all Pakeha educators to reflect on e.g. Is everything I do in regards to Māori culture for the benefit of Māori children and their whanau's? Is the practice fostering positive bicultural understanding? Is this meeting the

specific needs and interests of Māori children and their whanau's through meaningful participation? (Smith, 1986) [SWY3P9].

Issues of Identity, Culture, and Different World Views

Nine of the assignments discussed issues of cultural identity. In the year three course Professional Educator, 1058.310, a self-chosen topic, a student made very good use of course readings in discussing issues of identity, culture and difference:

In terms of culture it is important that professionals recognise children's knowledge as a resource. Derman-Sparks (1993) suggests that children are not oblivious to difference and that they bring, observations, knowledge and attitudes towards cultural diversity with them into the centre. Greenberg (1992) suggests that as part of a democratic programme, children should be encouraged to contribute their views, ideas and beliefs in order to foster a sense of self importance, self identity and self esteem. I believe that educators are accountable for developing these observations and knowledge into unbiased attitude to difference. However it is important to identify that unbiased does not mean denying or ignoring difference as Derman-Sparks (1993) points out. To be truly diverse educators and programmes must embrace differences so that the rights of "every ethnic group in our country (can be) seen, heard, respected and prepared for living in a complex, diverse world community." (Derman-Sparks 1993:8). Harker (1994) agrees, stating that treating all children "equally" is detrimental in education. When this occurs the cultural identity of the system or educator, Pakeha (European New Zealander) culture in Aotearoa New Zealand's case, becomes forced upon culturally different groups of children. This unfamiliarity negatively affects their learning and development and infers that their own culture is unimportant or unworthy. In order to be equitable professional educators must therefore acknowledge and welcome difference [SWY3P1].

Later, she makes a significant connection when she associates democratic processes, a course theme, with the ability to deliver cultural authenticity:

This paper has discussed how te Kōhanga Reo movement, as well as the inclusion of Māori reo and tikanga within Te Whāriki, (Ministry of Education 1996) has developed through the belief that Māori have the right to their culture and language and should have the freedom to speak, practice and teach reo and tikanga to New Zealand children. All children in Aotearoa, New Zealand have the right to know their country's history and to have Te Tiriti O Waitangi acknowledged and honoured. By developing truly democratic classrooms/centres educators allow children freedom of speech and self confidence to contribute their language and culture to the group. This is vitally important for ensuring authenticity and meaning of multiculturalism within early childhood care and education programmes [SWY3P1].

Another student also writing in a self-chosen Professional Educator, 1058.310 essay, grapples with the tension between respecting children's right to define their own understandings of issues of culture, and her professional responsibilities to provide positive guidance:

At the centre of any dilemma that I as a Pakeha may have are of course the children. It is important to note that children are subject to values and attitudes of adults around them and society as a whole. Children must be given the right to choose their own values and ideas. Early childhood educators must provide children with a variety of learning opportunities, this includes opportunities to learn and discover in a positive way that Te Reo is a living and meaningful language that reflects a unique culture of the Tangata Whenua of Aotearoa / New Zealand. (Ministry of Education, 1996a) It is important that children are given the power to make their own decision about how they portray and treat people from other cultures [SWY3P9].

This assignment went on to apply a course reading written from an Australian perspective to the New Zealand context, highlighting the need for positive cultural validation for Māori children:

Ignoring Māori children's cultural identity serves to "reinforce negative attitudes both in the way the children see themselves, and in the ways they are perceived by their Pakeha peers." (Stonehouse, p40, 1991) [SWY3P9].

I noted with interest that students were developing discussion around issues that were not introduced as part of any teaching, but which were relevant extensions of course ideas. Examples of these include concepts of "cultural equity" [SWY3P1] and "cultural wellbeing" [SWY3P6].

Respecting Cultural Differences

Nine of the assignments raised the idea of respect as important. A Cultural Studies II assignment acknowledged that Ministry of Education mandated documents raise issues for early childhood educators in terms of valuing cultural differences:

While the Te Whāriki document could be used with consideration only for the dominate Pākehā culture, its implications and that of the DOP's, place the onus on the staff of centres to look at the cultural backgrounds of all children in their care to see that their needs are being met in relation to these documents. So how do we go about putting into place practices which will

reflect the principles of the treaty, and Te Whāriki giving each child's culture the value and respect it deserves? [SWY2P2].

She later writes:

As teachers it is up to us to make bridges between the cultures of our centre. We need to address fears and concerns with openness and respect for all. We must acknowledge differences and value them. It is not for us to integrate all the cultures of the centre into one but to hold the philosophy of Te Whāriki that "the early childhood curriculum supports the cultural identity of all children, affirms and celebrates cultural differences, and aims to help children gain a positive awareness of their own and other cultures", (Ministry of Education, 1996, p18). Through consultation with parents and the wider community we must make sure that we are representing their culture in a way that they are proud of and is not a token gesture. Hopefully we can empower all the children in our care to be positive about themselves, to reach their full potential and to respect the right of others to do the same [SWY2P2].

Respect featured prominently in a year three bicultural "Vision Statement" from the course Partnership with Parents, which begins with the following statement of intent:

To provide an environment, which is bicultural in all area of the curriculum, where staff, parents, whānau and children can move comfortably and participate in both cultures with respect and sensitivity, recognising each others' values, differences and individual needs [SWY3P11].

Further excerpts include the following examples:

**Liaison with local tangata whenua and a respect for papatunauku should be promoted (Te Whāriki pg44).*

**The programme is sensitive to Māori and Pakeha culture, showing respect to their values and each child's individual differences:*

**Long Term: Staff, parents, whānau and children recognise the value and importance of using bicultural resources and regularly use them. They are always available and portray a cultural background, ensuring respect for the sources and culture.*

**Short Term: Staff are familiarising the children with a bicultural environment, visible displays and natural settings are incorporated in the centre, giving children the value of respect for the environment.*

**Staff should be telling the children of how the environment is important to us and that it should be treasured. Māori creation stories should be told when teaching the children respect for the environment [SWY3P11].*

In an essay written for the year three course Professional Educator, 1058.310, teaching respect for other cultural values is seen as an integral step towards eliminating violence and racism:

Within the bicultural curriculum measures must be taken to foster a curriculum of non-violence. In order to encourage a non-violent world educators must ensure they promote positive cultural identity and teach equity and respect. This means affirming cultural differences and addressing issues children have in order to enhance understanding and prevent racism (NAEYC, 1993) [SWY3P3].

Reflecting on her exposure to tikanga Māori during her practicum in a bicultural centre, a student noted that respect was intrinsic to Māori tikanga:

I did notice and hear of whakapapa being mentioned and just the respect for their knowledge was amazing. It is like they will believe no one else except their own spiritual guide/leader. This showed the enormous respect for the elders and their wisdom was paramount over anything else [SWY2P4].

She goes on to describe ways in which she began to apply the principle of respect in her own teaching:

I also emphasised respect in the way of other people, elders other cultures and allowing various learning outcomes. This incorporated respecting values and concepts that the Māori believe in, especially when it is related to respecting the environment. Which if you look at it looks after us so we should return respect it and look after the areas that are encompassed in it [SWY2P4].

She considered one of the areas in which she had progressed during that practicum to be:

My realisation and understanding of respect and cultural values are now more enhanced plus will always be of importance [SWY2P4].

Another student linked respect with cultural integrity and authenticity of te reo:

The issues raised are problematic because early childhood centres are only one domain in which Te Reo is spoken. Undoubtedly some children will only experience it here. If then the language is ignored, used 'wrongly' and without respect and/or as mere token gesture, so it will remain that way in the eyes of those children who do not learn otherwise. For non-Māori children this means the negative value systems of the dominant culture are reinforced,

and for Māori children their culture is not respected, and is undervalued. They are then disempowered [SWY3P9].

This student also discusses the issue of authenticity in relation to te reo:

Metge (1990), states that "since selectivity is inevitable, special care must be taken that the topics selected are studied as parts in the context of the whole; not in isolation, nor as if they were the whole." (p34) Māori language is intertwined and an integral part of everything Māori. If early childhood educators do not reflect this in their practice they are "reducing them to a fraction of their full richness". (Metge, 1990, p34). Every time Pakeha korero Māori, and/or incorporate an aspect of tikanga Māori into the programme, we must consider the whole culture, eg. when story telling remember that gathering, using te Reo naturally, laughter and sharing stories reflect the Māori way of life. (Bradley, 1996) Pakeha educators are not expected to be teachers of Maoritanga nor do they have the right, but we must all begin with supportive and positive attitudes in the centre. (Simon, 1996).

We must respect and value the language by using it in authentic and meaningful ways but recognise that Māori consider their language as a taonga of which non-Māori have no control over or claim to. (Waite, 1992). [SWY3P9].

There are interesting dilemmas raised here of selectivity and holism, control, and Māori autonomy.

Centrality of Relationships

Relationships as a central focus were evident in four of the assignments. In the introduction to her essay, one student positioned relationships as central to her understanding of her role as an early childhood teacher:

I will also be explaining the unique position of Aotearoa/New Zealand as a bicultural situation, obligated by the Treaty of Waitangi. I will be using the New Zealand Early Childhood Education Curriculum, Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education 1996) as a model for successful bicultural and multicultural relationships and programmes within the early childhood education setting and from this I will be drawing some recommendations for early childhood professionals [SWY3P1].

One student grapples with the tensions involved in building relationships with Māori whānau:

I am guilty of 'clamming up' in the presence of Māori parents, for fear of offending by speaking their language of which they may or may not have knowledge of. I have discussed this issue with Māori people that I know and I believe based on their advice that by earning their respect and trust, demonstrating my positive attitudes and my commitment to cultural diversity for the benefit of Māori this fear will be overcome. Establishing such reciprocal relationships between caregiver and parents and whanau is the responsibility of Pakeha early childhood educators (Ritchie, 1996). [SWY3P9].

A student reflecting on her practicum experience in a bicultural early childhood centre wrote:

The main aspiration for me would be as I have mentioned in the closeness and relationships within the preschool plus with the wider community. The whole centre was close-knit and drew on each others support plus also drew on support from the wider community. The whole centre revolved around the 'Aroha ki te tangata', (caring and sharing) concept all the time. The ongoing support, the routines and the atmosphere in the centre were just some of the ways [SWY2P4].

Relationships were again mentioned as she identified the 'processes' that she had employed for implementing te reo and tikanga requirements:

I explained Māori concepts to the best of my ability and knowledge. Drawing on support and relationships shared. Used centre and own resources; books, story tapes, pictures, stories, waiata charts and visual cultural symbols. Using Māori phrases and following with an English explanation [SWY2P4].

In her conclusion she wrote of her key learnings that:

Recognition of the importance of Te Reo Māori culture; language is the window to the culture, it nurtures the future. A recognition that Te Reo Māori must be saved, strengthened, and accessible. Plus the appreciation of the value of personal relationships for mutual understanding is important (Carr, 1993:page 6) [SWY2P4].

Another student utilised the concept of a Māori mentor, from the Cultural Studies II course text (Ritchie, 1992), applying this to the context of an early childhood centre:

I see value in the idea of a Māori mentor to support and guide centre staff (Ritchie, 1995, p.64). Although, as Pākehā, we make our best efforts to learn about, speak and encourage Māori language and culture, we may never have the total understanding that someone with a deep Māori

heritage has. Recruiting the assistance of someone, either a parent or community member, to work with the centre staff in presenting a balanced, culturally appropriate programme supports a true bicultural effort and can help to avoid what Metge call the "basket-weaving and spaghetti-eating approach", that is, where parts of a culture are taken out of context and presented as the whole culture (Metge, 1990, p.34). Ultimately, the cultural make-up of the centre staff should include Māori educators [SWY2P5].

This idea of Māori involvement could be extended beyond a reliance on a token Māori expert to an approach involving collaboration with the whānau Māori within the centre. Another student hinted at this process:

Positive outcomes for Māori children are fostered through positive attitudes and practice within the centre, even the Pakeha teacher, an 'outsider' to the Māori culture can achieve this. This can be achieved by seeking the input of Māori parents, whanau, and local Iwi in regards to the practical implementation of te Reo me ona tikanga. Be prepared to let Tangata Whenua take over a session, be it a waiata, pakiwaitara or pūrakau, or any other aspect of Maoritanga [SWY3P9].

She later elaborates on this possibility of humble, respectful collaboration with whānau Māori:

It is important not to claim to know it all and at the same time welcome constructive criticism, and develop respectful relationships with Māori parents and whanau. Māori parents/whanau and local Iwi are our greatest resource, from whom we may seek support, ask for help with pronunciation and continue to critically reflect on our own attitudes and take every opportunity to develop our own knowledge [SWY3P9].

Realities of Implementing a Bicultural Programme in Early Childhood Settings

Two of the students had criticisms of early childhood practices that they had encountered during practicum, in terms of a lack of bicultural development,. One pointed out that it was possible to implement Te Whāriki whilst ignoring the bicultural emphasis:

During practicum and Placements as part of my early childhood training, I have become aware of a number of early childhood educators, who have chosen not to make an effort towards change within the centre in moving from the domination of Pakeha value systems to a bicultural stance that is to the benefit of all children. Change inevitably means that not everyone will agree and some educators may feel unable to cope with this negativity. They may also be unable to really examine their own value systems and put the rights of

the child ahead of their own attitudes and beliefs. Even in centres that have Te Whariki as their curriculum document, I have seen all aspects of Maoridom ignored [SWY3P9].

She is also critical of inadequate efforts on the part of some early childhood teachers:

I have seen various levels of tokenism in early childhood centres throughout my training. I believe that many educators have conceptual beliefs about the need to incorporate te Reo me ona tikanga, but are unable to do so in meaningful ways in their practice. The odd "key-oar-ra!", or waiata only serves to denigrate Māori culture and passes on the message to Māori and non-Māori children that Māori language and culture is less important than pakeha and does not deserve our time and energy [SWY3P9].

She offers the following analysis on the subject of token usages of te reo such as nominal labeling of centre items, "to outright mispronunciation of Māori words and phrases":

As an 'outsider' to the Māori culture, the non-Māori early childhood educator has a responsibility to children, whanau, future society and to honour the treaty of Waitangi and are subsequently under a certain amount of pressure to use te Reo me ona tikanga in meaningful ways. Secondly, I have met early childhood professionals in the field today, who choose to disregard the valuable information entrusted to us at training institutes, such as the School of Education and University of Waikato, and find it easier to conform to the hegemony of our society, and be dominated by their own values and inability to take others perspectives. I believe this stance may also be fuelled by an inability to cope with the task of dealing with negative attitudes and various levels of racism from parents, families, colleagues, and the wider community [SWY3P9].

Another student expressed similar concerns regarding the inadequacy of implementation of Te Whāriki's bicultural commitment:

There also appears to be some early childhood educators out in centres who need to be educated in relation to the importance of a bicultural curriculum for all children as many still possess the attitude that a bicultural focuses is merely an option or something that is not to be taken too seriously. In order for positive changes to take place that will allow Māori children to obtain

*kotahitanga*¹¹⁹ and *whakamana*, and thus experience achievement, the issue of *Tino Rangatiratanga* must be addressed [SWY3P3].

In the following excerpt from a Cultural Studies II essay the student critiques a recommendation from one of the course readings that new parents be asked to fill out a questionnaire to inform staff of cultural values:

Patricia Clark (1995, p.156) suggests a questionnaire be given to parents at the beginning of each year asking about holidays celebrated and expectations of school. I think this idea has some merit - a written form allows the parents/whānau to think at more depth about the qualities of education or care they desire for their children and of which aspects of their culture they would like promoted at the early childhood centre. However, written communication is not always the most effective form of communication with families. I feel it is also imperative that a staff member is available to talk to parents/whānau at the beginning or ending of sessions, or if necessary, to make an alternative time available to discuss any concerns. Parents/whānau should be made to feel welcome to stay and take part in the sessions alongside their child [SWY2P5].

The following excerpt from the year three course *Belonging and Contribution*, which has a focus on the socio-cultural theory of Rogoff and others, shows how the student is applying her knowledge of different cultural values to the analysis of a particular curriculum issue:

The centres I have attended on practicum and placement have all had different expectations of appropriate meal time behaviour. In most centres children are not permitted to share their food with others, but in one child care centre toddlers were allowed to swap and share with their peers (and teachers too). Our attitudes to "appropriate" behaviour with food can perhaps be linked to our cultural views - with Māori and Polynesian communities having a focus on providing for the collective group. Other issues at the meal table include the appropriateness of conversation. While I feel that this is a good time to encourage conversation and sharing within the group seated at the table, some teachers appear to focus more on getting through the process of eating as quickly as possible so that the children can move on to more "productive" activities, preferring that children eat in silence. Again, clear communication with family/whānau regarding our different expectations can help to determine the way our routines are implemented. Looking at the

¹¹⁹Kotahitanga means unity and in Te Whāriki parallels the concept of holistic development (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 14).

sociocultural principle of learning taking place within social contexts, I feel that meal times can be used as another learning experience. There are opportunities to initiate adult/child conversations, to encourage child/child interactions, and promote small group discussions. Conversations may be based around how meal time rituals are different in other people's homes [SWY3P12].

In the same essay, the student focuses on 'mat-times' to discuss the tension between individual and collective that is explored in the course:

A scenario I have often observed in child-care settings is the young child being reprimanded for being unable to sit still at mat-time. During lectures for 'Belonging and Contribution' we have established that social rituals, such as mat-time, can be useful in helping to establish a "sense of community" within the early childhood environment (Lecture notes, 22.3.2000). However, from a sociocultural perspective, the objective of establishing a sense of community is to foster collaborative endeavours and develop a sense of caring and interdependence amongst its members (Ritchie, 1999, p. 3). From this perspective - is it really necessary that all the group's members are able to sit still? I would suggest that this expectation reflects outdated theories that saw the teachers as the "imparters of knowledge" and the children as the passive recipients. In deciding on appropriate action for this child then, I would consider the sociocultural aspect of looking at the child within the context of the activity - taking into account both the impact of mat-time on the child and the child on mat-time. I would look at how this child is interacting with the others - is the child actually disruptive? - is he/she interrupting others' conversations or physically annoying them, or is he/she merely fidgeting?, is the child seeking attention?, bored?. After assessing the child's needs I would evaluate the effectiveness of mat-time - whether this was appropriate practice for the children's age group - is the age range too great?, are the activities suitable?, could we implement more music and movement for the active child? I believe that collaboration with other staff members is necessary - both for an independent observation of what is taking place at mat-time, and for discussing and evaluating the effectiveness of the format of mat-time. Family/whānau also play a part in this collaborative process. Many families already operate within a collective cultural philosophy, for example the value of interdependence for Māori includes supporting tuakana/teina relationships (Lecture Notes, 24.3.2000), and they may have suggestions for more effective ways of implementing a collective philosophy [SWY3P12].

As in the previous excerpt, the student intends to work collaboratively with parents/whānau to determine appropriate expectations.

A student, applying the theme of 'democracy' from the year three course Professional Educator, 1058.310, stated the following:

Democracy should be maintained through the parents, whānau and community having an input into the curriculum (Carr and May, 1996). When this is carried out better relationships are fostered and a richer curriculum provided. The benefits of this are two fold, first it helps to ensure a bicultural environment is maintained and secondly whānau feel a sense of empowerment knowing they have made a contribution to their child's education (Carr and May, 1996) [SWY3P3].

Student Practicum Experiences

Practicum experiences provide opportunities for students to reflect upon their learnings as they integrate theory and practice. Four of the assignments discussed issues related to their practicum experiences in early childhood centres. One student had experienced a very positive year two practicum in a bicultural early childhood centre. She had this to say of what she had gained from this opportunity:

In the end for me my feeling of being culturally aware is not just to be aware of other cultures, but to be also aware of your own cultural identity. For me the experience in my centre on practicum has made me look at my identity within my cultural background more. I find myself now relating to the "Treaty of Waitangi", more now the better understanding I have obtained of the 'Māori' and other cultures. I am more in-tune to my place within the natural heritage of 'Aotearoa', and my culture as a person in general. This I think has opened up my mind to the many varying cultures and people out in the world today. One thing I believe in though despite worries, fears and insecurities I have grown within my culture and am a better stronger more determined person because of my better understanding. I hope to and intend to make some noticeable changes out there within society as it is today and as it will be in the future [SWY2P4].

In terms of actioning their practicum requirements to implement te reo and tikanga, it appears that a common pattern documented by students is a gradual but definite improvement in responses from children, and their own growing confidence, as they persist over the several weeks of the practicum. Here are some excerpts from one student's written reflection:

WEEK TWO - 6th until the 10th of May.

Kept on using the singular words. Has a better response this week from the children. Some of the morning children knew the colour song and some know a few of the numbers in Māori. I spent about quarter of an hour with 2 morning children teaching them the te reo numbers. The response from their learning was great. They really felt like they had learnt something and felt very proud of themselves. I checked with them later in the session to see if they still remembered them and they did. So that was really great . . . I still seem to be finding it difficult with the afternoon children. But even with me speaking it to them, they are getting used to hearing it. So I will continue with that

WEEK THREE - 13th until the 17th of May.

This week's te reo seems to be getting a little bit easier. I am still using the singular words with the children and they are getting used to it. The words I am using are: ringaringa, nono, the numbers and colours, and a few natural resource names - harakeke, rakau. Also being used are: kia ora, ka kite, kai time, aporo, panana and ka pai. The morning children especially seem to be picking up what the words mean when I say them in a sentence. They don't seem to be using them yet themselves unless I probe them to. I am encouraging them to repeat the words after me and they are. But I would like to see them eventually using them without my probing them. I will continue with this for next week, using the same words so that the children pick them up themselves. The afternoon children are still getting used to it and some are finding it very unusual, but I will continue so that they get used to it.

WEEK FIVE - 27th until the 31st of May.

My te reo seems to be progressing gradually as I continue with the basic language and sentence structuring for the children. The children seem to be more forthcoming when I speak the language, more accepting. Unfortunately there is no progress of the children using the language themselves. If I am with them and say "Can you say ...?" then generally they will respond. But not any Māori language being use independently. I will persevere with the basic language and hope that the children will eventually use it by themselves. I have also continued with the reading of the Māori language books. This seems to be working really well with the children, they are enjoying the stories and responding well. In particular, one of the stories that the staff made up. It has Māori numbers and complete te reo throughout it. The children just love this book and some of the morning children are even anticipating what is going to happen next. They seem to be picking up the Māori numbers really well, and are doing them themselves, when it gets to that part of the story. So I am really pleased with that aspect of it, and will continue with this.

WEEK SIX - 3rd until the 7th of June.

This week things have really improved. This is mainly because of the book that the staff made up. They also made it into a magnetic story which the children have really been getting involved in. The children are anticipating what is going to happen next in the story, such as 'Te Po'. Some of them are also using the Māori numbers in their counting. This is not only with the story though. I have heard a few of the children using te reo when counting with other books etc... This is a really great step for the children and the staff are really pleased. One staff member over heard a few children reading the story book together, they weren't using all the Māori words, only some of them. But one child corrected the others when they got the story wrong and he said "No, it goes like this," and he told them the correct way. Then at the end of the book the kuia is holding the last carrot and she says "Aue ... ko taku kāroiti!"¹²⁰ When this group of children got to this point in the story this one child said to the rest "Au ... ko taku". This child said it with such great expression on his face that you could tell that he knew what he was talking about. It is so neat to see the children using te reo and gradually picking it up and integrating it into other curriculum and play areas themselves. So this week has been really neat and rewarding for us as staff to see the break through with the children [SWY3P8].

Of particular note here is the way in which children are demonstrating leadership in using te reo, and also the sense of staff collaboration. Staff support was a key feature noted by another student also:

I feel that most of the activities went well and it was not until around the second week that I feel my pronunciation and use of phrases was getting more profound. I felt more comfortable and not so self conscious. This could of been due to the team support that I received and drew on [SWY3P8].

And later in her reflection she wrote:

I backed up the explanations of the Māori concepts with the use of 'pakiwaitara' and knowledge from resources and associates. I kept the team support and associate support ongoing, plus shared many experiences with them. I allowed them to engage in similar activities while I was implementing one for attend support and interest. This was excellent for me and the children, because where I might not of been providing the right information the associate outside was adding on where I might of left off. Usually I would be inside doing an activity and something similar would be occurring outside.

¹²⁰ Aue ko taku kāroiti! – Oh dear, my carrot!

We would continually feedback to each other and ask out of general concern, how we thought it all went [SWY3P8].

These excerpts from student assignments indicate some of the ways in which students are considering the project of bicultural development, and making links between its theory and practice.

Appendix 3.2.4 Graduate Review Questionnaire

These data come from a questionnaire survey of graduates from the early childhood teacher education programme at the University of Waikato, which was designed to provide information to be utilised in reviewing the programme. The questions were obtained from various members of the Department of Early Childhood Studies, who were consulted about the questionnaire design. The School of Education Ethics Committee approved the application that stipulated that data would be used for other purposes including this study. There were two groups of respondents. One was the group of students completing the programme in the year 2000 who are identified as recent graduates [RG_]. Thirteen students returned a completed questionnaire from an intake of 31. The second sample was obtained through a mail-out using contact address from the University of Waikato Alumni Office, and these are identified as prior graduates [PG_]. 175 questionnaires were sent out, but only fifteen were returned completed. Twenty of the envelopes were returned unopened, as the addresses were no longer current. There was a total sample of 28 questionnaires returned.

Challenges to beliefs

The first question asked the graduates to identify any ways in which the core early childhood courses challenged their ideas and assisted them to form new ones. One of the 2000 graduates and seven of the prior graduates mentioned bicultural issues as a particular area in which their ideas had been challenged.

I have had a complete turnaround regarding cultural awareness and in cultural/Māori te reo and tikanga into daily programmes. I always thought it was a bit overdone and couldn't see the point, however now I have a better understanding and more confidence in integrating and including the skills I now have [RG13].

Bicultural issues – showed the importance that ecce teachers should have an understanding of relative issues as well as a knowledge of tikanga and te reo Māori . . . [PG3].

The course challenged my ideas in many, many ways. One being through biculturalism, Māori society and multiculturalism. I find that in the working situation that there are many people who are so uninformed about the history of New Zealand in particular, and it is great that we were well informed at Teachers College and we can convey information to others, i.e. parents. Not many people understand that te reo is an official language of New Zealand [PG5].

It made me think that all children need their own individual programme and they should only be compared with where they had come from, not with others. The programme needs to be flexible to suit the child rather than the child fitting the environment. Increased Māori cultural understanding [PG6].

All the courses have challenged my existing ideas and I have become a lot more tolerant and open-minded of differences [RG12].

Reflection on Practice

The second question asked them about particular learnings they had gained from the programme that enabled them to analyse their teaching practice. None of the recent graduates mentioned cultural issues directly, although the following comment is relevant:

Reflective thought, the ability to evaluate what I am doing and why, who is benefiting from my actions or practice, is the best way of doing something? [RG13].

Two of the prior graduates mentioned bicultural learnings as useful in reflecting on their teaching:

. . . Te reo Māori can be used in the centre to help children feel welcome, that there is a place for them [PG15].

Bicultural aspects are ongoing for me and have been since being employed, aspects of which were identified in courses on Te Tiriti o Waitangi issues, Kingitanga movement . . . [PG7].

Empowerment

In response to a question enquiring as to how useful the focus on empowerment within the programme had been, recent graduates raised the concept of children's agenda, rights and voice as significant:

This has been invaluable to my philosophy. I now believe that children's voices need to be heard. All planning should be initiated from children's own agendas. I had no idea of the importance of this when I started the course [RG3].

I found these very useful. It took the focus off my views and placed it on the child's views. I feel that these courses have made me more aware of children's abilities, rights and their own value as individuals [RG10].

By allowing children to have a voice. To actively encourage to be responsible for their learning and to value what they can do [RG11].

A graduate working in a Kōhanga Reo wrote extensively on this issue:

Being able to include the child's language and culture into our programme empowers the child to be given the opportunity to develop skills, knowledge in an environment that is similar to her/his home and wider community. It has assisted me in developing strategies to:

- *provide the child with learning experiences that are meaningful;*
- *ensuring parents and their whānau feel welcomed and comfortable to participate within the Kōhanga Reo;*
- *reviewing our policies and procedures;*
- *to guide and support staff;*
- *supporting children's learning through quality interaction and meaningful planning that is manageable;*
- *supporting staff for professional development to have a firm understanding and appreciation in forming ideas in promoting and providing opportunities to empower children.*

That our programme, resources, assessments, staff, management, environment, the way in which we interact, individual reactions to situation can determine whether tamariki are empowered or not.

That every child has the right to be protected.

That every child has the right to be respected as to how adults would like to be treated.

That we should plan, implement and evaluate curriculum for children in which their health is promoted and emotional wellbeing nurtured, and they are kept safe from harm.

To really listen to the child.

To provide quality and quantity of resources that is appropriate to the levels of the child's development.

That relationships and interactions which are responsive, reciprocal, positive and encouraging [PG11].

Cultural Issues

The item of the questionnaire specifically related to this research project asked the following: How have the opportunities to strengthen your awareness of cultural issues been useful in your teaching context? Do you have any thoughts on how the core early childhood courses could have better prepared you for this aspect of your teaching role?

Prior Knowledge of Tiriti and Cultural Issues

Two graduates mentioned that they came to the programme having little knowledge of these matters:

At the beginning of my university education I had little knowledge of Māori culture and language. . . [RG2].

..I had no previous knowledge about the Treaty [RG9].

. . . I think I was quite unaware before commencing School of Education courses. . . [PG12].

Another felt that Te Whāriki was the key to applying her existing cultural awareness to her practice in early childhood education:

I have always had a reasonable awareness of cultural issues. I have been brought up in a diverse community. However, learning the aspects of Te Whāriki taught me to relate this to an educational setting. . . [RG3].

Twenty of the responses indicated that the programme had enhanced their cultural awareness. Some examples include:

Think early childhood training prepared me well in this aspect. Cultural issues have become extremely important to me following my early childhood training. I learn from my Māori children – as a Pakeha, they are my role models [PG1].

Cultural issues are a challenge in teaching roles as even today many parents/caregivers are against biculturalism. The things I learnt at Waikato

Uni have helped me express to parents/caregivers why this is an important aspect of our curriculum [PG3].

These opportunities have been very useful especially in regards to cultural sensitivity, being aware of meeting different cultural beliefs and needs – although I continue to develop this. I think the course did a great job of preparing for this role (but I do work in a centre with a high Pakeha and European population). Whether I would be prepared enough to work in a different area with a higher population of another culture may be another story [PG4].

Learning about the historical, social, political, economic and cultural contexts of other cultures helped me develop strategies in terms of being culturally sensitive and understanding what my role is in providing an environment that is culturally and developmentally appropriate. To understand the whole context of different cultures has helped me personally and professionally in terms of feeling confident and comfortable with making children and their families feel comfortable and connected. Knowing even simple greetings, familiar customs and rituals is a start. I have a cultural and professional responsibility to promote and support all children's language and culture into the daily programme within the Kōhanga Reo. The commitment to being culturally aware empowers the child and his/her family. The child has the right to learn their culture and language. It is the responsibility of all people caring for children to provide those opportunities and learning experiences [PG11].

Looking back I feel that biculturalism papers studied while at school of education provided a good foundation/baseline, e.g. Te Tiriti o Waitangi workshop provided basic information, but it was not until I did a 2nd workshop that I really considered it at a personal level. Practical issues such as problems of cross-cultural communication have been retained and I am aware of these in my teaching. I received (and still have) a lot of great readings relating to cultural issues. I am unsure how early childhood courses could have better prepared me, I think it comes back to the level of maturity and receptiveness of individuals [PG13].

Absolutely great – much more aware of the child family as a whole (holistic approach), e.g. respecting child is understanding cultural values and beliefs [PG14].

One of the recent graduates remarked that

I feel I am much more aware of cultural issues. I would have liked to learn more of other cultures, but what I have learnt in a bicultural context will help lead to

understanding in a multicultural context. I feel I have the basics I now need to apply them and learn from there [RG10].

Requesting More Reo and Tikanga

Responses are included here from question four on cultural awareness, and from the final sections asking for suggestions for improving the programme. In the cultural awareness section, fourteen respondents asked for more te reo and tikanga, whilst in the final, open section, six respondents raised this issue. Some examples include:

More Māori pronunciation [RG1].

More Māori language, especially Māori sentence structure [RG5].

I feel a lot more knowledgeable about cultural differences now. I don't feel the course of CS1 and 2 teaches us enough te reo to enable us to feel confident using te reo in early childhood settings. More te reo would be useful [RG12].

. . . Cultural Studies 1 and 2 helped me to develop a very basic knowledge of this culture. I would have like to be given more Māori resources in the form of waiata, and learning basic Māori stories [RG2].

One student raised the issue of accountability between expected competency levels in te reo and the amount of support provided to students to meet these:

Cultural issues (bicultural) needs so much more emphasis. More Te Reo needs to be taught, especially pronunciation..... Students are expected to have a high level of competency in te reo and tikanga, but have little information to go on...[RG4].

This respondent pointed out that aside from the specialist Cultural Studies courses, many of the courses did not contain enough bicultural content:

More cultural studies/bicultural courses. All the courses are supposed to have biculturalism throughout, but they almost never do, (unless Ki Taiao were in our class at the time). More te reo needs to be taught especially pronunciation. Inclusive Progs, Cultural Studies 1 and 2 have been the most useful. The rest lack in biculturalism in a big way [RG4].

In contrast, a previous graduate's recollection was that cultural issues were addressed throughout the programme:

Yes, included in all courses. Māori perspective always challenges me/interests me [PG2].

Te Tiriti o Waitangi

Workshops and other classes on Te Tiriti o Waitangi and anti-racism were mentioned by eight respondents, for example:

I found the Treaty workshops at the very beginning really great. I had no previous knowledge about the Treaty. . . [RG9].

I used a lot of the knowledge of cultural issues I gained from Teachers College. Practical things such as songs, stories, words, games are as valuable as the concept – the understanding of cultural differences. The Treaty of Waitangi workshop was very poignant in my learning as was the multicultural papers. Most of cultural issues need to be dealt with personally, however, as each family no different etc., and most of your learning occurs once you graduate [PG8].

. . . Te Tiriti o Waitangi from a Pakeha perspective was great. More experience on a marae and learning protocol to use in early childhood centres could be of use, e.g. why we take shoes off at the door, separating washing, not sitting on tables, etc. A whole cultural awakening for a lot of Pakeha, understanding differences [PG12].

Treaty Waitangi – found out why it was still an issue. Equity and education. Equity – how we don't all have the same advantages and choices [PG14].

Realities of Developing Bicultural Programmes

An issue that emerged was the application of bicultural learnings within early childhood centres. Two respondents raised the issue of resistance to bicultural kaupapa:

. . . I find the main issue now is helping management committees to understand DOP's in regards to the implementation of Te Tiriti o Waitangi in the centre – programme/policies. Talking with parents about cultural issues/sensitivity is huge and ec educators need to be able to do this [PG10].

Cultural issues are a challenge in teaching roles as even today many parents/caregivers are against biculturalism. The things I learnt at Waikato

Uni have helped me express to parents/caregivers why this is an important aspect of our curriculum [PG3].

A respondent working in Kōhanga Reo saw recognition of culture as central to her practice:

Learning about the historical, social, political, economic and cultural contexts of other cultures helped me develop strategies in terms of being culturally sensitive and understanding what my role is in providing an environment that is culturally and developmentally appropriate. To understand the whole context of different cultures has helped me personally and professionally in terms of feeling confident and comfortable with making children and their families feel comfortable and connected. Knowing even simple greetings, familiar customs and rituals is a start. I have a cultural and professional responsibility to promote and support all children's language and culture into the daily programme within the Kōhanga Reo. The commitment to being culturally aware empowers the child and his/her family. The child has the right to learn their culture and language. It is the responsibility of all people caring for children to provide those opportunities and learning experiences [PG11].

Partnerships with families/whānau

Responding to a question about useful aspects of their practicum experiences, graduates identified that this was an important opportunity for gaining confidence in building relationships with parents and other whānau:

Building relationships with families made me more aware of their needs and expectations [RG13].

Developing relationships with parents. Practicing different aspects of teaching, e.g. mat times, setting up activities etc. The length of the third practicum really gave me the opportunity to become settled and focused. [PG4]

. . . Gaining confidence to approach families [PG6].

This was a challenging area for four respondents. Some considered that associate teachers and the early childhood programme could have offered more support in this area:

There should be a bigger focus on partnerships between parents or whānau and teachers. This is a major part of being an early childhood educator and I felt totally unprepared for what I encountered when I started working in the

sector especially for the fact that at any one time I am dealing with 60 different families and their ideals and beliefs about how their children should be taught - this sometimes proves tricky [PG4].

Maybe more programmes on strategies to develop partnership with families and whānau within a centre [RG4].

Three respondents discussed partnership in terms of a bicultural development process.

Te Tiriti of Waitangi – my ideas were challenged and I learnt how to foster a partnership principle and how my ideas impact on my teaching. . . [PG13].

. . . Continuing on to a level 3 course would be useful - how to set up and maintain partnerships with local iwi for example [RG9].

Understanding the development of infants, toddlers and young children so that I am able to assess and meet the needs of group and individual situations that are developmentally and culturally appropriate. Encouraging children and families to play a part in planning. Planning, implementing, observe, assess, evaluate, implement, observe, assess. Using desirable documents such as Te Whāriki curriculum Framework, DOP's, Early Childhood Regulations and Te Korowai to assist me with analysing my teaching practice. Partnership with parents, whānau and wider community. Providing the space and opportunities will assist children to develop their own point of view. Hence the relationships and interactions between adults and children and between children and children in early childhood settings are a key component in supporting our tamariki. I believe that our planning and time for interacting with children and adults must be meaningful. Developing new ideas. Utilising human and practical resources to improve my teaching practice. Having the understanding of theory and practice [PG11].

This survey has provided the Department with a range of graduates views, not only on the bicultural aspects of the early childhood teacher education programme, but on a range of different components. This will provide valuable data for the next review of the degree.

Appendix 3.3 Co-theorising Hui with Māori Participants

In May 2001, during a semester of study leave, I arranged a hui with Māori participants to present back draft sections of data, and engage in a collaborative theorising of the project to date. Of a total of 8 participants invited, who had all been previously interviewed for the project, six were able to attend. The hui took place at the workplace of several of the participants, who are providers of kaupapa Māori professional development for early childhood services. After checking verbally with each participant individually, I obtained written consent to tape the discussion. The hui began at 10.30 with karakia and then wound down at mid-day for a lunch, which was a good chance for a more informal catch-up.

“We Still Need to Work in Partnership”

The hui began with a question to me about my understanding of “biculturalism”, and this led to discussion pertaining to a recent Hui Taumata Mātauranga, that several participants had attended, at which Mason Durie had presented an opening address entitled “A Framework for Considering Māori Educational Advancement” (Durie, 2001). One participant described Durie’s emphasis on partnership as a strategy:

MPH1: *It was very enlightening in that he presented it really well, a lot of participants, or people who had gone to the hui, had in mind tino rangatiratanga, but what he was really saying is that Tiriti was actually about working in partnership. My whakaaro is that we need to still work in partnership. and that some of the power and control is actually given over to Māori to make their own decisions within that structures rather than separating out and if it goes back to iwi based, at this time I don't think we've got the very skilled and experience people in all the iwi . . .*

Another participant explained Durie’s (2001) model which identified three pathways for Māori educational advancement: Māori-centred, Māori -added, and collaborative:

MPH5: *And I can still see all those strands as working in partnership in one way or another and to me they can all be pathways to bicultural development. Given the space Māori will create Māori-centred pathways, but with the support of non-Māori....*

JR: *So that support is essential?*

MPH5: You know there are varying ways of getting bicultural development.

MPH1: Yeah but that support too is still not allowing Māori to determine, they're still not handing over, they still want to have the control. They see the support as the controlling still. ... they are not endeavouring to bring Māori forward and put Māori into those positions to actually determine their own pathway collaboratively.

MPH6: And they probably never will.

MPH1: Well we can't get tino rangatiratanga until we work collaboratively anyway.

MPH5: But I - and I'm thinking of [a Māori professional development provider], as a Māori-centred pathway - but we actually work with support of non-Māori too. That we actually have the tautoko of non-Māori who come in to work with us, so therefore in a sense they are actually working in conjunction with us towards bicultural development.

There appears to be a distinction here between concepts of Māori development that is by Māori and for Māori, and bicultural development within the mainstream. The key issue for a project of bicultural development within a mainstream setting, may well be to critique its agenda as to whether it is genuinely about supporting Māori aspirations, and if so, to examine to what extent Māori are defining and controlling the process. In other words, the bicultural development project needs to function with a commitment to tino rangatiratanga as fundamental. Even though Māori are prioritising kaupapa Māori and other tino rangatiratanga-based endeavours, the mainstream can not relinquish its responsibility under Article Two and Three of Te Tiriti to work for change that will support Māori aspirations within the mainstream.

The dilemmas of working within a partnership model were recognised as requiring Māori to work as change agents:

MPH5: So, therefore, the dilemmas are there in terms of respectful partnership happening, there is a dilemma there and a tension, but the reality is we still have to kind of work with it and move to shift it, don't we? That's the biggie really.

MPH3.: It's the shifting.

MPH5: It's the shifting.

MPH3.: And I think that that is where we're really placed right now.

MPH5: It's helping to be change agents really.

This conscious awareness of agency in creating social change indicates commitment to a transformation agenda.

“The Main Focus is our Tamariki”

A professional development facilitator elaborated on their work as kaupapa Māori professional development providers:

MPH3: It's that Māori-driven kaupapa that we have . . . What [MPH5] was saying about the mind shift, making that shift and as we shift, we try to advance people in that shift. And that's where this collaborative way of working is just so important. It's not easy! But it's healthy! [laughter]

MPH1: Is it?

MPH3: Yes it has to be...because I think the main focus for us, when we look at it now, and when we looked at it six years ago, the main focus was our tamariki, and whatever we could do outside that circle to advance things for them, then we were moving forward and that's what our focus still has been.

The importance of delivering kaupapa Māori early childhood education to the many Māori children who do not attend Kōhanga Reo or any early childhood service at all was a concern for participants:

MPH3: What's horrifying me right now is the language that is coming out of the Ministry in terms of we're our Māori children are. And one of the big things that I picked up at that hui was that when they talk about Māori children and when they talk about Māori education in early childhood... they automatically think Kōhanga Reo, which actually leaves our other children out here, in no-people's land.

MPH1: They want kaupapa Māori, they really do want te reo, but they feel whakamā in a kōhanga environment, because they are actually not te reo speaking themselves. Some of the things they've talked about is they are wanting all those things that they do at kindergarten and Playcentre, so we're talking about activity, choice and options, and, yeah [pauses]

JR: Fun educational stuff

MPH1: Yeah, that's what they want as well as tikanga Māori.

Further discussion covered related issues. Participants identified that kindergarten is cheaper and more accessible to Māori families, since other centres, including kaupapa Māori, have to pay staff salaries, and that cost is transferred in fees. It was also pointed out that qualified Māori early childhood teachers are hard to come by.

Bicultural Development in Mainstream Early Childhood Centres

I asked the group to consider the issue of bicultural development in mainstream early childhood centres:

MPH1: It can be done in kindergarten, but Playcentre has moved away from kaupapa Māori... there is not a lot of understanding of Tiriti responsibility. When you went back into the 80s and the early nineties, everyone was aware, 'cos you had a government that encouraged it, supported it, it was in all the documents. Now its been taken out of the documentation and nobody feels they've got a responsibility to do it ..but most of the kindergartens are really committed to provide a lot for their Māori children.

MPH3: I think, Jenny, while we would like to see kindergartens and so forth take on the responsibility of bicultural development within those centres somehow I get the feeling in reality, that's not as good as we hoped it would be.

Discussion followed on the issue of burnout of Māori graduates in kindergartens, and the need for Māori professional development provider support for Māori early childhood educators working in mainstream.

MPH3: But while they are out there, they have a really hard time, and for some of them its because their centre is not fully on board. How far are we asking our centres to go in this whole area of bicultural development? There are no benchmarks.

JR: Perhaps we need to start asking what would they be? This seems to be one of the key questions for this research project, that is identifying "indicators" of bicultural development in early childhood centres, so that these can then inform the teacher education preparation that we deliver.

We returned to consider the role of mainstream early childhood in terms of bicultural development. According to one participant:

It's possible. It depends who is actually driving the waka at the top [MPH5].

This participant elaborated on the significance of management leadership and support. In her view, this was crucial, but needed to be sustained in order to endure beyond staff changes. She gave the example of a bicultural checklist that had been

required by a Kindergarten Association, which had also required all staff to undertake bicultural professional development.

An example of bicultural development process, being facilitated participants, is a Playcentre group who have chosen to work collaboratively in that Māori and Pākehā from the same centre have chosen to work together, rather than in the parallel structure more common to Playcentre.

That's actually quite big Jen and this is coming from educators who are defining those guidelines for themselves. But its actually about respectful relationships, there's respect across their whānau, they listen, they're engaging, they're actually hearing each other. So you know, it's not easy to make this happen, but we wouldn't really be here, if we didn't think something could happen. That's the other reality [MPH5].

There was discussion as to whether lack of commitment to bicultural development was a key factor in the lack of progress of many mainstream centres. Issues of staff overload and fear of criticism were raised for consideration:

I think centre staff from whatever service, who are not Māori, have so much stress on their plates about what they've got to do already, that they have to actually put personal commitment into doing things tikanga or te reo Māori. So they make a personal commitment, also outside of their work hours to actually put a lot of their own work into it before they can actually deliver. And I'm not sure that that's not the reason they don't want to go there. Another reason is that when they've tried to do it there's been a lot of criticism that it is not correct... I know that people out in those centres are too afraid to make the commitment though they genuinely want to in case they're doing it wrong [MPH1].

Following up a comment from a bicultural development facilitator (not one of the participants), I asked whether “wairua” was missing from mainstream centres’ efforts at bicultural development:

And there's a sense of “what's optimum?” Educators who have a heart for it, have the wairua for it, have the skills for it. That's the optimum. But I'm not sure if there's a Māori heart and is there another type of heart? Is that openness or that sense of wairua - everyone has wairua – so it's actually connecting with different wairua. But I'm not sure that you can say, plant Māori wairua into things – that pertains to Māori. I don't know, it's just a question. What's wairua, what's Māori wairua, what's not Māori wairua, and

can we expect, if you don't have those relationships, whatever Māori wairua means to you? Can we ask others, to say "You don't have that particular..." but they've got their own wairua, so it just comes down to respectful relationships for people and what they bring, just trying to find the connections within the wairua realm, so to speak [MPH5].

One participant related her recent experience with teachers who said that they haven't got time to welcome new parents with a cup of tea. There was discussion as to whether this stance came from a belief that teachers should prioritise their work with children, or whether tea-making was considered outside of their "professional" responsibilities.

They might think "I'm a teacher, I don't make cups of teas for other people [MPH6].

If teachers see their focus quite narrowly as "teaching children", they may well miss opportunities to develop the warm relationships with whānau that are central to a bicultural development process, and perhaps contribute to that feeling of warmth and connectedness associated with wairua.

"It's easy not to try" - Supporting Students

One of the participants described the progress that she had seen in one of her students at the University of Waikato early childhood programme:

MPH3:She said "It's easy not to try. I could leave it out there. I don't have to. It makes my life so simple. But, I will never know how successful I am until I try." And that, to me, was a very powerful statement, because, in the time that I had been with her I had seen this progress - for someone that was, to my mind, quite a red-neck - to see them kind of part way down this continuum line. And its like, this person is trying and with that effort, she is feeling okay and there is a degree of success which is even pushing her even further ahead.

JR: So what was supporting that process?

MPH3:Number one, a mentor. It was really important to have a mentor that she could sort of touch base with and just confirm things like, you know how we were saying, some people have a fear of entering into that arena because of the mistakes, so having a mentor that was the biggest factor.

JR: A Māori mentor?

MPH3:Yes it was a Māori mentor. Because we talk about, if you are going to move in this direction, we talked about we all need a kaitiaki to move us along

this pathway. That was a pivotal factor. And of course being able to make the mistakes. I always say, “Hey, while we are here, lets make those mistakes and feel okay about it. No one is going to jump down you... Let’s try it out and when you get out there and you need to come back and touch base that's okay”.

MPH5: It’s building up that framework of positive support... .Its not really just about development of skills is it? Accompanying that, it’s actually about getting an understanding of Māori ways of knowing and being. It’s actually developing a long host of things together. So accompanying that its actually a better an understanding of building a more respectful relationship with Māori.

MPH4: So in essence, aroha mai, I’m just picking up here. So in essence what you are saying it is that for mainstream educators, they need positive exposure too, and positive role models.

Key factors identified in this discussion as contributing to non-Māori students’ progress in terms of their commitment to bicultural development include:

- having a supportive Māori mentor,
- creating a supportive, accepting climate where it is safe to make mistakes
- developing “an understanding of Māori ways of knowing and being”
- gaining an understanding of building respectful relationships with Māori
- and exposure to positive role models.

Referring to her experiences within her own organisation, one of the participants identified different approaches utilised by Māori and non-Māori colleagues:

MPH6: Non-Māori may take the stance of “Okay, I’ve got this checklist of things to do –A,B,C, and keep within the timeframe”, while Māori may go off and work within a collaborative whanaungatanga approach... where they achieve the same outcome, but come through different processes of getting there.

JR: Maybe we need to be helping our students look at a whanaungatanga approach?

MPH5: So it’s an understanding of that philosophical base then of Māori, then isn’t it? It’s actually inter-weaving it alongside our practice.

MPH1: It’s about relationships, eh.

The centrality of whānau to bicultural development had been identified in a recent professional development hui facilitated by some of the participants. One [MPH3]

described how the group had moved past using the term “Families and community”, because that had a focus on “adults”, whereas “whānau” was about **children** and their whānau. The group of early childhood teachers had identified whanaungatanga as a key process to take back to their centres.

MPH5: And they also began to explore “What’s the process for building that whanaungatanga process within a bicultural development arena?”

MPH3: One of the exciting things happening...talking about how we can move it so that it becomes whanaungatanga, and bring on board non-Māori.

A participant related how the staff at a centre she had been supporting decided to use the story of Rangī and Papa, and sent it home with parents before introducing it with the children. This preparation was well-received by parents:

MPH6: Preparation and being creative about how we can deliver that message and make it tangible enough for non-Māori to see “Okay, we can belong to that” .

MPH3: That’s right, and so it was a non-threatening way of including all the families.

MPH5:And it’s also like seeing the face of Māori through their tūpuna, through Rangī and Papa¹²¹.

MPH3:The connection to that was to that whole whakapapa.... But the thing that also came out alongside of whakapapa...and understanding that wairua is something that you carry anyway and that that wairua is all about connecting and the connections that you make in those relationships are whanaungatanga. That’s just so awesome, and the important thing is that they are actually articulating it and they are talking about moving it out beyond the staff and into their whānau.

MPH5:Bringing Te Whāriki together.

MPH3:An indicator of that is the child role-modeling Maui out in the playground. So something really great is happening, eh. It’s becoming part of their knowing. It’s a natural part of it.

Maybe this is a very central “indicator” of bicultural development, that is, when

¹²¹ Ranginui and Papatuanuku, the Skyfather and Earthmother.

tikanga Māori “is becoming part of their knowing”.

The role of non-Māori and misappropriation of Māori concepts

The question was raised as to whether Māori content should be delivered by non-Māori in early childhood centres:

MPH1: Are we talking about Māori working with mainstream centres to do Māori? Or are you also looking at a partnership of Tauīwi who have learnt things Māori delivering Māori to those centres?

MPH5: I actually believe we want Māori to operate at every level, and where they choose to place themselves, then that's ka pai.

MPH1: There's such a shortage of qualified Māori, so it's actually about making available training. . . . None of this bicultural stuff isn't going to happen until you get Māori qualified. And to me I have a real concern about non-Māori delivering Māori, because their perception is not the same as Māori, and I am continuously in argument about what does manaakitanga mean, what does aroha mean, what does koha mean, over and over again, because someone has gone and got training – its dangerous!

MPH6: That sounds like the wero¹²², but is it the same wero that we were asking for ten years ago?

Later in the discussion, I sought further clarification of participants' views on the issue of non-Māori delivering Māori content:

JR: Can they be reflexive enough and have the networks to keep their understandings in check?

MPH3: Its about having access to information so that information informs the practice.

One participant felt very strongly about the possibility that her Māori child could be exposed to a non-Māori role-model appearing to be an “expert” in things Māori. She considers that Māori children need positive Māori models, rather than being exposed to Pākehā purporting to represent things Māori. In her view, Pākehā need to demonstrate ‘humbleness’ in this regard.

The worst thing that can happen is that there's a Pākehā who stands to represent me on behalf of me and the way I see the world. ..For me as a young Māori mother, the message is that that Pākehā knows more about being Māori than I ever could, therefore I failed straight away...[MPH4]

¹²² A wero is a challenge.

Other considerations regarding the issue of non-Māori having access to Māori knowledge, were that there should not be a power struggle, that it required attitude change and that good tutors were essential.

The reality in mainstream early childhood is that there are not enough Māori early childhood teachers for Māori content to be delivered only by Māori. As one participant pointed out, it is the responsibility of any teacher to be able to make meaningful connections with the children's world view, in order to affirm their understandings:

MPH5: Can I just come back to that bicultural development of non-Māori because really I have got some really clearly defined expectations of non-Māori at the early childhood face front, and for example, if they are facilitating here on Tainui whenua, I have an expectation that as non-Māori they will have an understanding of Tainui kawa¹²³ and kaupapa, so that if a child comes into the centre and says "Gosh I was at Koroneihana¹²⁴ and so and so" I expect that they will know what Koroneihana means, so that they can really hear what those kids are saying, because you know, they can't actually help scaffold and develop their language and understandings if they don't have an understanding themselves. So its not actually about "teaching" Koroneihana, but they must have an understanding if so they can support the Māori children not just Māori children, all the children and their families. . . . And I expect that they will say our kids names, tautoko and honour and respect them, so there are some of those kind of key things that I see are crucial to bicultural development – they are key, we can't do it without their integrity to supporting.

MPH1: What about families Māori just with tangihanga¹²⁵, eh?

Unless the teacher has knowledge of tangihanga, she will find it difficult to demonstrate genuine understandings with a child who has recently attended a tangi¹²⁶. Having this knowledge will enable a non-Māori teacher to genuinely empathise with Māori children's core values and lived experiences.

¹²³ Kawa is protocol.

¹²⁴ Koroneihana is a celebration of the Māori Queen, Te Atairangikahu's Coronation.

¹²⁵ Tangihanga is funeral proceedings.

¹²⁶ Tangi (literally: to cry) also means funeral.

Need for kaupapa Māori early childhood qualifications

The recent disestablishment of the Ki Taiao kaupapa Māori early childhood programme previously offered at the University of Waikato was criticised as was the failure of the institution to repeat the off-campus model successfully delivered in Turangi in the early 1990s to a group of Māori women. Also identified was the need for more active recruitment of younger adults into the early childhood field. A further issue raised was that wahine Māori commencing training need support to enable their whānau to come support them, and scaffold them through the tensions which are generated as the women become empowered through their learning.

Role of a mainstream university teacher education programme.

The final topic discussed resulted from a question I posed, “What are some things we can do in our mainstream institution? They considered that Māori lecturers are often spread too far, across too many courses to deliver the “Māori perspective” in each. Confined to Māori kaupapa, they are unable demonstrate expertise in Western knowledge as well:

MPH4: The message that students get is that Māori can only do Māori stuff, practical stuff like weaving, not the “academic” stuff.

MPH5: It's about recognising the academia in Māori ways of knowing and being. Academia is not over here within that Pākehā tohu, academia is actually within our own rohe¹²⁷. . . . I'm actually talking about really practical stuff, the way children see shapes, they might see the koru design for example, that's a way of seeing your mathematical world. It's all those things. It's like that's actually a very firm knowledge base, and its not to be underestimated. It's like seeing the knowledge, seeing the learnings. That's awesome, that's powerful!

MPH4: So mainstream students need to be exposed to that knowledge...

MPH5: Well they need to know that our kids carry those sets of knowledge and that they see their world according to some of those sets of knowledge.

*JR: I also think its important for Māori knowledge to be paralleled alongside because to me that's part of a critical process of seeing our way, the Pākehā dominant way, as only one way and not to see it as **the** way, and I think that's an important realisation for monocultural people. They suddenly have to step outside of their monocultural box and say “Hey there are other*

¹²⁷ Rohe are boundaries or a particular area.

ways of seeing the world!”. And by having a reasonable understanding of another way of seeing the world, that will enable that reflexivity, that being able to reflect and see those two ways of seeing the world and suddenly being more aware.

MPH6:Open-minded.

MPH5:And putting our kids in a credit base, you know, because they're actually carrying those two sets of knowledge. Its actually seeing Māori children, not as where the deficit is, “Oh Māori because they don't have this and they don't have that”. Because that's the reality. That's what they are saying about Māori kids in early childhood. I'm saying, you know, “Shift your thinking, it's actually about where you place your thinking”, because our kids actually carry two sets of knowledge. But its acknowledging, it's saying “Hey, we should be working with what these kids are carrying, and they've got two sets of ways of seeing things here”, but because most people can't see those two sets of knowledge, and they don't even talk about it actually. They don't actually acknowledge it. But I think that actually needs to come out far more. . . It's actually like turning it around a bit.

MPH1: The only way that it's going to happen, the only way it can happen for educationalists to pick up the bicultural aspect that you're wanting to do, Jenny, is by media exposure, and that its an okay thing to do, and it's a powerful learning thing. It's got to be bigger than us, it's got to be a national effort...

Positioning Māori knowledge alongside Western knowledge enables not only a critical perspective of worldviews, but also has the correlation of positioning possessors of dual knowledge systems as doubly enriched. This is an inversion of the historical 'deficit' view of Māori children, hence the participants use of 'credit' to describe this repositioning. The implication is that this reconceptualisation is a key task for bicultural development in early childhood.

The final point raised in the above excerpt is somewhat salutary in that it points to the systemic nature of monocultural dominance, and the need for much stronger political leadership to support bicultural development within and beyond the education sector.

Glossary of Māori Terms

The following glossary is offered as a tool to understanding, since footnotes and in-text explanations of Māori terms have usually only been provided on the first usage. The primary source for the explanations below was the Dictionary of Māori Language by H.W. Williams, 7th Edition (1992).

Aotearoa: a Māori term for New Zealand.

Ataarangi: an oral immersion method of teaching te reo Māori, which uses cuisenaire rods ('rākau') as props/prompts.

Aue ko taku kāroti!: Oh dear, my carrot!

Auraki: refers to mainstream programmes.

Awhi: to embrace, foster, cherish.

E whā ngā kāroti: four carrots.

Hāngi: a feast cooked in an earth oven.

Hapū: sub-tribe or clan.

Harakeke: flax.

Hōhā: wearied with expectation, importunity, anxiety. Can also mean wearisome.

Hui: gatherings, meetings, people coming together for some common purpose.

Iwi: tribe.

Kai: food.

Kaiako: teacher.

Kaitiaki: guardian or mentor.

Kamupūtu: gumboots.

Kapahaka: the performance of Māori dance, song, haka, poi, and so on.

Karakia: ritual incantations.

Karanga: a call, in this case summoning entry to the marae.

Kaumātua: elders.

Kaupapa: a term for programme or philosophical framework.

Kaupapa Māori education: refers to education based on Māori philosophy, and taught through the medium of te reo Māori.

Kaupapa whakahaere: the principles of Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 14).

Kawa: protocol.

Kawanatanga: governance, as used in Te Tiriti o Waitangi to refer to the role of the Crown.

Kei runga tō rākau: [put] your stick up.

Kete: a flax basket.

Kia ora: a greeting or positive acknowledgement.

Kirikiroa: a name for Hamilton.

Koha: a gift

Kōrero: speaking or narrative.

Kotahitanga: unity; in Te Whāriki parallels the concept of holistic development (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 14).

Kōwhaiwhai: painted scroll ornamentation.

Kuia: female elders.

Kura Kaupapa: schools which are based on Kaupapa Māori, or Māori philosophy, and teach through the medium of te reo Māori, following a document called Te Aho Matua as their philosophical guide (Smith, 1997).

Korowai: a woven cloak.

Kuri: dog.

Mahi: work.

Maihi: the carved facing boards on the gable of a Māori whare (house).

Mana: “authority, control... Influence, prestige, power... Psychic force... Effectual, binding, authoritative... Having influence or power ... Vested with effective authority... Be effectual, take effect... Be avenged...” (Williams, 1992, p172).

Marae: the courtyard in front of the wharenuī, or main meeting house.

Marautanga: curriculum.

Mātauranga: knowledge.

Mātua: parents.

Maui: a supernatural ancestral hero who accomplished many legendary feats.

Mauri: life principle.

Mere: a short flat stone weapon.

Mokopuna: grandchildren.

Morena: Good Morning.

Motu: island, or a general term referring to the country.

Ngā tikanga Māori: Māori values and cultural practices, that is, that which is ‘tika’, or right, from a Māori perspective.

Pākehā: a term for New Zealanders with European ancestry.

Pakiwaitara: legends or traditional stories.

Pāua: a type of abalone.

Poi: a light ball with string attached, swung rhythmically to accompany song

Pōtae: hat.

Pukapuka: books.

Pūrakau: a form of oral tradition, legend, myth, incredible story

Ranginui and Papatuanuku: the Skyfather and Earthmother.

Rangi and Papa: the Skyfather and Earthmother.

Rohe: boundaries or a particular area.

Rumaki education: schooling through the medium of total immersion in te reo Māori.

Taha Māori: the Māori dimension, or a Māori perspective.

Taiaha: a long, bladed wooden weapon

Tamariki: children.

Tane: the atua (supernatural being/god) of the forest. Papatuanuku is the Earth Mother.

Tangaroa: the atua (supernatural being/god) of the sea.

Tangata whenua: “people of the land”, that is, Māori, also used to refer more specifically, to Māori of a particular tribal area.

Tangi: to cry; funeral.

Tangihanga: funeral proceedings.

Taniwha: water-residing super-creatures, often kaitiaki or guardians of a local river or sea.

Taonga: anything highly prized, including both tangibles such as land, or intangibles such as te reo Māori.

Tapu: “Under religious or superstitious restriction... Beyond one’s power, inaccessible... Sacred... Ceremonial restriction...” (Williams, 1992, p. 385).

Tautoko: to support.

Te ao Māori: the Māori world or worldview.

Te Ataarangi: a Māori language instruction method using immersion.

Te pō: the night.

Te reo Māori: the Māori language.

Te reo me ngā tikanga Māori: the Māori language, values and cultural practices.

Te reo me ōna tikanga: the Māori language and the values and cultural practices that it expresses and encapsulates.

Teina: younger siblings.

Tira: a company of people as in a group of travellers or a choir.

Tiriti: refers to the Māori version of the treaty.

Tuakana: older siblings.

Tauwi: strangers or foreigners. Used in this document to describe people other than Māori or Pākehā.

Tititorea: short sticks used rhythmically with song.

Tūpuna: ancestors.

Turangawaewae: your place of belonging.

Wahine: woman.

Waiata: songs.

Waitangi Tribunal: a Government Commission which investigates Māori grievances stemming from breaches of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi.

Waka: canoes.

Wero: a challenge.

Whakaari: a show, or in this sense, a performance.

Whakaaro: an understanding, thought, or plan.

Whakairo: carved ornamentation.

Whakamā: shyness or shame.

Whakamana: to give prestige to, to give effect to, to make effective, rectify, and is also used to mean to refer to empowerment, as in Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996b, p. 14).

Whakapapa: genealogy.

Whakarongo mai: listen to me.

Whakatauki: sayings, proverbs, aphorisms.

Whānau: extended family practice and principles for operating within this collective.

Whanaungatanga: the sustenance of whānau relationships.

References:

- Abbott, M., & Durie, M. (1987). A Whiter Shade of Pale: Taha Māori and Professional Psychology Training. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 16, 58-71.
- AGB/McNair. (1992). *Survey of Demand for Bilingual and Immersion Education in Māori. A Report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington: AGB/McNair.
- Akinyela, M. (1991). *Bicultural Development Specialization: A Vision Toward the Future*. Pasadena CA: Pacific Oaks College.
- Alloway, N. (1997). Early childhood education encounters the postmodern: What do we know? What can we count as 'true'? *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*, 22(2), 1-5.
- Andersen, M. L., & Collins, P. H. (1995). *Race, Class, and Gender: an Anthology*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.
- Atkinson, P., & Hammersley, M. (1998). Ethnographic Research and Participant Observation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (pp. 110- 136). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Au, K., & Jordan, C. (1981). Teaching to Hawaiian Children: Finding a Culturally Appropriate Solution. In H. T. Trueba & G. P. Guthrie (Eds.), *Culture and the Bilingual Classroom* (pp. 139-152). Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Aubrey, C., David, T., Godfrey, R., & Thompson, L. (2000). *Early Childhood Educational Research. Issues in methodology and ethics*. London and New York: Routledge/Falmer Press.
- Avery, C., & Zabel, D. (1995). *Gathering Client Data: What Works? In: Total Quality Management in Academic Libraries: Initial Implementation Efforts*. Paper presented at the International conference on *Total Quality Management and Academic Libraries*, Washington D.C.
- Awatere, D. (1984). *Maori Sovereignty*. Auckland: Broadsheet.
- Baker, C. (1995). Language Revival and Reversal. *Set*, 1(item 4), 1-4.

- Ballara, A. (1986). *Proud to be White? A survey of Pakeha Prejudice in New Zealand*. Auckland: Heinemann.
- Ballard, K. (2000). *Social Justice and Diversity: Some thoughts on culture, colonisation, and inequality*. Paper presented at the "Surviving paradox: Education in the new millenium" Conference of the New Zealand Association for Research in Education, University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Banks, J. A. (1996). Transformative Knowledge, Curriculum Reform, and Action. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Multicultural Education, Transformative Knowledge and Action. Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. (pp. 335-348). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Barnhardt, C. (1994). *Life On The Other Side: Alaska Native Teacher Education Students And The University Of Alaska Fairbanks*. Thesis Submitted In Partial Fulfilment Of The Requirements For The Degree Of Doctor Of Philosophy, The University Of British Columbia.
- Barrett-Douglas, R. (1989). Equality of Opportunity or Equality of Outcome. In L. Whitwell (Ed.), *Hugs and Hassles. He Awhi, He Pōrearea. Parents and Children Growing Together* (pp. 63-67). Auckland: New Zealand Playcentre Federation.
- Bartolome, L. I. (1994). Beyond the Methods Fetish: Toward a Humanizing Pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(2), 173-194.
- Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's Ways of Knowing. The Development of Self Voice, and Mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Belich, J. (1996). *Making Peoples. A History of the New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Belich, J. (2001). *Paradise Reforged. A History of the New Zealanders From the 1880s to the Year 2000*. Auckland: Allen Lane. The Penguin Press.
- Bell, A. (1996). 'We're Just New Zealanders'. Pakeha Identity Politics. In P. Spoonley & C. Mcpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Nga Patai. Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 145-158). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

- Bell, C. (1996). *Inventing New Zealand. Everyday Myths of Pakeha Identity*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the Bottom of the Well. The permanence of racism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bennett, R. R. M. (1989). Faith, Culture and Identity. In B. Kernot & A. McBride (Eds.), *Te Reo O Te Tiriti Mai Rano: The Treaty Is Always Speaking*. (pp. 34-38). Wellington: Tertiary Christian Studies Programme of the Combined Chaplaincies, Victoria University.
- Bernhardt, E. B., & Schrier, L. (1992). The Development of Immersion Teachers. In E. B. Bernhardt (Ed.), *Life in Language Immersion Classrooms* (pp. 113-132). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bhabha, H. K. R. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Bhavnani, K. (1990). What's power got to do with it? Empowerment and social research. In I. Parker & J. Shotter (Eds.), *Deconstructing Social Psychology* (pp. 141-154). London: Routledge.
- Bishop, R. (1996). *Collaborative Research Stories: Whakawhanaungatanga*. Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- Bishop, R. (1997). Interviewing as Collaborative Storying. *Education Research and Perspectives*, 24(1), 28-47.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). *Culture Counts: Changing Power Relations in Education*. Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- Booze, R., Greer, C., & Derman-Sparks, L. (1996). Creating Culturally Consistent and Inclusive Early Childhood Programs for All Children and Families. *Child Care Information and Exchange*, 1, 60-62.
- Borofsky, R., Howard, A., & Friedman, D. I. (1990). *Making History. Pukapukan and Anthropological Constructions of Knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

- Bowman, B. (1991). Educating Language Minority Children: Challenges and Opportunities. In S. L. Kagan (Ed.), *The Care and Education of America's Young Children: Obstacles and Opportunities*. (pp. 17-29). Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Bredenkamp, S. (c1987). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children,.
- Bredenkamp, S., & Copple, C. (1997). *Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programmes*. (revised ed.). Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Brodigan, D. L. (1992). Focus Group Interviews: Applications for Institutional Research. *Association for Institutional Research*, 43, 1-6.
- Brookfield, F. (1989). The New Zealand Constitution: the search for legitimacy. In I. Kawharu (Ed.), *Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, R., May, H., Meade, A., Podmore, V., & Te One, S. (1998). *Draft Options Paper: Early Childhood Qualifications and Regulations*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Buck, Peter (Te Rangi Hiroa) (1970). *The Coming of the Maori*. Wellington: Whitcomb and Tombs.
- Burns, R. (1994). *Interdisciplinary Teamed Instruction: Development and Pilot Test*. Washington D.C.: Appalachia Educational Lab. Charleston, W. Va. Office of Educational Research and Development.
- Campbell, A. E. (1938). *Modern Trends in Education: the Proceedings of the New Education Fellowship Conference held in July, 1937*. Wellington: Whitcombe and Tombs.
- Canella, G. (1997). *Deconstructing Early Childhood Education: Social Justice and Revolution*. New York: Peter Lang.

- Carkeek, L., Davies, L., & Irwin, K. (1994). *What Happens to Māori Girls at School? Summary Report*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Carr, M. (1993). Biculturalism Position Paper. In M. Carr & H. May (Eds.), *Te Whāriki: Curriculum Papers*. (pp. 107-116). Hamilton: University of Waikato: Early Childhood Curriculum Project.
- Carr, M., & May, H. (1993). Choosing a Model. Reflecting on the Development Process of Te Whāriki: National Early Childhood Curriculum Guidelines in New Zealand. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 1(3), 7-21.
- Carr, M., May, H., & Mitchell, J. (1991). *The Development of an Integrated Early Childhood Programme*. Paper presented at the Fifth Early Childhood Convention, Dunedin, New Zealand.
- Carr, M. A. (1997). *Technological Practice in Early Childhood as a Dispositional Milieu*. Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Carter, M., & Curtis, D. (1994). *Training Teachers. A Harvest of Theory and Practice*. St Paul, MN.: Redleaf Press.
- Clark, P. (1995). Culturally Appropriate Practices in Early Childhood Education: Families as the Resource. *Contemporary Education*, 66(3), 154 - 157.
- Clifford, J. (1988). *The Predicament of Culture*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Cockrell, K. S., Placier, P. L., Cockrell, D. H., & Middleton, J. N. (1999). Coming to terms with "diversity" and "multiculturalism" in teacher education: Learning about our students, changing our practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15, 351-366.
- Colenso, W. (1890). *The Authentic and Genuine History of the Signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, New Zealand February 5 And 6, 1840*. Wellington: George Didsbury, Government Printer.
- Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19(5), 2-14.

- Consedine, R., & Consedine, J. (2001). *Healing our History. The Challenge of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Constas, M. (1998). The Changing Nature of Educational Research and a Critique of Postmodernism. *Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 26-33.
- Cook, H. M. (1985). *Mind that Child: Childcare as a Social and Political Issue in New Zealand*. Wellington: Blackberry Press.
- Cooper, D., & Tangaere, A. R. (1994). A Critical Analysis of the Development of Early Childhood Education in Aotearoa. In E. Coxon & K. Jenkins & J. Marshall & L. Massey (Eds.), *The Politics of Learning and Teaching in Aotearoa-New Zealand* (pp. 82-111). Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- Cormack, I. (1997). Creating an Effective Learning Environment for Māori Students. In P. Te Whāiti & M. McCarthy & A. Durie (Eds.), *Mai i Rangiātea. Māori Wellbeing and Development* (pp. 163-169). Auckland: Auckland University Press with Bridget Williams Books.
- Coxon, E., Jenkins, K., Marshall, J., & Massey, L. (1994). *The Politics of Learning and Teaching in Aotearoa - New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- Crawford, J. (1992). *Hold Your Tongue: Bilingualism and the Politics of "English Only"*. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Creason, P. (1991). *Focus Groups as an Evaluation Tool*. Paper presented at the Asilomar Research Conference, ERIC Document, ED 362 563.
- Creasor, B., & Dau, E. (1996). *The Anti-Bias Approach in Early Childhood*. Pymble: Harper Educational.
- Cross, T. (1995). The Early Childhood Curriculum Debate. In M. Fleer (Ed.), *DAPcentrism: Challenging Developmentally Appropriate Practice* (pp. 87-108). Watson, ACT: Australian Early Childhood Association.
- Cubey, P. (1992). *Responses to the Treaty of Waitangi in Early Childhood Care and Education*. Unpublished Masters of Education Thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.
- Culpitt, I. (1994). Bicultural Fragments - A Pākehā Perspective. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*(2), 48-62.

- Cummins, J. (1988). From Multicultural to Anti-racist Education. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle* (pp. 127-157). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering Minority Students: A Framework for Intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18-36.
- Daloz, L., A. (1990). *Effective Teaching and Mentoring*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darder, A. (1991). *Culture and Power in the Classroom: A Critical Foundation for Bicultural Education*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
- Davies, M. W., Nandy, A., & Sardar, Z. (1993). *Barbaric Others: A Manifesto on Western Racism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The Silenced Dialogue: Power and Pedagogy in Educating Other People's Children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 280-298.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other People's Children : Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: The New Press.
- Delpit, L. (1993). The Politics of Teaching Literate Discourse. In T. Perry & J. Fraser (Eds.), *Freedom's Plow: Teaching in the Multicultural Classroom* (pp. 285-295). New York: Routledge.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1998). Introduction. Entering the Field of Qualitative Research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (pp. 1-34). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Department of Early Childhood Studies. (1994a). *Maori Immersion Early Childhood Programme. Final Report for Te Puni Kōkiri*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Department of Early Childhood Studies. (1994b). *Review of Integral Theme of 'Biculturalism'*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Department of Early Childhood Studies. (1994c). *Vision Statement*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Department of Early Childhood Studies. (1997). *Issues in Early Childhood Education, 1058.217. Course Outline*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.

- Department of Early Childhood Studies. (2001). *Cultural Studies II, 1058.213A, Course Booklet*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Derman-Sparks, L., & A. B. C. Task Force. (1989). *Anti-Bias Curriculum. Tools for Empowering Young Children*. Washington, D.C.: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Derman-Sparks, L., & Phillips, C. B. (1997). *Teaching/Learning Anti-Racism*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dockett, S. (1995). Children as theorists: Developing a Theory of Mind. In M. Fleer (Ed.), *DAPcentrism: Challenging Developmentally Appropriate Practice* (pp. 55-69). Watson, ACT: Australian Early Childhood Association.
- Durie, A. (1994). The Treaty of Waitangi in the Life of the Nation. In P. F. Green (Ed.), *Studies in New Zealand Social Policy* (2nd ed., pp. 103-124). Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- Durie, A. (1997). Te Aka Matua. Keeping a Māori Identity. In P. Te Whāiti & M. McCarthy & A. Durie (Eds.), *Mai i Rangiātea. Māori Wellbeing and Development* (pp. 142-162). Auckland: Auckland University Press with Bridget Williams Books.
- Durie, E. T. J. (1991). The Treaty in Maori History. In W. Renwick (Ed.), *Sovereignty and Indigenous Rights, The Treaty of Waitangi in International Contexts*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora: Maori Health Development*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (1995). Tino Rangatiratanga: Māori Self Determination. *He Pukenga Kōrero: A Journal of Māori Studies*, 1(1), 44-53.
- Durie, M. (1998). *Te Mana, Te Kāwanatanga. The Politics of Māori Self-Determination*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. (2001). *A Framework for Considering Māori Educational Advancement*. Paper presented at the Hui Taumata Mātauranga, Turangi/Taupo.
- Durie, M. H. (1997). Whānau, Whanaungatanga and Healthy Māori Development. In P. Te Whāiti & M. McCarthy & A. Durie (Eds.), *Mai i Rangiātea. Māori*

- Wellbeing and Development* (pp. 1-24). Auckland: Auckland University Press with Bridget Williams Books.
- Edge, J. (1996). Cross-Cultural Paradoxes in a Profession of Values. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(1), 9-30.
- Education Review Office. (1998). *Use of Te Whariki*. Wellington: Education Review Office.
- Eisenhart, M. A., & Howe, K., R. (1992). Validity in Educational Research. In M. D. LeCompte & W. L. Millroy & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education* (pp. 643-680). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Eisikovits, R. (1995). An Anthropological Action Model for Training Teachers to Work with Culturally Diverse Student Populations. *Educational Action Research*, 3(3), 263 - 277.
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review of Educational Research*, 59(3), 297-324.
- Else, A. (1997). *Maori Participation & Performance in Education. A Literature Review and Research Programme*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Fay, B. (1987). *Critical Social Science : Liberation and its Limits*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Fishman, J. A. (1990). What is Reversing Language Shift (RLS) and How Can it Succeed? In D. Gorter (Ed.), *Fourth International Conference on Minority Languages* (Vol. One: General Papers, pp. 5-36): Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Foley, D., Levinson, B., & Hurtig, J. (2001). Anthropology Goes Inside: The New Educational Ethnography of Ethnicity and Gender. *Review of Research in Education*, 25(2000-2001), 37-98.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Foucault, M. (1991). *The Foucault Reader. An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*. London: Penguin.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993). *white women, race matters. THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF WHITENESS*. London: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. London: Penguin.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1995). A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 377-402.
- Freire, P., & Shor, I. (1987). *A Pedagogy for Liberation : Dialogues on Transforming Education*. Houndmills: Macmillan.
- Fullan, M. (1995). Contexts: Overview and Framework. In M. J. O'Hair & S. J. Odell (Eds.), *Educating Teachers for Leadership and Change. Teacher Education Yearbook III*. (pp. 1-10). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The New Meaning of Educational Change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gale, J., & Kogan, S. (1996-7). The Local Accomplishment of Power: Dialogic Selves in Participation. *American Family Therapy Academy Newsletter*, 67(1), 4-5.
- Garcia, E. (1993). The Education of Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Children. In B. Spodek (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on the Education of Young Children*. New York: McMillan.
- Gee, J. (1990). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. London: Falmer.
- Gee, J. P. (1989). Literacy, Discourse, and Linguistics: Introduction. *Journal of Education*, 171(1), 5-17.
- Genishi, C., Anne Haas Dyson, Rebekah Fassler. (1994). Language and Diversity in Early Childhood: Whose Voice is Appropriate? In B. Mallory & R. New (Eds.), *Diversity and Developmentally Appropriate Practice*. (pp. 250-268). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gifford, A. (2002, April 30). *Nga Korero o te Wa*, pp. 1-8.

- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and Resistance in Education: a Pedagogy for the Opposition*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Giroux, H. (1994). Doing Cultural Studies: Youth and the Challenge of Pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(3), 278-308.
- Giroux, H. (1995a). Foreword. In A. Darder (Ed.), *Culture and Difference. Critical Perspectives on the Bicultural Experience in the United States* (pp. ix-xi). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Giroux, H. (1995b). Series Foreword. In J. Jipson & P. Munro & S. Victor & K. Jones & G. Freed-Rowland (Eds.), *Repositioning Feminism and Education. Perspectives on Educating for Social Change* (pp. ix-xi). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1992). Writing from the Margins: Geographies of Identity, Pedagogy, and Power. *Journal of Education*, 174(1), 7-30.
- Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1996). Teacher Education and the Politics of Engagement: The Case for Democratic Schooling. In P. Leistyna & A. Woodrum & S. A. Sherblom (Eds.), *Breaking Free: The Transformative Power of Critical Pedagogy*. (pp. 301-331). Cambridge MA: Harvard Educational Review.
- Glass, R. D. (2001). On Paulo Freire's Philosophy of Praxis and the Foundations of Liberation in Education. *Educational Researcher*, 30(2), 15-25.
- Glickman, C. D., Lunsford, B. F., & Szuminski, K. A. (1995). Co-Reform as an Approach to Change in Education: The Origin of Revolution. In M. J. O'Hair & S. J. Odell (Eds.), *Educating Teachers for Leadership and Change. Teacher Education Yearbook III*. (pp. 11-24). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Gonzalez, N. (1998). *Where's the culture in the sociocultural perspective?* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA.

- Gonzalez-Mena, J. (1992). Taking a Culturally Sensitive Approach to Infant-Toddler Programs. *Young Children*, 47(2), 4-18.
- Gonzalez-Mena, J. (1997). *Multicultural Issues in Child Care* (2nd ed.). London: Mayfield.
- Gonzalez-Mena, J. (2002). *Cross-Cultural Infant Care and Issues of Equity and Social Justice*. Paper presented at the World Forum on Early Child Care, Auckland.
- Goodall, D. M. (1995). Chapter Thirteen: Dr Maarire Goodall - former Chief Researcher for the Waitangi Tribunal and Maori publisher. In H. Melbourne (Ed.), *Maori Sovereignty. The Maori Perspective*. (pp. 131-142). Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett.
- Gould, S. (1999). *Rock of Ages. Science and Religion in the Fullness of Life*. New York: The Ballantine Publishing Group.
- Goulton, F. (1998, July 7-9, 1998). *He Huarahi Ako: Pathways to Learning*. Paper presented at the Te Oru Rangahau Conference, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Grace, P. (2000). *The Treaty of Waitangi and the Expression of Culture in Aotearoa*. Paper presented at the Treaty Conference 2000, Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland.
- Graue, M. E., & Walsh, D. J. (1995). Children in Context: Interpreting the Here and Now of Children's Lives. In J. A. Hatch (Ed.), *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Settings* (pp. 135-154). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Greenberg, P. (1992a). Ideas that Work With Young Children : How to Institute Some Simple Democratic Practices Pertaining to Respect, Rights, Roots and Responsibilities in any Classroom. *Young Children*, 47(5), 10-17.
- Greenberg, P. (1992b). Why Not Academic Preschool? (Part 2), Autocracy or Democracy in the Classroom. *Young Children*, 47(3), 54-64.
- Greene, M. (1986). Philosophy and Teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 479-501). New York: MacMillan.
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the Imagination. Essays on Education, the Arts, and Social Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Grieshaber, S., Cannella, G., & Leavitt, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Shifting Identities in Early Childhood Education: Expanding Possibilities for Thought and Action*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Grossberg, L. (1994). Introduction: Bringin' it all back home - pedagogy and cultural studies. In H. Giroux & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies* (pp. 1-25). New York: Routledge.
- Harris, T. (1990). Aboriginal World View, *Two-way Aboriginal Schooling: Education and Cultural Survival*. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Hatch, J. A. (1995). Studying Childhood as Cultural Invention: A Rationale and Framework. In J. A. Hatch (Ed.), *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Settings* (pp. 117-133). Westport, C.T.: Praeger.
- Hauser, M. E. (1995). Life History of a First Grade Teacher: A Narrative of Culturally Sensitive Teaching Practice. In J. A. Hatch (Ed.), *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Settings* (pp. 63-78). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hawira, O., Mitchell, L., & Baxter, J. (1990). Starting Early. *PPTA Journal, Term 1*, 12-13.
- Head, L. (2001). The Pursuit of Modernity in Maori Society. The conceptual bases of citizenship in the early colonial period. In A. Sharp & P. McHugh (Eds.), *Histories, Power and Loss. Uses of the Past - A New Zealand Commentary* (pp. 97-121). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Hemara, W. (2000). *Māori Pedagogies*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Henry, E. (1995). Chapter One: Ella Henry - Executive Director of Greenpeace New Zealand. In H. Melbourne (Ed.), *Maori Sovereignty. The Maori Perspective* (pp. 13-22). Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett.
- Heshusius, L. (1994). Freeing Ourselves from Objectivity: Managing Subjectivity of Turning Toward a Participatory Mode of Consciousness? *Educational Researcher*, 23(3), 15-22.
- Hewitt, K.-A. (1996). Our Culture/Your Good Intentions. *Primary Voices K-6*, 4(3), 38-41.

- Hindmarsh, J. H. (1993, 11-17 December). *Facing the Limitations of 'Biculturalisms' and 'Antiracisms' in Aotearoa/New Zealand: work in progress*. Paper presented at the World Indigenous People's Conference on Education, Wollongong, Australia.
- Hirini, P. (1997). He Whakaaro mō te Ariā Whanaungatanga: He Āta Rapu. Toward an Understanding of Whanaungatanga. *He Pukenga Kōrero*, 2(2), 43-51.
- Hirsh, W., & Scott, R. (1990). *A Report on Issues and Factors Relating to Maori Achievement in the Education System*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Hohepa, P. (1978). Maori and Pakeha: The One-People Myth. In M. King (Ed.), *Tihei Mauri Ora. Aspects of Maoritanga* (pp. 98-111). Auckland: Methuen.
- Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate Methodology and Social Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, T. (1992). *Australian Aboriginal Language Early Childhood Education Programmes. Report prepared for the Australia - New Zealand Foundation* (ED 351 134). Wellington: Wellington College of Education.
- hooks, b. (1984). *Feminist Theory: From margin to center*. Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1989). *Talking Back: thinking feminist, thinking black*. Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress. Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hotere, A. (1997, September 10). Maori stance anti-academic. *New Zealand Education Review*, p. 10.
- Hyun, E. (1998). *Making Sense of Developmentally and Culturally Appropriate Practice (DCAP) in Early Childhood Education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Ihimaera, W. (Ed.). (1998). *Growing Up Maori*. Auckland: Tandem Press.
- Ingleby, D. (1986). Development in Social Context. In M. Richards & P. Light (Eds.), *Children of Social Worlds* (pp. 297-317). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Irwin, K. (1988). Racism and Education. In W. Hirsch & R. Scott (Eds.), *Getting it Right: Aspects of Ethnicity and Equity in New Zealand Education* (pp. 49-60). Wellington: Office of the Race Relations Conciliator.

- Irwin, K. (1990). The Politics of Kōhanga Reo. In S. Middleton (Ed.), *New Zealand Education Policy Today* (pp. 110-120). Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Irwin, K. (1993). Maori Education in 1993: A Review and Discussion. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 3, 129-160.
- Irwin, K., & Davies, L. (1994). Māori Education in 1994: A Review and Discussion. *N.Z. Annual Review of Education*, 4, 77 – 108.
- Jacka, B. (1990). Attitude Change During Pre-school Teaching and Childcare Courses. *South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 18(1), 51-54.
- Jackson, M. (1992a). The Crown, the Treaty, and the Usurpation of Maori Rights. In Project Waitangi Tamaki Makaurau & The Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand (Eds.), *Why the Treaty of Waitangi is Important* (pp. 44-48). Auckland: The Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand.
- Jackson, M. (1992b). Justice for Māori. More than one option. *Race Gender Class*, 14, 44-50.
- Jackson, M. (1992c). JUSTICE: Unitary or Separate. In D. Novitz & B. Willmott (Eds.), *New Zealand in Crisis. A debate about today's critical issues* (pp. 171-183). Wellington: G.P. Publishers.
- Jackson, M. (1992d). Māori Access to Justice. *Race, Gender, Class*, 11/12, 36-41.
- Jackson, M. (1992e). The Treaty and the Word: The Colonisation of Māori Philosophy. In G. Oddie & R. Perrett (Eds.), *Justice, Ethics, and New Zealand Society* (pp. 1-10). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Jackson, M. (1992f). The Treaty of Waitangi. In Project Waitangi Tamaki Makarau & The Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand (Eds.), *Why the Treaty of Waitangi is Important* (pp. 40-42). Auckland: Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand.
- Jackson, M. (1997, October). Maori Law Commission. *Kia Hiwa Ra. National Maori Newspaper*, p. 18.
- Jahnke, H. T. (1997a). Māori Women and Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives. In P. Te Whāiti & M. McCarthy & A. Durie (Eds.), *Mai i*

- Rangiātea. Māori Wellbeing and Development* (pp. 96-112). Auckland: Auckland University Press and Bridget Williams Books.
- Jahnke, H. T. (1997b). Towards a Theory of Mana Wahine. *He Pukenga Korero: A Journal of Māori Studies*, 3(1), 27-36.
- Janesick, V. (1998). The Dance of Qualitative Research Design. Metaphor, Methodolatry, and Meaning. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (pp. 35-55). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Jenkins, K., & Pihama, L. (2001). Matauranga Wahine: Teaching Maori Women's Knowledge Alongside Feminism. *Feminism & Psychology*, 11(3), 292-303.
- Jenks, C. (1996). *Childhood*. London: Routledge.
- Jipson, J. (1991). Developmentally Appropriate Practice: Culture, Curriculum, Connections. *Early Education and Development*, 2(2), 120-136.
- Johnson, R. (1999). *Hands Off! The disappearance of touch in the care of young children*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Jones, A. (1992). Writing Feminist Educational Research: Am 'I' in the Text? In S. Middleton & A. Jones (Eds.), *Women and Education in Aotearoa 2* (pp. 18-32). Auckland: Bridget Williams Books.
- Jones, A. (2001). Cross-cultural Pedagogy and the Passion for Ignorance. *Feminism & Psychology*, 11(3), 279-292.
- Jones, A., McCulloch, G., Marshall, J., Smith, L. T., & Smith, G. H. (1990). *Myths and Realities. Schooling in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- Jordan, C. (1985). Translating Culture: from Ethnographic Information to Educational Program. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 16(2), 105-123.
- Jordan, C. (1995). Creating Cultures of Schooling: Historical and conceptual background of the KEEP/Rough Rock Collaboration. *The Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(1), 83-100.
- Ka'ai-Oldman, T. (1988). A History of New Zealand Education from a Māori Perspective. In W. Hirsh & R. Scott (Eds.), *Getting it Right* (pp. 22-29). Auckland: Race Relations Office.

- Kawharu, I. (Ed.). (1989). *Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Kawharu, H. (1992). The Treaty of Waitangi: A Maori Point Of View. *British Review of New Zealand Studies*, 5, 23-36.
- Kelsey, J. (1989). Free Market “Rogernomics” and Maori Rights Under the Treaty of Waitangi and irresolvable contradiction? *Race, Gender, Class*, 8, 1-19.
- Kelsey, J. (1991). Tino Rangatiratanga in the 1990s. *Race Gender Class*, 11-12, 42-47.
- Kelsey, J. (1996). From Flagpoles to Pine Trees. Tino Rangatiratanga and Treaty Policy Today. In P. Spoonley & C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Nga Patai. Racism and Ethnic Relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 177-201). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Kendall, F. (1996). *Diversity in the Classroom. New Approaches to the Education of Young Children*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kincheloe, J., & Steinberg, S. (1997). *Changing Multiculturalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Kincheloe, J. L. (1991). *Teachers as Researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment*. London: Falmer.
- King, E., Chipman, M., & Cruz-Janzen, M. (1994). *Educating Young Children in a Diverse Society*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- King, J. E. (1994). Dysconscious Racism: Ideology, Identity, and the Miseducation of Teachers. In L. Stone (Ed.), *The Education Feminism Reader* (pp. 336-348). New York: Routledge.
- King, M. (1999). *Being Pākehā Now. Reflections and Recollections of a White Native*. Auckland: Penguin.
- King, M. (2000, January 2). A Vision for the Millennium. *Sunday Star Times*, pp. 44-46.
- Kitchener, K. S. (1983). Educational Goals and Reflective Thinking. *The Educational Forum*, 75-95.
- Knudtson, P., & Suzuki, D. (1992). *Wisdom of the Elders*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

- Koopu, A. (1995). Chapter Five: Areta Koopu - President of the Maori Women's Welfare League. In H. Melbourne (Ed.), *Maori Sovereignty. The Maori Perspective*. (pp. 91-96). Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But That's Just Good Teaching! The Case for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, 34(3), 159-165.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1990). *Talking Power. The Politics of Language*. New York: Basic Books (Harper Collins).
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting Smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern*. London: Routledge.
- Lave, J. (1993). The Practice of Learning. In S. Chaiklin & J. Lave (Eds.), *Understanding Practice: Perspectives on Activity and Context* (pp. 3-32). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Leavitt, R. (1994). *Power and Emotion in Infant Day Care*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Leavitt, R., & Power, M. (1997). Civilizing Bodies: Children in Day Care. In J. Tobin (Ed.), *Making a Place for Pleasure in Early Childhood Education* (pp. 39-75). Yale University Press.
- Lewin, K. (1948). *Resolving Social Conflicts*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Limerick, B., Burgess-Limerick, T., & Grace, M. (1996). The Politics of Interviewing: power relations and accepting the gift. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 9(4), 449-460.
- Lincoln, Y. S. (1995). In Search of Students' Voices. *Theory into Practice*, 34(2), 88-93.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Denzin, N. K. (1994). The Fifth Movement. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 575-586). London: Sage.
- Lopez, G., R. (2001). Re-visiting White Racism in Educational Research: Critical Race Theory and the Problem of Method. *Educational Researcher*, 30(1), 29-33.

- Loucks-Horsley, S., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). Using Knowledge of Change to Guide Staff Development. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), *Staff Development for Education in the 90s: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lubeck, S. (1994). The Politics of developmentally Appropriate Practice: exploring issues of culture, class, and curriculum. In B. L. Mallory & R. S. New (Eds.), *Diversity & Developmentally Appropriate Practices: Challenges for Early Childhood Education*. (pp. 17-43). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Lubeck, S. (1996). Deconstructing "Child Development Knowledge" and "Teacher Preparation". *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 11, 147-167.
- MacNaughton, G. (1995). A post-structuralist analysis of learning in early childhood settings. In M. Flear (Ed.), *DAPcentrism: Challenging Developmentally Appropriate Practice* (pp. 35-54). Watson ACT: Australian Early Childhood Association.
- MacNaughton, G. (1998). *Respecting difference or recycling racism? A case for reconceptualising curriculum discourses of multiculturalism and gender equity*. Paper presented at the Reconceptualising the Early Years of School Conference, Canberra.
- Mallory, B. L., & New, R., S. (Eds.). (1994). *Diversity & Developmentally Appropriate Practices. Challenges for Early Childhood Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Mangione, P. L., Lally, J. R., & Singer, S. (1993). *Essential Connections: Ten Keys to Culturally Sensitive Child Care*. Sacramento, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Māori Education Commission. (1999). *Report Three to the Minister of Māori Affairs*. Wellington: Māori Education Commission.
- Marshall, J. D. (1995). Needs, Interests, Growth, and Personal Autonomy: Foucault on Power. In W. Kohli (Ed.), *Critical Conversations in Philosophy of Education* (pp. 364-378). London: Routledge.

- Martinez, K. (1993). *Supporting the Reflective Practitioner*. Paper presented at the Fifth National Practicum Conference, Macquarie University, Sydney.
- May, H. (1992). Learning Through Play: Women, Progressivism and Early Childhood Education 1920s-1950s. In S. Middleton & A. Jones (Eds.), *Women and Education in Aotearoa 2* (pp. 83-101). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- May, H. (2001). *Politics in the Playground. The world of early childhood in postwar New Zealand*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books and New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- May, H., & Carr, M. (1997). Making a Difference for the Under Fives? The early implementation of Te Whāriki, the New Zealand National Early Childhood Curriculum. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 5(3), 225-232.
- May, S. (1999). Critical Multiculturalism and Cultural Difference: Avoiding Essentialism. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical Multiculturalism. Rethinking Multicultural and Antiracist Education*. (pp. 11-41). London: Falmer.
- McDonald, G. (1973). *Maori Mothers and Pre-school Education*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- McLaren, P. (1991). Critical Pedagogy: Constructing an Arch of Social Dreaming and a Doorway to Hope. *Journal of Education*, 173(1), 9-34.
- McLaren, P. (1995). Multiculturalism and the postmodern critique. Towards a pedagogy of resistance and transformation. In P. McLaren (Ed.), *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture* (pp. 201-228). London: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. (1996). Liberatory Politics and Higher Education: A Freirean Perspective. In H. Giroux & C. Lankshear & P. McLaren & M. Peters (Eds.), *Counter Narratives: Cultural Studies and Critical Pedagogies in Postmodern Spaces*. (pp. 117-148). New York: Routledge.
- Mead, L. T. T. R. (1996). *Nga Aho o te Kakahu Matauranga : The Multiple Layers of Struggle by Maori in Education*. Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Auckland, Auckland.

- Meade, A. (1988). *Education to be More: Report of the Early Childhood Care and Education Group*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Melbourne, H. (1995). *Maori Sovereignty. The Maori Perspective*. Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett.
- Meredith, P. (1998, 7-9 July, 1998). *Hybridity in the Third Space: Rethinking Bi-Cultural Politics in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Paper presented at the Te Ora Rangahau Conference, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Metge, J. (1976). *The Maoris of New Zealand. Rautahi* (revised ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Metge, J. (1990). *Te Kohao o Te Ngira, Culture and Learning*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Metge, J. (1995). *New Growth From Old: The Whānau in the Modern World*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Metge, J., & Kinloch, P. (1987). *Talking Past Each Other: problems of cross cultural communication*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Mikaere, A. (1998). Taku Titiro: Viewpoint Rhetoric, and Recrimination: Striving to Fulfil the Bicultural Commitment at Waikato Law School. *He Pukenga Kōrero: A Journal of Māori Studies*, 3(2), 4-14.
- Ministry of Education. (1988). *Before Five: Early Childhood Care in New Zealand*. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Ministry of Education. (1990). Early Childhood Education Charter Guidelines: A Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices, *Supplement to the Education Gazette*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (1994a). *Education for the 21st Century*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1994b). *Ngā Haeata Mātauranga, Ministry of Education Annual Report 1994/94 and Strategic Direction for Māori Education 1994/1995*. Wellington: Learning Media.

- Ministry of Education. (1996a). Revised Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices (DOPs) for Chartered Early Childhood Services in New Zealand, *Supplement to the Education Gazette*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (1996b). *Te Whāriki. He Whāriki Mātauranga mō ngā Mokopuna o Aotearoa: Early Childhood Curriculum*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (1998). *Quality in Action/Te Mahi Whai Hua*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2001). Strengthening kaupapa Maori in early childhood education. *Te Whāriki Update*(1), 1-3.
- Ministry of Education. (2002). *Pathways to the Future: Ngā Huarahi Arataki. A 10-Year Strategic Plan for Early Childhood Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education, N. Z. (1993). *Te Whāriki, Draft Guidelines for Developmentally Appropriate Programmes in Early Childhood*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Mitchell, J. (2001). *Early Childhood Student Teachers' Beliefs About the Role of the Teacher and How Young Children Learn*. Unpublished PhD, University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Mohanty, C. T. (1994). On Race and /Voice: Challenges for Liberal Education in the 1990s. In H. A. Giroux & P. McLaren (Eds.), *Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Morss, J. R. (1996). *Growing Critical. Alternatives to developmental psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Murphy, J. (1995). Changing Role of the Teacher. In M. J. O'Hair & S. J. Odell (Eds.), *Educating Teachers for Leadership and Change. Teacher Education Yearbook III*. (pp. 311-323). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Murrow, K. (1995). *Early Childhood Workers' Opinions on the Draft Document Te Whariki* (Research Report Series No. 5). Wellington: Ministry of Education.

- Nahir, M. (1988). Language Planning and Language Acquisition: the "Great Leap" in the Hebrew Revival. In C. B. Paulston (Ed.), *International Handbook of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education* (pp. 275-295). Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Nairn, M. (1989). Changing my Mind - Transitions in Pākehā Thinking. In H. Yensen & K. Hague & T. McCreanor & J. Kelsey & M. Nairn & D. Williams (Eds.), *Honouring the Treaty: An Introduction for Pākehā to the Treaty of Waitangi* (pp. 75-89). Auckland: Penguin.
- Nairn, M. (2000). *The Future of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Paper presented at the Treaty Conference 2000, Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland.
- Nairn, R. (c1986). *Obstacles to Māori Education*. Issues in Education - number 9. Auckland: Programme on Racism.
- Nepe, T. (1992). The Conscientisation and Politicisation of Maori Women. *Te Pua*, 1(1), 15-19.
- New, R. S., & Mallory, B. L. (1994). Introduction. In B. Mallory & R. New (Eds.), *Diversity and Developmentally Appropriate Practices. Challenges for Early Childhood Education*. (pp. 1-13). New York: Teachers College Press.
- New Zealand Parliament (1988) State Sector Act, Part V: Personnel Provisions: 56, Part V11: Education Service: 79 (Commenced 1 April, 1988).
- Nicholson, R., & Garland, R. (1991). New Zealanders' Attitudes to the Revitalisation of the Maori Language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 12(5), 393-410.
- Noddings, N. (1994). An Ethic of Caring and Its Implications for Instructional Arrangements. In L. Stone (Ed.), *The Education Feminism Reader* (pp. 171-183). New York: Routledge.
- Noddings, N. (1995). *Philosophy of Education*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- O'Loughlin, M. (1992a). *Appropriate for whom?: A critique of the culture and class bias underlying Developmentally Appropriate Practice in early childhood education*. Paper presented at the Conference on Reconceptualizing Early Childhood Education: Research, Theory, and Practice, Chicago, Illinois.

- O'Loughlin, M. (1992b). Engaging Teachers in Emancipatory Knowledge Construction. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(5), 336-346.
- O'Loughlin, M. (1994a). Book Proposal (unpublished). Hofstra University, New York.
- O'Loughlin, M. (1994b). Fostering Hope and Nurturing Dissent: A Pedagogy of Possibility. *Hofstra Horizons: Research at Hofstra University*, 13-15.
- O'Loughlin, M. (1995a). Daring the Imagination: Unlocking Voices of Dissent and Possibility in Teaching. *Theory into Practice*, 34(2), 107-116.
- O'Loughlin, M. (1995b). *If not 'child development', then what? : Six propositions concerning children, their worlds, and the language we use to describe them.* Paper presented at the Reconceptualizing Early Childhood Education: Research, Theory, and Practice. Fifth Interdisciplinary conference, Santa Rosa, CA.
- O'Loughlin, M. (1997). Opening the closet of unexamined racial privilege: Queering racism in teacher education and schools (unpublished) (pp. 1-23). New York: Hofstra University.
- O'Malley, A., & Ritchie, J. (1995, September 5-8). *Anti-Racism Education within an Early Childhood Education Diploma Programme.* Paper presented at the Sixth Early Childhood Convention, Tamaki Makaurau - Auckland.
- O'Rourke, M. (1992). Results From The Education Sector Census Of Ethnicity, Disability And Language. *Education Gazette*, 71(8), 1-2.
- Oliver, W. H. (1991). *Claims to the Waitangi Tribunal.* Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal Division, Department of Justice.
- Olson, D., & Bruner, J. (1996). Folk Psychology and Folk Pedagogy. In D. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), *The Handbook of Education and Human Development. New Models of Learning, Teaching and Schooling.* (pp. 9-27). Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Orange, C. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi.* Wellington: Allen and Unwin/Port Nicholson Press.

- Orange, C. (1988). *The Treaty of Waitangi - A Historical Overview*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Planning Council Seminar: "Pakeha Perspectives on the Treaty", Wellington.
- Osborne, B. (1991). Towards an ethnology of culturally responsive pedagogy in small-scale remote communities: Native American and Torres Strait Islander. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 4(1), 1-17.
- Paki-Slater, M. & Day, F. (1998). "Who's Including What?" *Experiences of Teaching Tertiary Educators about the Treaty of Waitangi and Equity. A Pedagogy of Liberation?* Paper presented at the Remapping Teacher Education for the 21st Century - New Zealand Teacher Education Conference, University of Waikato.
- Parata, H. (1995). Chapter Three: Hekia Parata - Former General Manager, Policy, at Te Puni Kokiri (Ministry of Maori Development), now a manager with the world-wide consultancy firm, Arthur Andersen. In H. Melbourne (Ed.), *Maori Sovereignty. The Maori Perspective*. (pp. 37-44). Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett.
- Patterson, J. (1992). A Māori Concept of Collective Responsibility. In G. Oddie & R. Perrett (Eds.), *Justice, Ethics, and New Zealand Society* (pp. 11-26). Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Penetito, W. (1996). He Kōinga Mō Te Pūmahara. Memory And Scholarship For A Liberating Pedagogy. In B. Webber (Ed.), *He paepae kōrero. Research Perspectives in Māori Education*. (pp. 1-18). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Penetito, W. (1998, July 7-9, 1998). 'He Haeata Tiaho': *Strategic Planning for Whānau, Hapū, and Iwi Education*. Paper presented at the Te Oru Rangahau Conference, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Pere, R. (1991). *Te Wheke*. Gisborne: Ao Ake.
- Pere, R. (1982). *AKO. Concepts and Learning in the Māori Tradition. Working Paper No 17*. Hamilton: Department of Sociology, University of Waikato.

- Peshkin, A. (2000). The Nature of Interpretation in Qualitative Research. *Educational Researcher*, 29(9), 5-9.
- Peters, D., & Klinzing, D. (1990). The Content of Early Childhood Teacher Education Programs. Child Development. In B. Spodek & O. Saracho (Eds.), *Early Childhood Teacher Preparation* (Vol. 1, pp. 67-81). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Philips, S. U. (1993). *The Invisible Culture: communication in classroom and community on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation*. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Phillipson, R. (1986). English Rules: a study of language pedagogy and imperialism. In R. Phillipson & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.), *Linguistic Rules in Education* (pp. 124-343). Roskilde: Roskilde University Centre, Denmark.
- Phillipson, R. (1988). Linguicism: structures and ideologies in linguistic imperialism. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority Education: from Shame to Struggle*. (pp. 339-358). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pihama, L. (1997). Ko Taranaki Te Maunga: Challenging Post-Colonial Disturbances and Post-Modern Fragmentation. *He Pukenga Kōrero: A Journal of Māori Studies*, 2(2), 8-15.
- Poata-Smith, E. T. A. (1996). Te Ao Marama? 'Cultural' Solutions to Maori Educational Inequality: A Critique. *ACCESS. Critical Perspectives on Cultural Policy Studies in Education*, 15(1), 34-56.
- Podmore, V. N., May, H., & Mara, D. (1998). *Evaluating Early Childhood Programmes Using Te Whāriki*. Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.
- Pogrebin, L. C. (1991) Deborah, Golda, and Me. Being Female and Jewish in America. New York: Crown.
- Potaka, H. (1995). "Flashback into the past, forward into the future". Address to the 1994 Playcentre National Convention. *Playcentre Journal*(92), 6-7.

- Prasad, R. (1996). *The Challenge of Positive Race Relations: Our Responsibilities as Citizens of New Zealand. An Address to the Annual Meeting of Selwyn College PTA*. Auckland: Office of the Race Relations Conciliator.
- Project Waitangi. (1992). Te Tiriti o Waitangi. In Project Waitangi Tamaki Makaurau & The Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand (Eds.), *Why the Treaty of Waitangi is Important*. Auckland: Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand.
- Quantz, R. A. (1992). On Critical Ethnography (with Some Postmodern Considerations). In M. D. LeCompte & W. L. Millroy & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education* (pp. 447-501). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Ramsden, I. (1994a). A Challenge to Education. *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand*(3), 18-25.
- Ramsden, I. (1994b). Cultural Safety. *Mental Health News, Summer 94/95*, 23.
- Ramsden, I. (1997). Cultural Safety: Implementing the Concept. The Social Force of Nursing and Midwifery. In P. Te Whāiti & M. McCarthy & A. Durie (Eds.), *Mai i Rangīātea. Māori Wellbeing and Development* (pp. 113-125). Auckland: Auckland University Press with Bridget Williams Books.
- Ramsden, I., & Spoonley, P. (1993). The Cultural Safety Debate in Nursing Education in Aotearoa. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 3, 161 - 174.
- Rashid, H. M. (1981). Early Childhood Education as a Cultural Transition for African-American Children. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 6(3), 55-63.
- Reedy, T. (1995). *Toku Rangatiratanga na te Mana-Matauranga. 'Knowledge and Power Set Me Free...'*. Paper presented at the Sixth Early Childhood Convention, Tamaki Makaurau - Auckland.
- Reyes, M., & J., H. (1988). Racism in Academia: the Old Wolf Revisited. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 299- 314.
- Rhedding-Jones, J. (1995). What do you do after you've met poststructuralism? Research possibilities regarding feminism, ethnography, and literacy. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 27(5), 479-500.

- Richardson, L. (1997). *Fields of Play. Constructing an Academic Life*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Rippa, S. A. (1988). *Education in a Free Society*. New York: Longman.
- Ritchie, J. (1990). *Honouring the Treaty of Waitangi: Some Pedagogical Considerations*. Unpublished Masters Dissertation, University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Ritchie, J. (1994a). *Content-Based Methodology: Implications for the Māori Immersion Early Childhood Programme, Report to Te Puni Kōkiri*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Ritchie, J. (1994b). Development of a Maori Immersion Early Childhood Education Diploma of Teaching. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. ED393 291*.
- Ritchie, J. (1994c). Implementing a commitment to Biculturalism in Early Childhood Training. *Australian Journal of Research in Early Childhood, 1*, 122 - 132.
- Ritchie, J. (1994d). *Literature Review on Pedagogy of Second Language Acquisition in Immersion Early Childhood Care and Education Settings Report to Te Puni Kōkiri*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Ritchie, J. (1995). Thesis Proposal for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Ritchie, J. (1996a). Anti-Racism Education within an Early Childhood Education Diploma Programme. *International Journal of Early Years Education, 4*(1).
- Ritchie, J. (1996b). Early Childhood Education as Critical Pedagogy. In H. May & M. Carr (Eds.), *Implementing Te Whāriki, Te Whāriki Papers 2*. (pp. 113-125). Wellington and Hamilton: Institute for Early Childhood Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, and Department of Early Childhood Studies, University of Waikato.
- Ritchie, J. (1996c) Tino Rangatiratanga and the Implementation of Te Whāriki. In H. May & M. Carr (Eds.) *Implementing Te Whāriki, Te Whāriki Papers 2*, (pp. 77-88). Wellington and Hamilton: Institute for Early Childhood Studies,

Victoria University of Wellington, and Department of Early Childhood Studies, University of Waikato.

Ritchie, J. (1997). *Submission to Bicultural and Multicultural Practice Review Team from Department of Early Childhood Studies*. Hamilton: Department of Early Childhood Studies, University of Waikato.

Ritchie, J. (1999a). *Three Cheers for Early Childhood – Care, Community and Collectivism as Strategies against Market Forces*. Paper presented at the Seventh Early Childhood Convention, Nelson, New Zealand.

Ritchie, J. (1999b). The Use of Te Reo Māori in Early Childhood Centres. *Early Education*, 20(Winter), 13-21.

Ritchie, J. (1999c). *Voices of Experience: early childhood graduates implementing bicultural pedagogy in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Paper presented at the Australian Research in Early Childhood Education Conference, Canberra.

Ritchie, J. (2000a). *Commitment, Confidence, Competence, Collegiality and Critical Analysis. Dilemmas in preparing preservice teachers to deliver bicultural early childhood programmes in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Paper presented at the New Zealand Association for Research in Education, University of Waikato.

Ritchie, J. (2000b). Critical Questions: Implementing A Bicultural Commitment In Early Childhood Teacher Education. *Australian Journal of Research in Early Childhood*, 7(1).

Ritchie, J. (2001a). Collaborative Research in Early Childhood Care and Education: Some Issues and Reflections from Recent Experience. *New Zealand Annual Research in Early Childhood Education*, 4, 133-138.

Ritchie, J. (2001b). Implementing a bicultural curriculum: Some considerations, *Early Childhood Folio 5: 2001* (pp. 23-26). Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Ritchie, J. (2001c). Reflections on Collectivism in Early Childhood Care and Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In S. Grieshaber & G. Cannella & R.

- Leavitt (Eds.), *Shifting Identities in Early Childhood Education: Expanding Possibilities for Thought and Action* (pp. 133-147). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ritchie, J., & Walker, R. (1994a). *Philosophical Framework for the Māori Immersion Early Childhood Programme, Report to Te Puni Kōkiri*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Ritchie, J., & Walker, R. (1994b). *Policy Recommendations for the Māori Immersion Early Childhood Programme, Report to Te Puni Kōkiri*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Ritchie, J., & Walker, R. (1994c). *Programme Framework for the Māori Immersion Early Childhood Programme, Report to Te Puni Kōkiri*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Ritchie, J. E. (1992). *Becoming Bicultural*. Wellington: Huia Publications.
- Ritchie, J. E. (1995). *Biculturalism at Waikato University*. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association Meeting, Washington, DC.
- Robinson, G. (2000). *Essential Judaism. A complete Guide to Beliefs, Customs, and Rituals*. New York: Pocket Books.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking : Cognitive Development in Social Context*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B. (1998). Cognition as a Collaborative Process. In D. Khun & R. Siegler (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 2, pp. 679-742). New York: John Wiley.
- Rosaldo, R. (1989). *Culture and Truth; the remaking of social analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1987). *The Treaty of Waitangi and Social Policy. Discussion Booklet No 1*. Wellington: Royal Commission on Social Policy.
- Ryan, J. (1992). Aboriginal Learning Styles: A Critical Review. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 5(3), 161-183.
- Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Chatto & Windus.

- Salmond, A. (1991). *Two Worlds: first meetings between Māori and Europeans, 1642-1772*. Auckland: Viking.
- Sanson, A., Augostinos, M., Gridley, H., Kyrios, M., Reser, J., & Turner, C. (1997). *Racism and Prejudice: Psychological Perspectives. APS Position Paper*. ANC: Australian Psychological Society.
- Schensul, J. (1985). Cultural Maintenance and Cultural Transformation: Educational Anthropology in the Eighties. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 16, 63-68.
- Schensul, J., & Schensul, S. (1992). Collaborative Research: Methods of Inquiry for Social Change. In M. LeCompte & W. Millroy & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. (pp. 161-200). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Scheurich, J. (1995). A postmodernist critique of research interviewing. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8(3), 239-252.
- Scheurich, J. J., & Young, M. D. (1997). Coloring Epistemologies: Are our research epistemologies racially based? *Educational Researcher*, 26(4), 4-16.
- School of Education. (1993). *Academic and Administrative Plan for 1993-1995*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- School of Education. (2001). *Academic Goals 2001-2003*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Schulz, R., Schroeder, D., & Brody, C. M. (1997). Collaborative narrative inquiry: fidelity and the ethics of caring in teacher research. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 10(4), 473-485.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). Foreword. In M. J. O'Hair & S. J. Odell (Eds.), *Educating Teachers for Leadership and Change. Teacher Education Yearbook III*. (pp. xi-xiii). Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Shadbolt, M. (1999). *From the Edge of the Sky. A Memoir*. Auckland: David Ling Publishing.
- Shah, S. (1989). Effective Permeation of Race and Gender Issues in Teacher Education Courses. *Gender and Education*, 1(3), 221-236.

- Sharp, A. (1995). Why Be Bicultural? In M. Wilson & A. Yeatman (Eds.), *Justice and Identity: Antipodean Practices* (pp. 116-133). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Sharp, A. (2001). Recent juridical and constitutional histories of Maori. In A. Sharp & P. McHugh (Eds.), *Histories, Power and Loss. Uses of the Past - A New Zealand Commentary* (pp. 31-60). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Sheets, R. H. (2000). Advancing the Field or Taking Center Stage: The White Movement in Multicultural Education. *Educational Researcher*, 29(9), 15-21.
- Shivnan, S. (1999). *An Ethnographic Inquiry into the Empowerment of Maori Families within a Mainstream Early Childhood Setting*. Unpublished Masters of Education Thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Shotter, J. (1990). Social Individuality Versus Possessive Individualism: The sounds of silence. In I. Parker & J. Shotter (Eds.), *Deconstructing Social Psychology*. (pp. 155-169). London: Routledge.
- Shotter, J. (1993). *Cultural Politics of Everyday Life. Social Constructionism, Rhetoric and Knowing of the Third Kind*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Simon, J. (1989). Aspirations and Ideology: Biculturalism and Multiculturalism in New Zealand Education. *Sites*, 18, 23-34.
- Simon, J. (1996). Good Intentions, but . . . In R. Steele (Ed.), *Whakamana Tangata* (3rd ed., pp. 38-42). Wellington: Quest Rapuara.
- Simon, J., & Smith, L. T. (2001). *A Civilising Mission? Perceptions and Representations of the New Zealand Native Schools System*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Simon, R. (1992). *Teaching Against the Grain. Texts for a Pedagogy of Possibility*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.
- Simon, R., I. (1987). Empowerment as a Pedagogy of Possibility. *Language Arts*, 64(4), 370-382.
- Sinclair, K. (1986). *A Destiny Apart. New Zealand's Search for National Identity*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin in Association with the Port Nicholson Press.

- Siraj-Blatchford, I. (1995). Racial equality education: identity, curriculum and pedagogy. In J. Siraj-Blatchford & I. Siraj-Blatchford (Eds.), *Educating the Whole Child: cross-curricular skills, themes and dimensions*. (pp. 42-55). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Siraj-Blatchford, I., & Siraj-Blatchford, J. (1997). Reflexivity, Social Justice and Educational Research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 27(2), 235-248.
- Siraj-Blatchford, I., & Siraj-Blatchford, J. (1999). 'Race', Research and Reform: the impact of the three Rs on anti-racist preschool and primary education in the U.K. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 2(1), 127-148.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1991). Bicultural Competence and Strategies for Negotiating Ethnic Identity. In R. Phillipson & E. Kellerman & L. Selinker & M. Swain (Eds.), *Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research* (pp. 307-332). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Sleeter, C. (1992). *Keepers of the American Dream: A Study of Staff Development and Multicultural Education*. London: Falmer.
- Sleeter, C. (1996). *Multicultural Education as Social Activism*. Albany: State University of Albany Press.
- Smith, A. (1993). Early Childhood Educare: Seeking a Theoretical Framework in Vygotsky's work. *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 1(1), 47-61.
- Smith, G. H. (1986). Taha Maori: A Pakeha Privilege. *Delta*, 37, 11-23.
- Smith, G. H. (1990). Taha Māori: Pakeha Capture. In J. Codd & R. Harker & R. Nash (Eds.), *Political Issues in New Zealand Education* (2nd ed., pp. 183-197). Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- Smith, G. H. (1992a). Education: Biculturalism or Separatism. In D. Novitz & B. Willmott (Eds.), *New Zealand in Crisis. A debate about today's critical issues*. (pp. 171-175). Wellington: G.P. Publications.
- Smith, G. H. (1992b). *Research Issues Related to Māori Education*. Auckland: University of Auckland.

- Smith, G. H. (1995). Whakaoho Whānau. New Formations of Whānau as an Innovative Intervention into Māori Cultural and Educational Crises. *He Pukenga Kōrero*, 1(1), 18-36.
- Smith, G. H. (1997). *The Development of Kaupapa Maori: Theory and Praxis*. Doctor of Philosophy in Education Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Smith, G. H., & Smith, L. T. (1996). New Mythologies in Maori Education. In P. Spoonley & C. Macpherson & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Nga Patai* (pp. 217-234). Palmerston North: Dunmore.
- Smith, L. T. (1995). The Colonisation of Māori Children. *Youth Law Review*, August/September/October, 8-11.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies. Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London and Dunedin: Zed Books Ltd and University of Otago Press.
- Smith, M. (1995). Chapter 10: Mike Smith - A community organiser who caught the headlines by taking a chainsaw to the pine tree on One Tree Hill. In H. Melbourne (Ed.), *Maori Sovereignty. The Maori Perspective* (pp. 97 - 107). Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett.
- Smyth, J. (1989). Developing and Sustaining Critical Reflection in Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(2), 2-9.
- Somerset, G. (1976). *Vital Play in Early Childhood*. Auckland: New Zealand Playcentre Association.
- Soutar, B. (1988). Māori in Early Childhood. *Early Education*, 16, 13-15.
- Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (1987). Teaching and Learning How to Do the Ethnography of Education. In G. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds.), *Interpretive Ethnography of Education at Home and Abroad* (pp. 17-33). Hillsdale N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Spolsky, B. (1989). Maori Bilingual Education and Language Revitalisation. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 10(2), 89-106.
- Spoonley, P. (1988). Are You Racist? - You'd be Much Nicer if You Weren't. In W. Hirsh & R. Scott (Eds.), *Getting it Right: Aspects of Ethnicity and Equity in*

- New Zealand Education* (pp. 42-48). Wellington: Office of the Race Relations Conciliator.
- Spoonley, P. (1990). Racism, Race Relations and the Media. In P. Spoonley & W. Hirsh (Eds.), *Between the Lines: Racism and the New Zealand Media* (pp. 26-37). Auckland: Heinemann Reid.
- Spoonley, P. (1993). *Racism & Ethnicity*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Spoonley, P. (1995). Constructing Ourselves: The Post-Colonial Politics of Pakeha. In M. Wilson & A. Yeatman (Eds.), *Justice and Identity: Antipodean Practices* (pp. 96-115). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Stairs, A. (1988). Beyond Cultural Inclusion: An Inuit example of indigenous educational development. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority Education: from Shame to Struggle*. (pp. 308-327). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Stake, R. (1998). Case Studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (pp. 86-109). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2002). *Statistics New Zealand Fact Sheet* [2002, 3/6/2].
- Stonehouse, A. (1991). *Opening the Doors. Childcare in a Multicultural Society*. Watson, ACT: Australian Early Childhood Association.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1999). Grounded Theory Methodology. An Overview. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. (pp. 158-183). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
- Sullivan, K. (1993). Bicultural Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Establishing a Taiwi Side to the Partnership. *New Zealand Annual Review of Education*, 3, 191-221.
- Suransky, V. P. (1982). *The Erosion of Childhood*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tahi, B. (1995). Biculturalism: The Model of Te Ohu Whakatipu. In M. Wilson & A. Yeatman (Eds.), *Justice and Identity: Antipodean Practices* (pp. 61-77). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

- Tammivaara, J., & Enright, D. S. (1986). On Eliciting Information: Dialogues with Child Informants. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 17, 218-238.
- Tangaere, A. R. (1997). Māori Human Development Learning Theory. In P. Te Whāiti & M. McCarthy & A. Durie (Eds.), *Mai i Rangiātea. Maori Wellbeing and Development* (pp. 46-59). Auckland: Auckland University Press with Bridget Williams Books.
- Tatum, B. D. (1992). Talking about Race, Learning about Racism: The Application of Racial Identity Development Theory in the Classroom. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(1), 1-24.
- Tau, T. M. (2001). Matauranga Maori as an Epistemology. In A. Sharp & P. McHugh (Eds.), *Histories Power and Loss. Uses of the Past - A New Zealand Commentary* (pp. 61-73). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Te Awekotuku, N. (1984). Conclusion. In P. Spoonley & C. Macpherson & D. Pearson & C. Sedgwick (Eds.), *Tauwiwi. Racism and Ethnicity in New Zealand* (pp. 244-248). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press Ltd.
- Te Awekotuku, N. (1991). *He Tikanga Whakaaro: Research Ethics in the Māori Community*. Wellington: Manatu Māori.
- Te One, S. (1998). The Taniwha Turtle: A Story of Contribution and Reflection. *Early Education*, 18, 19-21.
- Te Paa, J. (1995). Chapter Sixteen: Jenny Te Paa - Ahorangi (Dean) of Te Rau Kahikatea, the Maori Theological College at St John's Theological College in Auckland. In H. Melbourne (Ed.), *Maori Sovereignty. The Maori Perspective* (pp. 167-175). Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett.
- Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development. (1998a). *Making Education Work for Māori. Report on Consultation*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development.
- Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development. (1998b). *The National Māori Language Survey. Te Mahi Rangahau Reo Māori*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Maori Development.

- Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development. (1998c). *Progress Towards Closing Social And Economic Gaps Between Māori And Non-Māori*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Maori Development.
- Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development. (1999). *Te Tūāoma. The Māori Language: The Steps That Have Been Taken*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development, New Zealand.
- Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development. (2000). *Progress Towards Closing Social and Economic Gaps Between Māori and Non-Māori. A Report to the Minister of Māori Affairs*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development.
- Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Maori Development. (2001a). *Ngā Tatauranga mō te Reo me ngā Tikanga Māori. Maori Language and Culture Statistics* Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development.
- Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Māori Development. (2001b). *Maori in New Zealand - Maori Population - Maori Children*. Wellington: Te Puni Kōkiri/Ministry of Maori Development.
- Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa/New Zealand Childcare Association. (1992). *Report to 29th Annual Conference*. Wellington: Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa/New Zealand Childcare Association.
- Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori/Māori Language Commission. (1995). *Āe Rānei, He Taonga Tuku Iho? National Māori Language Survey: Provisional Findings*. Wellington: Te Taura Whiri i Te Reo Māori. Maori Language Commission.
- Teacher Registration Board. (2001). *The Satisfactory Teacher Dimensions*. Wellington: Teacher Registration Board.
- Teariki, C., & Spoonley, P. (1992). *Te Whakapakari Te Mana Tangata: The Politics and Process of Research for Māori*. Palmerston North: Department of Sociology, Massey University.
- Tobin, J. (1995). Post-Structural Research in Early Childhood Education. In J. A. Hatch (Ed.), *Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Settings* (pp. 223-243). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

- Tomlinson, J. (1995). The importance of children in social policy: danger signals from a greying society. *International Journal of Early Childhood*, 27(1), 15-18.
- Troyna, B. (1993). *Racism and Education: Research Perspectives*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- University of Waikato. (1992). *Charter*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- University of Waikato. (1999). *University of Waikato Strategy Statement*. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- University of Waikato. (2002). *Calendar*. University of Waikato [25/10/2002].
- Van der Veer, R., & Valsiner, J. (1994). *The Vygotsky Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Vasil, R. (1988). *Biculturalism - Reconciling Aotearoa with New Zealand*. Wellington: Victoria University Press for the Institute of Policy Studies.
- Viruru, R. (2000). Subjugated Knowledges as the Foundation for Reinvention. In: Canella, Gaile S. Critical and Feminist Reconstructions of Early Childhood Education: continuing the conversation. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 1(2), 215-221.
- Wagner, J. (1993). Educational research as a full participant: challenges and opportunities for generating new knowledge. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 6(1), 3-18.
- Waitangi Tribunal. (1986). *Te Reo Māori Report*. Wellington: GP Publications: Waitangi Tribunal.
- Waitangi Tribunal. (2001). *The Napier Hospital and Health Services Report*. Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal.
- Waite, J. (1992). *Aotearoa: Speaking for Ourselves. A Discussion on the Development of a New Zealand Languages Policy*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Walker, R. (1982). Development from Below: Institutional Transformation in a Plural Society. In I. Shirley (Ed.), *Development Tracks: the theory and practice of community development*. (pp. 69-89). Palmerston North: Dunmore.

- Walker, R. (c1987). *The Meaning of Biculturalism*. Auckland: Maori Studies Section, Anthropology Department, Auckland University.
- Walker, R. (1987). *Nga Tau Tohetohe*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou. Struggle Without End*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Walker, R. (1996). *Ngā Pepa a Rangunui*. Auckland: Penguin.
- Walker, Rita. (1995). 'Ko ta te wahine he mana rereke'. Paper presented at the Education and the Equality of the Sexes Conference, University of Waikato.
- Walker, Rita. (1998). Cultural Values Dictate Collectivism. Paper presented at the Reconceptualizing Early Childhood Conference, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Watts, M., & Ebbutt, D. (1987). More than the Sum of the Parts: research methods in group interviewing. *British Educational Research Journal*, 13(1), 25-34.
- Way, K. (2000). *Directions for Pakeha Tauwiwi in Strengthening the Treaty*. Paper presented at the Treaty Conference 2000, Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland.
- Wells, G. (1986). The language experience of 5-year-old children at home and at school. In J. Cook-Gumperz (Ed.), *The Social Construction of Literacy* (pp. 69-93). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- West, C. (1993a). The New Cultural Politics of Difference. In S. During (Ed.), *The Cultural Studies Reader* (pp. 203-220). London: Routledge.
- West, C. (1993b). *Race Matters*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the Language of Racism. Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A Critical Analysis of the Research on Learning to Teach: Making the Case for an Ecological Perspective. *Review of Educational Research, Summer*, 68(2), 130-178.
- Williams, H. W. (1992). *Dictionary of the Maori Language* (7th ed.). Wellington: G.P. Publications.
- Williams, J. (2000). *The Treaty of Waitangi and Western Democracy in Practice*. Paper presented at the Treaty Conference 2000, Tamaki Makaurau/Auckland.

- Wolcott, H. F. (1987). On Ethnographic Intent. In G. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds.), *Interpretive Ethnography of Education at Home and Abroad*, (pp. 37-57). Hillsdale N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1997). *A Proposal for Qualitative Proposals*. Paper presented at the Te Tari Māori, University of Waikato, Hamilton.
- Wolcott, H. F. (2001). *Writing up qualitative research*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Working Party on Cultural Issues (Rōpū Hanga Tikanga). (1990). *Whānau Tupu Ngātahi: Families Growing Together. Report to the New Zealand Playcentre Federation from the Working Party on Cultural Issues*. Auckland: NZ Playcentre Federation.
- Young, L. S. J. (1998). Care, Community, and Context in a Teacher Education Classroom. *Theory into Practice*, 37(2), 105-113.
- Zeichner, K. M., Grant, C., Gay, G., Gillette, M., & Villegas, A. M. (1998). A Research Informed Vision of Good Practice in Multicultural Teacher Education: Design Principles. *Theory into Practice*, 37(2), 163-171.