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Kua hinga te totara i te wao nui a Tane

The totara has fallen in the forest of Tane

This whakatauki is a good place to start this volume of Early Education in which we acknowledge not one, but two leaders in early childhood education, who have recently passed away.

The first is Professor Judith Duncan, who passed away in April from motor neurone disease.

The second is Professor Brian Sutton-Smith, who was the first recipient of a doctoral degree in education in New Zealand and whose voluminous work on the importance of play has inspired many early childhood educators internationally. We are grateful that we can pay tribute to these luminaries in this issue.

Resilience in the face of adversity features in both their stories. They also both shared a sense of being grounded in strong principles and support communities. They both had strong ideals yet were able to work effectively in the practical world of teaching and research. They knew the importance of knowing 'where they came from'.

This ability to link the past and the future, and connect the local with the global is a theme that runs through other contributions in this issue. The 2014 recipient of the Margaret Blackwell Trust travel award, Chrissy Lepper slips us gracefully in her luggage and takes us on a round the world trip allowing us to peek into the possibilities and pedagogies affecting e.c.e. teachers in Italy, England and Canada.

Three e.c.e. teachers – Anna Jo Perry, Mallory Schoonebeek and Susan Bates – bring their teaching to life for us. Jo picks up the slippery but enduring concept of 'teachable moments' and wonders how they can be taught to new e.c. teachers. Mallory has been noticing how children engage with animals. She introduces us to the ethical domain of 'speciesism' – the assumption that some animal species has more value than other. An advocate for 'cultural competency' in e.c.e. teachers, Susan challenges readers to slow down and to show curiosity about the language and culture of the child 'in front of us'.

Drawing on more than a decade of advocacy and research on bicultural practices in e.c.e. in this country, Mary-Elizabeth Broadley, Chris Jenkin, and Jill Burgess consider the progress and impediments to enacting the bicultural curriculum, Te Whāriki. They offer a set of reflections and resources for teachers which will be useful to the many centres that struggle in this regard.

Louise Green of the NZEI reports on a recent symposium in Auckland with Professors Helen May and Margaret Carr as panel members, which considered the future of Te Whāriki in the increasingly commercial world of e.c.e. provision. Her report serves to remind of us to consider where we have been and where we are going – a theme that Michelle Simon picks up in her consideration of futures-focused and 'sustainability' using with pedagogies that build metacognition.

Our book reviews also are a celebration of resilience. Playcentre Publications has rebranded itself as Ako Books and continues to publish for parents and for early childhood teachers – even as other publishers move off shore. Two recent publications from Ako Books are enthusiastically reviewed by academics with specialist knowledge: Jean Rockel considers Pennie Brownlee’s revised Dance with me the heart; and Valerie Margrain considers Megan Howell and Emma Smolend’s Ideas for play: Literacy. These books are both examples of how complex topics can be made understandable by capable authors and by beautiful design.

We are finalizing the content for this issue a few weeks before the start of the 11th Early Childhood Convention – the first such convention since 2007. Given that the 10th Convention never happened – the organisation was irretrievably broken by the earthquakes of that year – this current convention’s theme is poignant: “He Waiwhakariporipo – Making waves in Early Childhood – surviving the storm”. It is a robust theme and a reminder that even as we farewell colleagues and mentors, aspiring to a sector that can bring out the best results for children and their families remains a project worthy of our ongoing care, love and political feistiness.

Nga mihi aroha kia koutou

Claire McLachlan and Sue Stover
Editors, Early Education
In 2013 I was awarded the Margaret Blackwell Scholarship, providing me with the opportunity to ‘double tick’ some things on my bucket list while researching teaching and learning around the world. Margaret Blackwell studied with Susan Isaacs and was responsible for accompanying children from Europe to safety in England during the second world war. Trained as a Karitane nurse, Margaret Blackwell was one of the first people to promote holistic wellbeing of children while recovering in hospital, introducing the idea of having a parent stay with them in the 1950’s. While this is something we take for granted now, this was a significant leap for the thinking at the time.

Before leaving on my world tour in 2014, I had only been to Melbourne twice before in my life and here I was packing to travel to Europe, England, Scotland and Canada ‘on my own’ for three months. My first stop was Milan, Italy where I met up with the other members of my study tour group. I was very relieved to see Denise holding a sign at the airport; that connection is enduring and I have a new lifelong friend. The study tour at Reggio Emilia held at the Loris Malaguzzi International Centre was everything I imagined, and of course so much more. I had been forewarned about the study tour experience by others and came prepared. I was one of 550 people from 50 different countries attending the study tour. Being in the Loris Malaguzzi International Centre and walking through the town provided contrasts between the history of the town that is pivotal to the educational approach, and new developments influences by social and political forces.

The study tour was inspiring and left me with more questions than answers. I am already planning my next study tour trip to Italy. There was an opportunity to hear from a pedagogista about the approach to professional development when there is a citywide approach to education. Engaging teachers in encounters as part of refreshing experience and understanding was particularly interesting for me as involving teachers in ‘playful’ moments is something I had moved away from in professional development. I have a renewed interest in exploring the arts and involving adults in ‘playful’ moments.

We visited early childhood services where we were able to observe teachers ‘in research’ with children. I was overwhelmed by the complexities in the teaching practices unfolding in front of my eyes and was reminded how much focus is required to meaningfully connect with children. I appreciate the enterprise of people in Reggio Emilia. We were not able to take any photographs in the early childhood services and the presentations are exactly that - a presentation. The shop is where you access information to ‘take away’, so we were all writing and sketching furiously while out and about, and spending our Euro dollars. Most of the presentations are in Italian and translated for the group, giving time to capture notes and soak it all in. I can neither confirm nor deny I have photos for fear I may incriminate myself.

After a quick visit to Florence and Venice, we returned to Milan where the remaining members of the study tour returned home and I headed for London before making my way to Corby to the Pen Green Centre in Northamptonshire. I was able to spend three days at Pen Green Centre meeting teachers, children, researchers and lucky me, I met Margy Whalley! My own research questions now have a place in a more interactive way with others.

I was interested in how teachers connect with families and include what they learn about children through their families in their teaching and responsiveness. I was also looking for traces of how this dynamic is made visible through the assessment documentation. Talking with teachers provided useful insights into what they pay attention to through observation and how the key elements of the Pen Green approach are constantly in the frame of teachers thinking. Teachers shared examples of practice such as the importance of home visits and seeing children with their families in their home setting.

Home visits are an important feature of the activities of
the teachers. The teachers visit to meet the child in their own space and to enable them to engage in conversations about things relating to the environment of the child when at the centre. One idea was to take photographs of the doors of where the children live while visiting so there is an image to revisit. It also helps children explain to others where they live and opportunities for storytelling and rich language experiences. There are two ‘traveller’ communities that have children attending so I was intrigued about how this works. It is important for teachers to ‘be with children and families’ in their spaces and to get a sense of the culture of the family through being in their home. The induction period is also important to settle the whole family. How much effort do we put in and continually work on to induct the whole family?

‘Schemas’ are one of four dominant focus elements at Pen Green Centre. Teachers and parents are observing children through the lens of ‘schema’. Teachers and parents are confident talking about schemas. I knew Pen Green had spaces for parents and children, however I had not appreciated the variety of spaces and multiple functions these spaces provide. ‘Little Jimmy’s’ is the drop-in space for families for a range of purposes. The space is named after a Councilor - Jimmy Kane - who partnered up with Margy to lobby the council for the provision of a service over 30 years ago. The space is named to recognise his contribution to the establishment and growth of Pen Green.

The main educational themes are evident here too: schema, parent engagement and wellbeing. One parent pointed out to me the ‘trajectory’ schema of a child and when I asked how long she had noticed the schema strengthening, she promptly told me that this child was not her child. This reinforced to me the authenticity of the claim which Pen Green Centre makes about being in partnership with parents and having a community development focus. Parents are curious about all children learning and they see the ‘hosting’ of visitors like myself as a shared responsibility. Parents were very open to talk with me and gave me permission to be involved as an observer at times, such as during baby massage and induction conversations. Meeting with Margy Whalley and the research team was a highlight and after many years at the Pen Green Centre, the passion and sense of purpose remain strong.

Chrissy Lepper

Margy described my journey as one of ‘Roots and Routes’. I left Corby and headed for southwest Scotland to meet cousins and to stand on the land of my ancestors. It is true that family is family and with three weeks’ notice I was welcomed into the home of my cousins. This very personal and emotional part of my journey is momentous in terms of my own culture and identity. I stood on the land and climbed the mountain of my ancestors. There are crumbling remains of the original dwelling. My cousins think the reason there is not much left of the stone house is due to all the family coming from around the world and taking the stones away with them.

After two nights in Glasgow, I headed off to Canada for five weeks. In Canada I stayed with friends MaryLynne and Geoff, whom I now call family. In Canada I visited many early childhood services talking with them about their approach to education. In Alberta the team developing the curriculum were in the final phases. It was a great opportunity to hear the ideas they are foregrounding in the curriculum and talk with teachers involved in the pilot programmes. I visited many services and met many passionate and focused professionals in Edmonton, including professional development providers and accreditation agency staff. I discovered the power of Blogging at Kinder Campus Childcare - Lions Gate centre.

‘Terra’, the teen parent centre in Edmonton was a stand out for me with the holistic and empowering approach to education with parents and children. It was here that I met Margaret - a ‘baby cuddler’. In the rooms with the very youngest children, there is a very important role that volunteers play. The official title of this generous group of people is a ‘Baby Cuddler’. Their role is to be with the babies and give them lots of attention. With the very young children, this ensures their needs are being met at all times, ensuring optimum experiences so early on. Here they also focus on characteristics of the child and the stories behind names.

Some useless information for you: I saw six bears in one day. Some Canadians might see two or three in the wild in their lifetime. Two of them were cubs with their mother. I travelled 13 hours in the car from Edmonton to Kelowna. Eight of those hours were spent in ‘The Rockies’. Some Canadians think I am from the twilight zone and think it is funny that I get excited by snow. I have been in the second largest mall in the world - it was awesome! I am planning a return visit there too.

Before returning home I spent time with Prof Joce Nuttall in Melbourne talking about CHAT - Cultural Historical Activity Theory. I did not get to meet up with Prof. Marilyn Fleer, however I have not given up on this happening; this remains on the top half of my bucket list.

As I travelled around, talking with professionals, teachers, parents, children and leaders, it is encouraging to discover that the issues we are confronting in Aotearoa New Zealand are similar to the tensions and challenges the sector is facing around the world. You would not believe how universal our challenges are!

I am thankful to the trust responsible for administering the award through NZCER, Sarah Boyd who made everything so easy while I was away from home, and finally to Prof. John O’Neill - Director of the Institute of Education at Massey University for supporting my application. I will be forever grateful to John for putting this opportunity in front of me and encouraging me all the way. For more detailed information about specifics of my travels, check out my blog http://myscholarshipadventure.blogspot.co.nz/

Chrissy Lepper
Over a 12 year period, the three authors of this article have undertaken research in a common area of interest: bicultural development in early childhood education in Aotearoa New Zealand. This article draws together that research:

• an action research project and Master’s thesis research by Jill Burgess (2002, 2005);
• a doctoral thesis research by Chris Jenkin (2010);
• and Ako Aotearoa National Project Māori Initiative Stream research by Mary-Elizabeth Broadley (see Williams et al., 2012).

The purpose of this article is to offer an overview of bicultural practices, and to offer some resources we have devised to support bicultural development. Our intention is that these understandings and resources may contribute to the work of those engaged in the early childhood education sector.

We start from the understanding that the bicultural nature of early childhood curriculum Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996) enacts obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi (Ritchie, 2003, 2013). We also believe that it is crucial that we in early childhood education move beyond deficit thinking in relation to bicultural development and build on what works. We advocate that teachers should be supported to develop a ‘bifocal lens’ to see both Māori and Pākehā worldviews. Teacher education providers and other professional mentors should equip teachers with sufficient skills, knowledge, and confidence to implement bicultural development.

According to recent research, early childhood teachers lack commitment, knowledge, and skills to support these curriculum obligations in a way that would uphold the treaty partnership agreement and cultural knowledge of both heritages in equal status (Burgess, 2005; Forsyth & Leaf, 2010; Jenkin, 2010; Ritchie, 2002, 2013). In 2005 Burgess found that early childhood teachers interpreted biculturalism in three main ways:

• personal (in relation to one’s self as a bicultural being – “being” bicultural): or
• political (as part of a progressive social movement - that is “doing” bicultural); or
• power-sharing.

Burgess concluded that “personal biculturalism supports and embeds political biculturalism throughout the society” (p. 18).

A decade later, these challenges were expanded by Williams et al. (2012, p. 32) who identified:

• the paucity of Māori language used by early childhood teachers (Ritchie, 1999; 2008);
• the constraints of bicultural dichotomies to which a bicultural curriculum lends itself (Hemara, 2000; Ritchie, 2008);
• the selective and problematic interpretation and application of the obligations of partnership under Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Metge, 2010; Rau & Ritchie, 2005; Ritchie & Rau, 2006);

• the difficulty for early childhood educators to suspend their own cultural assumptions and let go of personal and professional beliefs and values (Davis, 2009; McCarthy, 1998);

• a lack of personal comfort and confidence with the application of te reo Māori and tikanga (Ritchie, 2008); and,

• a lack of understanding of key Māori cultural concepts such as wānanga tanga and the application of these in early childhood education (Hemara, 2000; Pere 1982, 1991; Ritchie & Rau, 2006; Royal-Tangaere, 1997).

The common themes in these research findings indicate a lack of confidence and competence in implementing bicultural development in early childhood education in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Research themes

Insufficient Skills, Knowledge, and Attitude

Separated by ten years, the action research project of Burgess (2002) and Williams et al.’s (2012) research both found barriers to implementation of te reo Māori. According to Williams et al. (2012), the reasons included:

• fear of not being a perfect speaker;

• a need for region-specific te reo Māori me ona Tikanga-a-Iwi;

• superficial understanding of Tikanga Māori; and

• that because of lack of reinforcement by central government, Te Tiriti o Waitangi is not taken as seriously as other curriculum requirements, such as literacy and numeracy.

In addition, the authors pointed to lack of understanding amongst teachers about how one’s own cultural identity had implications for how teachers teach.

It is disturbing that many early childhood services are not providing adequately for Māori children but there is also the implication that early childhood teachers are unresponsive to bicultural development as being for all children, not only those of Māori descent, as espoused in Te Whariki (Ministry of Education, 1996). It was noted by the Education Review Office (2013) that when there were no Māori children, relatively few services were “well placed to promote success as Māori for any Māori children that might enrol in the future” (p. 20). This means that for all children in these centres, there was little opportunity to develop understanding and competence with te reo and tikanga Māori.

Requests for resources

A need for resources, identified during Burgess’s 2002 action research project, led to development of a 2-page language resource (see page 11). Its availability, however, was limited to research participants and interested parties, and a request for resources was still evident in 2012 when Williams et al. developed a teaching framework to build kaupapa Māori principles, processes and practices, as well as curriculum-contextualised resources which support teachers to adapt and adopt regional-specific te reo Māori me ona Tikanga-a-Iwi within the context of the early childhood setting. (See page 9.)

Mentorship and leadership

Participants in the research of Williams et al. (2012) requested mentorship in three distinct areas:

Māori mentors with expertise in Te Ao Māori in early childhood education, Māori mentors in the community with whom a centre or service can network, and proficient teacher educators to support the implementation of Kaupapa Māori theories in daily practice (p. 47).

Early childhood teachers typically work in teams, so in order to implement effective bicultural development, all members of the team need to be aligned and support each other. Nevertheless, one person can make a difference in taking on the commitment and passion to model implementation of the bicultural curriculum and inspire the team efforts in this area. Jenkin (2010) noted that leadership could have a positive effect to sustain and encourage bicultural development. As Katene (2010) states, “transformational leadership … leads to others being motivated by the leader to do more than they originally intended and often even more than they thought possible” (p. 3). Conversely, when a leader has not provoked the team to work collaboratively to implement the bicultural curriculum, or to take responsibility for their commitment, if that leader departs from the centre it is unlikely to be sustained. Crucially, individual teachers must work together but must also take ownership of bicultural development, if implementation is to be successful (Jenkin, 2010).

Ownership

Non-Māori teachers who understood themselves and their own identity as bicultural in the Aotearoa New Zealand context were more receptive to bicultural practices and were more likely to take responsibility for bicultural practices in the centre (Burgess, 2005). Such teachers also believed in their partnership in and consequent responsibilities resulting from Te Tiriti o Waitangi. However, it is important to understand that “individual team members must also take ownership” (Jenkin, 2011, p. 59) of the bicultural curriculum. Jenkin found that with ownership comes responsibility for implementation of bicultural curriculum.
Tangata whenua responses

In the research undertaken by Williams et al. (2012), three tangata whenua groups expressed a range of views in response to the question of whether the learning of te reo Māori should be compulsory for early childhood teachers. For some, knowledge and practice of Tikanga Māori was more important. In relation to the majority of tangata whenua research participants:

… (while) there was strong support amongst most groups for knowledge of te reo Māori in the (early childhood) sector, this study found no consensus over whether te reo Māori should be a compulsory part of the ITE [Initial Teacher Education] curriculum, or over the level of expertise required (p. 39).

Bicultural resources

A first useful step for teachers is to self-assess their position in relation to bicultural development. Based on several pieces of research, Jenkin (2011) developed a useful continuum to do just that. Teachers can locate themselves on the continuum and work out where they might develop their relationship with bicultural development. (See Table 1.)

Williams et al. (2012) developed a framework with bicultural teaching tools based on 12 kaupapa or theoretical tikanga principles. Each principle highlighted the need for government agencies, including teacher education providers, to determine and further develop an acceptable and appropriate level bicultural competence to be obtained within graduating teacher and registered teacher standards. A response by one graduate teacher who participated in the research carried out by Williams et al., in 2011 is worth noting here:

… until a funding–aligned early childhood education bicultural competency indicators are developed, we will not see the serious bicultural shift. We really need teacher education providers, centre settings and government agencies’ commitment to resourcing the sustainability of this treaty-based bicultural agreement.

Research recommendations

The research findings from the three projects highlighted that early childhood education teacher education providers desire bicultural mentoring to guide their own bicultural development. In addition, the participants questioned accountability around competency-based assessment procedures. Questions were raised by the participants about teacher education providers’ ability to deliver appropriate training around te reo Māori me ōna Tikanga components so that graduate teachers enter the profession with bicultural confidence and competence.

Frustration was expressed by a few participants, as they thought it was time for providers to move away from a silo-superficial bicultural acknowledgement model to a significant bicultural development continuum model which is woven into every teaching component of early childhood education programme (Williams et al., 2012). The Ministry of Education (2011) has developed a set of cultural competency guidelines for teachers of Māori learners. This is currently being included in many teacher education programmes.

The teaching profession draws on a range of kaupapa Māori principles and best practice tikanga tools when acknowledging and working alongside the children, families and professional in early childhood centres (Williams et al., 2012).

The writers of this article have a shared vision of the sustainability of bicultural development not only within Aotearoa New Zealand. Our purpose has been to share our knowledge and resources so that they may contribute to the work of teachers/lecturers within the early childhood education sector. We want our experiences to help them create their own curriculum and teaching process in ways which are relevant to their community of learners within their cultural and linguistic landscape.

He ohonga ake i taku moemoea ko te puawaitanga o ngā whakaaro

Dreams become reality when we take action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori–superseded (by multiculturalism)</th>
<th>Māori-reliant</th>
<th>Māori-friendly</th>
<th>Māori-co-construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers claim that a New Zealand focus is primary which means multiculturalism is more important than biculturalism (Burgess, 2005).</td>
<td>Teachers acknowledge biculturalism and Māori to be part of mainstream but those without skills in te reo Māori me ōna tikanga are reliant upon those Māori teachers who have these skills.</td>
<td>Teachers assume as a personal priority that including Māori culture reduces prejudice and discrimination. This leads to better educational achievement as Māori grow a positive self-image but Pākehā remain in control (Johnston, 2001).</td>
<td>Weaving a joint whāriki. Teachers develop constructive mutually supportive working relationships. To achieve such partnerships teachers must become bilingual and bicultural (Tamarua, personal communication, 2009).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Continuum of Teacher’s Relationship to Bicultural Curriculum (Jenkin 2011, p. 51).
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**Glossary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aotearoa</th>
<th>New Zealand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td>Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupapa Māori</td>
<td>Ways of being Māori: rules, roles and relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Indigenous people of Aotearoa New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahia ngā Mahi</td>
<td>Putting it into practice: doing the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangata whenua</td>
<td>People of the land, local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonga</td>
<td>Treasures, both tangible and intangible, that are highly valued by Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te ao Māori</td>
<td>The Māori World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te reo</td>
<td>The language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te reo Māori me ōna tikanga-a-īwi</td>
<td>Māori language and customs of the local tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</td>
<td>The Treaty of Waitangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whāriki</td>
<td>The woven mat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga</td>
<td>Customs, practices which are correct procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanaungatanga</td>
<td>Relationship, kinship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Te Reo to use with young children

This resource developed by Jill Burgess may be useful as a model for early childhood settings where teachers are taking first steps to honour the languages of children attending the service. Feel free to use this as you wish.

Kia ora
Hello
Goodbye
Thank you
That’s a good idea!

Morena
Good morning
Haere mai
Welcome
Come here!

Haere ra
Farewell (to someone leaving)

E noho ra
Goodbye (to someone staying)

Kia kaha!
Be strong!

Kia manawatū!
Be staunch!

Haere mai ki te kai!
Come to lunch!

Haere mai atu ki waho!
Let’s go outside!

Kia tūpato!
Be careful!

Kia ngawari!
Be gentle!

Ata haere!
Go carefully!

Kia tere!
Be quick!

Kia taringa i te tāru!
Stop jumping!

Kia tētū ki te peke!
Don’t run!

Hoki mai!
Come back!

Kei te manaakitū taku ringaringa.
I’ve got a sore finger!

Kei a wai ngā kutikuti?
Who’s got the scissors?

Kei hea ō hū?
Where are your shoes?

Kei hea ō tokena?
Where are your socks?

Kei hea tō peke?
Where is your bag?

Ka pai ki ahau tō waiata.
I like(d) your singing.

He pēke hou tēnei.
This is a new bag.

He pene hinu tēnei.
This is a red crayon.

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?

Kei a wai ngā mea nei?
How many (things) are there?
Cultural competence begins with oneself

Susan Bates

I was at an early childhood centre where a greeting from every language of children in the centre was boldly and colourfully displayed on the wall as one walked in. I was heartened. But when I asked how many children came from homes where languages other than English were spoken, no teacher could tell me. I realised that half of the children in the under-twos room heard a language other than English at home. But the only languages spoken in the room were either English or Te Reo. In my time as a teacher at the centre, no parent or grandparent with limited English was ever addressed in their own language. One of the children was from Vietnam, and the best guess a teacher gave was “somewhere Asian, but not China. Thailand maybe.” The child had been there for almost two years. The teacher had been there longer than that.

This article is based on my personal reflections as a qualified early childhood teacher who has worked in a wide range of centres both as a reliever and as an appointed staff member.

I am a Pākehā New Zealander with a deep interest in the diversity of cultures that still exist in the world. Finding many of those cultures in e.c.e. centres is a source of fascination to me. Having studied basic Mandarin, Spanish, and French, having visited Vanuatu, and Singapore, and having lived for almost a year in South America, I have some cultural capital to draw on. I know that even a few words of language, and the courage to try them, can build a bridge where there was none, but to build relationships, the most basic of dispositions – curiosity – is what opens the doors.

Culture and language define us as human. To not engage with others from this standpoint, I believe, is to deny a human right. In multicultural communities – such as are found in many early childhood settings – what is needed is curiosity about other cultures and other languages.

An ece centre is a microcosm of its neighbourhood; each e.c.e. centre has its own culture. It has been argued that it is also a place of conservation and preservation of language and culture. The sector has become increasingly multicultural since then, so we need to re-engage with questions, such as – in the context of cultural diversity, what is Best Practice? In my experience, Best Practice has to be child-centred. Best Practice requires us to look and see ‘Who is the child before me?’ (Tobin, 2015). To ask: ‘How can I affirm and encourage this child to experience creativity, independence, self-regulation, curiosity, and joy?’

In education, particularly in New Zealand, a level of cultural competence in teachers has never been more necessary. In Te Whāriki (Ministry of Education, 1996), it is quite clearly written that “The languages and symbols of their own and other cultures are promoted and protected” (p.16); and that e.c.e. teachers have a responsibility to “help children gain a positive awareness of their own and other cultures” (p.18). As part of the holistic development aspiration, Te Whariki also includes the need to encourage children to understand and respect different cultures. However, ‘respect’ is a cold and neutral word. It is possible to respect someone, or their work, without actually liking them.

Cultural competence requires a much more engaged and committed approach. I contend that curiosity is the greatest and most fundamental pre-requisite for achieving personal cultural competence. It requires that we assume first that this ‘other’ is going to enrich our lives, widen our view and heighten our understanding of the whole of humanity, including ourselves and our place in it. It is a reciprocal, more or less circular process which will have its own path.

Curiosity about others is not a straight-line, or carefully defined. It cannot be described in a manual; the means and methods may not be reusable. There are so many factors to be considered, internal and external, local, global, religious, economic, cultural, and personal. These factors are fluid, changeable, and reacting constantly (Husband, 2015). This challenge can be seen as difficult and daunting, or, if it is approached with the natural curiosity and wonder we encourage in our children, it can be seen as fun and enriching.

Early childhood centres are increasingly multicultural. My experience as an e.c. teacher in Auckland has been that many children in our centres are not supported well enough. The attitude of some teachers and parents that the children will (and must) catch up in English is contributing to many children dropping their home language as quickly as possible. Many parents have told me that it takes a
disciplined approach to keep home languages alive. A parent wrote to me:

"I really hope C & C can speak English, Cantonese, and Mandarin in the future. At this moment, I don't push them too hard, I am afraid they will hate learning Chinese. We speak Cantonese at home, even though they always reply in English, but I won't give up."

In one centre, the youngest children were all Chinese speakers so I quickly let them know that I could speak some Mandarin. Each child smiled at me as they recognised what I was saying. They realised too, that my level of Mandarin was somewhat less than their level of English, and this gave them confidence. When reading a story, I chose stories with animals and asked them the Chinese names. I was able to attempt them with some confidence but when I got it wrong, they patiently repeated it until I had the pronunciation correct. I was then able to teach them English in the same way. We had a nice time doing this, and when I asked them something difficult, they no longer looked away, or stared at me, they listened and gave it a try.

This willingness is so appreciated by small children, that I can make any child smile by speaking just a few words in their language. This has included Arabic, Dutch, Russian, Thai, Cambodian, Korean, Kichwa, Japanese, Vietnamese, Papua Pidgen, Samoan, and Tongan. The little boy from Papua, (a remarkably inventive and expressive child) was able to tell me a story about how his father was kicked by a horse once, using a lot of acting, expressions and the half dozen words that his mother had taught me, and then bursting into laughter. It bonded us for the duration of my stay at that centre, and our conversations facilitated his English acquisition. We treated each other as equals in the language game.

With languages I have no familiarity in, I have still tried hard to learn a few words to at least greet them, their parents or grandparents, and to say ‘Thank you’. When I can, I find out how to say; ‘Come this way please’, ‘Are you sad?’, ‘You are angry’, ‘That is great work’. To politely request, to ask how a person is, to acknowledge feelings, and to encourage, are all basic interactions with children. These simple phrases make a good beginning for a relationship, and open the door to trust, comfort, self-regulation and pride. As teachers we must ask how committed we are to the people that stand before us. Children’s language acquisition is based on the words they hear. They must hear a wide range of words in different contexts to become proficient. If they only hear orders, or constant repetition of the same words used to shepherd them through the routines, this is the language they will learn. Conversation is critical (Aukrust & Rydland, 2011).

**Discussion and conclusion**

Curiosity is a prime motivator for infant exploration and it is mentioned several times in *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) with regard to children’s attributes, but what about their teachers?
The word ‘curiosity’ is found nowhere in the Teacher Registration Criteria, the Graduating Teacher Standards or in the Teacher Council’s Code of Ethics (see Education Council of Aotearoa New Zealand, 2015). ‘Reflective’ (which appears frequently), requires a looking back when something has already happened. ‘Inclusive’ (another common word) requires that each child is given the same opportunity.

Curiosity is different. Curiosity is interested inquiry; a desire to know. Curiosity includes joyful exploration, wonder, and excitement in finding out.

Cultural competence is the ability to work with people from various and wide ranging cultures, languages, and values to get things done. It is a realisation that ‘we are all in this together’, that every member has something to offer the group just because of their difference. Homogeneity is not the purpose, enrichment through diversity is. The ability to work in diverse teams has been termed collaborative intelligence (CQ), and has been described as a more valuable skill or attribute for the future of business, economics, ethics, education, politics and leadership, than EQ or IQ (Hackman, 2011).

Cultural competence begins with oneself. There is no one size fits all formula, no template, no Ministry of Education booklet. It is a personal commitment to step out from our own perspective and step into another. This begins with a curiosity, scaffolded by affection, and sustained by an aspiration for equity, social justice, and peace.

Stepping outside our own perspective requires a knowledge of where one’s boundaries actually are. Knowing one’s own culture and values, knowing the place from which you come, is a prerequisite, according to many scholars (see Williams, Broadley, & Lawson-Te Aho, 2012). Developing the centre culture from this standpoint is also possible. I expect the work I do with each language and culture to contribute to the group culture, so identifying the centre culture is just as important as identifying one’s own.

The two critical conditions for cultural competence are time to spend on the relationship, and making spaces to let it happen. The relationship between teachers and the children is the most important factor with regard to their learning, parent satisfaction, and our enjoyment of the job. Attachment, collaboration, affection, openness, trust, and communication must all be present for persistent curiosity from our children. I have been most able to work on satisfying relationships with children with limited English when I have been a teacher in smaller centres (maximum of 20 children, a ratio of 1:6 or 7 for children who are aged over three years; and half that ratio for children aged less than three years).

The teachers in e.c.e. are also increasingly culturally diverse also. Those who are bilingual are often expected to ‘help settle in’ children who speak the same language. Having home language speakers should not be an excuse for the rest of us teachers to become complacent. The discovery of the FOXP2 gene has indicated that speech development is individual and genetic (Enard, et al., 2002), whereas language development is social and relational (Vygotsky, 1962). It requires joint attention, relationship and lots of talking. This can be achieved through a stepping in to the child’s language and culture.

The world currently faces huge challenges in health, wealth, education, opportunity, food and water security, resource sharing and climate change. These are everyone’s problems, the whole of humanity. We are humanity, but we are not all humane. Empathy must be present to eradicate the ‘us and them’ mentality that currently drives protectionist and assimilation policies, which are prevalent in classrooms and in early childhood centres. Encouraging empathy in early childhood is creating future citizens (Johanssen, 2009). Teachers are either at the ‘coal face’ of creating a better world, or they are determined purveyors of the status quo.

I believe that as teachers our empathy must find its voice through care, effort, and education, but perhaps most importantly, through curiosity.
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Vignettes about cultural competence and language sharing in e.c.e.

Vignette 1

Two French girls, one aged only two years old, appreciated everything I said in French. One of the mothers did not like my accent particularly, but we worked on it with good humour and mutual effort. I was able to take the little one to wash her hands, instruct and request simple things, and say ‘thank you’. I think this is incredibly important actually. More than just giving orders, it is important to also use courtesy when communicating with children who do not have English. The little one came only to me when she was upset because I could at least say in French that she was sad or upset, acknowledging her feelings, and sing ‘Frere Jacques’, (badly) but it was a comfort to her.

The older girl was almost four and her English was building every day. We engaged in a daily ‘swap meet’, where she would ask me what a thing was in English, and I would ask ‘Que’est-ce en Francais’? She was very happy that I was such a willing student, and the more I learned, the more satisfying our relationship became. I translated the ‘Sit down’ song into French and brought it into our music times. The other children were quick to learn it, and it sparked a general interest in languages among the predominantly English-only children. This extended to learning Te Reo and sign language. The children were open and excited to find other means of communication.

Vignette 2

A Thai girl had been adopted into a German speaking family so she was able to converse easily in German. Learning English was a struggle for her in the beginning, but she was a very inquisitive child, and very inventive, happy with her own company and constantly experimenting with the world around her. She was clearly unable to communicate with other children, and I felt it was important that she had communication with someone in our centre. I began to learn some German.

Her parents were very grateful, as they worried about her socialisation in an environment where not one other person could speak with her. I was able to provide something familiar, she knew I was just learning, and she was a very patient teacher.

Vignette 3

A boy had both Chinese and English as first languages, but he had a speech impediment which made it very difficult for other children and teachers to understand him. A child said to me on my first day, “He can’t talk properly.” They usually ignored his efforts to communicate. Everyone was just too busy. I spent as much time as I could talking with this boy, asking him to keep explaining what he meant until I understood. We used actions, pointed at things in books, whatever we could find. He also was very patient and once I was tuned into his language, I could translate for him. His mother noticed and was tearful when we talked about it. She was so pleased that someone other than her could talk with him. It just took time and listening differently.

Vignette 4

A Japanese speaking girl, also with English as a first equal language, nevertheless contributed to the culture of the e.c. centre by greeting me with a little bow and the correct Japanese greeting. This happened because I was willing, and her mother helped me. At first, the girl was visibly uneasy with this, no other parents or children did this in the morning, but it soon became a ritual we went through and was special to us. I was encouraged by this to develop special rituals with other children through language and culture, and this has been very satisfying.
The magic in teaching

Exploring teachable moments in early childhood practice

Anna Jo Perry

Every early childhood teacher can describe moments in which teaching and learning have happened in a way that they could never have planned for and that had important impacts for both the teacher and the learner. For me, these are magical situations which I recognise as ‘teachable moments’. Hyun (2002) says that teachable moments ‘represent new, emerging ways for us to learn from each other by temporarily ignoring our institutional identities (teacher, learner) in order to become participating members of a teaching and learning community (p. 14).’

However, apart from cursory mentions in literature on the teacher’s role, little has been written about teachable moments in a way that makes them easy to spot or to understand. It is, thus, difficult to explain to new teachers what these moments look like, how to watch for them or what steps to follow as they eventuate. Casual observers, or even teaching colleagues, may not recognise when a teachable moment is occurring. In my experience, the ability to recognise and navigate a teachable moment can differentiate a confident teacher from a novice. Yet in Hyun’s (2002) opinion, teacher’s ignoring teachable moments may be unaware of the potential power imbalance they are causing. Instead of following the child’s lead, they remain in control (gently or otherwise) of the direction of the teaching and learning environment. This paper looks at two such moments from my experience as a teacher in an effort to give examples of what is meant by this description of teaching.

The events described below feature two occasions which I experienced as a teacher returning to practice in an early childhood centre as part of a ‘regaining currency’ project. I had been teaching in a tertiary institution for six years and in that time had only engaged with children in Centres during my work during teaching practices as a visiting lecturer. Therefore, when the opportunity arose to return to this area of practice, I took it willingly. Looking back over my visits, it is clear that regular time with children has given me the chance to re-engage with theory. It has provided me with the chance to recognise that in my own practice, I can recognise teaching moments, and further from my subsequent reflections, I can see that teaching moments provide me with morale-lifting moments of understanding and clear purpose. They represent occasions when the connection between the children and I, suddenly and for a brief moment, is much deeper.

Event One

This event happened in the over-3’s room of an early childhood centre with a small group of children. It is a moment that was special to me because I hadn’t planned for it to happen, it simply emerged. It was a moment of transition between the routines of the Centre. My response secured a space for this moment which would otherwise have passed by.

It was just before lunch time and we had come in from the garden. As we were a little early for lunch, the group of three year olds and I sat down with a plastic construction set to talk. There were different types of pieces included in the construction set including connecting pieces, screws and nuts. Child A was looking at the large screws that were included and she began to pick out a group of yellow ones which she put on the fingers of one hand. As I watched, she started to sing “Daddy Finger where are you” whilst wiggling her thumb with the screw on top. She continued with the song and each family member, wiggling the appropriate finger as she did so. Child A had been moving the screws around on her fingers and started the song again as soon as she saw my fingers. Again, she started singing and I joined in. After the ‘brother finger’ she stopped singing and said ‘now you do it’. I continued to the end and she listened, wiggling her fingers at each change of family member. Child B had been moving the screws around on her fingers and started the song again as soon as she saw my fingers. Again, she started singing and I joined in. After the ‘brother finger’ she stopped singing and said ‘now you do it’. I continued to the end and she listened, wiggling her fingers at each change of family member. Child B also had found other blocks for his fingers and was joining in by the end of the second repeat. The event was ended by the intrusion of routine.

Reflection

I recognise this as a teachable moment, but I was not the teacher, I was the student. The teaching events were moving forwards but I was not in control of it, the children were and they remained focused over the whole period. It became a teachable moment because, by going along with what was happening, I enabled the events that occurred between us and this prolonged their focus. They were exploring the role of teacher, living out how they had seen it done by others. I knew from previous experience, that Child A often broke into song or the bits of song that she could remember and
Taking the role of the teacher allows a child to create a meaningful learning situation

that she was very confident at these moments. However, I didn’t lead this event, the children did. Child A, started the train of events, and Child B found the resources for his and my fingers so we could engage in the events more fully and add to the space that opened up. Perhaps, how the children deliberately positioned themselves during this time enabled the teachable moment. Alternatively, by following the children’s lead, I also made a space for them to ‘teach me’, and thus show what they could do.

Hyun’s findings suggest that taking on the role of the teacher allows a child to create “emotionally, cognitively and culturally meaningful learning experiences” (2002, p. 15). Child A was trying out the teacher’s role. She selected substitute resources for the finger puppets she had seen the teachers use and felt safe enough to try out her ideas. It was in the culture of the Centre that music and singing were everyday events that were strongly encouraged. Thus, the scene was set for her to engage with the moment and me.

I also recognise that teachable moments such as this one can raise ethical issues, for example when the primacy of clock-driven routines is assumed as normal. In this situation, could I have asked for more time? Or was it already too late and the intrusion of the routine sufficient to dissolve the collective focus? Yet, if I had ignored it, what damage would it have done to my relationship with the children?

Two further questions emerged for me from this moment. First, what was it in the lead up to it that I recognised? Child A and I were not playing together at that moment. We were exploring the same resources but separately. I was observing her from a distance as she was examining the plastic screws and trying them out on her fingers. I was wondering what she would do next. She turned and looked at me and from a moment where I was standing back and observing, suddenly I was being offered an invitation to be involved. The choice that I made at that point enabled the space for the teaching moment. Therefore, teaching moments can be made or lost by either deciding to maintain the teaching role and with it the power and control in the situation, or waiting for a second longer to see what happens and then accepting even a small gesture of inclusion. The latter is much harder than the former and yet what may emerge is much deeper connection.

The other question for me to consider was what did this moment mean for me and my own practice. First, I learned, once again, the importance of flexibility in the teacher’s role. I could have gone on with discussing the construction game and ignored the singing, finger movements, and eye contact. Second, I learned again the importance of being present.
in the moment and sometimes what is to be learned is not what was planned, and that is ok. Third, I saw, once again, the value of accepting that, when the mantle of teacher passes to someone else, I can still learn a lot.

These sorts of moments are important to me both personally and professionally and this may be why I recognised the moment and could engage. This is not always the case, however. Sometimes the moment is recognised too late and any possible teaching and learning or extension of thinking is missed. This was the case in event two.

Event Two

This second event happened at the swings and is given as an example of not taking advantage when important events happen.

Today, the children just wanted to stay at the swings. I tried to move them around but they were very clear about staying put and were organising the lists of turn-taking on the blue swing which they all seem to want. I was pushing Child A on the swing and Child B said “I can do that and count too” and started the counting sequence for each time she caught and pushed the swing forward “one…two…” She was very confident as far as fourteen and there were no pauses or hesitations. However, after fourteen there was a small pause in which I could see her look sideways at me for a second and I was just forming the word to help her when she said “five-teen”. There was only a split second for me to respond before she carried on to the end. I couldn’t think of anything to say that acknowledged that use of all the knowledge she had previously accumulated. At the end, I simply added “well done” and one of the other children took over the counting.

Reflection:

This was also a teachable moment where I could have extended the children’s learning but I missed it. Realising the importance of this moment and my lack of response has since caused a great deal of reflection as to why I had nothing to say and what I would say if the moment were now repeated. Having had time to consider what I would say in a similar situation, I would be ready with “wow, what a clever idea” or “I like the way you understand how to use the numbers to ten and then add ‘teen’ after to show they are bigger than ten” or “can you tell me about the numbers after ten and how they work”.

So, what did I recognise in this moment? Child B wanted to share the counting and was very confident until she reached fifteen. I am sure that the sideways glance was a quick check to see if I had noticed the pause and was I about to help her forward. The small silence and the little glance may even have been an invitation to do so. I was, I think, open to the possibilities of the moment. I just took too long to recognise what was happening and to respond. As I realised it, the moment was gone.

So what did this event mean for me and my practice? Even though there were other events happening around me like pushing the other child on the swing and others talking about turn-taking, the need to be present in every moment going on around me was reinforced. I should have noticed the little hesitation and the sideways glance quicker and known that it heralded a moment when new ideas were being born. I have wondered whether giving her the word ‘fifteen’ would have been too much of intrusion into her thinking and letting her decide on an alternative was, fact, the better way. Inevitably, the moment remains one that I missed and one on which I have reflected many times.

The importance of such a moment is the possibility for extending children’s thinking about the events that are happening. Hyun (2002) suggests that teachable moments are when teachers “recognise and interpret their observations according to their own understanding of child development theory” (p.10). I knew when I heard “five-teen” that Child B already knew about number sequence and the construction of numbers passed ten. I could also see that she was literally filling-in a gap based on her previous knowledge. Importantly, Hyun also mentions that teachable moments depend on the teacher’s ability to ‘read the moment’ as it begins to unfold. Thus, presence in the moment and flexibility to go with the events rather than maintaining control are crucial. I have learned from this to be really aware of those small moments of hesitation, perhaps some eye-contact to see if I will give support, and obvious considered thinking. In my experience, these are pointers to a possible teachable moment unfolding.

Why are these particular moments teachable?

A further question that needs to be asked in my reflections on these moments is ‘what makes these events teachable moments to me’, when, for others, they may not have been extraordinary. The fact that I recognised these moments at all, indicates my previous experience with other similar events over time where I have often been ‘taught’ by a child taking my role or invited to be part of the game. I could also see the theory (e.g. the principles of ‘ako’ and ‘tuakeina-teina’ relationships) really clearly encapsulated in those moments of practice with the children. In this way, familiarity made them special. At the same time, the importance of a trusting reciprocal relationship is clear in each event.

Discussion

“Teachable moments” is a concept associated with both John Dewey and Jerome Bruner, educational theorists who emphasised the importance of intrinsic motivation in learning. Bruner (1996) described a teachable moment as showing a ‘meeting of minds’ (cited by Glasswell & Parr, 2009, p. 354). However, Dohnke, Ziemann, Will, Weiss-Gerlach and Spies (2012) suggest that the idea of a teachable moment is “poorly conceptualised and untested” (p. 1293) which means that it is difficult to explain these times to new teachers. Despite this, there is literature about ‘teachable moments’ in many different disciplines. Griffin and Ward (2015) explain teachable moments in maths education as when teachers “encounter an unexpected response or question from students, they must make an
instant decision about the significance of the question and choose their response accordingly” (p. 34). Desai and Graves (2008) link these moments to a “patron’s point-of-need, thereby presenting the ideal teachable moment” (p. 242). It might be suggested that a teachable moment is not necessarily born from a need but can also come from an observation or a moment of ‘wondering’. The underlying core, however, is that it is the teacher’s response that is critical in these moments.

In terms of early childhood education, Hyun (2002) suggests that there is little discussion about what the term ‘teachable moment’ means. She proposes that it is heavily dependent upon the teacher’s ability to ‘see’ the initiation of the phase. She also questions whether what teachers describe as ‘teachable moments’ are really their own “appropriate, memorable, empowering or effective teaching experiences”. She goes on to suggest that there is no “literature directly discussing what a teachable moment is [or] who wields the “real” power during that moment” (p.3).

Teachable moments are part of a pedagogy that “foregrounds play” and in which children have choices both to make and to offer (Davis, Reed & Stover, 2013, p.63). Such pedagogy is less predictable than one that is ‘play-based’ because there are no fixed scripts, the events begin to unfold and the participants make choices about how to respond. Teaching and learning in these circumstances rejects power inherent in roles and focuses on the interplay of the relationship between those involved.

Engaging in such play with children does not mean directing the events, but being part of them, providing questions and provocative possibilities to extend the thinking (Fleer, 2015). When teachers are “open to the possibilities in play” (Davis, et al., 2013, p.66) they enable children to really be competent and confident learners, rather than merely paying lip-service to this concept. Such possibilities open teachers to a “universe that has no limits” (Davis, et al., 2013, p.63). “foregrounds play” and in which children have choices both to make and to offer (Davis, Reed & Stover, 2013, p.63).

Recognising and enabling teachable moments is seen as part of the teacher’s role in the literature, and yet it is getting more difficult in many Centres where time-bound routines and learning outcomes rule the day. Time to engage at the level of a teachable moment comes second to beginning the next activity on time or listening to the teacher’s instructions. A strong adherence to ratios and a subsequent critical in these moments.
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To meet the needs of a fast changing society, educational models are required which move beyond 'what' facts, and towards models where students learn in trans-disciplinary and collaborative ways, with the emphasis on 'how'. This is a key feature of 'futures' focused education and is also known as 'new knowledge production' (DuPuis & Ball, 2013).

This article draws attention to the importance of promoting teaching practices which are 'futures- focused' through metacognitive awareness, emphasising the need for qualified, informed, and professionally active teachers.

What is metacognition?

Metacognition entails having knowledge about your own thinking process (Clarke, 2007). Metacognition is evident in such processes as planning, monitoring, and evaluating the approach to a learning task, as well as having the motivation to continue, irrespective of the difficulty. Reflection and self-regulation are identified as two aspects of metacognition (Darling-Hammond, Austin, Cheung, & Martin, 2003). Reflection requires thoughts on what is known, whereas self-regulation demands management on how to go about learning.

The regulatory function of language and internalisation of others’ discourse form the basis of Vygotsky’s sociocultural and developmental theory upon which the theory of metacognition is based (see Fang & Cox, 1999). Consequently, through the joint construction of meaning, and within the context of social interaction, it is believed that the most effective learning is to be found as the child progresses to new learning with the aid of a more knowledgeable peer; in other words through the ZDP (the zone of proximal development). As a result, relations with others offer the motivation for an individual to gain awareness of their meta-cognitive processing, and dialogue is identified as critical in expressing and developing children’s thoughts (Larkin, 2006; Robson, 2010).

Metacognition demands a variety of teaching skills. This includes clear and appropriate planning relating to the task sought, requiring the environment to include an ethos of mutual respect, and respect for exploration where children can feel comfortable to explore and take risks. Finally, time should be granted where children and teachers can reflect on their thinking and express thoughts about their learning (Jones, 2007). In the context of early childhood settings, this requires ensuring sufficient time for children to complete tasks, to see through ideas and to reflect upon them (Robson & Hargreaves, 2005). However, unless concepts and theories can be applied in new situations, they have little value (Owen, 2007).

Studies of metacognition such as Livingston (1997) have offered insight in distinguishing between the cognitive processes of successful students and less successful students. Poor students are believed to fail as a result of not using their knowledge and their skills of planning and strategising when attempting tasks, along with not monitoring their own progress. Children therefore require metacognitive help so as to develop and “improve their self-regulation and monitoring of learning” (Fisher, 1998, p 16). As children become aware of their own thinking, they become conscious of their strengths and strategies which are useful to their own learning. Metacognition can therefore be taught through the clear introduction of language for thinking and learning, such as happens in an engrossing discussion.

Metacognition and the socio-cultural curriculum

The influence of social interaction is connected with children’s conceptions of thinking and how it is exhibited. It further draws upon Vygotsky’s perspective where learning and development are viewed as social processes and that (especially within contexts that are meaningful to children) children are capable of displaying metacognitive and self-regulatory behaviour (Salmon & Lucas, 2011). Relevant content, along with joint engagement and sustained conversations are therefore considered invaluable for children’s thinking and development (Meade, Williamson, Stuart, Smorti, Robinson, & Carrol-Lind, 2013).

Educational theorists such as Dewey, Freire, and Bruner have long advocated for the value of collaborative learning (see DuPuis & Ball, 2013). Through experiential, active, service- and practice-based learning, these educational thinkers have endeavoured to create socio-constructivist
pedagogies. These pedagogies prepare children for the world they live in through asking questions, and working amidst others to find answers, thus adding to knowledge. This shifts the emphasis from *content* mastery to *learning* mastery (Richardson, 2012b).

Activities which are meaningful to children and build on previous knowledge are more likely to encourage reflection and strategising through questions and discussion (Hammond et al., 2003). The New Zealand early childhood curriculum, *Te Whariki* (Ministry of Education, 1996) offers an image of learning that is reflective of linked experience and meaning making. These are interwoven and integrate the child’s whole context, viewing the child as: “...a person who wants to learn, sees the task as a meaningful whole, and sees the whole as greater than the sum of its individual tasks or experiences” (p. 41).

So a pedagogical framework that reflects these principles would build on participatory learning theories, where children’s experience in families, communities and cultures are constructed. Here, ‘funds of knowledge’, working theories and dispositions are viewed as outcomes based on children’s early cognitive and affective development reflecting everyday experiences and learning processes (Hedges & Cullen, 2011). This illustrates Vygotsky’s assertion that learning should be authentic and relevant to the daily life and practices of children in communities or cultures (1986, as cited in Hedges & Cullen, 2011).

The role of the early childhood professional

When learning is focused on transforming knowledge and practice, teachers’ pedagogical options will include co-construction, dialogue, relationships and participation. Thus learning occurs via joint activity, dialogic co-construction, with cultural artefacts and tools (Wells, 2002, as cited in Hedges & Cullen, 2011). From a sociocultural perspective, a pedagogical model of ‘participation plus’ views innovative learning and ‘knowledge building’ as occurring through participation in complex cultural activity. Through building and re-building, obtaining new ideas and offering feedback, the learner is engaged in assessing one’s work (Richardson, 2012b). Through adults acknowledging learning, opportunities open to engage in sustainable and relevant conversations with children, thus extending children’s thinking (Meade, et al., 2013).

Within supportive environments, children learn to demonstrate agency, as well as developing skills and aptitudes to deal with and learn about negotiation, compromise, success, and failure (Macfarlane & Cartmel, 2008). However, individuals who work with young children need to understand how this agency develops, as well as its contribution to the way children learn. Episodes of sustained shared thinking and co-construction are more evident amongst teachers who are qualified, than unqualified teachers (Meade et al., 2013).

‘Futures-focused learning’ can only be developed if teachers understand how children think. Through the understanding of metacognition, and by valuing thinking, teachers can construct children’s thinking dispositions, thus creating the awareness in children essential for learning how to learn – a key to metacognitive awareness (Owen, 2007; Salmon & Lucas, 2011).
This requires training in all fields, as well as applying collaborative skills which extend disciplinary boundaries (DuPuis & Ball, 2013). Children should be inspired to pursue their own interests which will require a high standard of teacher engagement and inquiry, as well as teachers being perceptive of children’s unique ways of learning. Most importantly, teachers should be participants and role-models in the learning process (Richardson, 2012b). Unless teachers have direct experience, they will tend to classify sociocultural pedagogies as too abstract and theoretical. Through engagement and experience, teachers are better able to role model innovative teaching strategies (Wubbel, 1992, as cited in Owen, 2007).

Metacognition can be taught through modelling and using vocabulary in thinking and understanding. By scaffolding complex cognition and generating dialogic thinking, teachers can make thinking more visible because dialogue, alongside play, is considered a fundamental psychological tool of young children's development in self-regulation (Salmon & Lucas, 2011). Furthermore, problem solving and the development of thinking skills can be incorporated into everyday practice (Robson & Hargreaves, 2005; Robson, 2010).

Children develop their own thinking skills through self-initiated activities and according to a study by Robson & Hargreaves (2005), are most effective if working in pairs. They suggest that children are most likely to experience ‘sustained shared thinking’ when involved in one-on-one interaction with a peer or adult. As children learn to listen, contribute and share within a group, their social skills are extended. In addition, through provocation in a group setting, reflection is encouraged, along with the provision of opportunities to collaborate and construct new ideas (Larkin, 2006).

Metacognition can be role modelled. Through insightful questioning children can be encouraged to consider how to solve problems, why they accept/reject ideas, or why and how they could do things differently next time. Enquiry into children’s thinking (and what they have said) can facilitate learning as metacognitive questions develops consciousness as children are challenged to become aware of their thoughts and feelings (Jones, 2007; Clarke, 2007).

However, metacognitive processes are difficult to assess; achievement and progress are usually more focussed on the individual (Larkin, 2006). Assessment methods also tend to focus on what students can show that they know, instead of focusing on what they can do with what they know (Richardson, 2012a). Recognition should be given to the key role of the teacher who offers scaffolding which teaches development of children's knowledge, skills and understanding.

metacognition, futures education and sustainability

Calling upon universities to “make education for sustainability a central focus of higher education curricula” (DuPuis & Ball, 2013, p. 64), the United Nations declared 2005 to 2014 as the Decade of Education for Sustainable Development. “Creativity and managing the growing complexity of the world” (Richardson, 2012b, p. 138) have been named as the most crucial factor for future success. As a result, creative thinking, flexibility, self-direction, inventiveness, curiosity, risk-taking and higher order thinking are all dispositions which educators are challenged to embrace. These are considered invaluable for children growing up in the 21st century as the emphasis is on teaching students how to problem solve, to feel secure with challenges, to recognise new patterns, as well as to maintain high levels of inquisitiveness; to be able to learn, unlearn and relearn (Richardson, 2012b). This stands in contrast to encouraging students to only learn about ‘things’ (Salmon & Lucas, 2011).

‘Futures education’ positions learning as moving from re-telling to discovery, from information transfer to learning to learn, from being time-based to being outcome-based, and from being textbook-driven to being research-based. Passive learning is replaced by active learning and learning in isolation by learning collaboratively. Teachers are seen less as authorities and more as facilitators (Rotherham & Willingham, 2009).

This highlights the need to shift practice in accordance to what is required for future education. To do so effectively, requires a knowledgeable teaching force that can identify different levels of awareness within metacognition so as to assist children to develop and extend these teachable skills.

To be literate in the 21st century, children will be proficient in using the tools of technology, and to be able to construct relationships to pose and solve problems collaboratively and cross-culturally. For a variety of purposes, information for global communities is designed and shared, along with the capacity to manage, analyse and produce numerous streams of simultaneous information. Furthermore, multimedia texts are required that analyse, critique and evaluate whilst, in addition, attending to ethical responsibilities within these intricate environments (Richardson, 2012b).

Education services are places where children can learn and be inspired with, and alongside, others in their attempt to pursue mastery and expertise. This could then be used to influence the world in a positive manner, as children will often pursue their passion. Ironically, the push for standards comes mainly from people and organisations who are not educators, and organisations appear to “preserve the problem to which they are the solution” (Richardson, 2012a).

However, teacher expectations can be raised through encouraging ongoing professional learning of the teachers’ own interests and construction. Furthermore, teachers can then share these new ideas and constructs with parents, have discussions and include the community in understanding education, rethinking the works of education, and transition to an alternative: more cultural- and context-relevant approach. Thus, teachers can advocate for new ways of thinking and doing based on rational and applicable conversations about what our children actually need to know (Richardson, 2012b).
Conclusion

Metacognitive awareness can be taught through the introduction of language for thinking, planning, exploring and risk taking (Fisher, 1998; Larkin, 2006; Jones, 2007; Robson, 2010). Similarly, practice that promotes active and collaborative learning within an environment where research and outcomes are encouraged through exploration, are considered essential for ‘futures education’ (Richardson, 2012b; Rotherham & Willingham, 2009). Thus, echoing a sustainable learning environment as children are encouraged to be self-directed, curious, flexible, engaged in creative and higher-order thinking, as well as take risks (Richardson, 2012b).

This highlights the need for a knowledgeable teaching force that can identify different levels of metacognitive awareness, using a socio-constructivist, pedagogical framework where children are prepared for the world they live in through an authentic cultural context, based on active research, (Hedges & Cullen, 2011; Richardson, 2012b). Ongoing professional learning of teachers’ own interests and construction, and advocating for new ways of thinking, can raise teacher expectations which could then be shared and co-constructed with parents and the community. This approach is complementary to Te Whāriki, as it is designed for each childhood setting to intertwine its own curriculum, reflecting the social and cultural context in which it is rooted (Ministry of Education, 1996).

This means a unique and constantly updated curriculum, developed through children's interests, needs and dispositions. Such a curriculum is based on what one knows and what one needs to know next. As a result, the curriculum is discovered with children, instead of delivering it to them.
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What are children's views on speciesism?

A literature review and personal journey

Mallory Vera Schoonebeek

I was outdoors with a group of children aged under two years old when a surprising thing happened. A cockroach appeared and the children became frightened. I had not expected the children to fear the cockroach, but I was even more surprised when a child asked “Where’s the spray?” and then exclaimed loudly “Get the spray!”

To me, this was quite fascinating, as I did not believe that the cockroach was harming anyone, especially because the cockroach was outside, in its own domain. I was also surprised that a child so young could be so fearful of an insect.

I have always been fascinated with the issue of how humans use animals, and people’s views of animals and I became interested in the topic of ‘speciesism’ after another observation in an early childhood centre where I witnessed another child, this one was aged 2½, also become highly distressed. The distress was prompted by another child pretending to cut into a small plastic toy pig with a playdough knife. The child started crying, screaming and shouted at the other child “No! Stop! We don’t eat pigs! You’re hurting the pig!”. The child who was upset was an omnivorous child, whom I had witnessed eating pork – clearly ‘we do eat pig’ but the child did not realise it.

This experience reinforced my working theory that very young children rarely realise that meat is obtained from animals and compelled me to investigate this further. I want to know more about children’s attitudes to animals; for example, what are children’s moral views of killing animals? Do children think certain animals are more important than others? What are the children’s views of animals and species that are considered pests? This paper is my attempt to position my own experience and observations alongside the existing literature on ‘speciesism’ especially in children, but of course what adults think, do and eat influences how children understand the relative value of animals as well.

What is speciesism?

The term ‘speciesism’ was developed in 1970 by Richard D. Ryder, a British psychologist who argued that speciesism is a form of discrimination and prejudice against beings because of their species membership. Ryder argued that speciesism is a form of oppression that appears in two main forms: the assumption of ‘human supremacy’ (and therefore that other species of animals have fewer rights than humans); and that certain species are awarded more rights than others, (or are perceived by humans as being of more value or importance than other species). For example, in Western countries dogs are seen as having more rights than livestock, for example, with greater rights to freedom, and to protection from exploitation (Cavalieri, 2001; Ryder, 2009; Zamir, 2009).

I have witnessed speciesism occurring in children in early childhood settings. For example, I was recently surprised when a child stomped on a worm in the outdoor area. When I asked the child “what are you doing?”, the response was: “I’m killing the worm!”. I then explained that the worm was a being that experienced pain and fear, and that the garden was the worm’s home. When I asked “Why did you want to kill the worm?”, the answer was “I hate worms
because they’re slimy”. I then asked “Do you like dolphins and frogs?” to which the child replied “Yes”. I then said that dolphins and frogs are also very slimy, as they live in water. The child then said “I also don’t like them because they are yucky and dirty”.

This event is an example of speciesism – the worm was not worthy of the respect given other animals. When I started researching speciesism, I found that this child’s view of worms is not unusual. For example, in a survey of Norwegian children’s different perceptions about different animal species, Bjerke Ødegårdstuen and Kaltenborn (1998) found that worms were amongst the creatures least preferred of children – they are often seen as dirty, (even though they are so important to maintaining healthy soil; a point I tried to talk about with the child who squashed the worm).

In their research Bjerke et al. (1998) asked children to rank animal species and they found that children identified dogs and cats as the most preferred animals, while the least preferred animal species were crows, worms, bees and spiders. Pets were perceived by children to be nicer, more intelligent, more useful, more interesting and less scary than farm animals. Spiders were considered to be the most boring, least useful, ugliest, and most stupid.

Interestingly, Bjerke et al. (1998) also found distinct differences between urban children and farm children. Wild animals were of more interest to urban children than to farm children, and urban children liked animals more than rural children did.

Both Bjerke et al.’s Norwegian research and Loveridge (2009)’s research in New Zealand found that farm children were more likely to see animals as being economically useful, whilst also being more aware of conservation issues than were urban children. Loveridge (2009) suggested that “considerable attention has to be given to socializing children into attitudes that allow them to tolerate the more exploitative aspects of handling farm animals and killing pests” (p. 30).

This is an example of how children’s ideas appear to reflect their social and environmental context. According to Loveridge (2009), because farm children are more influenced by their parents’ views, they are more likely to view ‘pest’ animals in a negative manner, because farmers see pests as a threat to livestock due to being carriers of illnesses which may impact livestock and conservation issues such as deforestation and native species destruction. Loveridge (2009) argues that viewing certain animals as pests is passed down from older generations to younger generations, and that this intergenerational exchange results in rural children being more aware that possums, stoats, and rabbits are considered a threat to New Zealand’s native birds and trees.

A community’s view of animals ‘as pests’ can also influence children. Amey (2008) provides a good example of this when she describes a rural New Zealand school’s fundraising which includes annual possum hunts, possum shooting competitions, and possum ‘best-dressed’ competitions. Other fundraisers include a pig hunting competition and pig carrying competition. Loveridge (2009) suggests that this might be viewed as unsavoury and barbaric by urban communities, but in rural communities where there are more farms and a more accepted view of pest control, it can be accepted as normal.

Stewart and Cole’s (2009) research focused on the use of imagery to promote meat consumption and speciesist views in children which they maintained are socially constructed and contingent on how animals exist in relation to humans – for example, as wild animals, utility animals, pets or vermin. These relationships are reinforced or challenged through children’s literature, toys, resources and media such as television and film, whereby children are taught speciesist views and to love and respect certain animals and that using other animals is acceptable.

Reflecting on the morality of exploiting animals

Recently, when I was setting up farm resources at the beginning of the day I paused, and wondered what this may teach children. Am I teaching children that animals are ours to use as resources in society where we deem fit? Am I promoting speciesism? When songs such as “three blind mice” are sung, what impact do they make? I believe that it is important for teachers to question these things, and examine how common practices may influence speciesist attitudes in children. For example, I believe it is important that children learn that animals are sentient beings, about
their intelligence and habitats and that they have the right to be protected and be free from exploitation.

Stewart and Cole (2009) have explained it is important for careful attention to be paid to the use and presentation of different forms of media, resources and literature. I suggest this would include the resources available to children in early childhood settings.

In an exploration of children’s moral reasoning about killing animals, Erricker (1997) had conversations with five London school children aged nearly seven years old. Of these two children were particularly interested in the topic, and Erricker proposed that the empathy that children can feel for animals allows them to critically reflect on and debate theological, scientific and moral issues that would seem to be beyond their developmental capabilities.

She also maintained that children base their views and moral opinions about the value of animals on what they have learned in their own social context. Similarly Stewart and Cole (2009) contend that children categorise animals and species through the relationships that they form with animals. Children are also influenced by the ideas which are passed on to them from their parents and other adults or from advertising and media, whether these are of animals being pests, or cute and cuddly creatures whose purpose is to generate sales and profit. To illustrate this point, these authors explain that cute animal toys are often used to encourage sales of takeaway food to children (the example they use is ‘Happy meals’ at McDonalds), and that sales of pork went down after the release of the movie *Babe* (which had a pig as the ‘lead character’).

In a study of meat consumption in US schools, Rice (2013) uses the concept of ‘cognitive dissonance’ to explain how older children can be both empathetic to animals yet willing to eat meat. ‘Cognitive dissonance’ is an important concept – and one that is worthy of adult consideration.

According to Festinger (1957), ‘cognitive dissonance’ as a threat to existing beliefs and values. He found that when there is a discrepancy in what we believe, we feel a sense of discomfort. Often an attempt is made to maintain our core beliefs and understanding, through discrediting any new information that we obtain. An example of this could be the earlier story of the child who was distressed at the idea of eating a pig, yet ate pork, although the child had yet to make connection.

According to Rice (2013), teachers can promote animal rights and welfare and to encourage children to reflect on the use of animals. It is also suggested that teachers can inform children about the environmental impact of meat consumption, the wastage of food, land and water, deforestation issues, pollution, humanitarian issues and other ecological implications. Importantly, Rice (2013) maintains that it is important for teachers themselves to become informed so that they are able to teach children about these issues, and to involve parents and family. To be aware of the need for sustainable eating habits – yet to continue to eat meat – could be an example of cognitive dissonance, even amongst adults. What do we as e.e. teachers role model about animal-dependent diets?

These studies of children, empathy and moral decision making are all relevant to me personally. As a child of nine years old, I became a vegetarian after seeing a transport truck containing cattle on its way to the nearby abattoir. As the truck turned down a long driveway, I asked my grandmother where it was travelling to. My grandmother answered “to become hamburgers”. At the beginning of this year, I became an abolitionist vegan.
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Te Whariki and the future of ECE in an open market

Reclaiming quality

Louise Green

Te Whariki is a unique document, greatly admired by early childhood teachers and academics around the world. But as it turns 20 next year, it is worth revisiting it and considering its place in a rapidly changing education environment. In July NZEI organised an Auckland ECE symposium with more than 200 teachers and a panel with two of the Te Whariki authors, Dr Helen May and Dr Margaret Carr.

There was spirited discussion about the impact of the market model in the early childhood sector and what can be done to strengthen Te Whariki, particularly given its uneven use across the sector. While many services and qualified, registered teachers adhere to the principles of Te Whariki, there is concern about the growing number of untrained workers in the private sector who have little or no understanding of it. These workers (through no fault of their own) struggle to contribute to quality conditions or the professional status of the sector.

The increasing commercialisation and profit-seeking in the sector (more than 60% of services are now in private ownership) have exacerbated the pressure services are facing as a result of the Government’s funding freeze in ECE. There are all-too-obvious flow-on effects for quality, with too many operators employing the bare minimum of qualified teachers. We have had numerous reports of corners being cut even further where operators think they can get away with it.


The report’s findings were disappointing but hardly surprising. Previous reports from the Children’s Commission and from an inquiry into quality for under-2s have signalled quality concerns. NZEI’s Education Aotearoa magazine has also investigated poor practice in large for-profit centres. Stories of huge, crowded centres with poor teacher-to-child ratios were distressingly easy to find. Teachers in these centres reported being reduced to ‘crowd control’ and shared their heartbreak at not being able to give children the one-on-one care and attention they need and deserve.

Without a serious injection of investment in better ratios for babies and toddlers and focussed professional learning and development and induction and mentoring, this will not change.

Unfortunately, there is no evidence that the market forces model the Government appears committed to can ever provide quality in the compulsory public education sector. The rampant growth in the sector is simply driving quality down, as corporates use their economies of scale and lower quality standards to out-price their competitors or simply buy them out.

The current Taoiseach (Prime Minister) of Ireland, Enda Kenny, said in 2013, “We need to move from viewing childcare as a business, a sector or an industry to viewing it as a profession.” It’s time our Government took heed. (See http://www.startstrong.ie/files/Childcare_Business_or_Profession_Full_Report_Web_Version.pdf). NZEI has publicly called for reinstatement of the 100% qualified teacher target, improved ratios and an enquiry into the ECE sector and how the market has been allowed to become so prevalent. It is particularly galling when for-profit operators are given taxpayer subsidies under the Targeted Assistance for Participation programme to build centres in areas that are already well served, and then proceed to entice families from existing centres with freebees and other offers.

Whether by parental choice or government design, 43% more children are attending early childhood services than a decade ago, according to Ministry of Education figures. But more striking is that all this growth has been in for-profit, all-day services.

A total of 91,207 children now attend for-profit services, while the number of children in kindergartens run by non-profit associations has fallen slightly to 24,949. Since 2011, when regulations that limited the size of centres to 50 children were changed, 124 centres have been licensed to cater for up to 150 children. One for-profit operator owns 28 of these large centres.

Big corporate providers tend to run their own PD, and even their own teacher training. But student teachers in corporate centres do their practicum in other centres. Educators from corporate centres may not have seen what quality looks like. That’s where we education professionals can widen their horizons. Explain what quality looks
like and support them to support their students.

NZEI members around the country are running ECE networks in their communities. You don't have to be an NZEI member to join in. Let educators in your community know that it's an option. Many networks offer PD as well as peer support. Ring the NZEI helpline 0800 693 443 and ask to speak to the NZEI lead organiser in your area.

NZEI members are running a campaign, All Kids Deserve the Best Start, to improve the provision of quality ECE (www.beststart.org.nz and a facebook group by the same name). Quality is at the centre of our campaigning in the ECE sector and we continue to lobby the government to shift its focus from participation (which is now very close to 100%) to quality. Enrollment is only the very beginning of what is required to give children an early childhood education that is going to prepare them for a lifetime of learning.

NZEI believes that the five stars of quality in ECE are:

- 100% qualified teaching staff
- Good teacher-to-child ratios
- Small group sizes
- Relationships
- A warm and welcoming learning environment

However, quality-driven private and non-profit services are struggling to keep parent charges down (and therefore to keep families) because qualified teaching staff, small group sizes and good teacher-to-child ratios all cost money.

This has been a major challenge for the sector since the government reduced its subsidy for 100% qualified teaching in 2009, now only paying the qualified rate for a maximum of 80 per cent of staff. Centres and services determined to employ only qualified teachers, despite the additional unfunded cost, are under increasing pressure.

There was no relief from that pressure in this year's Budget, which was condemned by organisations across the sector. The Budget delivered an additional $75 million over four years to fund earlier and increased ECE participation. However, there was no adjustment for inflation for existing universal subsidies, 20-hours ECE or for teacher and support staff pay. This is effectively a budget cut and the Early Childhood Council has estimated that each centre will have a $15,000 annual shortfall.

One positive development this year has been the Joint Initiative between NZEI and the Ministry of Education, aimed at boosting children's educational success through development of a new model of learning communities. The initiative came out of primary teachers' rejection of the controversial Investing in Educational Success policy and will now include ECE centres and potentially stretch up to tertiary education as well.

NZEI members had fought for a child-centred, workable model that would be responsive to local needs and could change over time. The model will give communities of learners the ability to design the roles and resourcing required to meet the needs of their own students. It includes teaching roles focussed on better supporting children's transition from ECE to school and from school to school; improving engagement with the community and boosting cultural competency.

The model includes distributed leadership roles and the recognition of a range of leadership expertise that communities may require. As of writing, NZEI is currently negotiating the primary school roles and resourcing in the Community of Learning model. If this process is successful, we expect that phase two of the Joint Initiative may lead to further development of the approach in ECE.

The model was agreed by the Ministry and NZEI after a joint working party of NZEI members and Ministry staff researched evidence from successful practice already occurring in schools and centres and looked at the international and national research literature.

Now that the general shape of the Joint Initiative has been agreed, phase 2 will involve engaging with NZEI members and various sector groups, including ECE. You can learn more about the initiative at http://www.nzei.org.nz/joint-initiative. We are optimistic about the potential of this initiative and are looking forward to working with the various sectors to get great outcomes for our children.
This book is framed with stories: stories of bonding relationships and stories of kindness – which are fundamental if we want a better world. Primarily this book is written for parents, though every person involved in infant care can reinforce these principles of loving care. The metaphor of *dance in the heart* is inspirational for parents (or educators) in order to more easily relate to the key processes instrumental in mutual learning. The concept of a partnership is one that early childhood teachers are familiar with and Pennie Brownlee’s approach shows how this can work inclusively.

Many infant programmes in early childhood centres use *Respect* as the cornerstone of their philosophy, and this book supports this philosophical position. If the philosophy of respect is new to you, the author’s message of heart/head coherence will help you to understand the early foundation of lifelong respect for others.

The author reveals some of our culture’s subconscious stories around babies. Writing directly and honestly about the need to have personal awareness of the stresses and strains that can impact on our attitudes towards infants, she points out that negative stories still exist today - and that some beliefs are “past their use-by date” (p. 7)! These stories have been around a long time – seeing infants as a ‘blank slate’; incapable; helpless. The negative stories are often accompanied by comments such as “…you’ll make a rod for your own back … you have to show him who’s boss early”. Scary as these sound – they are still sometimes heard as a result of past personal experiences, rather than updated views on infant learning.

Pennie Brownlee cautions that a negative slant in viewing the baby as a “cunning adversary” leads to someone becoming a “baby-battler” (p. 9). Baby battlers can misinterpret the cues that babies give in order to match their own view of babies. She warns this is damaging. Alternatively, she says there is the chance to rethink these stories and develop stories that are worthy of the child; such as that “every child is born capable”, and then use the heart to create a positive partnership.

The goal of making positive partnerships is one that will benefit everyone responsible for establishing secure relationships with very young children. These views support the claim for a calm, loving and focussed approach to learning (for both adult and infant). Such ideas are also stated in the neuroscientific literature as necessary for the critical period of brain development in the first years of life. The author emphasises the significance of heart/head coherence with each other in terms of the adult being a learning ally, and states that babies can then learn to their heart’s content.

Pennie Brownlee is talented at drawing attention to key issues through the use of eye-catching headings and imaginative ways of giving explanations. For example, “The *tuning fork effect*” illustrates the point that “Once the baby is out of the womb he no longer gets flooded with his mother’s hormones, he makes his own. But he will make them according to his mother’s emotional state” (p.120). The image of the tuning fork powerfully illustrates this story of heart/brain coherence in relation to adult-child behaviour. In the case of an early childhood centre, the system of primary care is advocated to enable this coherence to occur.

A short text of just over 100 pages, *Dance with me in the heart* is able to convey potent messages without losing any sense of justification. The 22 sections are brief, which makes them easy to use as a quick reference in the future. These sections are beautifully interwoven with illustrative photographs of infants and adults. The book ends with photographs of recommended toys based on natural or home-based items, and a survey to examine personal practices. There is a useful bibliography with a wide variety of perspectives on parenting. Though many of these titles might be interpreted as new-age parenting and be unfamiliar or even hard-to obtain today, it is evidence of the author’s commitment to find new ways of opening up our thinking.

Though Pennie Brownlee’s purpose is to reach out and support parents in the initial response to their baby, the ideas here relate to establishing a sense of togetherness that benefits both adult and infant. This book with its messages of respect and practical application could form the essential hub of any professional library.

I would recommend purchasing at least two copies – one for teachers, and the other for parents. Sharing the ideas together will be a most valuable opportunity for ongoing discussion.
In praise of multimodal literacy

Review of Ideas for play: Literacy: Playful ways to grow children's communication

Emma Smoldon & Megan Howell
Publisher: Ako Books, Auckland (http://www.akobooks.co.nz/)

Reviewer: Valerie Margrain

One can find many books on early literacy, and it’s not uncommon that there is some acknowledgement that play provides an important context within which early literacy develops. What makes this book refreshingly different is that play is the unashamed focus.

The book title begins “Ideas for Play” – and there are a wealth of these. As the authors say on the book’s final page: “The emphasis is firmly on play: child-led, open-ended, and full of endless possibility” (p. 91).

The book follows a clear and helpful structure. The main body of the text is structured around six multi-literacies:

- audio and oral;
- gestural; tactile;
- spatial;
- visual; and
- written.

For each multi-literacy, there is a brief explanation, practice example(s) and ideas for play. The ideas for play have three levels of complexity: ‘make a start’, ‘add complexity’ and ‘go all out’. I thought that this was an excellent strategy and meant there was something for everyone: from the most tentative to the most experienced of educators.

The authors have also included some ‘good reads’ based on favourites of their own, and I agree with them that the book Each Peach, Pear, Plum is a worthy mention. In addition to the ‘multi-literacy’ pages, there are some useful initial sections explaining some key play and literacy concepts and concluding pages focusing on “ready for school ... ready for life.”

When I first picked up the book, I recognised many areas of playful interaction and exploration that took me back to my days as a Playcentre supervisor: squishing playdough, building, painting, using puzzles, maps, baking, making music, story-telling, sorting, reading, writing and many others.

However, the book also includes some examples that I did not expect to find; for example, dance, running, jumping, rolling, swinging, climbing, and splashing. I had thought I held a holistic view of learning and realised that it was not holistic enough. The book reminded me to stretch my thinking and apply the theoretical knowledge I had about multi-literacies in a practical sense.

I realised that I had many ‘easy’ traditionalist connections to audio and oral, gestural, visual and written literacies, but not yet accommodated tactile and spatial literacies as strongly. That realisation made me read the text more carefully, and I was grateful for the chance to have this learning.

An example of a section that taught me to make a new insight with literacy was ‘Dig.’ I knew that digging was fun. I remember the delight my three year old daughter experienced returning to Playcentre and digging deeply in just the right place to re-discover the treasure she had buried deeply on her last visit. I remember many collaborative digs to construct flowing rivers and moats. But unless some signs and labels were brought to the sandpit, I probably hadn’t thought of the activity as literacy, though I would have recognised communication as literacy in conversations during and after the digs, learning stories or recounts. Page 46 shares some physical connections to literacy that provide another perspective that I had previously missed:

Digging, scooping and sifting sand is a great exercise in ‘heavy work’ – getting the joints and muscles working hard and providing lots of feedback about positioning in space (proprioceptive input). This helps with knowing how much force to apply with different tools (think of how you use a spade versus a pencil).

What would I question about the book? The introduction notes that “The book is intended as a straightforward
entry to emergent literacy learning in the early years” (p. 7). From an academic point of view the term ‘emergent literacy’ is loaded with connotations that I do not think the authors intended, including that the children are learning to be literate, or emerging as literary individuals. Instead, the position of literacy as social practice is a more useful theoretical stance, and the authors do refer to this elsewhere in the book. Within this construct, it is acknowledged that the very youngest of children are literate, through such early communication as chortles, coos and cries.

The book aims to motivate and inspire and give tools. It achieves that, and it also maintains a strong respect for children's agency and competence. All of the children we work with are literate in many diverse ways, but we can support them in their play to continue to learn. We can also join them in playful literacy experiences and have fun of our own.

Although my youngest is now a strapping teenage young man, I will add a surprise note in a lunch box (p. 85) and we will make a smoothie together (p. 51). I shall share with my 70-year old mother that the walk we took in the rain last week was a literacy activity because:

The surrounding environment is a rich visual resource. Finding authentic ways to explore and connect with the world builds visual literacy, giving children skills to observe or ‘read’ what they see, and offering opportunities for rich conversation about the places, people encountered, and the journey (p. 70).

Who should buy the book? Every centre and every primary school should have a copy for their teachers and another for parents to borrow. Every student teacher should read this book. Copies should be in every public library for parents to access. And every academic who thinks they understand literacy and multiliteracies should have a read and make sure they really do know how to connect theory and practice.

I think the early childhood fairy godmother should ensure that a copy should arrive on the desk of every politician, policy-maker or media presenter who want to justify narrow definitions of literacy, or who suggest that the PISA and PIRLS data justify this. All these groups should read the book to not only learn and get good ideas, but also with a smile as they remember that playful learning is meaningful, fun and joyful.

That is the kind of literacy learning I want my student teachers to be using when on practicum and the kind I want my grandchildren to experience.

7 questions to the two authors: Megan Howell and Emma Smolden.

How long was this book in gestation?

The book has its beginnings in a professional development programme, facilitated by the Educational Leadership Project over 2010 and 2011. After this hands-on experience, we ran a literacy workshop for a number of different Playcentres, which helped us to hone our ideas – teaching can be a great way of clarifying ideas and learning more! Writing the book took around nine months, squeezed in around other projects.

You speak of knowing that play was important to literacy but not having ‘the words’ to describe what you could see. Why do the words matter?

Words absolutely matter. How we frame an idea, how we are able to talk about it with others, to recognise, reflect and deepen our practice of that idea: all this relies on the words that we use. For us, exploring the language of literacy enriched our understanding of how it develops in the early years. It allowed us to appreciate the range of literacy learning that was taking place in our centre, and to have confidence in our practice.

Who needs to be convinced about the connections between play and literacy?

At one level, the connection between play and literacy is a common sense one, handed down culturally through nursery rhymes and pat-a-cake games. Yet, in our communities and in ECE settings today, we see parents who are feeling a need to begin more formal literacy instruction for their preschoolers, as a part of ensuring their children are ‘ready’ for school.

Against that background, we find that both parents and educators need supporting evidence and tools to be confident in taking a play-based approach, to affirm that such an approach is not only credible, but essential.

Can you remember ‘powerful words’ that opened up what you discovered about play and literacy?

There are some words that we use a lot in our workshops
– more important for the ideas that they signify than the words themselves. Examples are:

Understanding literacy as a two-way process of making meaning for ourselves and communicating with others;

Appreciating that literacy is multi-modal, well beyond the traditional ‘reading, writing and arithmetic’

That meaningful literacy experiences are contextual and purposeful – a socially grounded experience with meaning and value for participants well beyond abstract ‘skill and drill’ exercises.

The significance of story to children – with opportunities for them to define and share their own stories as well as experiencing the enriching, imagination-laden possibilities within others’ stories.

The book is beautifully designed – a new focus/a new colour on every page. What was behind the way it is designed?

Design was an integral part of our process from the start, ensuring that the book spoke to readers in multiple ways. After all, multi-modal literacy is as relevant to adults as it is to children. As well as the words, we thought about the visual elements, bringing the book to life by telling stories through images.

We worked out the spatial aspects by using colour, space and unifying elements to create an easy-to-navigate layout that was consistent throughout. Even the tactile quality of the paper was a consideration. We are delighted with the end result.

Our main design aim was to reach families and provide information in a format that many would find inviting, providing inspiration and leads for further readings or ideas. Structuring the book around a range of actions, for example ‘sing’ or ‘scribble’, allowed us introduce a lot of material in a very simple, relaxed way.

New technologies, with whole worlds of information at our finger-tips, in all kinds of media, are changing how we engage with texts. We recognized that for many people – busy parents and educators included – there is limited opportunity to sit and read a book from cover to cover. We wanted a book that would allow people to choose how they would engage – reading from start to finish, or dipping in and out, browsing and revisiting over time.

What was the biggest challenge in researching, writing and publishing the book?

Finding the right structure, pitch and tone to express the deep body of research in a way that is easy to understand, for an audience of parents and educators with widely varying levels of prior knowledge. Once we had the structure, and a framework for describing the many modes of literacy in early childhood, the writing was reasonably straightforward.

You’ve both got careers outside of your lives at Playcentre. What does this book mean to you long term?

Emma – I am currently working for Auckland Playcentres Association as an educator to different centres. I coach sport and volunteer at my children’s school and am looking to return to secondary education in the New Year. The book came into being with so much willing help and support of Playcentre members – past and present. It is a testament to that learning community and their passion for children and play.

Megan – I am still at Playcentre with my young daughter, as well as working part time as a political advisor and lecturing at tertiary level. Writing the book was a great opportunity to clarify my own understanding about an issue I find fascinating, and to gift something lasting to the Playcentre whānau.

“Introduce children to the idea of ephemeral art using natural resources to create a temporary creation. Do this outside or provide pieces of felt or plain cloth to explore and arrange on.” (From p. 69 of Ideas for play: Literacy.)
A tribute to Brian Sutton-Smith (1924-2014)

Sophie Alcock

The internationally esteemed play researcher and academic Brian Sutton-Smith, who died last year as a United States resident, was born and played, as a child growing up, in Wellington. In New Zealand during the stifling 1950s era, Brian challenged existing norms around education, academic protocols, and children’s play. On the international stage, Brian contributed hugely to the subject of children’s play becoming a respected area for academic study.

In *The ambiguity of play* (1997), Brian addresses multiple perspectives that convey the complex, contradictory and cross-disciplinary nature of play. Subject disciplines, such as psychology and education, did not constrain Brian’s broad theorising. Instead he managed to retain a very open appreciation of the ambiguously complex, yet critically important, role of play for humans (and other animals). He has written on many aspects of play from different angles including rough ‘n tumble, organised games and recreational sport, as well as children’s pretend play.

In researching for writing this very short acknowledgement I am struck by Brian’s playfully subversive style in challenging the status quo around understandings of play and related issues. For example, Brian initially failed the university entrance requirements to get into Wellington Teachers College; he had used street language, which was grammatically incorrect, in his essay-writing descriptions of boys playing. In his words “a year later I passed by writing about matters more prissy (2008, p. 82)”. A lifelong friend, Beverley Morris, recalled their time as student teachers and “the minor rebellious activities of Brian, but I agreed with him that playtime was important. He insisted that play is not a sideshow – it is critical to children’s development” (personal communication). Brian’s interest in sports as play fitted with his attraction to teacher training as an avenue for playing football on Wednesday afternoons!

Brian received New Zealand’s first PhD in Education (1954) but also not without bumpy challenges. His thesis was based on detailed observations of the playground games of primary school children. However before embarking on his PhD studies, Brian wrote stories for and about children, based on his childhood memories of play. These were published in the New Zealand School Journal as the series *Our Street* and distributed free to all schools. *Our Street* and the later series, *Smithie does a Bank*, aroused the ire of public authorities and parents because they were real. The children in these stories were not nice English children. They used slang and played in the ways children did when left alone to play on the streets, coastal shore and hills that surround Island Bay, where he grew up, in Wellington, during the 1930s-1940s. But the children he taught, and many others, loved these real-life stories. Censorship of the day ruled and the offending issues of the School Journal were withdrawn from school circulation.

Brian’s PhD took two years to mark because the chairman of the marking committee “seriously objected to my including the disgusting jokes and rhymes that I had discovered children whispered to each other…. He also hated my references to Freud” (2008, p. 88). The upshot was that Brian’s wife, Shirley, retyped his entire thesis removing the authentic voice of children’s slang, and confining all references to Freud and psychoanalytic theory to the Appendices. Incidentally in the 1970s, Shirley and Brian together wrote a guide to parenting called *How to play with your child* (and when not to).

After submitting his PhD thesis in 1952 Brian embarked on a Fulbright scholarship to the United States, where he gave talks based on his playground findings and met a wide range of play-interested people, including folklorists. Interestingly, it was the folklorists around the world whom Brian acknowledged as his greatest academic supporters. Like play, the study of folklore crosses disciplines; it encompasses the very broad study of folk or traditional every-day cultural and social practices including studying the objects and things that people make with hands and words. Folklorists study traditional art and furniture, myths, legends and fairy-tales, games, chants, folk-songs and the area of child-lore.

Brian is remembered in New Zealand through an annual doctoral award instituted in 2007, by The New Zealand Association for Research in Education (NZARE). Interestingly the award is made for ‘an excellent doctoral thesis by an NZARE member’.
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With the courage to research

A tribute to Judith Duncan

Lia de Vocht and Glynne Mackey

In April of this year Professor Judith Duncan passed away after a courageous battle with motor neuron disease. The early childhood community has lost in Judith, a committed researcher, a caring teacher and passionate advocate for children's rights. Judith's career spanned both academia and early childhood teaching. Judith accepted a position as Associate Professor at the University of Canterbury (UC) in 2008. In 2013, at the pinnacle of her career, Judith was appointed to the position of Professor of Early Childhood Education, the first such position at UC. Prior to her shift to Canterbury, Judith was employed as a researcher at the Children's Issues Centre at the University of Otago where she advocated for the rights of children. Judith began her teaching career as a kindergarten teacher in Otago and Southland between 1983-1993.

What comes first to mind when thinking about Judith is her advocacy for young children, their parents and teachers in early years education. Judith’s view of an early childhood teacher was equally about teaching young children and supporting the parents. During her years as a kindergarten teacher she was active in the Kindergarten Teachers Association and the Combined Early Childhood Union of Aotearoa.

At Judith’s memorial celebration in April, 2015, Professor Helen May, her colleague from University of Otago maintained that although Judith was a professor, she always remained a kindergarten teacher. "Her career in academia was shaped by her kindergarten experience during the late 1980's and early 1990's where advocacy for children and families became her foremost concern. Judith fully enacted the spirit of a Froebelian kindergartener that became the hallmark of her teaching, writing and research". When Judith took on an academic role at the Children’s Issues Centre at Otago, theory and practice went hand-in-hand; her experience as a teacher working with disadvantaged families helped inform her research.

Judith wanted teachers to see themselves as researchers. Our early childhood community in Christchurch will continue to hold The Gathering, an annual event that Judith initiated, where teachers talk to other teachers; investigating and researching pedagogy in ways that encourage each other to think in new and different ways and to think about research’ (Judith at the 5th Gathering, 2013).

We, her colleagues and students at the University of Canterbury, benefitted hugely from Judith’s talent for networking and her strong international connections. Academics from around the world visited our university and shared their knowledge with us. Professor Marilyn Fleer from Monash University, Melbourne, was the last visitor that Judith invited, unfortunately Judith passed away just at the time that Marilyn arrived.

Some of Judith’s fields of research are: policy and practice; history and philosophy of early childhood education; teachers and teaching; children’s rights and children’s participation. For many years to come early childhood educators and researchers across the world will be able to access and build on the wealth of research that Judith has

On the occasion of Judith Duncan’s retirement from the University of Canterbury, she is flanked by two other ECE professors: Margaret Carr (Waikato University) and Helen May (University of Otago).
left us, too numerous to mention. For detailed information about her publications we have included access to her UC profile:


One glance at her research outputs shows how Judith had an amazing ability to bring people together and to write collaboratively. Although Judith is no longer with us in person, she lives on in the rich legacy of research, writings, records and published works that she has left us with. Even in the last 16 months of her life, while the illness took most of her physical abilities, Judith completed a large number of publications and reports, achievable only due to her persistence, courage and a stoic attitude.

Professor Lindsey Conner who co-edited a book with Judith ‘Research Partnerships in Early Childhood Education. Teachers and Researchers in Collaboration’ (Authors?2013) shares her experience of working with Judith:

I thoroughly enjoyed working with Judith on our joint edited book on partnerships in research. Judith always upheld her values and what she believed was important, especially in relation to young children and what adults can do to support their development. She also translated this to how she operated as a researcher and author. Her attention to detail, insistence on delving deeper into issues and her extraordinary organizational and networking skills meant that my job as co-editor was made easy. Her strength and commitment to education are portrayed in her numerous publications that will remain as part of her legacy to us.

Judith will not only live on in her writings but also in the students she has guided, mentored and inspired both at undergraduate and post-graduate level. One of Judith’s PhD students, Alison Warren, had this to say:

Judith guided me through my Masters journey and got me started on doctoral study. She was an inspiration and guiding light to me, always down to earth and practical. Judith was generous in the quality and quantity of feedback she gave me, and paid amazing attention to detail. She was always available to me, which I appreciated as a distance student. We had supervision meetings in person in Christchurch and in Nelson, by phone and by Skype, including when she was on sabbatical in Canada. I always knew I was being guided by someone who cared and had faith in me, and she got me through some tough times in my thesis. I miss her immensely, and still find myself thinking “I must ask Judith…”

Shil Bae, who is one of Judith’s Masters students describes how Judith not only mentored her but also the strong relationships Judith built with her postgrad students:

I first met Judith as one of her undergraduate students, and under her ‘gentle’ nudging, I became one of her postgraduate students, a friend and then a part of her family. As an immigrant who has all of my family members living far from here (except my husband), the moment Judith said to me, “You are our family from now” will always stay in a special place in my heart. She did not only share her knowledge and wisdom, but she also opened her heart. Judith was so good at recognising potentials within us, and helped us to go further than we have ever imagined possible for ourselves. She taught us and lived herself that what we do in ECE is so crucial that nothing will do but only our absolute best. One of the best compliments we had as her students was that just by looking at our works and presentation; people can tell that we are Judith’s students, just by high quality and ethic of our work.

For Judith, her career and her close-knit family were never far apart and in her extensive career, especially during her illness she drew strength from her husband, Frank and son, Lucas.
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