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Introduction

What is the role of state education in sustaining identity, language, and culture? What makes the biggest difference – socio-economic status or excellent teaching to educational achievement? What is the role of leadership and planning in education transformation? How has our current education system developed in response to migrant learners? This chapter addresses these questions through exploring the history of Pasifika education. It not only presents a different argument to the socio-economic approach of Chapter Eight, but in doing so, shows you educational debate in action. The focus is on the development of Early Childhood Education (ECE) and school education from the early missionary initiatives in New Zealand-based Pasifika education in the 1850s, to the expansion of curriculum, delivery, education research, policy, and teacher education in more recent times. We show what has happened in New Zealand education for Pasifika learners in broad terms and through a case analysis of Pasifika ECE. This historical overview highlights significant themes associated with Pasifika education and outcomes. It is in this exploration of the distant and recent past that we hope to generate enthusiasm for better education futures. At its core, improving Pasifika education outcomes is about having a high quality New Zealand education system that is equitable, responsive, and empowering to all; playing its key part in developing a strong economy and healthy society.

Pasifika migrant education

The history of the education of Pacific peoples in New Zealand is strongly linked to colonial history. Early contact with the Pacific Islands was often by missionaries. Anglican missionary, George Selwyn, visited New Caledonia, the Loyalty Islands, and Vanuatu in the 1850s. That decade, promising young men from the Melanesian Islands, such as Vanuatu, were brought by Bishop Selwyn to Mission Bay, Auckland. There, at the Melanesian Mission over 18 years, 152 youths were schooled during the
summer. They returned north in autumn because the winter was ‘too cold and too wet for such hot-house plants’ (Armstrong, 1900).

For over 130 years peoples from ‘the South Pacific’ have featured in New Zealand statistics. The 1872 New Zealand census lists 31 people born in the ‘South Sea Islands’. While it is possible some may have been island-born colonials, it is also likely that some were indigenous islanders. 1916 records show that a range of peoples from the Pacific had settled in New Zealand, including 18 Melanesians, 49 Fijians, and 151 others who were ‘undefined’ Polynesians. University and school records show that after the Second World War students from the Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, and Tuvalu attended New Zealand schools and universities. In the 1920s and 1930s a few Cook Island girls attended schools such as Hukarere Maori Girls’ College in Napier. In 1956 Francis Talasasa graduated with a Bachelor of Arts from Canterbury University - the first Solomon Islands to receive a degree. One year later, Fanaafi Ma’ia’i graduated from a New Zealand university - the first Pacific Island woman to do so. In 1988, Albert Wendt took up a professorship of English at the University of Auckland, the first person of Pacific ancestry to hold a professorial chair in New Zealand.

Government initiatives have been crucial to Pasifika student population growth in New Zealand. For example, from 1963 the government offered scholarships to Tokelau, helping 186 students to study in New Zealand between 1963 and 1982. Although there was an expectation for the students to return, most remained in New Zealand after their education. Secondary scholarships led to a few Solomon Islanders coming to New Zealand in the 1960s. Migrant families hosted Solomon Islands university students, who, in turn, taught Melanesian kastom (tradition) to their New Zealand-born children. From a wider perspective, the New Zealand government introduced a labour scheme for peoples of some Pacific nations in the 1970s. This allowed some people to work in New Zealand on 11-month contracts. Some settled permanently, attracting further migration, and ensuring the growth of New Zealand-born populations of Pacific ancestry. Education was one, amongst several reasons, behind a decision to migrate. Financial, health, political, and environmental reasons also featured. Targeted education opportunities drove some visits and migration patterns, which in turn, influenced the growth of Pacific nation culture and community education in New Zealand.

School districts came to reflect the ways in which migrants from the Pacific tended to live in the same districts of New Zealand. The New Zealand Tongan population, is one example. Taumoefolau (2007) describes how the 1990s saw a shift of the Tonga population, which was concentrated in central Auckland, to south Auckland. This was, in part, due to inner-city
rental houses being sold and renovated, forcing tenants to find cheaper housing further out. The two areas of concentration were Otara and Mangere, where some of the biggest Tongan churches were built. Other notable concentrations were in the Auckland suburbs of Grey Lynn, Glen Innes, Otahuhu, Onehunga, Mt Albert, Mt Roskill, and Avondale, and in the Waitakere suburbs of New Lynn, Henderson, and Massey. In 2001, 80 percent of Tongans were living in the Auckland region. Wellington was the second largest settlement area, with 5 percent of the Tongan population. The largest Tongan community in the South Island in 2001 was in Christchurch, with 770 or 2 percent of all Tongan people in New Zealand. Pasifika education initiatives were able to be localised due to settlement patterns.

**Culture and language**

In some cases, the New Zealand-based populations have come to outnumber the population base in the Pacific nations themselves. This means that New Zealand-based populations represent a critical mass for the preservation and advancement of some Pacific cultures. One example is that of Niue. In 2003, Niue's government estimated its population to be 1,700 (others suggested it was 1,300). By comparison, in New Zealand in 1991, there were 14,424 Niue people; this rose to 22,476 by 2006 - 75 percent were New Zealand born and disproportionately young (approximately 41 percent were under 15 in the 2000s). The New Zealand Niue population rarely returns to the atoll, and remittances, so important to island relatives, have recently declined. Significantly, those born in New Zealand use English as their first language. So the preservation of language has become a priority. Since 1983 some New Zealand schools have had Niue language materials. Early childhood centres and primary schools offered Niue language programmes by the 1990s. Guidelines for the use of Niue language in the New Zealand curriculum were launched in 2003. It remains however that English is increasingly the language spoken by New Zealand Niueans. 28 percent spoke their heritage language in 2001 down from 32 percent in 1996. Retaining the language depended on the New Zealand Niue population learning and using it. Schools were been identified as having a key role to play. The Niue Foundation was established to address community fears that the language might disappear, even from Niue. Since 2001 the Foundation has lobbied for government resources to promote language and culture. The case for support for language education links with questions around constitutional rights associated with the special relationship between New Zealand, Niue, and indeed several Pacific nations (Ministry of Justice, 2000).
Many cultural values and practices (including language) have been maintained through community-based education. Some are under threat and steps have been taken in response. For example, community-based education, for students from Papua New Guinea, is maintained through online technologies. While there are hundreds of languages spoken in Papua New Guinea, the New Zealand group communicates in Pidgin. In the early 2000s an online chat room (PNG Wantoka [friends] in New Zealand) was established.

A further example is Fijian culture in New Zealand. While Fijian, Fiji Hindi and English are the main languages of Fiji, settlement in New Zealand limits these languages, especially among recent younger migrants and new Zealand-born Fijians. There have been some efforts to promote language classes for Fijian children, but, as a small population group, the life of the languages depends upon family use, maintaining contacts with Fiji, and community-based media. Indo-Fijians have their own media services, including radio, newspapers, and internet. Fijians also have slots on community access radio.

The Fiji experience signals the way in which migrant populations have, overtime, developed both shared and diverse approaches to language and culture education. The Cook Islands community has had a long-term acceptance of collective identity in New Zealand as well as maintaining island, village, and district affiliations. A national focus on Cook Island language education resulted in the development of a Cook Islands language curriculum for New Zealand. This was launched in 2004. The Atiu, Pukapuka, and Manihiki communities have each built community halls in Mangere and at Cannons Creek, Porirua. A specialist Pukapukan publisher, Mataaliki Press, prints children’s books in the Pukapuka language.

The New Zealand Tongan community also experienced language loss from the 1980s to 2000s, and has taken action to reverse the trend. As the number of Tongans born in New Zealand increased, the number who spoke Tongan slowly declined - from 63 percent in 1996 to 60 percent in 2001 (Taumoefolau, 2007). Many Tongans believed that, without their language, people lose their identity, and that to develop anga faka-Tonga (the Tongan way) the language must be a feature of children’s upbringing, education, and socialisation. Not surprisingly, since the 1980s, the Tongan community has set up early childhood centres based on Kohanga reo (language nest) principles, to enable young Tongan children to use the language. In 2004 a draft curriculum for Tongan language was produced for ECE, and primary and secondary schools.
**Being PI in NZ**

Many of those from Pacific nation ancestry who are New Zealand-born students take on the ‘PI’ (Pacific Island) identity (Anae, 2007). This is a combination of traditions and community expectations, with contemporary urban society, music, international fashions, and lifestyles. The PI identity is adopted mainly by younger, New Zealand-born people of Pacific ancestry, who feel a greater bond with one another from a breadth of nation groups, than do their island-born elders. Reinforced by inclusive PI groupings in schools and institutions, the PI identity offered a broader identity than the single nation. It also offered a larger peer group, more easily adopted by those not comfortable in traditional languages or cultures (Anae, 2007). The term PI was about finding and making identity at a time of an evolving and sometimes confusing experience of migrant history. Those who are New Zealand born would be challenged by their own communities for behaving too much like Europeans; for being ‘coconuts’. Wider New Zealand seemed to expect New Zealand-born people of Pacific heritage to be ‘fresh off the boat’ (‘FOBs’). Taking on the PI identity offered both security of identity and confusion.

By the 1970s, the PI group name had expanded to include names such as Pasifika, Pasefika, and Pacific. The Ministry of Education adopted ‘Pasifika’ as a collective term when Pacific communities discussed and set up the Anau Ako Pasifika project, government funded between 1996 and 2000. Parents were visited by home tutors who offered advice and support for home-based ECE, and help for Pacific families to access other necessary services that enabled them to participate fully in New Zealand society. In 2008, the Ministry of Education continued a tradition of using ‘Pasifika’ to refer to New Zealanders of Pacific heritage. This showed Government investment in Pasifika education. Its classification of Pacific Islanders/ Pasifika/ Pasefika/ Pacific drew each member group into this wider identity.

From the 1990s onwards, there was debate about the use of an encompassing term, when there are distinct population needs, such as ESOL skills, language preservation, and home-school relations. In the 1990s, Samu (1998), and Sasao & Sue (1993), argued for greater consideration of the holistic context in which identity is formed and expressed, and for the interaction between school and home, fanau and individual, spiritual and secular dimensions. By 2008, there was a call for the ‘untangling’ of Pasifika population cohorts in New Zealand (Airini, Anae & Schaar, forthcoming). This meant looking more closely at the inter- and intra-ethnic dimensions of the diverse groupings and identities of Pasifika peoples in New Zealand (see Anae et al, 2001).
In the New Zealand Tongan community, three main types of Tongans were identified (Taumoefolau, 2007): Those raised in anga faka-Tonga and still maintaining their language. Second were New Zealand-born with decreasing knowledge of the language and anga faka-Tonga. The third group were those who identified themselves with all ‘Pacific Islanders’. Taumoefolau (2007) suggests that, in creating an identity that is generically Polynesian, New Zealand-born Tongans tended to develop and learn a distinctive brand of English that was often mixed with smatterings of their heritage tongue. Pacific Islanders found community in those aspects of history that were shared, especially the experience of migration, and the earlier historical impact of the arrival of Europeans and the missionaries. This provided the sense of community and solidarity that their own group did not give. Yet, many New Zealand-born Tongans still retained the ability to ‘switch’ (Taumoefolau, 2007); to move in traditional ways of being, particularly in their churches and at community gatherings.

By the 2000s, separate Pacific ethnicities began to demand their own recognition in education research, statistics, and funding. The all-inclusive Pacific Island framework in New Zealand education began to replaced by a duality – the use of a collective term (PI, Pasifika, Pasefika, Pacific) for convenience, plus the use of separate identities (e.g. Samoan, Tongan, Cook Island and Niue) in policy, data, and research. Fundamentally this duality was also one in which ‘PI’ also lived – having both solidarity with all those with Pacific-nation ancestry, yet also a core connection to one’s own particular ancestry.

**Being Pasifika and not being Maori**

There is an acknowledgment by many Pasifika peoples of the tangata whenua status of Maori, and the protection of Maori rights under the Treaty of Waitangi. It affirms the teina-tuakana relationship of Pasifika peoples and Maori in Aotearoa New Zealand. This relationship between Pasifika and Maori is dynamic. The term ‘PI’, for example, was to be a reference point for both Pasifika and Maori. The breadth of the PI groupings and sense of relatedness meant that ‘PI’ embraced young Maori as well, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s (Anae, 2007). Maori revivalism in the 1970s, however, led to the separation of Maori from the PI group, with PI culture emerging as the focus of identity for non-Maori Polynesians.

Throughout the 1990s, education policy tended to combine Maori and Pasifika. However their education experience and outcomes did vary – both between Maori and Pasifika, and within each of these groups so that initiatives were needed that responded differently to the two groups. By the 2000s, Government strategies in education actively distinguished
between Maori and Pasifika. See for example the Tertiary Education Strategy: 2007-2012; The Pasifika Education Plan; Ka Hikitia- Managing for Success. The Maori education strategy 2008-2012. Demographic trends meant that Maori and Pasifika were no longer automatically coupled and there was an increasing focus on the Asian populations. (Chapter Six discusses the migrant experience of people from Asia in greater detail).

‘[Education] leadership should reflect the makeup of communities as well as the reality of New Zealand within the South Pacific, greater representation of Maori, Asian, and Pacific Peoples will require specific strategies to recruit a culturally diverse workforce and then to retain them in the face of an increasing range of career opportunities. At present all three ethnic groups are under-represented among teachers especially at leadership levels’ (Durie, 2006).

If New Zealand were to thrive through the educational success of some, then it would have to strive for the educational success of all.

What makes a difference?

Socio-economic status

Despite a raft of education initiatives since the 1970s, there is an extreme degree of inequality in the New Zealand education system (Hattie, 2003). In the 1980s, Ramsay, Sneddon, Grenfell and Ford (1981) warned that ‘tomorrow may be too late’, in addressing the academic achievement of Pasifika students. Surveys from the past 25 years have shown that the educational achievement of the bottom 25 percent is worsening (Hattie, 2003). These students are still achieving below national norms (Flockton & Crooks, 2005). However, in the 2000s, many Pasifika students in South Auckland’s evidence-based reading programmes started to show success (see McNaughton, MacDonald, Amituanai-Toloa, Lai & Farry, 2006).

Hattie argued in 2003, that, if low socio-economic status was the problem, then students grouped by ethnicity (e.g. ‘Pasifika’) and who come from similar socio-economic backgrounds would perform similarly. He found, however, that the difference in reading in decile 1 to decile 10 schools is still present even when socio-economic background is held constant. This means that the differences between Pasifika and Pakeha are as great within a decile as they are between the highest and lowest decile. A focus on social-economic status in solving Pasifika underachievement will not help. Instead, Hattie and others argue that the evidence points more to the relationships between teachers and Pasifika students as the major issue. It is a matter of cultural relationships, not socio-economic resources as these differences occur at all levels of socio-economic status (Bishop, 2002).
Teachers and teaching

Recent studies have investigated the variance in student achievement (Alton-Lee, 2003; Hattie, 1999). They identify the proportional influences attributable to students, the curricula, policy, the principal, school climate, the teacher, the various teaching strategies, and the home. According to Hattie (2003), teaching is one source of variance that can be enhanced with the greatest potential of success in relation to Pasifika education outcomes:

> It is highly likely that we have not engaged Pasifika students in schooling, not belonging to the school climate, and we have not encouraged them to gain a reputation as learners within [the New Zealand] school system – regardless of socio-economic background. Maybe we have known about this lack of engagement for a long time, but we have explained it away as something to do with home and the parents, and thrown more money at the schools. Instead, we need to strategically resolve who we are. It is we, the teachers, and we need to ask how teachers can better “relate” to students from different cultures, and we all need to esteem culturally rich schools and not bewail the problem as something to do with ... students – it is not the problem of the students.

Leadership Through Initiatives

A number of events and initiatives have taken place which have provided leadership in Pasifika education. These fall within five categories of initiatives, small and large, theoretical and practical, which are part of Pasifika education history. At their best they show a wide approach has been taken to finding education solutions to unlock Pasifika potential. However, the range, pace, scope, duration, and evidence-base of the initiatives suggest a need for greater coherency, collaboration, and leadership.

1. Create coherent national strategic plans

In 1996 Ko e Ako 'a e Kakai: Pasifika Pacific Islands People's Education in Aotearoa, New Zealand was launched. The Plan was a first step in developing Pacific Islands education within the Ministry. It aimed to lift the achievement levels of Pacific Islands students and provide a framework through which Pacific Islands education became a core function of the Ministry. In 2001 First Pasifika Education Plan (Ministry of Education, 2001) was published. Its task was to coordinate all policies
designed to improve education outcomes for Pasifika peoples. This is followed by further *Pasifika Education Plan* launches in 2006 and 2008.

2. *Develop enabling policy*

In 1992, the New Zealand Curriculum Framework (NZCF) (1993) included one page on 'Languages and Languages' saying Pacific languages may be used as the medium of instruction in schools. Following this, Pacific language curriculum statements were developed in Samoan (1996), Cook Islands (2004), Vagahau Niue (2007), and Tongan (2007).

Between 1999-2001 a sector-wide approach ('Closing the Gaps') was implemented to improve Pasifika outcomes. As a result there has been some improvement in education performance for Pasifika along with a range of new initiatives and associated research initiatives. During 2000 the Pacific Teacher Supply strategy was implemented. 115 TeachNZ scholarships worth $10,000 each are allocated to encourage Pacific graduates and non-graduates to undertake teacher training.

In 2002, the National Diploma in Teaching (ECE Pasifika) (Level 7) was registered on the National Qualifications Framework in order to promote choice in early childhood teacher education and a new National Diploma was created. In 2004, The Secretary of Education, Howard Fancy, refocused policy direction when he stated that Pasifika underachievement is 'not because they are less able but rather because the system fails to do as well as it should with these students. Too often educators and others make judgements based more on the background of Pasifika students and their characteristics than they do on their learning potential. Too often policy makers and educators pay insufficient attention to home and cultural factors...[I]t is obvious that change must happen in the classroom and at home' (Ministry of Education, 2003).

The Secretary's reference to 'insufficient attention to home and cultural factors' and his insistence that change occur in the home as well as at school draws attention to theoretical and policy tensions between a 'home must change' approach on the one hand and a 'teacher and school effectiveness approach on the other'. See for example, John Hattie, 2003; and Russell Bishop, 2002, who advocate changes to teacher interactions with students and Roy Nash and Roger Openshaw (both discussed in Chapter Eight) who consider the socio-economic context of the home as the major influence.

3. *Promote Pasifika knowledge creation*

In 2001 the first *Pasifika Education Research Guidelines and Literature Review* on Pacific education were published. These reports were commissioned by
the Ministry of Education as part of the *Pasifika Education Plan 2001*. They identified current and future research about Pasifika education. The Aoga Faasamoa was announced by the Government in 2004. It is one of six new Centres of Innovation which will be used to build a strong research base to inform and develop models of best teaching practice. Established in 2004, this centre had become an exemplar for Pasifika-medium centres that would follow. In 2007 over 40 Pasifika education researchers from seven universities and consultancies and representatives from seven government agencies met for the *Is Your Research Making a Difference to Pasifika Education?* symposium. This was the first stage in the development of guidelines for stronger links between research and policy for improved Pasifika education outcomes.

4. *Inspire and mobilise collectively*

The *Pacific Vision* conference took place in 1999. It was hosted by the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (MPIA). Over 700 people attended to define a vision for Pacific peoples in New Zealand and suggest a blueprint for Government to take Pacific peoples forward. This is followed in 2000 by the *Pacific Capacity Building Strategy* which was launched by the Coalition Government to reduce the social and economic inequalities for Pacific Peoples in education, health, housing and employment by building their capacity for self-reliance. The MPIA, with over 30 Government agencies and departments, worked in eight regions to develop regional programmes of action to help Pacific communities achieve their self identified goals and vision. Over 5000 Pacific peoples were involved. In 2001, the regional Programmes of Action was presented to Cabinet for consideration. Cabinet approved all the recommendations; 80 percent of which can be actioned immediately. In 1999 the Pasifika Nations Education Association (PNEA) was established following an inaugural conference for all Pasifika teachers and educators from ECE to tertiary education as well as those working in or with an interest in Pasifika education.

5. *Unlock Pasifika potential through ECE/school and training iniatives*

The inaugural Auckland Secondary Schools Maori and Pacific Islands Cultural Festival was hosted by Hillary College, Otara, in 1976. Five schools took part. By 2002, the Auckland Secondary Schools Maori and Pacific Islands Cultural Festival, hosted by Tangaroa College, required five stages at the Manukau Velodrome to accommodate the large number of participating schools. In 1999, Professor Konai Helu-Thaman, a leading Pacific educationalist, suggested to educators at the *Innovations for Effective Schooling* conference, Wellington that it was time to stop seeing culture as a
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'barrier' to everything but to regard it as a potential source for solutions to improved teaching and learning.

In 2000, the Ministry of Education established the cluster of all the schools in Mangere and Otara (Ministry of Education, 2000) to focus strongly on developing early literacy skills. Later that year the Government launched the Pacific English Language and Literacy initiative aimed at improving teacher capability in teaching English as a second language. Fifty primary and secondary Pacific teachers from thirty schools in the Auckland region receive scholarships to assist with costs for a Diploma of Teaching English to speakers of Other Languages (DipTESSOL).

**Case Study: Pasifika ECE**

The history of Pasifika early childhood education in Aotearoa New Zealand originates in the 1970s, when Pasifika women became responsible for the establishment and continued existence of early childhood education centres. These consisted mainly of playgroups (Mara, 2005). The development of Pacific Islands 'language nests' followed soon after. The name 'language nest' was given because they focussed on cultural beliefs and values that are preserved through language. The underlying philosophy was that the child will 'learn to socialise in the child’s first language’ (Ete, 1993, p. 90). According to Burgess (1990, cited in Ete, 1993) two thirds of Pacific Island language nests were managed and governed through the local churches by church ministers and their wives. The church offered their facilities, leadership expertise, and most importantly, their voluntary services. The active involvement of the church meant that spiritual aspects and religious practices, considered of great importance, were deemed crucial to the development and growth of the child (Mara, 2005; Podmore & Sauvao, 2003; Mara, Foliaki & Coxon, 1994; Ete, 1993).

**ECE and Pasifika aspirations**

Pasifika parents migrated to New Zealand with aspirations for their children (Macpherson, 2004). The parents preferred an early childhood setting that would be caring, secure and incorporating discipline, routines, and rules that take into account similar features of those of the home environment. Pasifika parents believed that cultural values shaped the way children of Pacific Island migrants learn (Schoeffel et al., 1996). According to Mapa, Sauvao & Podmore (2000) first language development and a cultural identity were seen by Pasifika parents as being important for their children:

One of the major reasons why Pacific Islanders set up Pacific Island early education centres in New Zealand was the desire of Pacific Island parents that their children have equal opportunities to
education like any other New Zealand child who attends kindergartens ... thus giving the child a chance to socialise and experience all the early childhood educational activities (Ete, 1993, p. 90).

In the mid 1980s, New Zealand underwent major educational reform in its provision for early childhood education and care (Codd & Openshaw, 2005). These reforms allowed diverse philosophies and cultures in New Zealand under the rubric of the neoliberal choice. (For a detailed discussion of the neoliberal reforms in education see Scott Ray’s Chapter Two). The development of the national early childhood curriculum *Te Whariki* (Ministry of Education, 1996), explicitly acknowledged the special relationship that Pasifika people have with New Zealand. The Pasifika education sector had been represented in the consultation and drafting of the early childhood strategic plan *Nga Huarahi Arataki* (Ministry of Education, 2002). This resulted in specific outcomes for Pasifika within each of the three goals of the strategic plan. During this time the Pasifika early childhood sector continued to develop in a dynamic environment, notable for its ‘changing political ideologies, changing education policies, regulations reviews and new curriculum developments’ (Mara, 2005, p. 2).

**Diverse Pasifika Early Childhood Education Services**

Meade, Puhipuhi, and Foster-Cohen (2003) have identify three broad categories with which Pasifika early childhood education services have been associated over time:

*Category One: Parent-education home tutoring.* Anau Ako Pasifika, is a parent education-home tutoring programme which targets disadvantaged parents. It provides services such as regular home visits, home tutors who work alongside parents and families to assist with the transition of children from the home to an early childhood service. *Category Two: Licence-exempt Pasifika Early Childhood Groups (PECGs).* PECGs were funded by the Early Childhood Development (ECD). These licence-exempt groups are operated by parents and extended families with support and advice from Pasifika Co-ordinators. *Category Three: Licensed and chartered Pasifika Education and Care Centres (PECCs).* Pasifika communities invested in PECCs because they are unique in their potential for maintaining Pasifika languages and cultures. As early as 1999, there were 52 licensed and chartered Pacific EC Centres (Samoa, Cook Islands, Niue, Tonga, Tuvalu, Mixed).

Demand from Pasifika communities led to the development of organisations such as Aoga Amata Training Centre (Ete, 1993), Pacific Islands Education Resource Centre, Anau Ako Pasifika, Pacific Islands Early Childhood Council of Aotearoa (PIECCA) (Meade, Puhipuhi, &
Foster-Cohen, 2003), Kautaha Aoga Niue, Te Punanga o te reo Kuki Airani, SA'ASIA (Sosaiete Aoga Amata Samoa i Aotearoa Incorporated). Each of these continues to play a supporting role within the Pasifika early childhood sector (Mara, 2005). In addition, demand continues for English-medium ECE Centres, especially where the teachers are responsive to Pasifika cultural interests.

**Teacher education**

Alongside English-medium teacher education, alternative programmes were developed which offered the opportunity to undertake teacher training through Pasifika approaches and models. In 1998 the Pacific Islands Early Childhood Care Association (PIECCA) Diploma (level 5) was launched to provide initial teacher education for Pasifika ECE teachers consistent with government standards. Two years later, the first level 7 Pasifika teaching qualification was launched. The DipTchg(ECE)-PI (a level 7 qualification requirement) commenced at the former Auckland College of Education. This qualification too, was consistent with new Government standards. Also in 2001, the Government developed unit standards for a Pacific Diploma of Teaching (ECE) qualification. The National Diploma in Teaching (ECE Pasifika) (Level 7) was registered on the National Qualifications Framework in 2002. In 2003, Te Tari Puna Ora o Aotearoa/ New Zealand Childcare Association and AUT University provided the National Diploma of Teaching (ECE, Pasifika).

The University of Auckland, in 2007, launched the first degree with a specialisation in Pasifika ECE. A unique feature of the degree was that over ten of the courses are named in Pacific nation languages. The following year AUT University established a degree in Pasifika ECE.

**Challenges**

Pasifika early childhood services have faced challenges in their establishment and delivery. These include: Firstly, changes in decision-making about teacher qualifications. Secondly, the absence of a Pasifika languages education policy that could provide for children who complete Pasifika-medium ECE and then enter primary school (most often in an English-only language environment). Thirdly, the need for teacher education programmes that cater for Pasifika communities and their aspirations and that ensure Pasifika peoples are present at every level of decision-making. Fourthly, Pasifika ECE teachers work in restricted or poor conditions with minimal pay and compete with English-medium early childhood centres for quality teachers. Fifthly, there is a lack of mentor-supervisors to aid teacher registration, and finally, there is a need for language-specific resources. Mara (2005) strongly recommends the
support of an effective association to shoulder some of the administrative burdens placed upon Pasifika early childhood teachers so they can focus on the job of teaching children.

**Conclusion**

An important reason for recalling past events is to identify significant themes and trends so that the tasks ahead might be more readily identified. Four themes are identified in this chapter.

*Sustaining identity, language, and culture*

Although the ideal learning outcomes for Pasifika learners is yet to be agreed upon (and there is some question about whether that would ever be possible), the recent history of New Zealand does give some indication. The *Schooling Strategy 2005-2010* has recognised the fulfilment of potential as a central medium term goals for education *(Ministry of Education, 2005)*. *Secondary Futures* identifies 'Students First' as one fundamental value for education in New Zealand. Students' dreams and talents are also recognised as pivotal to education, to be placed at the centre of learning and educational systems. These strategies promote a discourse of inclusion where cultural identity is defined more in terms of potential than difference. This could encourage students of Pacific nation ancestry to connect to their identity, language and culture. They may enter the world of their Pasifika communities with ease, converse in languages of their communities, and to learn whether informally or formally, Pasifika imagery, humour, respect and traditions.

However, the challenge for the *Schooling Strategy 2005 – 2010* will be to agree on the extent of responsibility from either the state on the one hand, and the family and community on the other, for education pertaining to the language and culture of each group.

*Inspiring teachers*

The inspirational teacher is concerned with addressing disparities and boosting success in the New Zealand curriculum through recognising the potential of Pasifika students. The challenge is to provide these expert teachers in every New Zealand classroom and education setting.

*Leadership and planning*

As you can see from the initiatives described in this chapter, the range of developments by government, education institutions, communities, researchers, and individuals is considerable. While some attempt has been made to put a planning framework on these (such as through the updating
of the *Pasifika Education*), the initiatives still show a need for greater coherence. This, in turn, suggests greater levels of collaboration between parties involved in Pasifika education, such as in education researchers, policy developers, teacher educators, teacher professional developers, and resource developers.

Leadership is needed to develop this coherent framework and engage the different parties in collaborative activities. In the past, leaders have developed through serendipity or emerged at times of crisis. Pasifika education development requires a more proactive approach to leadership for the next phase of Pasifika education reform.

**Pasifika-medium modes**

The development of Pasifika ECE as a medium for language maintenance and quality early childhood education was a significant move in Pasifika education. The focus on ECE suggests a commitment to strengthening communities of New Zealanders of Pacific ancestry by beginning in early years. The opportunity to take part in Pasifika-medium ECE contributes to some growth in school-based bilingual education. The very practice of Pasifika-medium ECE has brought the education sector and Pasifika communities in direct contact as never before.

New Zealand education has historically been the means for newcomers to realise their aspirations. Chapter One described 19th century migrants. Chapter Six looked at recent migrants. Common to all, including Pasifika, is the central place of education as a means for successful individuals, strong communities, and a progressive society.
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