CHAPTER 2

A rapid history of early childhood education in Aotearoa New Zealand

Sue Stover

Introduction

While the history of early childhood education in Aotearoa New Zealand can be understood to start in the 1880s with the opening of the first kindergarten, the drivers for this historic process have rarely been purely educational. Across its 100+ years of history, early childhood education's forms and purposes reflect how groups and individuals have understood their world, and how they have responded to technological innovations and social upheaval. Said another way – early childhood education is shaped by constantly shifting social contexts.

Our launching point for this history is the late 1980s; Part 1 of this chapter covers those chaotic years when, by virtue of research, advocacy and political activity, a sector of education called 'early childhood' became a political and social reality. Part 2 pushes further back into history to consider the evolution of the services which predate the sector. Part 3 jumps forward to the 1990s when the sector slowly professionalised, and Part 4 concludes the chapter with brief consideration of some of the challenges arising from the sector's rapid expansion.

Part 1: Creating a sector called 'early childhood education'

Although childcare was often regarded as the inferior service, it was the demand for childcare, coupled with the unexpected growth of Te Kōhanga Reo which precipitated a policy and funding crisis for the newly elected Labour government in 1984 (May Cook, 1985). Major changes had been promised. As the lobbying and the politicking began, so did the creative and collective (as well as coercive) process of uniting the services into a sector called 'early childhood education'. At the time, what existed was a powerful, often competitive collection of community groups and national organisations – each with its own history and identity – providing services to families. Some groups saw themselves as educating young children, but many had broader agendas; for example, community mental health; support for working women; the renaissance of Māori tikanga and Te Reo. Government involvement varied considerably with funding following different formulas depending on the service (Meade, 1999).

When they came, the changes were driven from inside the Prime Minister's office where a young academic, Anne Meade, convened a working group to chart the course of reform. It was significant that Anne Meade was closely connected with women's groups which had been actively lobbying for equitable systems of funding for early childhood services. It was also significant that the Prime Minister – David Lange – was closely aligned with the process because it marked a sea change in how childcare, in particular, was seen. As Anne Meade later wrote, 'If the Prime Minister acknowledged the value of childcare, perhaps it was all right?' (Meade, 1990: 104).

This inclusion of childcare as part of 'early childhood education' was a key shift in thinking and set the scene for pulling together the diverse early childhood services.

Uniting the sector was a formidable task. In the late 1980s, the dominant service was public kindergarten. Regarded as the preschool of choice for three- and four-year-old children, it had created a teaching service parallel to the public school system. However, the kindergarten service was already being remodelled. Kindergarten colleges had closed in the 1970s, and then an 'early childhood education' qualification replaced kindergarten-specific training in teachers colleges. This meant instead of focusing on play-based sessional education of three and four year olds at kindergartens, the new training programmes included training for full-day programmes, as well as the care and education of infants and toddlers (Shaw, 2006). A teaching force that could work across multiple services was developing.

Outside the tertiary sector, with a training programme and a strong national presence alongside a resilient community base, playcentres were the second-most prolific form of early education. They had expanded exponentially during the previous 40 years on the back of voluntary effort of parents – usually mothers. With their emphasis on parent and child learning together, playcentres were a fertile site for 'progressive' education, emphasising experiential and community education. But while Playcentre had captured the optimistic spirit of post-war New Zealand, its popularity also reflected its adaptability to local facilities and resources. In the upheavals of the late 1980s, many of these facilities, especially small and isolated ones, faced closure because of their inability to meet the impending minimum standards (such as having hot water and sufficient toilets) (Stover, 2003).

Like Playcentre, Te Kōhanga Reo had a broader brief than the education of young children; its commitment was to the renaissance of Māori tikanga and Te Reo (Tangaere, 1997). A relatively new phenomenon, Te Kōhanga Reo had begun in 1982 with close links to the Department of Māori Affairs. Tapping into the extraordinary energy for tikanga and Te Reo, Te Kōhanga Reo had already experienced heady growth but also major headaches as it grappled with limited resources and training, alongside high expectations. In fact, May Cook (1985) maintained that what forced the government to tackle the perplexing issue of the place of government in children's early years was the unexpected popularity of Te Kōhanga Reo. The 399 kōhanga that opened in the first three years overstretched the government's childcare budget.

All of these services – public kindergarten, Playcentre and Te Kōhanga Reo – each had a national body and distinct identity. In contrast, the service generically known as 'childcare' was a highly diverse collection of distinct centres and services with limited co-ordination and no united national presence. Its progress as a service was 'spasmodic and unco-ordinated' (Smith and Swain, 1988: 65).

These services included:

- home-based care and education programmes
- privately owned kindergartens and preschools
- 'language nests'

- community-run and 'shoppers'' crèches
- full-day workplace childcare.

Some offered programmes that reflected distinct philosophies such as Montessori, Steiner or Christian-based education. Some catered for specific cultural groups, especially within Pacific Island communities (Morgan, 1993; Leavasa-Tautolo, 2004).

Umbrella groups for childcare had formed and disappeared. The most enduring was the New Zealand Childcare Association (NZCA) founded by the charismatic Sonja Davies in 1963. Showing tenacious energy and vision, its leadership advocated for higher-quality provision in the face of widespread poor practice and managed to survive despite combining diverse groups: private and community operators; workers and employers. But many childcare centres were beyond the influence of the NZCA and their operations remained at basic level (May, 2003a).

The blueprint for uniting this sector came from Anne Meade and the working party that she convened. Their report – the 'Meade Report' (Early Childhood Care and Education Working Group, 1988) shaped, but was not fully represented in, the resulting policy document *Before Five* (Department of Education, 1989). However, in the *Before Five* reforms which followed, the building stones of regulation and control were carefully constructed. Licensing was required if more than four (non-family) children were regularly attending, thus effectively outlawing 'backyard care'. The standards for early childhood premises and equipment were set; funding was to be equitable. Raising the qualifications for teachers was foreshadowed.

These events in the late 1980s marked the start of the government-crafted sector designed for the control, delivery and support of early childhood care and education for families. But the sector – even before it was a sector – has its origins much earlier.

Part 2: The impulse to educate and care for children

Beginning points are tricky – for any beginning point, there is always a back story. Very young children were learning and being educated before the arrival of English colonists in the early nineteenth century, which led to mission schools that included very young children (May, 2005). For privileged families, there were nannies, governesses and nursemaids to help rear and educate children. For the unfortunate, there were orphanages (Kedgley, 1996). And independent of official structures, families created systems of 'backyard' childcare with family and neighbours (May Cook, 1985).

But a good starting point for understanding the impulse for early childhood education is a series of events in Dunedin. In the 1880s the country was moving out of recession as the land wars subsided, the railways system allowed for easier movement, and the chaotic commerce of the Otago gold rush helped establish Dunedin as a centre for manufacturing. In 1889, Dunedin was a city where poverty and affluence were in close proximity; where the young children of poorly paid working mothers were visible on the streets. The country's first crèche committee had started in Dunedin in 1879 but disappeared without establishing a viable service. However, the abysmal conditions for women and children still existed a decade later. Galvanised by the public concern about 'baby farming' in the wake of prosecution and execution of Minnie Dean for the murder of infants in her care (Hood, 1994; May, 1997), another Dunedin committee, this time under the charismatic leadership of the Rev. Rutherford Wardell managed to open a service. It was a service with multiple agendas, including the health and well-being of the children, their education and the education of their mothers (Duhn, 2009). What the committee established was a kindergarten which employed a German-trained kindergarten teacher.

But it can also be understood as the country's first childcare centre and was a very public act of charity and concern for the poor.

A similar Christian impulse of concern for children of the poor gave rise to another public act of charity in Wellington when, in 1903, Mother Suzanne Aubert and her Sisters of Compassion established not only the facilities to care for orphans and the children of working mothers, but also a soup kitchen and hospital for 'incurables' (May, 1997; Smith and Swain, 1988). Aubert operated with very little government support and used her considerable skill at fundraising to keep her many programmes operating. She also wrote at length about the spiritual and practical care of young children: 'Let the Sisters always keep an open eye on the children, not in the manner of gaolers, but in the manner of Guardian Angels who love those entrusted to them, guide them, instruct them and attend to them' (Sisters of Compassion, n.d.: 1). Her respectful approach to children and their parents helped to set a standard amongst those who cared to read and to listen. However, even the efforts of Aubert and her sisters could not make childcare socially acceptable.

Over the next 80 years, other childcare centres operated in church facilities, community halls and private homes, but use of childcare remained suspect. Childcare was seen as evidence of poverty, or parental neglect, or both. Another 'baby-farming' scandal gave rise to regulations in 1960 (Meade and Podmore, 2002); childcare continued to be seen as a form of welfare.

In contrast, kindergartens quickly became a nationally recognised educational service. Initially its impetus sprang from the mystical Christian writings of Friedrich Froebel, who believed in the unity of all things. His goal was to 'bring children to the understanding that everything in the universe stands in relation to God' (Kuschner, 2001: 276). Over a period of 20 years, he designed 'gifts' using balls, building blocks, clay, paper folding, and string, confident that children would 'naturally understand the metaphysical truths imbedded in the materials' (Kuschner, 2001: 280). The truths to be absorbed? Beauty, symmetry and aesthetics plus an expectation that by encountering the 'part', we sense the larger 'whole' of ourselves as part of God's world.

Play time! A sunny day at Taranaki Street Kindergarten in the 1920s.

© Robson & Boyer; Wellington Free Kindergarten Association Collection; Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington. Used with permission.
Ref: PAColl-1693-1-36.

Importantly, Froebel believed that because of their maternal instincts, women were particularly suited to teach children in groups. However, his teachers needed to be trained. This opened one of the few vocational opportunities for women and, in addition, provided an acceptable public platform for women to be visible outside the home (May, 1997; Singer, 1992).

In 1896 Mary Richmond, a middle-aged spinster from a large, influential Wellington family, sailed to England to train as a kindergarten teacher. Upon her return to Wellington, she became a tireless advocate for kindergarten, helping establish and sustain Froebelian societies. Her status in Wellington circles helped her gain government funding for kindergartens, and her organisational ability was key to creating programmes for teacher education (Bethell, 2008). Her work set the stage for more than 50 years of locally controlled kindergarten teacher education, often structured around mornings spent in kindergartens and the afternoons in college classrooms (Shaw, 2006).

MT ALBERT
DAY NURSERY

Home time! The children of the Mount Albert Day Nursery on a winter's day in Auckland, 1947

© New Zealand Free Lance Collection; Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington. Used with permission.
Ref: F- 67665-1/2.

In the years following World War I, progressive educational ideas captured the imagination of influential policy makers. Particularly important was C. E. Beeby, the Director General of Education. In 1937 he welcomed Susan Isaacs to New Zealand, who brought a message to teachers and parents about the importance of children learning through play. Her heady mix of Freudian theory and Deweyan ideas about free play inspired Beeby's wife Beatrice and a group of friends in wartime Wellington as they pioneered the first playcentre in 1941. Their initial impulse was to support women who were sole parenting as many of their menfolk were at war overseas. Playcentres provided a regular meeting space for children to play, but parent education and involvement were encouraged – initially for practical reasons, as the kindergarten-trained teachers needed informed 'mother-help'. But also within playcentres, there developed a strong co-operative movement that grappled with applying democratic principles both for children and for their parents (Stover, 2003). Progressive techniques such as observation, child studies, workshops, role plays, films and discussion were all pioneered in playcentre training. Publications were needed; pamphlets, journals, booklets and training manuals developed, leading to Playcentre establishing itself as an early, and durable, publishing venture dedicated to adult and early childhood education (Richards, 2003; Morton, 2003).

Through the post-war years, playcentres and kindergarten expanded. If a hierarchy existed, it would place kindergarten as being the most educational, with Playcentre next, but it had a controversial reputation for permissive parenting and came to be seen as 'part of a public challenge to mass authoritarian systems for socialising young children' (Nolan, 2006: 2). Government commissions in 1947 and 1971 confirmed the value of both kindergarten and Playcentre. Childcare, however, was frowned upon; at best it was tolerated as a necessity for working mothers, but was deemed regrettable as children were seen as needing to be with a parent during their early years (May, 2009).

Looking back at the post-war years, it is difficult to understand why there was fierce rivalry between kindergarten and playcentres. They both shared the status of being acceptable in the eyes of government, and had other features in common, including:

- play-based sessional (half-day) programmes;
- representation by not-for-profit national organisations;
- reliance on volunteers, especially parents.

They also were relatively inflexible to demands for longer hours. Kindergartens usually offered no more than 15 hours per week for four-year-old children; Playcentres usually offered even fewer.

However, despite their commonalities, the two services had deep historic divisions with kindergarten seeing itself as more professional and providing a well-balanced preparation for school. Playcentres often saw themselves as being more democratic and inclusive (for example, through mixed-age provision) as well as empowering parents.

Nevertheless, the divisions between the different services began to break down. Although organisations themselves remained distinct, some key people moved across the divides. This was happening in the early 1950s when Gwen Somerset, the first national Playcentre president, also lectured at Kindergarten College in Wellington. The movement across the divides appeared to speed up during the 1970s, when old loyalties were challenged in the context of pressing social issues and policy development. The success of the contraceptive pill allowed mothers to limit the size of their families, enabling them to consider paid careers and options outside their homes. Women met women in the feminist movement. The union movement adopted 'childcare' as a social justice

Welcome to our new Playcentre! After years in a scout hall, the families of Korokoro, Wellington, have a purpose-built centre, Autumn, 1978.

© Photographer Alan Stevenson. From the *Dominion Post* Collection: Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington. Used with permission. Ref: EP/1978/0995/17.

issue for working families. The first early childhood conventions helped to create shared perspectives grounded in personal and professional relationships (May, 2003b).

Pivotal in this process of breaking down the division between the services was the development of a professional early childhood research community, especially the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) which provided a platform for both critiquing and uniting the existing services. Published in 1975, educationalist David Barney's study of 'preschool' provision illustrated that the traditional providers were intransigent and unresponsive to both research and social change:

> If they could acknowledge that society is accepting change, that research has shown the safeguards that are most important to protect the child's development, that controlled and planned-for separation may not be all bad for the child and/or his mother, and that it is essential for some solo mothers under present financial arrangements to go to work, they could contribute a great deal of assistance from their own years of experience and pool of experts, without actively encouraging mothers to leave their children.
>
> (Barney, 1975: 281).

The NZCER also promoted the points of commonality across childcare, Playcentre and kindergarten. The pioneer in this area was Geraldine McDonald, who established the NZCER's early childhood section. She maintained that the existing early childhood services shared a common element – that they were of benefit to women. At the time, such a statement was highly contentious; one which, McDonald said, New Zealanders were 'coy' about admitting (McDonald, 1974: 24).

Within the tertiary sector – universities and teachers colleges (later colleges of education) – early childhood education was also growing. Offering relative affluence, status and stability of employment, academic appointments grew in response to demands for early childhood teachers. Academia provided a platform for a new generation of early childhood advocates who were prepared to tackle major social issues, which was a point of difference from traditional providers. As Smith and Swain (1988: xi) wrote, 'The need to get away from a monocultural and sexist perspective is of particular concern to both of us. We do not regard "academic" as a term of abuse'.

The growth of the tertiary sector also opened the market for publishing. In Dunedin, Anne Smith's return from international postgraduate study unleashed one of childcare's most powerful advocates. Her influential text *Understanding Children's Development* (Smith 1982; 1998) was not only required reading for student teachers and lecturers for decades, but also helped to signal a shift away from Playcentre's dominance of local early childhood education publications.

A united sector was also being pursued within the Department of Education. The movement in 1986 of 'childcare' from the Department of Social Welfare to the Department of Education was a major achievement of political co-operation across networks of researchers, policy makers, and political activists who had worked for its passage through Labour Party conferences prior to the 1984 election (Meade and Podmore, 2002; May, 2009).

And so we arrive again where we started – Wellington in the late 1980s. 1989 was the year of educational upheaval which produced one 'early childhood education' sector. The Meade Report was the breakthrough; the *Before Five* reforms were the first sustained test of government commitment. A year later, there was a new government in place, and while the early childhood education sector survived the transition to a new National government, the *Before Five* reforms were never fully implemented and some of its established provisions were quickly abolished (May, 2009).

Momentum for change continued. A national curriculum for early childhood education – that is, government mandating of educational purpose and processes – was in the wings and the next decade would see that change come about.

Part 3: Creating an educational sector

Te Whanau O Karori
Whanau O K
Whanau O Karori
Me tiaki au i aku taringa

Akona te reo! Tamariki of Karori Kōhanga Reo, Wellington, are up front about healthy ears and te reo Māori, 1992.

© Photographer: Ray Pigney. *Dominion Post* Collection; Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington. Used with permission. Ref: EP/1992/3951/16.

From the 1990s a new story begins about centralised policy governing early childhood education. During this era, neoliberal priorities led to governments' requiring new school curricula prioritising greater emphasis on economic outcomes and accountability for student achievement (Jesson, 2001). Similar thinking in 1991 prompted the Bolger-led National government to call for a curriculum for early childhood. This was new territory for all involved; up until that decision to create a curriculum was made, government had had no real involvement in the programmes that the various services undertook (Meade, 1999; Carr and May, 1999).

Within the early childhood community there was widespread concern that the new national curriculum for early childhood education might be instructional: 'skills and drills' were envisaged. This fear was part of what motivated the curriculum's developers, Margaret Carr and Helen May of Waikato University to create *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 1996), a complex curriculum, and open to diverse interpretations (Carr and

May, 1999), which was rather different in flavour and impact from the neoliberal forces that prompted its creation. It was, according to Farquhar (2008: 53), a curriculum that was 'democratic, bicultural and community based'.

Te Whāriki's slow evolution – it was circulated in draft form in 1993, revised and then gazetted in 1996 – occurred alongside new systems of accountability. The details were reworked several times in the 1990s, stabilising in 1998 with the new regulations (New Zealand Government, 1998) and the implementation of the revised DOPs (Statement of Desirable Objectives and Practices) (Ministry of Education, 1998).

Together these documents – *Te Whāriki* and the DOPs – signalled the arrival of educational ways of thinking, talking and systems. Programmes became 'curriculum'; 'childcare workers', and 'Playcentre parents', became 'teachers' and 'educators'. Watching children play was not sufficient for their learning, 'planning' needed to be visible and intentional. Children needed to be assessed. Documentation was required to an unprecedented level. Educators and management – whether voluntary or professional – needed appraisal.

While some services were familiar with some of these ways of thinking and operating, others floundered. From 1992, government contracts established systems of professional development to ensure the uptake and implementation of *Te Whāriki*, the DOPs, and later other government initiatives for quality early childhood education, including *Kei Tua o te Pae* (Ministry of Education, 2004).

At the end of the 1990s came the return to power of Labour-led governments and Anne Meade was again asked to take a leadership role in charting the future of early childhood education. The result was a 10-year strategic plan: *Pathways to the Future – Te Huarahi Arataki* (Ministry of Education, 2002) which timetabled ambitious targets for professionalising the early childhood teaching force by 2012 and improving participation rates, as well as establishing morale-lifting programmes such as the 'Centres of Innovation' and making *Te Whāriki* compulsory (which happened in 2006).

Out of the strategic plan also came the introduction of '20 free hours' of care and education for three- and four-year-old children in teacher-led services, which was heralded in 2007 as the largest reform of the education system since the 1930s when compulsory secondary education was introduced (Clark, 2007).

The election of a new National government in 2008 coincided with a world economic recession leading to cutbacks in early childhood education support services. Professional development contracts and the Centres of Innovation scheme were discontinued (Ministry of Education, 2009). However, provision of 20 hours per week of early childhood education for three and four year olds (no longer referred to as 'free') was extended to include Te Kōhanga Reo and Playcentres (National Party, 2008; Ministry of Education, 2009).

The underpinning rationale for such a high level of government involvement is a cocktail of economic and educational reasons. In the short term there are benefits to parents who, with early childhood services of reliable quality available, can increase their economic activity and income. A longer-term benefit is that children's early education is seen as maximising the individual's potential (Farquhar, 2008).

So across two decades, major involvement from governments of different persuasions has had the effect of first stabilising and then growing early childhood education. For the years between 1995 and 2007, Ministry of Education statistics show a nearly 20% increase in the number of enrolments across all providers, and a 30.4% increase in the average number of hours spent each week in early childhood services (Ministry of Education, 2008b).

However, the growth of the sector has not been even. Statistics suggest that some ethnic groups are more likely to miss out on early childhood education, as well as showing that some services are struggling to survive. In 2005, 97.7% of Pākehā children starting at school had attended an early childhood education service, compared with 84.5% of Pasifika children and 89.9% of Māori children (Ministry of Education, 2008a). The services offering childcare and education have expanded the most: there was an increase of 195.6% between 1990 and 2007. Over the same period, kindergarten enrolments remained remarkably stable, but Te Kōhanga Reo numbers declined by 10.5% while Playcentre numbers shrank by 35% (Ministry of Education, 2008a).

This, and other issues, has resulted in challenges for the early childhood education sector. The last section of this chapter concludes with a discussion of some of those challenges.

Part 4: What do we want for children and their families?

Early childhood education is complex. As a sector it has multiple stakeholders and fuzzy boundaries. Its history will never exist in one tidy form. This 'rapid' history leaves out more than it can include. And the history that is hardest to see and document is whatever has 'just happened'. With that in mind, but also because the sector's complexity requires engaging with diverse and sometimes unwelcome perspectives, these final pages offer a sample of the challenges and debates which impact on how families and individuals view early childhood.

- The sector has grown in part because early childhood education can be a profitable business reflecting customer (parental) demands, but also because of government financial subsidies. In earlier eras, there was little money to be made and childcare services were usually small owner-operator enterprises, or run through non-profit community organisations. The presence of international childcare 'chains' involved the volatility of the international financial system, painfully illustrated by the rapid rise and collapse of Australia's ABC Learning Centres (May, 2009).
- In the popular press, the requirement to have early childhood education teachers qualified by 2012 prompted amazement in some quarters with a national columnist suggesting that 'looking after' young children is not 'rocket science', and that academic qualifications are unnecessary to teach 'fingerpainting or invent dress-up games on wet Friday afternoons' (Black, 2009a: 94). Following the subsequent flurry of letters, the columnist later suggested the topic was surrounded by an 'environment of political correctness' that makes 'people reluctant to demur publicly' (Black, 2009b: 94).
- Some health professionals are challenging the sector to reconsider basic requirements for centres. Having observed recurring gaps between best practice and common practice in the care and education of infants and toddlers, Bedford and Stephenson (2008) described some centres as 'child farms' (p. 39). They suggested that owners are privileging 'efficiency and profit' rather than 'site selection or building design to achieve suitability for children' (p. 38). They express concern for the industrialisation of early childhood education, as well as the institutionalisation of children.
- Looking more broadly, a UNICEF report found that while provision of early childhood education is of a relatively high standard, Aotearoa New Zealand has major problems in the wider issues of parental leave, child poverty and child health (UNICEF, 2008).

- Parental choice remains a hallmark of early childhood education – it is not compulsory, after all. But parents who opt to stay at home and play a major role in the education of their children are an anomaly (Woodhams, 2007). And although he acknowledges that what is ultimately important is the quality of a child's relationship with key adults, Hassall (2008: 3) suggests that 'the prestige, enthusiasm and ubiquity of the teaching profession might have misled us into believing that the relationship between parents and their children has no more to offer than the relationship between teachers and children'.

Conclusion

While Farquhar (2008: 53) described it as 'facile' to suggest that parents cannot rear their own children, programmes such as '20 hours of e.c.e.' suggest there are expectations that young children will spend significant amounts of time within professionally led services for more hours every week than have been available through either of the traditional providers – Playcentre and kindergartens.

Across two decades, this is a fundamental shift in 'where we are likely to find' young children during daylight hours, and also 'where we are likely to find' their parents and caregivers.

QUESTIONS

1. What is the story of your family? Did your parents (grandparents?) attend an early childhood education service? Did you?
2. What early childhood services exist in your neighbourhood? Investigate what choices are available for families where you live.
3. Do you think early childhood education should be compulsory for all children aged four? For those aged three? Aged two? Aged one? Why, in each case, or why not?
4. What are the advantages when government plays a strong role in regulating early childhood education? What are the risks?
5. Consider the challenges outlined in Part 4 of this chapter. Have any of these affected you? How would you critique these challenges? What concerns do you have about early childhood education?

Select bibliography

Barney, D. (1975). *Who Gets to Pre-school? The availability of pre-school education in New Zealand*. Wellington: NZCER.

Bedford, M. and Stephenson, K. (2008). Early childhood education and care in New Zealand: Do we have a runaway train? *The First Years: Ngaa Tau Tuatahi: New Zealand Journal of Infant and Toddler Education*, *10*(1): 38–42.

Black, J. (2009a). The Black page: To a ridiculous degree. *Listener*, 4 July: 94.

Black, J. (2009b). The Black page: Choc shock. *Listener*, 25 July: 94.

Bethell, K. C. (2008). 'Not (just) for a name that we plead': Fashioning the ideological origins of early kindergarten in Dunedin and Wellington, New Zealand, 1870–1913. Unpublished PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington.

Carr, M. and May, H. (1999). Empowering children to learn and grow – Te Whāriki: The New Zealand early childhood national curriculum. In J. Hayden (ed.) *Landscapes in Early Childhood Education*. New York: Lang.