

# Waikato Journal of Education

Te Hautaka Mātauranga o Waikato



School of Education  
Kura Toi Tangata

The  
University  
of Waikato  
*Te Whare Wānanga  
o Waikato*

Volume 5 : 1999

Special Section: Teacher Education

# WAIKATO JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

TE HAUTAKA MĀTAURANGA O WAIKATO  
VOLUME 5, 1999

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Vouchers and the Privatisation of New Zealand Education</b><br>LIZ ELEY AND JOHN CLARK   | 3   |
| <b>Standards-based Assessment in English: Take 3</b><br>TERRY LOCKE   | 13  |
| <b>Poem: Untitled</b><br>PIRKKO MARKULA   | 32  |
| <b>Qualifications, Critiques, and Reforms: The Rhetoric Surrounding<br/>the New Zealand Qualifications Authority</b><br>IVAN HODGETTS AND DARRIN HODGETTS | 33  |
| <b>Poem: Boarder's Leave Ending</b><br>RACHEL WOOD  | 50  |
| <b>The Maori Language Science Curriculum in Aotearoa/New<br/>Zealand: A Contribution to Sustainable Development</b><br>MILES BARKER                       | 51  |
| <hr/>   |     |
| <b>SPECIAL SECTION: TEACHER EDUCATION AND TEACHING:<br/>TRENDS AND POSSIBILITIES</b>  | 61  |
| <b>Introduction</b><br>BARBARA HAROLD   | 61  |
| <b>Reviews of Teacher Education in New Zealand 1950-1998:<br/>Continuity, Contexts and Change</b><br>NOELINE ALCORN                                       | 63  |
| <b>Research Trends and Possibilities in Teacher Education</b><br>CLIVE MCGEE  | 77  |
| <b>Teachers Talk Back: Educational Theory and Teacher Education</b><br>SUE MIDDLETON AND HELEN MAY  | 89  |
| <b>Stories to Live by on the Professional Knowledge Landscape</b><br>D. JEAN CLANDININ  | 107 |
| <b>Remapping the Practicum in Teacher Education</b><br>ROSIE LE CORNU (DOBBINS)   | 121 |
| <hr/>   |     |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <b>The Effectiveness of a Māori-Focussed Teacher Education Programme</b><br>FRED KANA  | 133 |
| <b>Poem: Day is Done</b><br>TERRY LOCKE  | 138 |
| <b>Coping with the Dual Crises of Legitimation and Representation in Research</b><br>RICHARD PRINGLE   | 139 |
| <b>Poem: Tracks</b><br>JIM DENISON   | 151 |
| <b>Bright Future, Five Steps Ahead - Making Ideas Work for New Zealand: A Commentary</b><br>HOWARD LEE AND GREGORY LEE                                     | 153 |
| <b>Ka Ora Kāinga Rua: Finding a Home in the Academy. A study into the Experiences of Four Maori Women in the Academy</b><br>LAURA HAWKSWORTH AND PARE KANA | 165 |
| <b>Neo-Liberalism and Constructions of Democracy: The Impact on Teachers' Work</b><br>NESTA DEVINE   | 171 |
| <b>Producing an "Iwi-Meaningful" Doctoral Proposal: A Case Study</b><br>BELLA TE AKU GRAHAM  | 181 |
| <b>"Coming to Know" in Teaching Physical Education: Moving Across Cultural Boundaries</b><br>GEORGE SALTER   | 189 |
| <b>To the Fullest Extent of his Powers: C.E. Beeby's Life in Education</b><br>NOELINE ALCORN   | 199 |
| <b>Poem: Junia</b><br>DEBORAH FRASER   | 208 |
| <b>Poem: Tania</b><br>DEBORAH FRASER   | 209 |
| <b>Poem: Otorohanga, 1966</b><br>DEBORAH FRASER  | 210 |
| <b>Book Reviews</b>  | 211 |
| <b>Poem: Let's Hear It</b><br>TERRY LOCKE  | 217 |

# BRIGHT FUTURE, FIVE STEPS AHEAD – MAKING IDEAS WORK FOR NEW ZEALAND: A COMMENTARY

GREGORY LEE<sup>1</sup> AND HOWARD LEE<sup>2</sup>

1. Department of Education Studies, University of Waikato
2. School of Education, University of Otago.

**ABSTRACT** *In August 1999, the National government released Bright Future, Five Steps Ahead. This policy document represents, among other things, a last minute attempt (prior to a general election) to persuade tertiary students to choose particular courses and careers in preference to others. Bright Future is, therefore, aimed at correcting some perceived anomalies in students' course preferences in the highly competitive tertiary education sector favoured by the present government. Less obvious from the political rhetoric surrounding Bright Future is the likelihood that the policy recommendations in the document represent yet another effort to enhance New Zealand's lacklustre domestic and global economic performance. The same can be said of Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century and the Green and White Papers on tertiary education reform, the antecedents to Bright Future. Each of these documents was founded on a variety of unsubstantiated assertions about alleged deficiencies in the tertiary sector. In light of these factors, it is hoped that the New Zealand public will seriously question both the assumptions underpinning Bright Future and the education policymaking process itself.*

## THE SMITH ERA

Throughout the nine years of the Bolger and Shipley National ministries, successive Ministers of Education have sought to implement a variety of educational reforms. From the outset, it was expected that tertiary institutions would not be excluded from the reform process. The first to assume the portfolio during this period was Lockwood Smith, portrayed by Graham and Susan Butterworth as an exceptionally perceptive, energetic, and intellectually gifted minister (1990-1996).<sup>1</sup> Smith was convinced that tertiary funding had to be audited more closely (following the 1990-1991 fiscal crisis), to secure greater efficiencies. He was also keen to grant tertiary institutions corporate status – to reinforce their accountability to government, measured against specified charter objectives – and to ensure that each institution would set its own tuition fees, consistent with his professed support for greater institutional independence.<sup>2</sup> Within two years, the reforms had encompassed a proposed capital charge scheme for tertiary institutions (scheduled for introduction in 1993), as well as a tertiary sector Study Right scheme linked to a new student loan system.<sup>3</sup>

## EDUCATION FOR THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY

During his second term of office as Minister of Education (1993-1996), Smith chose to consolidate his educational vision in the form of a policy discussion document, *Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (1993).<sup>4</sup> This document outlined Smith's views on future education initiatives, although it did not concentrate exclusively on the tertiary sector. *Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* was to be "both explanatory and

visionary", the Minister announced,<sup>5</sup> and would set out future "specific, measurable" targets and desired "outcomes", initially for the period 1993-2001.<sup>6</sup> Smith declared that such an approach was necessary because of the rapidly accelerating rate of technological change, the existence of "a global community and a global market place", as well as the perceived need to commit more individual and national resources and energy to "education and training".<sup>7</sup> Improving educational performance, it was assumed, would enhance New Zealand's economic wellbeing as well as its social "harmony" and "progress".<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, readers were informed that this would create "a population skilled enough, adaptable enough, and innovative enough to be successful in international competition".<sup>9</sup> Smith maintained that "*Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* is a national goal-setting exercise and not a political document".<sup>10</sup> But he failed to acknowledge that, in asking the Ministry of Education to draft a public policy document relating to education, he was, by definition, participating in a political activity. As the Australian policy scholars Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard and Henry have observed, because "the state is not neutral with respect to the changes occurring in society . . . its own interest in sponsoring some changes and preventing others is reflected in policy".<sup>11</sup> Politics and education, they concluded, were inseparable, and ought to be acknowledged as such.

Smith was adamant that the newly introduced National Curriculum Framework (NCF) and the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) would result in a better transition for pupils between secondary schools and the variety of tertiary institutions now available. With the *Skill New Zealand* initiative – designed to "bridge New Zealand's [technical] skill gap...[by] extending systematic workplace training across all industries"<sup>12</sup> – and the establishment of Private Training Establishments (intended to "introduce a new element of competition and diversity")<sup>13</sup>, Smith was fully satisfied that the "diverse needs of all New Zealanders" could now be met.<sup>14</sup> He firmly believed that these reforms had to take place within the context of a "seamless education system", within which notions and phrases such as enhancing "flexibility", encouraging the breaking down of "traditional bricks and mortar" approaches to education, and allowing "educational opportunities to flourish"<sup>15</sup> were adopted uncritically.

The successful implementations of Smith's vision, we suggest, would depend largely upon the extent to which New Zealand citizens were willing to accept the Minister's pronouncement that there existed "commonly held values of individual and collective responsibility and accountability",<sup>16</sup> and that "equality of educational opportunity for all to reach their potential and take their full place in society" was a realistic and desirable "national educational aim".<sup>17</sup> The former aim simply reflected Smith's neo-liberal sentiments, wherein he thought that a values consensus could be arrived at fairly readily with the New Zealand public. The Minister assumed that such a consensus would ensure social harmony, albeit in the context of an enterprise culture whose official supporters advocated the teaching of "essential skills", international and individual competitiveness, and the introduction of student performance appraisals.<sup>18</sup>

As an expressed aim, "equality of educational opportunity" sits awkwardly with modern educational inquiry, which focuses on pupils' access to institutions and equity issues, among other factors. Moreover, Clarence Beeby, the Director of Education (1940-1960) who coined the phrase "equality of educational opportunity" 60 years ago, openly declared in 1992 that the "idea" had proven to be an "educational myth"; it represented an "unattainable but approachable goal [which had at least] an appearance of permanence", because it was in "general

accord with some strong public aspiration".<sup>19</sup> William Renwick, another former Director of Education (1975-1988), for his part, suggested that it was "a portmanteau phrase...[that masked] sharp differences in ideological commitment below a surface appearance of consensus".<sup>20</sup> The achievement of some sort of public consensus, it would seem, was a core ingredient in Lockwood Smith's educational vision.<sup>21</sup>

In both the discussion (1993) and post-consultation (1994) documents, the Minister emphasised the point that successful implementation of the proposed education policies depended upon obtaining a full public commitment to them.<sup>22</sup> The latter publication, for example, stated:

All New Zealanders – students, parents, educationalists, business people, and Government representatives – will need to make a commitment to *Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* if we are to achieve its goals. We will need to work as a team.<sup>23</sup>

With respect to the post-compulsory education sector, Smith was satisfied that existing tertiary institutions "contribute to the development of fields of knowledge which are essential to the social, cultural, and economic well-being of New Zealand".<sup>24</sup> Universities, in particular, were seen to be already making "a substantial contribution" to fundamental and applied research in a variety of fields deemed to be of "national or intrinsic importance".<sup>25</sup> Despite this rhetoric, the Minister thought that there was room for improvement. "Providers" were urged to be "[more responsive] to both the needs of students and the needs of the economy and society".<sup>26</sup> Readers of *Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* are also left in no doubt that Smith fully intended to use tertiary institutions to assist New Zealanders to become more adaptable and productive within the economy. It was presumed that such goals would be achieved by means of promoting an "increasingly diverse" tertiary sector.<sup>27</sup>

## THE TERTIARY EDUCATION REVIEW GREEN PAPER

We can presume that Smith's policy recommendations regarding tertiary institutions did not extend far enough in the opinion of his successor, Wyatt Creech, given that within 18 months of his appointment (in March 1996) he had overseen the release of a Green Paper, *A Future Tertiary Education Policy for New Zealand* (on 15 September 1997).<sup>28</sup> The Green Paper is remarkable for the frequency with which bold generalisations are made about perceived inadequacies or deficiencies in tertiary institutions, and their proposed resolution. For example, there is no comprehensive understanding of the different functions that various types of tertiary institutions necessarily perform – notably, polytechnics and universities – as well as demonstrating an inability to appreciate that staff in these institutions have long understood the extent to which "international credibility", "competition", and "information technology" will (and do) affect their teaching and research work.<sup>29</sup> There is also an ignorance of fundamental but important differences between qualifications and credentials, education and training, and knowledge, information and skills.<sup>30</sup> Emphasis is placed upon skill acquisition and performance, individual and institutional "adaptability", "responsiveness" to perceived student needs and demands, without any underlying theory of education and to the detriment of broader conceptions of citizenship. What is provided is an all-too-familiar business or commercial model which, when

applied, would be likely to create more problems than it could ever solve. As a result, tertiary education and the fostering of individual development, a passion for intellectual inquiry, and a desire to acquire and share knowledge for its own sake (rather than for largely utilitarian purposes) remains curiously and illogically disconnected within the Green Paper.<sup>31</sup>

Equally disconcerting is Wyatt Creech's bold assertion that the current tertiary sector was not "contribut[ing] fully to the many and changing needs of a modern society and economy", and his apparent confidence (like his predecessor) that an uncertain future can be planned for with a high degree of certainty.<sup>32</sup> Clearly, an interventionist and instrumentalist stance was being officially advocated, in an effort to address perceived anomalies and weaknesses which, it was believed, staff in tertiary institutions needed to have brought to their attention. Given the above thinking, it was unlikely that the "durable framework" sought by Creech would materialise. The premises contained in the Green Paper deserve closer scrutiny because, as he correctly observed, "very significant public policy issues are involved."<sup>33</sup>

In his concluding remarks, Creech urged "all involved to lift themselves above any narrow self interest and work towards solutions to serve the best interests of all New Zealanders."<sup>34</sup> But he appeared to overlook the fact that the government *also* had a vested interest in the matter of tertiary education. This essentially involved an attempt to re-engineer tertiary institutions to follow an agenda that appealed to the National Government; that is, to define educational and administrative "outcomes", to make the tertiary sector more "responsive and flexible", to change the ways in which tertiary institutions were administered, and to inform students that they ought to acquire (unspecified) "valuable" and "relevant" skills.<sup>35</sup> All of these aims are consistent with the present government's obsession with skill acquisition and its utilitarian, ends-oriented approach toward education.

## THE TERTIARY EDUCATION REVIEW WHITE PAPER

Fourteen months after the publication of the Tertiary Green Paper, the Tertiary White Paper was released (in November 1998).<sup>36</sup> According to the Minister of Education, the White Paper had carefully considered some 380 written submissions received by the Ministry's Post Compulsory Education and Training Policy office. These submissions, Creech reported, reflected "a broad spectrum of views," as well as those expressed by tertiary sector representatives which he labelled as being "the well-known views of interest groups".<sup>37</sup> Not surprisingly, there is a very close correspondence between the two papers (apart from the White Paper's inclusion of indicative legislation).<sup>38</sup> The overriding concerns continued to relate to the alleged lack of accountability by institutions across the tertiary sector, the pressing need for tertiary institutions to respond to employers' demands for "higher and more diverse skills and knowledge" from their employees, and the apparent inability of existing institutions "to [not only] consistently deliver quality education that meets international standards" but to also meet students' "changing needs".<sup>39</sup> All of these modifications were necessary, Creech maintained, if "an equitable, cohesive, and culturally dynamic society" was to be established.<sup>40</sup>

Evidently, both Creech and the Ministry believed that such a society would not eventuate unless far-reaching changes were made to the tertiary sector, in order to secure a wider range of courses, to internationalise education, and to fully

utilise information technology, alongside other reforms. Furthermore, it was assumed that without government intervention of the kind set out in the Green and White Papers, tertiary institutions would be unable to meet their students' expectations and needs, and could not deliver a high quality education (or training). They would also have no incentive to improve "the quality of [their] qualifications, research, and teaching"<sup>41</sup> or to provide their students with [information] about the available choices and opportunities".<sup>42</sup> Once again, these assumptions (and many others) remain unexamined in the documents.

### **BRIGHT FUTURE, FIVE STEPS AHEAD**

As we have seen with *Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* and the Tertiary Green and White Papers, Ministers of Education throughout the 1990s have consistently sought to put their personal stamp on education policy. The appointment of Max Bradford (in February 1999) as Tertiary Education Minister has proven to be no exception. Bradford was asked by Jenny Shipley to lead the government's newly created Enterprise and Innovation Team, which consisted of nine cabinet members, including Lockwood Smith and Nick Smith (the current Minister of Education). On 18 August 1999, the team released a policy document, *Bright Future*.<sup>43</sup> According to the Prime Minister, the initiatives contained in the document will assist "our 'ideas machine' [to] work better for all New Zealanders" by celebrating success, turning "ideas into wealth", and "building excellence in education".<sup>44</sup> Boldly depicted as an "agreed pathway into the future",<sup>45</sup> *Bright Future* maps out a largely predictable vision on the part of the Shipley government; one in which globalisation, information technology, practical skills, enterprise education, and a focused tertiary education sector are said to contribute to the creation of a "knowledge economy".<sup>46</sup> We are told that some 2000 "key business, education and research people"<sup>47</sup> participated in 25 national forums, and that in these forums, "some of the country's most inspirational people" asked the New Zealand government to provide the "leadership and direction" necessary to improve the country's economic performance.<sup>48</sup>

In Max Bradford's "overview" of the proposed changes he claimed that the economy "is in good shape" because it has a "strong base", and is now "open and internationally competitive".<sup>49</sup> Consequently, he believed that New Zealand was in an ideal position to create "a truly vibrant knowledge economy".<sup>50</sup> Such confidence is not shared universally by New Zealand economists and social commentators, however. Paul Dalziel, a Lincoln University economist, recently declared – after careful statistical analysis – that "the current direction of economic policy has failed us", and that "it must be changed".<sup>51</sup> At the same time Sandra Coney called for an end to the New Zealand "economic experiment" which, in too many areas throughout the country, has produced "no meaningful economic activity."<sup>52</sup> She lamented the dominance of a market model which has become "a kind of economic life force", one that has seriously disturbed New Zealanders' sense of "security, belonging, and citizenship".<sup>53</sup> To this end Coney wrote:

We have become a cash register society where only things that are able to be counted and costed matter. The market reduces the vast wealth and complexity of human relationships and experience to an economic exchange.<sup>54</sup>



Larry Elliott, writing in the London *Weekly Guardian*, provided a similar critique of the New Zealand economic reform process. He noted that the country "has become a laboratory for every crackpot laissez-faire notion considered too extreme to be road-tested even in Thatcher's Britain or Reagan's America".<sup>55</sup> Elliott concluded:

Growth has been sluggish, unemployment remains high, [and] the increase in inequality has been unmatched across the Western world.<sup>56</sup>

Readers of *Bright Future* may be excused for thinking that the National government advocates an uncritical, almost fanatical, endorsement of the "knowledge economy" mantra. Bryan Gould, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Waikato, echoed this sentiment when he observed that "our government seems to have an almost superstitious faith in the power of slogans – particularly slogans containing numbers".<sup>57</sup> Gould then remarked that "unfortunately . . . slogans are not enough".<sup>58</sup> Gwen Gawith expressed a similar view when she referred to the knowledge economy label as belonging to "the media school of cliché-driven hype and sloganeering".<sup>59</sup> Both commentators are correct – slogans *do* appear with monotonous regularity throughout *Bright Future*. We are told that a knowledge economy "places a premium on constant innovation [and] skill", and that "value lies in knowledge and fresh ideas".<sup>60</sup> Furthermore, "a culture of innovation and success", combined with "a flexible workforce", is said to lie at the heart of such an economy.<sup>61</sup> Success, value, and innovation are defined in solely economic terms by the economic gains produced.

### **BRIGHT FUTURE: PROBLEMS AND PRIORITIES**

The knowledge and skills deemed essential to the "knowledge economy" by the government are those associated with information and communications technology/computer science, science and technology, engineering, and mathematics.<sup>62</sup> What is needed, according to the Cabinet's Enterprise and Innovation Team, are "the right people with the right skills", a "strategically-focused, effective and efficient [tertiary sector involving] fewer but stronger institutions and centres of excellence", and to avoid "investment in the wrong sorts of research and development".<sup>63</sup> The National government, ever confident that it knows right from wrong, chose to largely undervalue the real and potential cultural and social contributions of many New Zealand citizens in its relentless quest for scientific, mathematical, and technological efficiency.<sup>64</sup> Such a deliberate devaluing of these contributions and activities can be attributed to the government's desire to see "the right beliefs, attitudes and values" fostered, if "a culture of success" is to become a reality.<sup>65</sup>

Reaction to the publication of *Bright Future* has not been resoundingly positive, notably from educational and social commentators. Jane Kelsey, President of the Association of University Staff of New Zealand (AUS), notes that "the mantra of the market has simply been replaced by that of the 'knowledge economy'".<sup>66</sup> She also observes that *Bright Future* does not adequately reflect an understanding of "a knowledge-informed *society*", and that the study of social sciences, language, culture, music, the arts, politics and history are marginalised; they are given "no explicit place" in the document.<sup>67</sup> Kelsey concludes that *Bright Future's* failure to argue a convincing case for educational reform points to the existence of "half-baked political ideas that lack any empirical foundations or

understanding of the[ir] implications".<sup>68</sup> The incoming President of the Association of Staff in Tertiary Education (ASTE), Jill Ovens, fully concurs with her university counterpart. After having identified the clear bias toward certain industries and types of knowledge and skills within the document, Ovens suggests an alternative approach:

What this country needs more than anything after 15 years of 'me-first' policies is a sense of community. The so-called 'children of the revolution' need a well-rounded education to fit them for society, not a narrow range of technological skills.<sup>69</sup>

As noted above, information and communications technology (ICT) was depicted in *Bright Future* as holding a key to New Zealand's future economic success.<sup>70</sup> But what is glaringly absent from the document is an understanding that without professional development and support, and without teachers who understand the complex dynamics of the learning and teaching process, the mere provision of ICT is unlikely to produce the anticipated "outcomes".<sup>71</sup> Linda Woon, Principal of Kawaha Point School (Rotorua), was alert to this fact when she wrote that "we have been warned that...we'd better hurry up and get on board/online or else risk getting wiped out by the technology tidal wave".<sup>72</sup> In pointing to the distinction between information and learning – one that requires the exercise of "wisdom and judgement" based on learning and experience – Woon shrewdly observed:

We've been told we can't expect to teach effectively as sages on stages . . . We must transmorph into facilitating 'guides on the sides' . . . We are made to feel that unless we are digital geeks and hypered to the max, that we are the dodos of the wired classroom.<sup>73</sup>

In this connection, we would be wise to heed Clarence Beeby's caution about the temptation for governments to adopt a cargo-cult mentality in education. The mere provision of money, resources, and equipment, he noted, does not guarantee results.<sup>76</sup>

## A MARKET MODEL

Besides the reservations highlighted above, *Bright Future*, we suggest, also provides compelling evidence that a market approach to tertiary education has not been successful in producing the kinds of graduates the government thinks are necessary for the economy. Ralph Norris, the Chairperson of the New Zealand Business Roundtable, recently declared that too many lawyers and accountants, and too few technology and science graduates, are being educated in tertiary institutions.<sup>75</sup> The Chief Executive Officer of the Institution of Professional Engineers of New Zealand (IPENZ), Warwick Bishop, expressed a similar concern. "New Zealand's knowledge economy is a fragile ship adrift on an outgoing tide of graduate engineers leaving the country" he contended.<sup>76</sup> What Norris, Bishop, and the government's Enterprise and Innovation Team have been reluctant to acknowledge, however, is the reality that tertiary students have generally understood trends in the New Zealand employment market and have responded accordingly; by enrolling in courses that were seen to provide a better 'dividend' for their investment of time, energy, and money. George Preddey's recent research into tertiary graduate students' course choices, destinations, and salaries

demonstrates that the "Five Steps Ahead" package is not only "over-hyped" but also represents "road to Damascus rhetoric".<sup>77</sup> Steve Maharey, the Labour Party's associate (tertiary) spokesperson, was similarly aware of the conflict between official rhetoric and employment realities:

The main reason that science has dropped off as a preferred subject for students is that anyone can see that science is no longer a desirable career. Just boosting [the] number of students will do nothing if scientists cannot get secure, properly funded careers.<sup>78</sup>

## POLITICS, ECONOMICS AND EDUCATION

In his overview of *Bright Future* Max Bradford concluded with the statement, "Why don't you become part of this vision the Government has for New Zealand? It's your future too".<sup>79</sup> Jenny Shipley issued a similar request: "I invite you to make your contribution to a bright future for New Zealand".<sup>80</sup> At the time of writing, it is unclear how the public will react to this policy document, but there is evidence to support the claim that *Bright Future* does not constitute a *truly public, inclusive policy*.<sup>81</sup> Tim Hazeldine, a University of Auckland economist, has argued, for example, that whenever an essentially bottom-up approach to formulating economic policy is adopted, this will enable "just about everyone [to] contribute".<sup>82</sup> Such a strategy was deemed vastly preferable to what he labelled as "the top-down, know-it-all *dirigisme* of Muldoon, Douglas, Richardson and Treasury", one that ignored the fact that economic success must be based on our own culture.<sup>83</sup> Hazeldine viewed the economy as "a living system in which the health of each organ depends on the health of everything else".<sup>84</sup> According to this thesis, true wealth therefore involved "that complex network of personal interrelationships that go to preserve fundamental human values".<sup>85</sup>

Prior to the release of *Bright Future* the prominent theologian, Selwyn Dobson expressed similar concerns to those of Hazeldine, Coney, and Elliott. Having noted that the current emphasis on economic indicators of success and wellbeing to the exclusion of other considerations amounted to "flying with one wing",<sup>86</sup> Dobson declared:

While in the past we have seen the excessive dominance of state over individual, or excessive individuality over the wellbeing of the state, any decent society does two things. As well as preserving the welfare and the freedom of every individual it also preserves a wholesome society, without which no satisfactory individual life can be lived.<sup>87</sup>

With a forthcoming general election, there is no better time than the present for the New Zealand voting public to decide if they wish to support the policies outlined in *Bright Future* or to challenge them. Either way, their response may ultimately determine the way in which public policy in education will be conducted in the future.<sup>88</sup>

## NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. G. Butterworth and S. Butterworth, *Reforming Education: The New Zealand Experience, 1984-1996*, Palmerston North: Dunmore Press, 1998, p.210.
2. *Ibid*, pp.183-186.

3. *Ibid*, p.186.
4. Ministry of Education, *Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: A Discussion Document*, Wellington: Learning Media, 1993.
5. Open letter from the Minister of Education, Lockwood Smith, 22 July 1993 (to accompany *Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*).
6. Ministry of Education, *op.cit.*, p.8.
7. *Ibid.*, p.7. Presumably, Smith thought that *Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* provided the necessary guidance for tertiary institutions who were seen to be lacking either in initiative or understanding of the changing economic and social environment in and beyond New Zealand.
8. *Ibid.*
9. *Ibid*, p.8.
10. *Ibid.*
11. S. Taylor, F. Rizvi, B. Lingard and M. Henry, *Educational Policy and the Politics of Change*, London: Routledge, 1997, p.5.
12. Ministry of Education, *op.cit.*, p.16.
13. *Ibid*, p.18.
14. *Ibid*, p.20.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*, p.23.
17. *Ibid.*, pp.22, 34.
18. *Ibid.*, pp.3, 7-9, 12, 23.
19. C.E. Beeby, *The Biography of an Idea: Beeby on Education*, Wellington: NZCER, 1992, p.302.
20. W.L. Renwick, *Moving Targets: Six Essays on Educational Policy*, Wellington: NZCER, 1986, p.63.
21. *Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* was re-released in 1994, after a three month "[public] consultation process" had occurred (from 23 July to 23 October 1991). Smith claimed that "the views of more than 100,000 New Zealanders" were represented in the submissions, which were allegedly considered prior to publishing the second version of the policy document. See Ministry of Education, *Education for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, Wellington: Learning Media, 1994, p.3.
22. Ministry of Education, *op.cit.*, 1993, p.3; Ministry of Education, *ibid.*, 1994, p.3.
23. Ministry of Education, *ibid.*, 1994.
24. *Ibid*, p.14.
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*, p.28.
27. *Ibid.*, pp.44-45.
28. Ministry of Education, *A Future Tertiary Education Policy for New Zealand: Tertiary Education Review Green Paper*, Wellington: Ministry of Education, 1997.
29. *Ibid.*, pp.5-13.
30. *Ibid.*, pp.7-8, 27-29. See also P. Roberts, "Qualifications Policies and the Marketisation of Education: A Critical Reading of the Green Paper", *Access*, Vol.16, No.2, 1997, pp.31-47.
31. Ministry of Education, *ibid.*, pp.7-8.
32. *Ibid.*, pp.3-4.
33. *Ibid.*, p.4.
34. *Ibid.*

35. *Ibid.*, pp.5, 7, 35-69.
36. Ministry of Education, *Tertiary Education in New Zealand: Policy Directions for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century – White Paper*, Wellington: Ministry of Education, 1998. [www.minedu.govt.nz/Tertiary/Review/wp/appendc.htm](http://www.minedu.govt.nz/Tertiary/Review/wp/appendc.htm)
37. *Ibid.*, p.1.
38. *Ibid.*, pp.66-97.
39. *Ibid.*, pp.1-2.
40. *Ibid.*, p.1.
41. *Ibid.*, p.9.
42. *Ibid.*, p.10.
43. Ministry of Commerce, *Bright Future, 5 Steps Ahead – Making Ideas Work for New Zealand*, Wellington: Ministry of Commerce, 1999.
44. *Ibid.*, p.5.
45. *Ibid.*
46. *Ibid.*, pp.6-11.
47. T. Steel, "Your Future – Our Bright Future", *Positive Times* (Hamilton), October 1999, p.6.
48. Ministry of Commerce, *op.cit.*, p.8.
49. *Ibid.*, pp.7-8.
50. *Ibid.*, p.7.
51. P. Dalziel, "Reaping the Whirlwind of the Economic Reforms", *Tui Motu Interislands*, August 1998, p.3.
52. S. Coney, "End the Economic Experiment – It's Hurting Too Many People", *Sunday Star Times*, 6 September 1998, C7.
53. *Ibid.*
54. *Ibid.* It is noteworthy that the Chairperson of the New Zealand Vice-Chancellors' Committee (NZVCC), Graeme Fogelberg, disagrees with Coney's and Dalziel's accounts. Fogelberg believes that "the macro and micro economic reforms of the past 15 years were necessary". See *NZVCC Newsletter*, No.54, September 1999, p.2.
55. L. Elliott, "The Politics of the New Right – The Only Way To Go!", *The Weekly Guardian* (London), reprinted in *Tui Motu Interislands*, June 1998, p.5.
56. *Ibid.*
57. B. Gould, "Bright Future", 14 September 1999. University of Waikato School of Education Board of Studies Document 99/367, p.1.
58. *Ibid.*
59. G. Gawith, "Editorial: The Knowledge Economy? Pardon?", *Good Teacher*, Term 4, 1999, p.3.
60. Ministry of Commerce, *op.cit.*, p.12.
61. *Ibid.* See also B. Ansley, "The Future of Work", *Listener*, 4 September 1999, pp.14-19 for some critical observations on the current state of the New Zealand job market.
62. Ministry of Commerce, *ibid.*, pp.6, 17-18, 21, 28.
63. *Ibid.*, pp.22-24, 30.
64. *Ibid.*, p.58.
65. *Ibid.*
66. J. Kelsey, "Stepping Ahead?", *AUS Bulletin*, No.43, September 1999, p.1.
67. *Ibid.*
68. *Ibid.*
69. AUS National Office (Wellington), AUS Flying Snippet No.21: ASTE Respond to the Bright Future, 19 October 1999.

70. A cynical view might be to suggest that those people employed in designing and/or manufacturing computers, their software and associated componentry have a vested (financial) interest in encouraging the government to actively promote an information and communications technology (ICT) strategy nationwide. The question remains: to what extent does the ICT promoters' interest sit comfortably with Wyatt Creech's request in the Tertiary Green Paper that "all involved [should] lift themselves above any narrow self interest and work towards solutions to serve the best interests of all New Zealanders."? See Ministry of Education, *op.cit.*, 1997, p.4;  
<http://www.moc.govt.nz/pbt/infotech/itag/member/htm>  
(for membership of the government's Information Technology Advisory Group, ITAG).
71. *Eduvac*, Vol.10, No.388, 9 August 1999, p.5. Article titled "Is ICT Really Working in New Zealand Schools?"
72. L. Woon, "Soapbox", *Good Teacher*, Term 3, 1999, p.1.
73. *Ibid.*
74. C.E. Beeby, *The Quality of Education in Developing Countries*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966, pp.7-28.
75. R. Norris, "Getting the Right Balance", *AUS Bulletin*, No.43, September 1999, p.6. It could be argued that the legal and financial changes proposed in *Bright Future* will require *more* lawyers and accountants, *not fewer*, contrary to the expectation of the government's Enterprise and Innovation Team. See *Bright Future*, *op.cit.*, pp.36-55.
76. *Eduvac*, Vol.10, No.396, 18 October 1999, p.7. Article titled "NZ's Knowledge Economy 'A Fragile Ship' – IPENZ Chief". Bishop also claimed that the New Zealand education system should have "adjust[ed] to [a] market-driven concept a long time ago".
77. G. Preddey, "UTTA U-Turn on the Road to Damascus?", *AUS Bulletin*, No.43, September 1999, pp.4-5.
78. M. Vercoe (Ed.), "Five Steps Ahead – A Knee-Jerk Reaction", 13 August 1999, *Wise Up*, p.1. (*Wise Up* is the Labour Party's education email). Maharey labelled *Bright Future* a "knee-jerk and panic response to the [government's] failure to lay the foundations for a knowledge economy over the past nine years".
79. *Bright Future*, *op.cit.*, p.11.
80. *Ibid.*, p.5.
81. *Bright Future* offers surprisingly little reassurance to Maori about their involvement in the "knowledge economy" and in "making ideas work for New Zealand". See pp.12, 24, 30, 42, 50, 61.
82. J. Elliston, "An Organic Approach to the New Zealand Economy". Review of T. Hazendine, *Taking New Zealand Seriously: The Economics of Decency*, *Tui Motu Interislands*, December 1998, p.28.
83. *Ibid.* *Dirigisme* refers to government control or intervention, especially in business activity or the economy.  
<http://www.elibrary.com/s/edumarkau/search>
84. *Ibid.*
85. *Ibid.*
86. S. Dobson, cited in A. Gray, "A Man for All Seasons", *Tui Motu Interislands*, May 1998, p.11. Rev Dobson, an octogenarian, was a former President of the Methodist Church and the National Council of Churches in New Zealand.

87. *Ibid.* See also to S. Turner, "Welcome to the Hikoi!", *Tui Motu Interislands*, October 1998, p.3.
88. See G. Lee and H. Lee, "Education Policy Dynamics Ignored", *New Zealand Education Review*, Vol.4, No.17, 27 August 1999, p.8, for a discussion of the variety of ways in which education policy is devised, implemented, and evaluated.