

November 2019

MULTI-ETHNIC STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR PERSPECTIVE OF CULTURE-BASED INTERVENTION PROGRAMS IN BELIZE: CASE STUDY OF PROGRAM FOR THE GARIFUNA PEOPLE

Juan Nunez
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Nunez, Juan, "MULTI-ETHNIC STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR PERSPECTIVE OF CULTURE-BASED INTERVENTION PROGRAMS IN BELIZE: CASE STUDY OF PROGRAM FOR THE GARIFUNA PEOPLE" (2019). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 1806.
<https://doi.org/10.7275/15142412> https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2/1806

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations and Theses at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

**MULTI-ETHNIC STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR PERSPECTIVE OF
CULTURE-BASED INTERVENTION PROGRAMS IN BELIZE: CASE STUDY
OF PROGRAM FOR THE GARIFUNA PEOPLE**

A Dissertation Presented

by

JUAN C. NUNEZ

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

September 2019

College of Education

Student Development

Social Justice Education

© Copyright by Juan C. Nunez 2019

All Rights Reserved

**MULTI-ETHNIC STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR PERSPECTIVE OF
CULTURE-BASED INTERVENTION PROGRAMS IN BELIZE: CASE STUDY
OF PROGRAM FOR THE GARIFUNA PEOPLE**

A Dissertation Presented

by

JUAN C. NUNEZ

Approved as to style and content by:

Richard Lapan, Chair

Laura Valdiviezo, Member

Briankle Chang, Member

Jennifer Randall
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
College of Education

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated all those who carry on the work of transmitting the Garifuna language to the next generation. To the members of my family – my siblings and parents – and especially to my wife, Vincent Nunez, who learned Garifuna to teach our children.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I received a great deal of support and assistance throughout my doctoral studies both at the University of Massachusetts Amherst and in Belize that led to the completion of this dissertation. First, I would like to thank Tom Schiff, my health educator supervisor as a graduate assistant, at the University Health Services. I would also like to acknowledge Bailey Jackson, chairman of my comprehensive qualifying/examination.

A special acknowledgement to my doctoral dissertation chair and mentor, Richard Lapan, whose unwavering encouragement and expert advice made the difference in completing my studies. His dissertation team consisting of Briankle Chang and Laura Valdiviezo added value to my experience.

I sincerely thank the Battle of the Drum Secretariat and its coordinators, the administration of St. Peter Claver School, and in particular, the teachers who allowed me into their classrooms and shared their perspectives. Special thanks to the children and their parents for their willingness to be observed and interviewed.

Finally, to my family and friends, who sacrificed their time and effort, so that I can finish!

ABSTRACT

MULTI-ETHNIC STAKEHOLDERS AND THEIR PERSPECTIVE OF CULTURE-BASED INTERVENTION PROGRAMS IN BELIZE: CASE STUDY OF PROGRAM FOR THE GARIFUNA PEOPLE

SEPTEMBER 2019

JUAN C. NUNEZ, B. S., MINNESOTA STATE UNIVERSITY

M. ED., UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

Ed.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Richard Lapan

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore how the development of Garifuna cultural identity by the Garifuna Language and Arts and Crafts in Schools Program at St. Peter Claver School in Punta Gorda, Belize. Culture-based education is described as contextualized relating “what students learn to their culture, communities, lives, and land.” This is a case study designed to understand the purpose of the program, identify its participants, review its curriculum, observe instructional strategies, and interview its stakeholders over a three-month period. Data was collected through documentation, direct observation, interviews, and audio recording. A descriptive framework was used as a general analytical strategy to organize the case study. The theoretical framework attended to critical theory, postcolonial theory, critical pedagogy, and social justice education. It is hoped that such a study will assist stakeholders in implementing similar programs intended to serve indigenous and minority populations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
CHAPTER	
LIST OF FIGURES	x
INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction.....	1
Problem Statement.....	2
Background.....	3
Purpose Statement.....	8
Central/Research Question.....	8
Definition of Terms.....	9
Placed-based pedagogy	10
Community education.....	10
Community-based education	10
Description of Program.....	10
Limitations of the Study.....	11
Significance of the study.....	12
Summary of the Chapter	13
LITERATURE REVIEW	14
Introduction.....	14
Interest in the Preservation of culture	15
Part 1: Cultural Identity Development of the Garinagu.....	18
Ancestral Origins of the Garinagu	21
The Landing: The Arrival of Adam	21
Demystifying the Adam and Eve Story	22
The Adaptation: Becoming a Carib/Garifuna.....	25
Interaction with and Influence of Enslaved Africans (Blackness).....	28
Interaction with the French	30
Interaction with the British	31
Interaction with Spaniards/Mestizos.....	33
The Belizean Garifuna Today	34
Conclusion	41
Part 2: The Garinagu and Education.....	42
Historical Overview	42
Pupil-Teacher System and Teacher Training Education/training.....	46

Influence of the Education System on the Garinagu	47
Garifuna Teachers' Role	56
Education Today	59
Conclusion	60
Part 3: Theoretical Framework and Conceptual Framework	62
Critical theory	63
Postcolonial Theory	64
Critical Pedagogy	65
Conceptual Framework	67
Part 4: Culture-based Education Programs	72
Purpose of Education (So as to become what and to do what)	72
Types of Programs	73
Curriculum (learn what)	74
Instructional Strategies (How should who learn)	75
Instructional Materials	76
Teachers By Whom should he/she be taught?	77
Community Involvement (With Whom)	78
Challenges and Obstacles	79
 METHODOLOGY	 81
Preamble/Introduction	81
Research Design	81
Direct observation	83
Observation Protocol	83
Interviews	85
Documentation	89
Data Analysis	89
Ethical Considerations	91
Positionality	93
 RESULTS	 96
Introduction	96
Program Description	98
Participants	99
How the Curriculum Was Developed	99
Instruction	100
Teaching Materials and Resources.	103
Purpose and Meaning	105
Secretariat	105
Coordinators	106
Teachers	106
Children	107
Attitudes and Perspectives	108
The Secretariat	108

The administration	108
Attitude of Teachers.....	108
Non-Garifuna Teachers.....	110
Teachers Not Involved in Program	110
Secretariat	111
Attitude of Parents	111
Attitude of Garifuna Children.....	112
Parents' Perspectives	113
Children's perspective	114
Determining Success.....	114
Teachers	114
Coordinators.....	115
Parents.....	116
Future of the Program	116
Conclusion	117
 SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION	 118
Introduction.....	118
Summary and Findings	119
Program description	119
Purpose and Meaning.....	123
Attitudes and Perspectives	124
Limitations of the Study.....	128
Recommendations.....	129
Genesis	129
Purpose and Meaning.....	130
Teachers	130
Measuring Success.....	130
Government Policy	131
Conclusion	131
 REFERENCES	 132

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Amunegu by Andy Palacio	16
2. Lamentations of a Garifuna Ancestor by Juan Nunez	17
3. Research Questions and Themes.....	97
4. Curriculum Guide Sample from Ministry of Education	100
5. Teaching Materials	104

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Education systems worldwide continue to erode the languages and the cultures of indigenous people. Education along with religion, as institutional agents of colonization, conditioned the minds of the colonized in order to control them, usurp their lands, and exploit natural resources for profit (Carnoy, 1974). According to Césaire (1972), colonialism “extend[s] to a world scale the competition of its antagonistic economies.” Educational institutions were established throughout the colonized world—the Americas, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific. Native American Indians in the United States, First Nation people in Canada, and Aborigines in Australia were forced to attend boarding schools (Spring, 1994). In India schools were built for the children of the elite to turn them into civil servants whereas in Australia children were educated to become laborers and servants. This onslaught of colonialism followed by globalization has left many indigenous people throughout the world unable to speak their own languages, ignorant of their rich cultural heritage, and with a poor sense of identity.

Belize’s colonial education system, like its counterparts worldwide, also served the interest of its mother country, Britain. In the process it enforced the values, norms, and the English Language on the indigenous people in Belize and ethnic groups brought in from Africa, India, and other parts of the world. Belize’s current neo-colonial, church-state system of education fits into what Carnoy (1974) described as remaining “in the European or U.S. model ...teaching or stressing the colonial language.” Although the colonizers have departed, their model of governance remains so that a situation of neo-

colonialism remains. The curriculum today is mono-cultural and neocolonial—a one-size-fits-all, just as it was in colonial days. The curriculum, by its omission of indigenous languages, dance, music, and arts and crafts and the stress on a “European language, values and norms (Christianity) ...” continues “the degradation of all that is native.” (Carnoy, P. 70)

Problem Statement

Many Belizeans can be described in Carnoy’s (1974) words as those unable to define themselves or as Enriquez (2015) lamented, those who “hardly learn about their own selves, their culture, their country or the value of their resources.” Most Garinagu and a growing number of Maya graduates in Belize cannot speak their own language and are totally unaware of their cultural heritage. To address this problem, a few nongovernmental culturally based, ethnocentric organizations have established cultural preservation programs in their local communities. The programs are solely in the hands of local communities, schools, and culture-based/ethnocentric organizations. Except for one recent study conducted by Gonzalez (2016), little is known about the nature of such programs. One such program is the Garifuna Language Arts and Crafts Programs in Schools in Punta Gorda, Belize. A cursory look at the objectives of the program in a two-page concept paper (Battle of the Drum Secretariat, 2012) raised more questions than answers regarding content, the level of Ministry of Education’s involvement, training of teachers, and student composition. A study of programs conducted by culture-based groups can establish if they are, in fact, supporting multicultural and socially just education. Given this situation, exploratory research would provide an appropriate first

step towards an in-depth evaluation of these important educational programs. These reasons, in part, led to the decision to undertake this study.

Background

The Belizean Garinagu are the descendants of Africans and ‘Red’ Caribs who intermingled on the island of St. Vincent sometime after the seventeenth century and from which they were later exiled. The Africans were shipwrecked or runaway slaves whom the Red/Yellow Caribs befriended and gave refuge. The Africans adopted the Carib culture and became known as the Black Caribs. The Black Caribs improved on the seafaring skills of their Amerindian ancestors, learned words from the French, and adapted guerilla warfare skills as they fought against the French and subsequently the British in their quest for freedom and independence. They took these skills and culture with them to Honduras when they were exiled from St. Vincent. In Honduras and later in Guatemala, countries to which they also immigrated before coming to Belize, they acquired one of the significant elements characteristic of the Belizean Gariguna—their Spanish last names.

Much has changed since the Garinagu arrived and settled in southern Belize, particularly in the demographic context. For quite some time after their arrival to Stann Creek and Toledo Districts, the Garinagu were the majority of the inhabitants in their home communities of Dangriga and Punta Gorda. Since then a number of them have moved to other parts of the country. Similarly, other ethnic groups have moved into and settled in what were previously traditional Garifuna communities. Today, the Garinagu live in a Belize in which they represent 4.6% of the population (down from 6.1% in 2000), although their actual number has remained the same (Statistical Institute of Belize,

2010). They now live in a multi-culturally diverse Belize, which, according to the House and Population Census of 2010 consists of 50 per cent Mestizo, 21 per cent Creole, 0.9 percent Asian, Africans/Blacks .4 percent, East Indian, 0.2 percent Hindu, 6 percent Maya Q'eqchi, 3 percent Maya Mopan, 0.7 percent Maya Yucatec, 3.5 percent Mennonites, and 6 percent of mixed parentage. The Mestizo is the largest ethnic group in Belize; they began migrating to Belize around the end of nineteenth century (Vernon, 2005). Their number has increased with the influx of refugees from Honduras, Salvador, Mexico, and Guatemala with the largest entry from the latter, (Belize Statistical Institute, 2010). The Creoles, "any person who has some African Blood," had constituted the largest cultural group whose numerically dominant status decreased due to their high emigration rate to the United States and the increase of the Mestizo population. The Maya, descendants of the ancient people of Southern Mexico and Central America, have communities mainly in the Toledo, Cayo, and Corozal districts. The East Indians came to Belize as indentured servants in the mid-to-late nineteenth century and have communities in the Toledo and Corozal districts. Recently there has been an arrival of small groups of East Indians and Asians whose purpose is to conduct commercial activities. This is the multicultural reality in which the Belizean Garinagu are living today.

Existing literature reveals that colonial education served the purpose of the European colonizers. Education served as a medium of cultural and religious imperialism to dehumanize colonized cultures for the purpose of exploitation and control. The colonized peoples were denuded of their history, culture, language, and any element that identified them as a people. According to Albatch and Kelly (1974), European languages "became the educational medium of all those (indigenous) destined for urban living." In

Belize, this was combined with religious and moral instruction to form the first curriculum of what is now the church-state system of education. The knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values that had ensured the survival of the Garinagu and the indigenous peoples of British Honduras (now Belize) prior to colonization were never taught in schools.

Generally, the standard practice was the teaching of a basic curriculum that consisted of writing, spelling, arithmetic, and of course religious instruction in the form of bible reading. Additionally, elocution and grammar were taught to the boys at the Honduras Free School while the girls were taught needlework. The provision of religious education was cemented with the passing of the 1850 School Act stating that religious instruction would be left entirely to the clergy. The School Amendment Act of 1855 further added Industrial Education (Bennett, 2008). This curriculum within the emerging Church-state system was already in place when St. Peter Claver School opened its doors in the Garifuna community of Punta Gorda in 1862.

A new curriculum was reported in 1945 but its effectiveness was questionable as the disparity among schools, teachers, and students was quite wide. There is no evidence, for instance, to show that a subject such as handicraft taught at the Wesley and Holy Redeemer Schools in Belize City were taught in southern Garifuna communities. The Garinagu were expert at handicraft such as basketweaving—Pataki (Young, 2002). The Garinagu made various implements for the baking of cassava. The author recalls mattresses made from reeds by an elderly woman and brooms from special leaves. The education system has failed, past and present, to utilize local handicraft.

Cultural imperialism has used colonial education to suppress the history, traditions, and language of the Garifuna peoples. Any history prior to internal self-government in 1964 was about the British and their exploits in the world. Since 1964 and after independence in 1981, efforts have been undertaken to focus on regional and national history. Recently, the teaching of African and Mayan history was introduced in elementary schools but neither addresses the “traditions and acquirements, habits conquests...” of the Garifuna people. Bennett (2006) cited the Baptist Church for extending its curriculum beyond teaching and preaching in English sometime around 1850 by making an effort to provide instruction in the languages of its students. A memorandum written in 1928 raised the issue of language in education and recommended teaching using the language of the students and the training of teachers. The Catholic Church limited its interest in the Garifuna language to its goal of converting the Garinagu to Catholicism. Woodson (2008) pointed out that traders and missionaries only paid attention to languages for the purpose of exploitation and proselytization. Except for the early attempts by the Baptists to train Garifuna teachers to teach and preach in Garifuna and the literary works of Fathers Stochl and Hadel, the educational system has made no substantive effort to promote the Garifuna language and culture. The emphasis has always been on the English Language.

Bartolo Polonio (2012) recalled that the speaking of Garifuna was not allowed in the classroom when he was a primary school student in the 1930s. Beatrice Arzu (2013) confirmed this and added that most students only spoke Garifuna and the little English they learned at school but not Creole. Creole was only spoken by the Creoles. Beatrice’s sister, Isabel Cayetano, had an entirely different language experience. Her teacher, a nun,

had Isabel's skirt lifted above and behind her head in order to expose her underwear. She was then whipped on her behind in front of the entire class (Cayetano, 2013).

Experiences like these forced Garinagu children to live in two realms: as a Garifuna and as a British subject (colonized). According to Memmi (1965., p. 107), the two worlds "are symbolized and conveyed by the two tongues ... in conflict; ... those of the colonizer and the colonized." This act of cultural imperialism devalued and dehumanized the language of Garifuna people.

The education of the Garinagu like the African Americans described by Woodson (2008) was "almost entirely in the hands of those ..." who oppressed and exploited them. The curriculum was British or American and supported by relevant texts. According to Brett (2012), the textbooks supporting the curriculum taught by the Sisters of the Holy Family in Stann Creek, were imported from the United States.

This background provided the context in which the languages and cultures of the colonized people were devalued within the colonial education system in British Honduras; it must change. The education system needs to become anti-racist and more inclusive. For too long reform efforts, before and after independence, have ignored the multicultural reality in schools and the communities of which they are a part. Providing opportunities for every child to attend school or mandating that he/she attend does not necessarily constitute inclusivity. Too many children are living dual lives: one at school and the other at home. The school should reflect the multicultural reality of its communities. Where the school is in a heterogenous community, efforts should be pursued to have the former reflect some of the latter's values, traditions and culture. The language, history, music, art, and dance of the children attending the school should be

part of the curriculum. The teaching of history should include not only stories about the heroes of one group but also an unsanitized account of all people's experience. The national university, the University of Belize, should be trained in social justice education and or multicultural education.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to explore how sponsors and beneficiaries view the Garifuna Language and Arts and Crafts in School Program at St. Peter Claver School in Punta Gorda. The Garifuna Language and Arts and Craft Program can be generally defined as a culture-based education program. I want to know what this process of Garifuna cultural education means to the sponsors of the program, how they see their role, how they perceive their experiences, and whether they view their efforts as successful. The sponsors are defined as all those who are involved in the workings of the program as managers, teachers, parents, or community members. The researcher also wants to know what the beneficiaries, the children, of the program think of their experience.

Central/Research Question

What does the Garifuna Language and Arts and Craft Program in Schools mean to the sponsors and beneficiaries participating in its program at St. Peter Claver School?

How do the sponsors and beneficiaries view the Garifuna Language and Arts and Craft Program in Schools at St. Peter Claver School?

Sub-questions to sponsors and beneficiaries:

1. How did you get involved in this program?
2. What do you understand to be the purpose of this program?

3. What does this program mean to you? How important is this program to you?
4. How do you determine the success of this program?
5. What attitudes do you see others have towards this program?
6. To whom should we talk to find out more about this program?

Definition of Terms

Culture-based education. “Culture-based education provides instruction and student learning...” grounded in the culture of a people (Kana’iaupuni, 2007) given that culture is meant to be the shared ways of being, knowing, and doing.” Instruction in the ways of being, knowing, and doing can also include values, norms, knowledge, beliefs, practices, and experiences (Kana’iaupuni, 2007). Such education would be culturally appropriate—in the language and cultural methods of teaching and learning of the people it serves (Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2007). Culture-based education can be described as contextualized learning that relates “what students learn to their culture, communities, lives, and land.”

Demmert (2011) identified three types of culture-based schools: (1) generic; (2) multicultural and, (3) culture-specific. The generic program meets the academic needs of all school children regardless of ethnicity. The multicultural approach is designed to cater to the academic as well as cultural needs of all ethnic groups. The third and final design, the culture-specific school meets the need of a particular ethnic or cultural set of learners. Based on this classification St. Peter Claver School would be a type one or generic school where the curriculum is monocultural and addresses only the academic needs of its students. The Garifuna Language and Arts and Craft Program in Schools (GLACSP), on

the other hand, while catering to students of diverse ethnicity is culture-specific in that it is based on the culture of one specific ethnic group.

Placed-based pedagogy

Placed-based pedagogy is comparable to culture-based education but with a focus on educating its constituents such that there is a direct effect on the social well-being of the immediate environment in which they live (Gruenewald, 2003). Thus, place-based education promotes learning that is rooted in what is local—the unique history, environment, culture, economy, literature, and art of a particular place—that is, in the students' own “place” or immediate schoolyard, neighborhood, town, or community.

Community education

Community education, also known as community-based education or community learning and development, promotes learning and social development work with individuals and groups in their communities using a range of formal and informal methods.

Community-based education

Abercrombie et al. (2006) defined community as “a collection of people with a particular social structure, a sense of belonging, who work and live within a geographical area.”

Description of Program

The GLACSP was established in 2008 as part of the Battle of the Drums Cultural Retrieval Program. The Battle of the Drums Secretariat is the brainchild of Mr. Darius Avila, a local businessman, and was conceptualized in October 2006 "to revive and promote ...the Garifuna culture." The program started off at the St. Peter Claver School

with a focus on drumming and arts and craft but expanded to the teaching of the Garifuna Language in 2012. The program was also extended to St. Joseph Roman Catholic School in the Village of Barranco that same year.

To further its agenda of promoting the retrieval and preservation of Garifuna culture, the Battle of the Drums Secretariat believed that more students could be reached if the program were to be integrated into the school system. The plan now targets Infant 1 to Standard 6 (Grades 1 - 8) at St. Joseph R. C. School and Infant I to Standard II (Grades 1 - 4) at St. Peter Claver School. The objectives, according to the Secretariat, are to (1) enhance teachers' knowledge, skill, and abilities in imparting Garifuna language lessons and arts and crafts and (2) provide introductory lessons in Garifuna Language and in the making of arts and crafts.

Limitations of the Study

This case study was limited to the GLACSP in Punta Gorda Town. Financial, distance, and time constraints did not allow for the inclusion of GLACSP at St. Joseph Primary School in Barranco. St. Peter Claver Primary School, the site for this study, is the largest school in the district. The student participants in this case study include only the current students served by the school and their parents. However, teachers and administrators past and present were also interviewed to capture any development that may have taken place over the few years since the program began. Past students were not involved as participants in this study. Identifying such a population and seeking the necessary permission to interview would have exceeded the budget and time limits of this study. Finally, the academic achievement of students will not be addressed in this study.

The limitations of the study include a small size sample consisting of only three teachers (Infant 1, Infant 2, and Standard 1), that the program is limited to only to one segment of the school (lower division), and the fact that the curriculum is restricted in its scope. Generalizing the finding to programs with more subjects in its curriculum across an entire school and to all students may prove challenging and require further research.

Significance of the study

The study will assist the many culture-based education programs that are emerging. Culture-based education programs are playing a critical role in teaching and preserving the traditional music, dance, art, history, and languages of the diverse ethnic groups in Belize. Thus, there is a growing need to understand how culture-based education programs operate. Future policy decisions should be based on research and the Ministry of Education will be in a better position to regulate, if necessary. Language revitalization and culture-based program organizers and sponsors, teachers (pre-service and in-service), university instructors, supervisors, Ministry of Education personnel, and UNESCO/Belize will also benefit from this investigation. This study will provide the data needed to solicit funding from potential donor agencies. The Garifuna language, part of the UNESCO cultural tangible heritage, is in the process of becoming extinct. It can be considered endangered. Pride and a sense of identity can be developed in Garifuna children through language learning. The experiences of teachers can be used by the national university to better prepare first-time teachers for teaching in schools with culture-based educational programs. Indeed, one of the outcomes of this study is to find out what the experience is like for teachers participating in these programs.

Summary of the Chapter

This chapter introduced the research topic by describing how the colonial system of British education has affected Garinagu cultural identity, the policy of the current Ministry of Education towards language education, and lack of studies of culture-based education programs that are emerging to address the issue of indigenous languages and culture in schools. The primary purpose of this study pinpointed the need to understand the culture-based education programs. The central research questions and sub-questions provided direction for the focus of the research. It also identified those entities who can best benefit from such a study.

This dissertation is comprised of five chapters. Chapter One, the introduction, provided important contextual information regarding the research problem. Chapter two, the methodology, is dedicated to taking the reader through the process of how data was collected. Chapter three, analysis of data, details how a qualitative analysis of the data is carried out. The final chapter, the summary, will discuss the results and offer recommendations for educational practice and policy.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review endeavors to assist the reader in understanding the socio-historical context in which the Garinagu were culturally oppressed in their relationship with colonial education, the impact of cultural imperialism, and their efforts to bring about educational change using culture-based education as a medium. The literature review will provide foundational knowledge about the development and scope of culture-based education as described by Demmert (2011) in the US, Kanayiaupuni (2007) in Hawaii, May (1999), and other proponents of similar programs with the goal of preserving the languages and culture of indigenous peoples. Brann's "questions for education" will provide a conceptual framework and social justice education-related theories, mainly Freirean critical pedagogy, will serve as the theoretical framework for analysis. The literature review is also expanded to connect the study with the identity development of the Garinagu. The review addresses how the growing interest of preserving the Garifuna language and culture began. The literature review then takes the reader to the origin of the Garifuna people, their culture and language followed by an explanation and analysis of the Belizean education system. The review ends with a comprehensive examination of the purpose, management, curriculum, student composition, staffing, and community involvement in culture-based education systems.

Interest in the Preservation of culture

An interest in the preservation of cultures and languages has been gaining ground in Belize over the past ten to fifteen years. Darius Avila, the president of the Battle of the Drums Secretariat probably explained it best.

Now as of late 70's early 80's I started to feel a deterioration now between 1981-1991. I was away from Punta Gorda Town. But I kept connected ... One thing that readily popped up was primarily the deterioration of our celebration for the 19th of November. I saw we were not re-enacting ... properly or to depict what should have been depicted. I saw when I was growing up from the 1st to the 19th of November, ... Garifuna celebrations drumming, singing, dancing, you know, exhibition, preparing for the mas service. The whole school came out and taught the mass in Garifuna and so forth. I noticed all of that started to disappear so much so that when I came back briefly in 1992. I left again in 1995 and then I came back in 1998. It was then I said to myself its worthless complaining about the deterioration. We need to do something.

This call for action came in the form of research, musical lyrics, poetry, and eventually a culture-based education program that has resulted in the teaching of languages and cultural activities in schools. Nunez-Gonzalez (2016) cited both Ruiz-Alvarez (2008) and Lopez (2009) who saw “the loss of indigenous languages and cultural practices ...” having “... ignited interest in the importance of culture and led organizations to implement programs to ensure cultural survival because its extinction means loss of their way of life as they know it.” Barret (2017), another Garifuna researcher, agreed that language loss has heightened awareness motivating indigenous community leaders and activists to explore how such loss can be minimized. Nunez-Gonzalez (2016) studied a primary school opened in 2007 in Dangriga, Belize “... to address the problem of Garifuna culture and language erosion.” Ruiz-Alvarez (2008) examined language and cultural endangerment in Corozal, Honduras. Barret (2017) looked at the perception of teachers in Stann Creek, Belize in connection with the

implementation of Intercultural Bilateral Education (IBE) as a language preservation program. The mere fact that Garinagu researchers, Nunez-Gonzalez, Ruiz-Alvarez, and Barret wrote their dissertations around the topic of Garifuna language loss within the last ten years is also testimony to the mounting interest in the language preservation efforts.

Several Garifuna musical artists, notably Andy Palacio, have added their voice calling for the preservation of the Garifuna language. Andy, widely acclaimed as a cultural activist, was described by Caribbean Beat (<https://www.caribbean-beat.com/issue-91/andy-palacio-bard-garifuna-goes-home#axzz5PUSDwX7q>) as one who, “Not since the days of Bob Marley has a Caribbean artist generated so much global interest, or garnered so many awards ... But unlike Marley or the Buena Vistas, Palacio was unique as a representative of the Caribbean’s indigenous people, pre-Columbian survivors, and as the first Garifuna superstar.” In his song, Amunegu (In Times to Come), Andy wondered:

Kaba funa san añuga wabute amuñegu
Kaba funa san ayanuha Garifuna numa amuñegu
Kaba funa san arumaha numa o amuñegu
Kaba funa san aduguraha wau o amuñegu

In times to come, I wonder who will bake cassava bread for us?
 In times to come, I wonder who will speak Garifuna with me?
 In times to come, I wonder who will perform (sing) along with me?
 In times to come, I wonder who will conduct our dugu (spiritual) rites with us?

Chuluhali dan lun lareidahoun
Chuluhali dan lun larufudahoun
Chuluhali dan lun lareidahoun
Feiridiwañali ei gumugubei

The time has come to preserve it
 The time has come to teach it
 The time has come to preserve it
 Before we lose it completely/forever

Repeat #1

Repeat #1

Ageindaguanian wayunagu lun habagaridun kei
Garinagu
Wagia me san afedirei wagaburi. Madugawamei

Our ancestor fought to live as Garinagu
 Will we be the one to lose our way of life?
 Let's not do it

Aganba humana aguburigu. harufudaha houn isanigu
Wererum luma weremuhan. wafien luma wabinahan

Parents listen to me, teach our children our language, our songs, our beliefs, and our dances.

Chuluhali dan lun laredahoun
Chuluhali dan lun lareidahoun
Chuluhali dan lun lareidahoun
Feiridiwañali ei gumugubei

The time has come to preserve it
 The time has come to teach it
 The time has come to preserve it
 Before we lose it completely/forever

Figure 1 - Amunegu by Andy Palacio

For my part, I took to poetry as early as 1986 to express my concern for cultural and language preservation and wrote, “The Lamentations of a Garifuna Ancestor.”

The Lamentations of a Garifuna Ancestor

Garifuna, Arihaba bun
Kasaueigie baramudebei bigubu?
Ladugasan magibuba?
Ladugasan marasaban?
Ladugasan mageiraba?
Garifuna ahuchuraguda bumutina

Garifuna, asa waweyurite?
Afeduha buguya
Abinaha buguya
Anabaha buguya
Bareingati wafedu uguñe

Garifuna, itarala lubasan
Garifuna, asa wasanigu
Debouyuhaniña ama bereigun, “baby!”
Dele beigaguduniña ama bereigun, “eat!”
Darile bawaruhoun ama bereigun, “come.”
Higeisan nirau, houba, higabu?
Garifuna, liraburisan dumurei nichugun beibun?

Garifuna, asa wasanigu?
Ariba biriduniña
Aba negei mamadugu wagiya meme
Emeri buriguda bumuti nawu
Darina, anahan feridinadibu
Erei, falalabadina

(Ayahuahani...)

Garifuna, au laduga san bupanta?
Ladugasan lubidu dan
Garifuna, sarawama, duguwama
Uwala busiganu
Mibelan ayanuhanile. Tatilan wadagumanu
Bungiu waba, wagia larigien

Garifuna look at you
Why are you hiding your face?
Is it because you’re faceless?
Is it because you don’t have an identity?
Is it because you’re placeless?
Oh ... Garifuna you scare me

Garifuna, how about Garifuna Settlement Day?
You celebrate
You dance
You curse/swear
And you say today is our Celebration Day!

Garifuna, is this the way it will be?
Garifuna, how about our children?
When you nurse them you say, “baby!”
When you feed them you say, “Eat!”
When you call them you say, “Come.”
How about nirau, houba, higabu?
Garifuna, were these the words I gave you?

Garifuna, how about our children?
Look at how you have named them
Aba (Unity) but we’re not united as one
Emeri but we are left without purpose
Darina, I am here but I have lost you
Erei, yet you have weakened me

(Wailing ...)

Garifuna, is it because of your arrogance
Is it because of good times
Garifuna, rise up, press on
Let there be no shame
Less talk. Let the work begin.
God leads, we follow.

Figure 2 - Lamentations of a Garifuna Ancestor by Juan Nunez

I can trace this concern for cultural and language preservation to the emphasis that my parents placed on speaking Garifuna at home and, particularly, in responding to them. That upbringing influenced my interest in issues around cultural and ethnic identity

development within the social justice education program at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.

I have always had questions about who I am and how I became who I am. I later understood this questioning as that of identity. I remember being critical of my Garifuna peers who were not able to speak the Garifuna language. I also recall finding it unnerving to realize that I did a lot of my thinking in English as opposed to Garifuna.

Both my upbringing in a traditional Garifuna family and my experience as a social justice education doctoral student at the University of Massachusetts Amherst have led to the development of strongly held beliefs about language and cultural preservation. Those beliefs have translated into this intellectualized pursuit to understand the phenomenon of language and cultural preservation. Such understandings and practices cannot be attained without theoretical knowledge and applied efforts (Fishman, 1991). I believe that everyone has a right to his/her own sense of identity and should not be coerced, indirectly or directly, to confirm or adopt the cultural values, beliefs, and customs of others. I also believe, like Paola Freire (2000), that humans have the capacity to better their lot regardless of circumstances. We can transcend from being victims of circumstances to agents of change. Education, which has been used as a tool for colonization, can play a crucial role in reversing its negative historical effects and become a tool for liberation. As part of this process of liberation, the cultures of colonized peoples can be promoted, affirmed, and celebrated.

Part 1: Cultural Identity Development of the Garinagu

The purpose of this section is to trace the cultural identity development of the Belizean Garinagu from their birth as a distinct ethnic group on the island of St. Vincent.

According to Macionis (2009), culture refers to *the beliefs, values, behavior and material objects that, together, form a people's way of life.*" The beliefs, values, language, and behavior make up the nonmaterial culture whereas the material objects are tangible products. Cultural identity, on the other hand, can be defined in at least two ways (Hall, 2003). The first is that cultural identity is "...one shared culture, a sort of collective one 'true self', hiding inside many other, more superficial or artificially imposed 'selves', which people with a shared history and ancestry hold in common."

All Belizean Garinagu, are from a new people in the Caribbean, who originate out of two peoples, the Island Caribs and Africans. The cultural identity of the Garinagu, their collective true self, has been molded and forged by oppression – war, marginalization, colonization, and cultural imperialism – as they fought for survival on the island of St. Vincent and in the societies to which they immigrated. Over the past 400 years, before and after their exile from St. Vincent, the Garinagu have been ascribed, by their oppressors, differing identities or imposed selves, and they themselves took on varying identities as they struggled to survive as a people. Undoubtedly, every encounter with other peoples, in each geographical location where they settled, helped in shaping their cultural identity. Their interaction with the French and British in St. Vincent, the role of the interactions they experienced in the three Spanish speaking countries – Honduras, Guatemala, and Nicaragua – and the influence of colonial and postcolonial life in Belize, formerly British Honduras, had an impact on their cultural development. Whereas the Belizean Garinagu share a lot in common with their counterparts in Honduras and Guatemala and to a lesser extent to those in Nicaragua, their British colonial experience since their first arrival in 1802 followed by their life as citizens of an

independent Belize since 1981 continue to develop a unique Garifuna culture. This unique Belizean culture takes us to the second definition of Stuart's cultural identity.

The second definition of cultural identity, according to Stuart (2003), is a matter of who we are becoming, as well who we currently are. Basically, cultural identity is fluid and constantly changing as it is impacted by elements of history, culture, and power. This second definition explains and clarifies that the Garifuna culture is not what it used to be and that the change continues. This will be highlighted in this section.

The Belizean Garinagu are the descendants of Africans and Yellow Caribs who intermingled on the island of St. Vincent sometime after the 17th century and from which they were later exiled. The Africans were shipwrecked or runaway slaves whom the Yellow Caribs befriended and gave refuge. The Africans adopted the Carib culture and became known as the Black Caribs. The Black Caribs improved on the seafaring skills of their Amerindian ancestors, learned words from the French, and adapted guerilla warfare skills as they fought against the French and subsequently the British in their quest for freedom and independence. It was these skills and culture that they took with them to Honduras after they were exiled from St. Vincent. In Honduras and later in Guatemala, countries to which they also immigrated before coming to Belize, they acquired one of the significant characteristic of the Belizean Garinagu, their Spanish last names.

Unlike their Honduran, Guatemalan, and Nicaraguan peers, the Belizean Garifuna identity has not only been influenced by Latin American geopolitics, but also by a history of citizenship in a colony controlled by their former nemesis, the British. The Garifuna colonial experience of living in a demographically different country, followed by living in post-colonial Belize, has resulted in the development of an identity unlike

those of the Garinagu in Guatemala and Honduras. Among the Garinagu, the Belizean Garifuna is unique.

Ancestral Origins of the Garinagu

The outward, physical appearance of a Garifuna person is African and undoubtedly the Belizean Garifuna, like his/her Central American brethren, can trace part of his/her ancestry to Africa. According to Palacio (2007), one of the shortcomings of the cultural identity ethnography of the Garinagu is the lack of studies on the specific origin of their African ancestry. It is generally accepted; nonetheless, that most of the Africans were from Western Africa. Palacio also acknowledged that tracing the Carib origin of the Garinagu to the time before St. Vincent is also not without its problems. Monsalve & Hagelber (1997) confirmed the African-slave and Amerindian origins of the Garifuna, as both Carib and Yoruba mtDNA haplotypes were detected in this population. Their DNA results show that both Amerindian and African slave females contributed to the formation of this group. This finding is significant for two reasons: (1) It confirms the presence of the African women's participation in the origin of the Garinagu and (2), given how the ethnography of the Garinagu has been written, copulation did not only between African men and Red Carib women.

The Landing: The Arrival of Adam

It is uncertain when the first Africans landed on the island of St. Vincent, subsequently intermingled with the "Island Caribs," and thus gave birth to a new people, the "Black Caribs." What is certain is that the presence of the 'negroes' was already felt by the July 13, 1653 hurricane (Martin & Kirby, 1972). Judging by the account provided by Gonzalez (1991), the arrival of the first African could have occurred as early as 1517.

The shipwreck of a Dutch ship off the Bequia coast in 1675 is one of the popular explanations of how the Africans met the Island Caribs but reports of other shipwrecks have also been recorded. One ship was hit by a storm and was wrecked in the northern part of St. Vincent (Le Breton, 1998). My calculations based on the evidence provided by Le Breton (1998) dated the shipwreck and the landing of the Africans somewhere between 1643 and 1650. This account by Le Breton was never published until 1998 and up until then was not included in the sources cited in the literature, (although it may have been the same shipwreck). Coke (1793) wrote that the “Black Caribbs” were brought over to St. Vincent by the Yellow Caribs after they were saved from a Guinea ship that wrecked off the coast of the Grenadilloes. Given that these shipwrecks were reported in mid-seventeenth century, it is safe to assume that the raids by the Island Caribs on ships and plantations to capture enslaved Africans were the second means by which “Negroes” got on the island of St. Vincent. The third source for Negro population growth on the island was through fugitives escaping from slavery – Barbados (Boucher, 1992; Hulme & Whitehead, 1992).

Demystifying the Adam and Eve Story

One can be led to believe, given how history has been written, that the origin of the Black Caribs (Garinagu), is sort of an Adam and Eve story where a man (African) met a woman (Carib Indian) and had children. Recent literature would make it appear as if the evolution of the Black Caribs in St. Vincent is solely the product of interbreeding between the Yellow/Island Caribs and Africans. For example, Hulme and Whitehead (1992) wrote that the Africans *intermingled* with the Yellow Caribs and some married Carib girls resulting in children of mixed parentage. In another account (Kirby & Martin,

1972), Raynal observed that children were more of the color of their fathers (Negroes), rather than their mothers (Carib), can be attributed to the growing number of Negroes on the island. Negro was one of the common terms along with Africans used for men of African heritage. These accounts did little to derail this Adam and Eve view of the origin of the Garinagu. According to Coke (1793), the Black Caribs are a 'motley mixture' resulting from a connection of a wrecked Guinea ship's cargo with the native inhabitants of St. Vincent, the Yellow Caribs. The Black Caribs were taller and stouter than the yellow Caribs (Shepherd, 1831). The Yellow Caribs, according to Lambertye (Hulme & Whitehead, 1992), were smaller, more rounded, and with long, straight, black hair. This racially mixed group made up the "motley mixture" on the island. Accounts like these gave the impression that the Garinagu evolved purely from the intermingling of African men with Carib women. Further review of the literature, however, has directed me otherwise. I believe that one 'became' a Black Carib, not only from mixed parentage but also by adaptation. One became a Garifuna either by (1) African adopting Yellow Carib ways, (nurture); or (2), as the descendant of a Yellow Carib and an African born into the Carib community (nature).

The Adam and Eve perception is probably caused by omission. African women are not mentioned in most ethnographical writings on the Black Caribs when, in fact, there is compelling evidence that African women were passengers in at least two shipwreck accounts. According to Gullick (1976), many Black ancestors of the Black Caribs came from recently enslaved people. In a recently found document, Le Breton (1998) wrote:

"In any case, it is certain that by the greatest luck fortunately only one 'Ethiopian' woman or perhaps two were found to have lost their lives in such

great a danger. As a result, in a short time, these Africans united themselves with the survivors (*sibi invicem*) ... They had children, whose numbers grew rapidly in the following years to such an extent that without overtaking the Karaybes race, they at least equaled it.”

In another account, Intendant Robert (Hulmes & Whitehead, 1992; pages 171 - 174), wrote:

“... many negroes and negresses from the said ship escaped on shore and were received kindly by the Caraiques: it is this event that began the settlement of these negroes to St. Vincent, where they live. There were negroes and negresses, they had children...”

It is difficult to ascertain from Le Breton’s account if the Ethiopians and survivors are from the same vessel, but it is clear from Intendant Robert that Africans had children among themselves on the island of St. Vincent. These children would have been of pure African stock. At no point in his writing did Le Breton (1998) discuss the intermingling of the Africans with the “Karaybes”. The Africans lived separately in small huts (Le Breton 1998; Hulme & Whitehead, 1992).

The third way in which the island of St. Vincent was populated was through the continuous inflow of escaped slaves from the other islands particularly Barbados and St. Lucia (Kirby & Martin, 1972). This added to the “pure” African group thereby increasing the number of Black Caribs. According to Kirby and Martin (1972), “...the negroes found their numbers increasingly swollen by the wave of ‘illegal immigrants.’”. This strengthens the author’s theory that many of the original Black Caribs were, in fact, former slaves and were not the product of any intermingling. The point that the author is trying to make here is that, at least for a while, Africans were having offspring who were not of Carib Indian heritage. Gonzalez (1990) alluded that the process of miscegenation and the creation of the new phenotype later known as the Black Caribs was a gradual

process. The intermingling with the Carib Indians appears to have happened afterward or at the very least at the same time. If the Africans *intermingled* much later, it meant that they became Black Caribs by adapting the culture and customs of the Carib Indians. Nevertheless, the process resulted in new people in the Caribbean with their own identity, the Garinagu.

The Adaptation: Becoming a Carib/Garifuna

According to Le Breton (1998), once the Africans were on the island they adopted the culture of the Island/Yellow Caribs using the same laws and assimilating their customs from a young age. Le Breton was obviously referring to the children of the Africans since he was clear about the fact that they lived separately from the Caribs.

They buried their dead in the custom of the Yellow Caribs by digging a round hole and propping up the body in a squatting position under the floor of their huts. Other beliefs and practices related to the dead were inherited from their Yellow Carib ancestors. For example, there was the belief that Caribs have three souls (Gullick, 1976). According to Valentine (2002), the three souls are the *ahari*, *afurugu*, and *uaña*. *Ahari* is the spirit transformed from the spirit of the dead, *afurugu*, which speaks with authority and is offered food. The practice of providing the favorite food of the deceased continues, in Belize, as it is in other Garifuna communities. The *afurugu*, although a spirit, is part of a living person which makes his/her personality and lives after death. The *uaña* literally means those who are no longer and is merely an all-compassing word for all those who have passed away.

According to George Davidson (Coke, 1793), the Black Caribs even resorted to flattening the head of their children. They also adopted the widespread use of the cassava

as a staple in their diet, as a beverage, and in meat preservation. Preparing the cassava for food included acquiring the knowledge and skills of making and using the grater, the wooden trough, the cassava-iron-plate, and the press (Coke, 1793). From their Carib ancestors, they learned how to make use of the cassava for food, boat building, and craftwork which included the making of hammocks, household utensils, weapons, cordage, hats, clothing, furniture and houses (Gullick, 1976; Coke, 1793). This is what the Garinagu in Belize brought with them including the construction of the grater, wooden trough, and the press (Coke, 1793).

Another custom they acquired from the Yellow Caribs was the killing of their male enemies and kidnapping the females as additional wives (Kirby & Martin, 1972). Labat, a French priest (Kirby & Martin, 1972; Hulme & Whitehead, 1992), observed that both Negroes and Caribs were painted red (rocoued, from annatto) and that the Caribs “regarded them as belonging to one and the same nation.” The practice of rocouing (reddening) exists today but is limited to dyeing the garments of *afunahoatiña* (the reddened ones) for the *dügü* (Cayetano, 1997). The *dügü* is the third and most serious of the Garinagu healing rites.

The Belizean Garifuna spirituality, an essential component of their identity, is influenced by their indigenous Carib ancestors, by Christianity, and to a lesser extent by the Zambos of the Mosquito Coast (Gullick, 1976). The similar practice of appeasing the ancestors through the intervention of “buyei” who interpreted various dreams is still carried on in Belize today (Gonzalez, 1988; Gullick, 1976). One of the issues that continue to pose a challenge is reconciling the extent of the impact of African culture on the development of Black Carib spiritual identity. Gonzalez (1990) pointed out that the

Yellow/Red Carib socio-cultural system remained, for the most part, intact with some form of syncretism. According to Gullick (1976), the influence of Christianity came about mainly from the Black Carib's contact with the Spanish and the Roman Catholics in particular. The influence of the Spanish was such that a non-Spanish speaking priest was viewed with distrust until he put on his priestly regale (Stephens, 1969). Later, after the 1940's, the mass was requested along with that of a *dügu*, as a further sign that Christianity had become a part of Garifuna spiritual practices (Gullick, 1976).

The relationship between the Black Carib and the Yellow Carib was never totally understood by the Europeans. Inevitably the two groups, although separate, fought common enemies, had a level of kinship, and shared the same aspirations - freedom to be left alone. In their quest for territory, the Europeans underestimated the relationship between the two groups. Despite the animosity that reportedly developed between the two, the Yellow Caribs refused to assist the French in fighting against the Black Caribs and opted to leave the island (Gullick, 1976).

Identity is a combination of how one sees him/herself and how others see him/her (Woodward, 2000). Labat, a French priest (Kirby & Martin 1972, Hulme & Whitehead/Neil 1992), observed that both Negroes and Caribs were painted red (rocoued) and that the Caribs "regarded them as belonging to one and the same nation (Kirby, Hulme & Whitehead/1992). Le Breton had this to say:

"Indeed they entertain very easy relations with the Karaybes, with whom they frequently stay. They give each other sumptuous receptions on special days taking turns without any apparent discrimination, and they also organize at the same time and in the same way banquets - to be more precise I should say drinking parties, since not more than drinks are served in which all too often - Oh what a scandal!"

Interaction with and Influence of Enslaved Africans (Blackness)

The Black Caribs identity as a separate ethnic, cultural group was further strengthened by their desire or need to distance themselves from the enslaved African population that was brought to St. Vincent by the French. Because of their physical resemblance to these slaves and in order to strengthen and preserve their identity, the Black Caribs flattened the skulls of their young children in the same way Island Caribs did to distinguish them from the Africans enslaved by the French, (Kirby & Martin, 1972). This distancing of themselves from their African brothers may have explained the negative attitude expressed by a Black Carib in British Honduras in the 1940's over the mixture of Africans with the Island Caribs (Taylor, 1951). It may also explain the saying by present-day Garifuna, "I was never a slave (Palacio, 2005)." This problem with their black identity was also evident when they expressed their displeasure with being named as Carib Negros in the Guatemalan constitution written up prior to their departure to Belize in 1832.

According to Gullick (1976), the relationship between the Black Caribs and enslaved Africans was antagonistic. The Black Caribs were prone to kill Africans during the war as a result of the deployment of African men in the conflict by the British. Negro rangers used during the war, (1795 – 1805), were so barbaric that they had to be removed from several encounters with the Black Caribs. The explanation is that the Black Caribs also enslaved some Africans and did not necessarily treat them well. In other accounts, (Martin & Kirby, 1972), however, the Black Caribs welcomed runaway slaves from Barbados and thus increased their numbers.

Earlier it was pointed out that the Black Caribs in St. Vincent were troubled by the fact that they looked very much like the enslaved African brought to the island by the French. The St. Vincentian Black Caribs adapted several Red Carib cultural practices to differentiate themselves from their look-alike. The British Honduran Black Caribs' anxiety over their blackness can be traced to their fear of being mistaken for an escaped slave while living in St. Vincent by the French or British. Their relationship with the British Honduran Creole must have been influenced by that apprehension which was, undoubtedly, compounded by the *divide and conquer* tactics of the British colonialists, who pitted the Creoles and Black Caribs against each other (Leslie, 1995). The Baymen (the British in British Honduras), given their treatment of the Black Caribs in St. Vincent and the fear of losing their slaves, had their own apprehensions. They portrayed the Black Caribs as devil-worshippers and baby-eaters. The Black Caribs, for their part, were proud of the fact that they had a distinct language which set them apart and superior to the English-speaking Negro. At the marketplace in Belize City, the Black Carib women stayed away from the Negroes (Gullick, 1976)

“The Baymen were afraid that the Garifuna would help slaves to escape. The Baymen, therefore, set up distrust and fear in the slaves against the Garifuna. They spread propaganda branding them as devil worshippers and baby eaters. This created a prejudice that persisted for a long time.” Pg. 59

According to Taylor (1951), the Creole viewed the Black Carib as untouchables with spotted skins, degraded morals, barbaric language and customs. The Black Caribs responded by calling the Creoles contemptuous names such as *megeru* (Negro), *giau* (infidel), *uadabu* (conch), and *dubu* (stone).

The extract from Gullick (1976) sums up the impact of the relationship of the Garinagu, as a minority group, on language. This may, in part, explain the decrease in the use of the Garifuna language:

The Black Caribs' relationship with all the peoples they encountered appears to have involved their learning the other's language and never vice versa.

This necessitated their learning a great number of languages, and they had, as Young wrote, a "great aptitude for the acquirement of languages, most of the men being able to talk in Carib, Spanish and English; some even add Creole-French and Mosquito; and I have heard even the women converse in Carib, Spanish, French, etc., or Carib, English, Spanish, and so on; indeed the universality of these languages appears strange." Thus, it is ironic today that the Garinagu, who have been adept at learning other languages, are not speaking their own.

Interaction with the French

The Garinagu's relationship with the French, either as friend or foe prior to their deportation from St. Vincent, made a permanent mark on the former's cultural identity. The Black Caribs fought against the French and then fought alongside them against the British. The French intervened during the misunderstanding between the Black and Yellow Caribs. It was during their struggle for land with the French, and later the British, that the Black Caribs acquired the assistance of French and British courts. The French drew a line, Barre de l'Isle, to solve the problem that had developed between the increasing population of Black Caribs and the Yellow Caribs (Kirby & Martin, 1972). This is significant since it further strengthened the Black Caribs' sense of identity and land ownership. It also marked the official establishment of the Black Carib community and nation. According to Kirby and Martin (1972), they took the French ruling seriously

and were willing to defend it. When they allowed the presence of the French on the island, they confined them to the section occupied by the Yellow Caribs. Owning their territory also gave them sovereignty to accept Africans escaping from other islands and thus increasing their own population. The French Revolution also inspired the Black Caribs to fight for ownership of the island and for freedom and independence. There is no record of any French influence after their exile from St. Vincent (Gullick, 1976).

It was also during their interaction with the French that the Black Caribs became known for their fighting style and skill with the pirogues/boat (Hulme & Whitehead, 1992). In fighting against and in collaboration with the French, the Black Caribs developed their fighting methods and thus earned the honor of being the first to use ‘guerrilla warfare’ in the Caribbean (Kirby & Martin, 1972; Gullick, 1976). This became a part of the Black Carib identity. The Black Caribs’ close contact with the French led to their taste for wine, interaction with missionaries, and proficiency in the French language, use of the gun, a beginning shift from fishing to farming, and the adoption of French names. Although the French missionaries returned, having failed with the Yellow Caribs, there is no evidence that they were successful with the Black Caribs. The Black Carib captains got their French names from their interaction with the French, (Whitehead, 1990).

Interaction with the British

These were the same Black Caribs that the British met in their attempts to gain control of St. Vincent. Whereas the French employed appeasement over conflict, the British used legalities and then turned to outright war. The French wanted to make St. Vincent their home. The British saw St. Vincent as an opportunity to acquire wealth and

return home to England (Kirby & Martin, 1972). Fighting against a common enemy undoubtedly united the loosely connected chiefdoms under the various Black Carib captains of St. Vincent.

The British discovered that the Black Caribs were determined to keep their land and that every and all attempts to deprive the Caribs of their land were fruitless. Efforts to buy or dupe the Caribs proved futile, they also found out that the Caribs were brave and adamant in protecting their land. In a sea encounter with the British, the Caribs, in spite of losing their canoes, swam towards the British vessels with cutlasses in their mouths to carry on the fight (Kirby & Martin, 1972).

Prior to and immediately preceding the Carib War with the British, the Black Caribs were viewed by the former as savages who stood between them and land (Young, 1975). This was further reinforced by the British mistrust of the Black Carib/French relationship “perpetrator of unprovoked wrongs.” Many accounts have demonstrated, however, that the Black Caribs, when left alone and treated with respect, were illustrious and peaceful. In 1792, the Black Caribs proved themselves to be skilled at ferrying goods to and fro from European sloops across dangerous breakers. They were described as “illustrious.” During times of peace, they sold their produce at the market, bartered, and exchanged gifts with the British. According to Gullick (1976) when no longer molested, they hold friendly intercourse with their neighbors “notable for a cheerful but light character, and for superior intelligence and adroitness.” Punishment was “seldom required as the Caribs are a peaceable body of men” (Gullick, 1976). The Black Caribs were also able to engender friendship across racial lines. Coke (1978) described an incident where one of Chatoyer’s sons was willing to teach a European the

Carib language without having to be compensated. Visitors, as in the case of Roberts at Black River, Nicaragua, were hosted with little remuneration and assisted settlers with building and planting. Shortly after the Caribs' arrival in Roatan in May 1797, a contingent of only 12 Spaniards sent to recapture the island was able to get the former to capitulate peacefully, even though 200 of them were armed with muskets and bayonets (Gullick, 1976). This was in stark contrast to the treatment they received in British Honduras five years later where they were discriminated against for what the British made them out to be. This was a behavior the Black Caribs were subjected to in St. Vincent five years earlier. They were only allowed 48 hours in a settlement and only after securing the permission of the Superintendent.

The Black Caribs lived a history of marginalization and many times outright rejection. During their first years in Belize, (then British Honduras). They were less than welcome to the colony. They were not allowed to man the lookout in Cay Corker (Caye Caulker) nor were they allowed, when permitted, to stay in the settlement for longer than 48 hours (Gullick, 1976). Nevertheless, the relationship and interaction with the British before and after their departure from St. Vincent affected the Black Caribs' political life and military strategies (Gullick, 1976).

Interaction with Spaniards/Mestizos

The third major European group with which the Black Caribs interacted was the Spaniards and or their descendants; this occurred after the Black Caribs were deported and abandoned in Trujillo, Honduras on April 12, 1791, by the British. Shortly after their arrival, they dispersed along the coast of Central America and became involved in the militaries of Guatemala and Honduras, in San Felipe de Lara and Omoa respectively,

where they distinguished themselves as excellent military men. Cortes (Palacio, P.66) recorded the names of Garifuna men, Pedro Gutierrez in Honduras and Juan Bulnes Walumugu of Morazan, who served in the military. It is interesting to note here that the Black Caribs as early as 1812, which was the year that Gutierrez commanded a battalion in Honduras, already had Spanish names. In Spanish-speaking countries, it is considered unremarkable if people of African descent have Spanish surnames. However, in Belize, the only English-speaking country in Central America, a person of African descent with a Spanish last name is usually identified as a Garifuna. Landing in Spanish speaking Honduras and Guatemala has resulted in most Garifuna acquiring Spanish last names, (Nunez, Martinez, Figueroa, Ramirez, among others)

The Belizean Garifuna Today

Today, over two hundred years since they were deported from St. Vincent, traversing the countries of Central America, subjecting themselves to British Colonial rule, and living in an independent Belize for the last thirty years, the Belizean Garinagu have evolved into a unique cultural group with its own food, music, dance, religion, and language. Even as the Garinagu distinguish themselves as a distinct ethnic group, they are already changing, metamorphosing to accommodate the challenges attendant in a multicultural Belize.

Demography

Much has changed since the Garinagu arrived and settled in southern Belize, particularly in the demographic context. For quite some time after their arrival at Stann Creek and Toledo, the Garinagu were the majority of the inhabitants in their home communities of Dangriga and Punta Gorda. Since then a number of them have moved to

other parts of the country. Similarly, other ethnic groups have moved into and settled in what were previously traditional Garifuna communities. Today, the Garinagu live in a Belize in which they represent 4.6% (down from 6.1% in 2000) of the population, although their actual number has remained the same (Statistical Institute of Belize, 2010). They now live in a multi-culturally diverse Belize, which, according to the House and Population census of 2010 consists of 50 per cent Mestizo, 21 per cent Creole, 0.9 percent Asian, Africans/Blacks 0.4 percent, East Indian, 0.2 percent Hindu, 6 percent Maya Ketchi, 3 percent Maya Mopan, 0.7 percent Maya Yucatec, 3.5 percent Mennonites, and 6 percent of mixed parentage. The Mestizo is the largest ethnic group in Belize, and they migrated to Belize, around the end of the nineteenth century (Vernon, 2005). Their number has increased with the influx of refugees from Honduras, Salvador, Mexico, and Guatemala with the largest entry from the latter, (Belize Statistical Institute, 2010). The Creoles, “any person who has some African Blood,” constituted the largest cultural group whose numerically dominant status decreased due to their high emigration rate to the United States and the increase of the Mestizo population. The Maya, descendants of the ancient people of Southern Mexico and Central America, have communities mainly in the Toledo, Cayo, and Corozal districts. The East Indians came over as indentured servants in the mid-to-late nineteenth century and have communities in the Toledo and Corozal districts. Recently there has been an arrival of small groups of East Indians and Asians whose purpose is to conduct commercial activities. This is the multicultural reality in which the Belizean Garinagu are living today.

The Belizean Garinagu have distinguished themselves, not only as a unique group among the ethnic groups of Belize but, among the Garifuna communities in Guatemala,

Honduras, and Nicaragua. As early as in 1943, the Belizean Garinagu, through the efforts of T.V. Ramos, were granted a public and bank holiday to commemorate their arrival to southern Belize on November 19. In 1997 the Government officially recognized November 19 as a national public and bank holiday. There is no evidence that the Garinagu in Guatemala and Honduras enjoy this kind of recognition. In contrast, it was not until a few years ago, that the Garinagu in Livingston, Guatemala, began celebrating their own Garifuna Day but without the benefit of a government-supported holiday.

The Belizean Garinagu have been and are key players in the national development of Belize and have participated in the country's political and religious life at the highest levels. In the 1970s a Garifuna was the principal of the Belize Teachers' Training College; 1979 saw the election of a Garifuna as the leader of the opposition party in a two-party political system, and appointment of a Garifuna to the Catholic bishopric. In 1988 a Garifuna rose to one of the highest positions in the country in the government public service, that of a *permanent secretary*. Today, a Garifuna serves as the ombudsman of Belize.

Garifuna Rites, Traditions and Practices

The one cultural marker that sets the Belizean Garifuna apart from their ethnic counterparts is their belief in connecting with their ancestors. These beliefs are manifested in rites and practices associated with death and the dead. These rites include the *amuyadahani*, the *chugu*, the *lemesi*, and the *dugu*. Cayetano (1997) identified three of the rites – *amuyadahani*, the *chugu*, and the *dugu* - as ancestral, whereas Valentine (2002) called the *chugu*, *lemesi* and *dugu* healing rites. The *amuyadahani* is the bathing of the spirit of the dead, a ceremony that symbolizes the end of the journey to Seiri, the

seat of God, by washing the evidence of that journey before being allowed to enter (Valentine, 2002). The *chugu*, the feeding of the dead, (Cayetano, 1997) or the offering of food to dead, (Valentine, 2002), is a shortened version of the *dugu* which Kerbs (1997) described as a one-day affair. The playing of Drums at the *chugu* may occur with the blessings of the ancestral spirits, but such accompaniment takes place only after the food has been offered, (Valentine, 2002). The *dugu*, on the other hand, definitely involves the playing of the drums. The *dugu* lasts at least six days and can go on for up to nine days. This is the most serious of these healing and ancestral rites. In addition to taking more days, it is more expensive, and the number of attendees is greater than for the other rites. Unlike the *amuyadahani*, both the *chugu* and the *dugu* need the participation of the *buyei*, or spiritual leader.

These rites may well be the last line of defense against the deculturalization of the Garifuna. Even as some decry the decline of the Garifuna culture, (Cayetano, 1997; Palacio, 2005; Valentine, 2002), ancestral rites are held on a regular basis, especially during the summer months of July and August. In one year alone, four (Fanny, Lulu, Lopez, Barranco) families held ancestral rites. Cayetano (telephone conversation, 1:10 p.m. October 23, 2011), pointed out that there is a resurgence in the practice of *diigü*, as evidenced by the existence of *dabuyaba*, (ancestral house, temple), in all but one of the Garifuna communities. This is significant because regardless of the extent to which the individuals assimilated into wider Belizean way of life, they feel obligated to participate in these rites. In other words, the ongoing belief and participation of the Belizean Garifuna in the ancestral practices of his/her forefathers, continue to identify him/her as a Garifuna today. The ancestral rites have and continue to be an expression of Garifuna

cultural identity. According to Valentine (1993), even when the Garifuna were afraid that their involvement would be discovered by the church, the Garifuna participated because of fear of what would happen to them if they did not. For this reason, the ancestral rites continue to play a key role in the preservation of Garifuna culture. Cayetano (1997) cited Palacio as having new hope for the preservation of the Garifuna culture as the *dugu* continued to be held. Death and or illness, especially unexplained, may be attributed to lack of cooperation with the family, or resistance to participation in the healing or ancestral rites (Valentine, 2002). The *diigii* would be undertaken to seek to bring together all parties, including both the dead and the living, to resolve their differences (Cayetano, 1997). Accidents, illness or death can also be attributed to a host of other things including obeah and lack of belief in the ancestral rites. Whether the practice of ancestral rites continues out of fear, or a sense of obligation to family tradition, further study would be required to arrive at a definitive determination.

Garifuna Music and Dance

Belizean Garifuna music and dance, once reviled as part of ‘devil worship’ rites, have transcended beyond a marker of Garifuna identity. Most Belizeans, Garifuna or not, have claimed Garifuna music and dance as Belizean. Garifuna music and dance have become known worldwide through the efforts of Pen Cayetano, Andy Palacio and many other musicians. Today, all Garinagu are proud to be associated and identified with Garifuna music and dance. The Drums, music, and dance which were key elements of Garifuna ancestral rites, have long found their way into Christian religious worship. According to Felicia Norales (2011), Osmond P. Martin, first Garifuna bishop of Belize, produced a Garifuna mass booklet in 1983 as part of Garifuna Settlement Day

celebrations. Sebastian Cayetano, a Garifuna author, said that Catholic Mass in Garifuna, (including singing and music), dates to the early 1970's. Such practices reflect the acceptance of Garifuna culture as part of Belize's national identity. The music and dance can be considered the outward expression of the Garifuna identity, whereas the ancestral rites reflect the inner soul.

The Garifuna drum is the single most material representation of Garifuna identity. It is essential for the performance of most ancestral and healing rites, performing arts, and many celebratory activities. It is an integral part of Garifuna music and dance and in some cases directs it as in Wanaragua, one of the many Garifuna dances. Books written or edited by three Garifuna authors, Sebastian Cayetano, Joseph Palacio, and Jervis Valentine have pictures of Garifuna Drums depicted on the cover.

Garifuna Foods

A reference to a call for ereba (cassava) and fish by a Garifuna, as opposed to rice, as the meal of choice, is Isabel Cayetano's way of emphasizing the preference of the former for his/her traditional food reflecting his or her cultural identity (Cayetano, 1997). Along with cassava and fish, plantain and coconut milk are the key elements in Garifuna cuisine (Palacio, 2005). The devices for making bread from the cassava serves as material representations of the Garinagu and Carib cultures of the Antilles and South America (Palacio, 2005). So important is the cassava in the Garifuna diet that quite a few meals and drinks are made from it. These include the cassava bread porridge, (*farina*), sweet cassava porridge, (*sahou*), and sweet cassava pudding, (*dani*). The cassava bread itself, (*ereba* or *maru-maruti*), is eaten with coconut milk, (*falumou*). *Maru-maruti* is a thicker version of the dried cassava bread. As mentioned earlier plantain is also a major element

of the Garifuna diet and, like green banana or sweet potato, is used as an alternative to cassava bread in soups, (*tikini* or *falumou*). *Tikini* is a browned flour soup which can substitute for coconut milk soup, (*falumou*), and is served with fish. Fish is also a common food item in the Garifuna cuisine and is included with the abovementioned menus. Whereas cassava, fish, and coconut milk are derived from their St. Vincentian ancestry and continue to play a major role in their diet, the Belizean Garifuna have been influenced by their interactions with Mestizos and Blacks of Central America including Belize (Palacio, 2005).

Garifuna Language

The Garifuna language, for the most part, is Arawakian in origin but different from the latter due to its French, English, Spanish, and to some extent African phonetics (Cayetano, 1997). It is the only language spoken by black people in Central America (Palacio, 2005; Vernon, 2005). Unlike their Garifuna counterpart in St. Vincent, the Belizean Garifuna continues to speak the language. Prior to coming to Belize and after being deported from St. Vincent to Trujillo, the Garinagu lived in Spanish-speaking Central America for five years at the very least. The Garinagu were reported in Stann Creek, Belize as early as December 1802 (Gonzalez, 1998; Gullick, 1976). The largest immigration came in 1832 with the arrival of more Garinagu, led by Alejo Beni, as fugitives from the civil war in Honduras. This migration highlights the source through which Spanish words found their way into the Garifuna language. The French influence on the Garifuna language occurred prior to the Garinagu's deportation from St. Vincent and after having had a long history of mixed relationship with the French, (Cayetano, 1997). Obviously, the presence of English loanwords in the Belizean Garinagu lexicon is

a result of having lived in Belize for the past two hundred years. During a survey conducted by Douglas Taylor in the middle of the twentieth century, he found 49 English loan words, (Cayetano, 1997). A unique characteristic of the language is a clear distinction in the use of words by men and women for “similar things”. This difference is not as pronounced in the speech of women and men today, (Palacio, 2005). Although the language is recognized by UNESCO as one needing to be preserved, along with folklore, dance, and music, little has been done by the government in that regard, (Palacio, 2005). Garifuna is falling out of use by the new generation of Garifuna Belizeans, (Cayetano, 1997). Efforts by one, Roy Cayetano, in producing the first phonological study of the language is encouraging.

Conclusion

The issue of Belizean Garifuna cultural identity continues to be one of duality, conflict, paradox, antithesis, and contradictions. At a time when Garifuna culture has become accepted as part of the Belizean identity, at a time when Garifuna music has become international, at a time when the Garifuna history is more studied than ever, at a time when there is more *dugu/chugu* than ever, when Garifuna Settlement Day has become a national holiday for all Belizeans, and at a time when the pride of the Garifuna in having a unique culture with its own language is at its pinnacle, the Garinagu are, ironically, struggling to retain their own identity. Assimilation is a two-edged sword for the Belizean Garifuna. Once recognized for their uncanny ability to learn languages, the Garifuna youth today struggles to speak his own language. Once recognized for his seafaring skill at navigating the seas, the Garifuna is, today, relegated to negotiating for the best price for a pound of fish at the local market. Nevertheless, if one understands

cultural identity from the perspective of Stuart (2003) second definition, “*a matter of who we are becoming, as well who we currently are. Basically, cultural identity is fluid and constantly changing as it is impacted by elements of history, culture, and power,*” he or she will appreciate that cultural identity is fluid and changing.

Part 2: The Garinagu and Education

Historical Overview

The Belizean education system has grown and transformed out of a colonial system of schooling where the initiative and control by the churches laid the foundation for what is now the church-state educational system. This transformation took place in, first; the settlement of Belize, second the colony of British Honduras, and finally in an independent Belize.

For most of its history and up until 1981, the Belize church-state educational system existed under British colonialism. Inevitably, the very nature of colonialism was embedded in the school systems and to some extent it still is today. In this system of education, the churches played a major role in the educational development of Belize while the local government represented the state and by extension the British colonial power. According to Alexander Bennett, (2008), “some of what happened in England impacted Education in Belize” and the pupil-teacher system and teacher training was such a practice. Whereas the state enacted Laws and Acts that gave education a general and academic direction, the churches focused on religious instruction and proselytizing. The Catholic Church, through the Society of Jesus also known as the Jesuits, was responsible for promoting Catholicism through education.

The settlement was also experiencing a greater sense of security in the aftermath of their victory in the Battle of St. George's Caye and felt a need for formal education. Schooling, however, was not initially intended for the children of slaves. Education for slaves was not a priority for the British colonizers whose sole purpose for being in Belize was strictly economical (Ashcraft & Grant, 1968; Bennett, 2008). The British feared that an educated populace would not want to work logwood/mahogany (Hitchen, 2005; Bolland, 2003). The first school was not established until 1816 (Johnson, 1985; Bennett, 2008)

This initial interest in education by the colonists concerned some disadvantaged children and the children of free parents. It was not meant for the slaves and laborers. Slavery, however, was abolished with the enactment of the Slavery Abolition Act 1833 although full emancipation did not occur until 1838. Schools were opened to the children of slaves, former slaves, apprentices, and others with the support of sympathetic Anglican with anti-elitist views (Bennett, 2008). The main purpose of such schooling was character training and the means to that goal was religious indoctrination. European education in the colonies, in this case the British, was designed to fit the roles set out for the colonized (Carnoy, 1974). Similarly, the churches provided education towards their own ends. One Jesuit priest wrote education was the "most important part of work for souls" (Woodstock Letters). This was part of British policy and was no accident. It evolved, as described earlier, into what is known in Belize today as the church-state system of education. Carnoy (1974) described such strategy as, "The juncture between Christian morality and capitalistic rationality."

The first school, the Honduras Free School, was established with the assistance of the colonial government under the auspices of the Anglican Church in Belize town in 1816. The English Baptist Church began its educational work in 1822. It extended its educational services to Orange Walk in the north and to Sibun and Stann Creek in the south. The Baptist was followed by the Methodist in opening a school 1829 in the Belize settlement. There were no Catholic schools in the Settlement until 1851.

The Garinagu have had nearly two centuries of close relationship with Belize's educational system. This section documents their recruitment, their training, and their contribution to the development of education. While they served as educational agents for the colony and then the nation of Belize, the educational system ignored their cultural identity. Nothing has changed over the centuries. The system of education is monolithic emphasizing only the language of its colonizer and its European opponents.

The study of Garinagu's interaction with the church-state system of education in Belize cannot be complete without an understanding of the Jesuit priests, the role the latter played in the recruitment of Garifuna teachers, the development of education, and the spread of Catholicism in Belize. The relationship between the Garinagu and the Catholic Church, apart from some merchants from neighboring republics, was the first in Belize. Strong evidence suggests that the Honduran refugees ministered to by Franciscan Friars at Mullins River were Garinagu in 1832. The Garinagu, even before they arrived in Trujillo, Honduras from St. Vincent were to some extent Catholics. A group of Garinagu fled to Stann Creek, Belize following the defeat of the revolutionary forces fighting against the Morazan government in Honduras in 1832 (Gonsalez, 1988). Buhler (1976) identified a 'small group of Caribs' as one of the two groups that made up the first

successful Catholic Church congregation in Belize. Incidentally, the first Catholic Church was built at Mullins River Village. It should not have been any surprise that the involvement of the Garinagu in the church-state system was through the Catholic Church.

The Garifuna connection with education and the Catholic Church in Belize is well-known and documented. The Garinagu are considered the pioneers of teaching in Belize. They were the first to educate Belizeans all over the country including the most remote communities. The first Garifuna teacher on record was Santiago Beni who was attributed with keeping the attendance of the Methodist School in Stann Creek alive after a dismal report in 1838 (Johnson, 1985). Santiago Beni had received his education in Belize City having been sent to live with the Governor of British Honduras (Sanford, 1974). The increase in the number of Garifuna teachers in the profession was due to the Catholic Church's need to send teachers to remote areas countrywide (Sanford, 1974).

Large scale employment and training of Garinagu as teachers, however, began under the direction of Fr. Herman Tenk, S.J., a priest from the Jesuits (Jesuit Bulletin, 1965). According to Schwickerath (1903), the Jesuits (1) pursued their goals with a single-minded purpose, (2) had a clear insight into the needs of the times, and (3) manifested a completeness with which they systematized their course, weighing as deliberately every word they spoke and measuring every step they took. In this typical Jesuit fashion, Fr. Tenk recognized the challenges of educating and proselytizing to the non-English speaking Maya in their remote and almost inaccessible villages. He appreciated the Garifuna men's natural ability to teach, their propensity for learning languages, and their sturdiness that would allow them to travel to and live in the remote Maya villages. He must have been aware of the Garinagu desire for respect and

acceptance in the wider colonial populace. Teaching, in spite of its low wages, would offer them some level of status and economic relief. He had a clear understanding of the times.

It was during Fr. Tenk's tenure that Punta Gorda became the source for the deployment of teachers in the village schools. He systematized the training of teachers in British Honduras where many of them started off as students and pupil teachers in Punta Gorda. Not only did he work hard to make them efficient teachers but also men of superb Catholic Character. The final single-minded Jesuit goal, of course, was to make them proselytes of the Catholic faith. Father Tenk supported the organization of the Catholic Teachers Association in Punta Gorda and arranged for Teacher Vacation Courses during the summer holidays (Arana, 2002; Jesuit Bulletin, 1965).

Pupil-Teacher System and Teacher Training Education/training

The Garifuna teachers were well prepared by the Jesuits to carry out the mission of spreading the teaching of the Church and western education. Preparing the teachers took place in several ways and at different levels as the years progressed. There was no established teacher training institution in the early days of the Garifuna teachers (Arana, 2002). Teacher training took the form of an apprenticeship system where an aspiring teacher, most likely out of Std VI, (Grade 8), began as a monitor and then as a pupil teacher under an experienced teacher. The pupil-teacher system was introduced in 1894 (Bennett, 2008). Eventually, Garifuna teachers were able to attend high school as part of the St. John's College teacher training program initiated by the Catholics in the 1940's; this closed in the mid-1950's (Arana, 2002; Bennett, 2008). Some of the pioneers in this training program include notables such as Theodore Palacio in 1947 and then again in

1950 and Julian Arzu, pictured in a photograph that included other Garinagu teachers, (Arana, 2002) dated it as having been taken in 1949. Of special interest was the fact that their high school experience at St. John's College was not limited to the secondary curriculum. They took teacher training courses at Holy Redeemer Primary School and sat teachers' examinations, (Arana, 2002, Bennett, 2008). With the opening of St. John's Teachers College in 1954, Garifuna teachers were able to further their teacher-training as was the case with Clifford Palacio. (Arana, 2002). Others such as Sebastian Cayetano, Wallace Cayetano et.al later pursued studies in the United Kingdom and Canada.

Influence of the Education System on the Garinagu

Assimilation/acceptance

Teaching was the entry ticket for the Garinagu to be accepted into Creole Belize – to be respected. Clifford Palacio (Arana):

“And it comes with dignity. It places us on a higher level. And at the same time, too, we were teachers because we were not yet accepted into civil service or other professions.”

Dr. Colville Young (2002) attributed the prejudice of the Creoles toward the Garifuna to a long history of mistrust dating back to July 1811. A directive was issued requiring the Caribs, considered a most dangerous people, to leave the settlement if they were not in possession of a Permit within 48 hours. He credited the final social acceptance of the Garinagu by the Creoles to (2002) the former's sheer achievement—their influence as educators and their involvement in various professions. In this regard, education may have served as a double-edged sword. Rejection by the Creoles based on their perception that the Garinagu were less educated and thus less superior strengthened

the latter sense of cultural identity (Young, 2002). Assimilation, on the other hand, has led to the Garinagu de-emphasizing their cultural and ethnic identity.

Quid pro quo

The Catholic Church, along with its counterparts in the church-state system, was able to spread their faith throughout Belize. The Catholic Church employed Garifuna teachers who became agents of cultural imperialism, religious oppression, and colonialism. In return, the Garinagu used education and Catholicism to gain acceptance into Belizean society which also resulted in job opportunities. According to Schwaller (2011), the colonized accepted the church for the benefits they could gain as was the case of the Garinagu teachers. The Garinagu got the acceptance they desired into the civil service whereas the church increased in its membership. Their acceptance of Catholicism elevated their status from the descendants of the so-called cannibals to the civilized. The Catholic Church played a major role in the assimilation of the Garinagu in Belize. In the exchange, Catholicism also play a role in influencing Garinagu spiritual practices.

Religious imperialism

It was the expressed intent of the Jesuits, regarding the Garinagu, to “-exterminate from their customs-’ ... “-everything indecent and pagan.” Father Di Pietro was referring to the “... kind of devilish dance that they call “-mafia-” ... the old national ball that they were accustomed to dance when pagans, and which they kept despite all the efforts of the missionaries to destroy it” (Letters and Notices, 1873). Here, Father Di Pietro would be described by Schwaller (2011) as “understanding the native cultures through the lenses of Christianity and European culture.” Many times this European view was outright

demeaning. Father Woollett in his description of the Garifuna language depicted it as similar to the “-jabber of the Haitian niggers” (Letters and Notices, 1873).

Cultural imperialism

The Catholics were also intent on putting an end to the Garifuna practice of concubinal relationships by insisting on marriage. The priest that visited Punta Gorda in 1839 rebuked a Carib woman, who brought her baby for baptism, for living out of wedlock (Stephens, 1854). Fr. Lynam, in 1910, had a Carib man in Stann Creek married in a week after relentlessly pursuing the matter (Woodstock Letters). However, it has been a long-understood practice that the Garinagu live in concubinage.

The Garifuna interaction with the church-state system of education brought them into contact with a diversity of teachers and thus got exposed to a variety of worldviews. They were taught by priests, nuns, international volunteers, and by Garifuna teachers as well. Without a doubt, the first teachers were Catholic priests from the Society of Jesus who established schools in Garifuna communities in the 1860'-s. The first teachers in Barranco from the Catholic Mission taught in Spanish in the 1870'-s (Lita Krohn, 1987). Most likely these were foreign teachers. An Irishman, Patrick McDonald took their place but taught in English. He, in turn, was followed by Garifuna teachers (Lita Krohn, 1987). A Mr. McDermott was also reported to have taught in Barranco in 1900 (Letters and Notices, Jesuits - 1900) There was a small school in Jonathan Point when Father Pietro visited in 1880 (Woodrow Letters, 1880). The Pallotine nuns, most of them Germans, came to Punta Gorda and took over the administration of St. Peter Claver School. Polonio (phone interview, March 2012) was taught by Sisters Sebastiana, Parks, and Rosela in 1938 (circa). Sister Gonzaga, a native Belizean was the principal. The Sisters of the Holy

Family from New Orleans began teaching in Stann Creek, another Garifuna community, in 1898. Catholic priests at various times did some teaching. The author took general science with Fr. Coombs, Mathematics and Chemistry with Fr. Ring and Scripture with Fr. Kramer. Three of these priests came to Punta Gorda when Lynam Agricultural College for boys in the Stann Creek district was closed in the early 1970's. They had taught several Garifuna boys at Lynam before coming to Punta Gorda.

Religious Life/Vocation

The opening of Austin High by the Sisters of the Holy Family in Stann Creek, in 1952 provided access for the first time to Garinagu girls and took them into the realms of the religious vocations. Through their association with the Sisters of the Holy Family, close to forty women had become nuns by the 1950's and by 1999 the number was fifty. Whereas Brett (2012) did not specify to which ethnic group they belong it can be safely assumed that most of the new nuns were Garinagu since most of them returned as missionaries to Dangriga, a municipality with the largest Garifuna population. The Sisters of the Holy Family also influenced the entry of Garifuna men into the priesthood with one of their former students, Father Philip Marin, was ordained as one of the first Garifuna priests in 1934. The other Garifuna priest was Father Arjonilla (Jesuit Missions, 1931). Another of their former students and a Garifuna, Osmond P. Martin, became the first Belizean-born Bishop of Belize in 1983. Their entry into the religious vocation also gave the Garinagu a gateway into advanced tertiary education with a number of them earning masters and doctorate degrees.

Political Influence of Education

The church-state education system played a major role, specifically through the Catholic Church in the cultural and political development of Belize. The Jesuits were responsible for the church establishing a presence in Belize. Their presence and influence expanded with the transfer of responsibility from the European Jesuits to the Missouri-based Jesuits in 1984. Although the Catholic Church was the last of the major churches to be established in 1851, sixty percent of all Belizeans were Catholics by 1921. In addition to their evangelization function, the Jesuits strengthened their hold on education and had opened the most prestigious secondary school in the country, St. John's College. Students and alumni of St. John's College along with the Jesuit administered Christian Social Action Group to field candidates for the Belize Town Board election in 1941. In 1944 George Price, who later became the first Prime Minister of Belize along with other St. John's College graduates, won a seat in the elections. The Catholic Church, through the Jesuits, had made its mark on Belize. (Shoman, 1995).

Curriculum

According to Albatch and Kelly (1974), European languages “-became the educational medium of all those (indigenous) destined for urban living.” The failure to address the absence of the Garifuna language from the colonial and postcolonial curriculum, continues to have more effect than the use of English as the medium for teaching. The Catholic Church limited its interest in the Garifuna language to its goal of converting the Garinagu to Catholicism. Woodson (2008) pointed out that traders and missionaries only paid attention to languages for the purpose of exploitation and proselytization.

As indicated earlier, the primary purpose of colonial education was to develop the character of the newly freed slaves and citizens in the British colonies (Bennett, 2008). The means to accomplish this was through religious instruction. It was the emphasis on combining the teaching of morals with religion that laid the foundation for the first and subsequent school curriculum. This policy of merging religious instruction, morality, and education created the fertile environment for the churches to play a significant role in Belize's educational system. This educational system, through its curricula, has played a role in the life of the Belizean Garinagu either through what was taught or omitted.

Industrial and agricultural education was encouraged by the Colonial Office but was not implemented in the Belize Settlement even though it was laid out in the law by the British colonial government in London. It was not unusual, however, for local authorities to make decisions on issues within their jurisdiction contrary to decrees from the kings in Europe (Schwaller, 2011). In any case, such decisions are still in favor of the colonizer rather than the colonized. Agriculture and land ownership were not encouraged since labor was needed for the cutting of logwood and mahogany. Therefore, neither was agricultural education. Even where agriculture education was encouraged it did not last for long. An industrial school inaugurated in 1927, with a strong bias for agriculture, failed due to lack of funds and administrative support (Bennett, 2008). Agriculture was not foreign to the Garinagu. They had plantations in St. Vincent prior to their deportation from Honduras. Stephens (1854) wrote about the verdant fruits and vegetation in the Garifuna community of Punta Gorda in 1839. The Garinagu were also involved in the trading of banana and coconuts with New Orleans ships traversing Belize from Guatemala. They had plantations between the Temash River and Crique Sarco (Letters to

the Editor, 1922). There are no such plantations today. The system of education has done little to maintain and develop the Garinagu love for agriculture.

A new curriculum was reported in 1945 but its effectiveness was questionable as the disparity among schools, teachers, and student were quite wide. There is no evidence, for instance, to show that a subject such as handicraft taught in the Wesley and Holy Redeemer Schools were taught in southern Garifuna communities. Agriculture, where taught, was subject to variation in the technical knowledge of teachers coupled with the lack of support. The century-long call for a practical education finally materialized at the secondary level in Belize City/Town in 1947. The school was for boys and no provision was made for girls. It's difficult to assess its impact on the Garifuna communities in the south (Bennett, 2008).

Generally, the standard practice was the teaching of a basic curriculum that consisted of writing, spelling, arithmetic and of course religious instruction in the form of Bible reading. Additionally, elocution and grammar were taught to the boys at the Honduras Free School while the girls were taught needlework. The provision of religious education was cemented around this time with the passing of the 1850 School Act stating that religious instruction would be left entirely to the clergy. The School Amendment Act of 1855 further added Industrial Education (Bennett, 2008). The curriculum within the emerging Church-state system was already in place when St. Peter Claver School opened its doors in the Garifuna community of Punta Gorda in 1862.

In 1871, it was stipulated that the curriculum include reading, spelling, writing, dictation, grammar, arithmetic, geography, outlines of history, and needlework for girls. A subsequent ordinance, 1892 Education Ordinance, reaffirmed that the reading and

writing of the English Language, Arithmetic, English Grammar and Geography as part of the curriculum. These were probably the subjects learned by children in the small school in the forty-house Garifuna village of Jonathan Point visited by Father S. D. Pietro in 1880. These were probably the subjects taught by the Garifuna teacher, Enriquez, when he took up the post in San Antonio, Toledo in 1907. Religious instruction was also a daily part of the school curriculum (Enriquez, 1907) along with basic skills, personal hygiene, personal appearance, discipline. He also taught songs and prayers in Latin. This was the curriculum to which the Garifuna child was exposed.

Language

Colonial education has been the tool of cultural imperialism that has suppressed the history, traditions, and language of our peoples. Any history prior to internal self-government in 1962 was about the British and their exploits in the world. Since 1962 and after independence in 1981, efforts have been undertaken to focus on regional and national history. Recently, the teaching of African and Mayan history was introduced in elementary schools but neither addressed the “Traditions and acquirements, habits conquests...” of the Garifuna people.

A memorandum written in 1928 raised the issue of language in education and recommended teaching using the language of the students and the training of teachers. The Baptist Church may have been the first to extend the curriculum beyond teaching and preaching in English sometime around 1850 by trying to provide instruction in the languages of its students.

Except for the early attempts by the Baptist to train Garifuna teachers to teach and preach in Garifuna and the works of Fathers Stochl and Hadel, the educational system has

made no substantive effort to promote the Garifuna language and culture. The emphasis has always been on the English Language. Obviously, there is a need to promote the heritage and languages of all the ethnic groups in Belize. Education can also be the instrument for creating socially just schools that will promote the cultural heritage of the Garifuna and all ethnic groups in Belize.

Two language policies and or curricular developments of primary interest are (i) the advancement of the ESL model in 1980's and (ii) a language policy declared as part of the National Comprehensive Primary School Curriculum in the late 1990's. The rationale for ESL is the recognition "... that Belize is a multi-cultural/multi-lingual society in which only a minority of its inhabitants use English as their home language." The 1990 Language Policy states that the Government of Belize "respects the multicultural and multilingual nature of the country and the acknowledged wishes of members of the community who belong to a variety of cultural groups and will encourage the use of native/home language ... and support efforts to teach ... languages other than English and Spanish" (Bennett, 2008). These are major progressive developments but, despite the letter of a memorandum written in 1928, little has been done in promoting the teaching of native languages.

Bartolo Polonio (2012) recalled that the speaking of Garifuna was not allowed in the classroom when he was a primary school student in the 1930's. Beatrice Arzu (2013) confirmed this and added that most students only spoke Garifuna and the little English they learned at school but not Creole. Creole was only spoken by the Creoles. For Beatrice's sister, Isabel Cayetano, language experience was entirely different. Her teacher, a nun, had Isabel's skirt lifted above and behind her head in order to expose her

underwear. She was then whipped on her behind in front of the entire class (Cayetano, 2013). Experiences like these forced Garinagu children to live in two realms; as a Garifuna and a British subject (colonized). According to Memmi (1965), the two worlds “-are symbolized and conveyed by the two tongues ... in conflict; ... those of the colonizer and the colonized.” This act of cultural imperialism devalued and dehumanized the language of the Garifuna people.

Garifuna teachers, for almost the entire history and development of education in Belize, were not involved in policy and decision making. There are no records of Garinagu playing any role at the leadership level in the selection of subjects within the curriculum or with its formation. The teachers and or their instructors were taught by the Catholic missionaries and the British colonizers. Knowingly or not, the Garifuna teachers taught the Garinagu children and all others in the same way their European teachers taught them. The education of the Garinagu like the Blacks described by Woodson (2008) “-is almost entirely in the hands of those ...” who oppressed and exploited them. The curriculum was British or American and supported by relevant texts. According to Brett (2012), the textbook supporting the curriculum taught by the Sisters of the Holy Family were imported from the United States.

Garifuna Teachers’ Role

The Garinagu played a multitude of roles while serving as teachers in their assigned communities. Bartolo Polonio, (2012 interview), explained that he served as scribe, interpreter, mediator, among other roles, in the village of Concepcion in the Orange Walk District. First and foremost, they were the church representative. In Seine Bight, Simeon Sampson, Sr. was the godfather of many children. He was also the

postmaster, Alcalde, Registrar of Births and Deaths, and health representative who administered the vaccinations. As Alcalde, he oversaw law and order and held court cases. Peter Avila, Sr. had similar experiences and was described, in addition to the above, as having served as a village scribe, mediator, catechist, and majordomo, (Arana, 2002). Andres Enriquez prepared students for both Holy Communion and Confirmation and taught church hymns in Latin (Enriquez unpublished work).

Evangelization on behalf of the Churches - Catechist.

Most, if not all, teachers served as a catechist in the communities where they were worked. A photograph taken in front of the Catholic Church in 1936, depicted Garifuna teachers at a Catechist Training Retreat. Jerry Enriquez, (Amandala Article), went so far as to attribute the spread of Catholicism throughout the entire country as having been by way of the Garifuna teachers from Punta Gorda. Most of them were devout Roman Catholics having been converted to Catholicism by the “priests and monks of Spain.” Stephens, (1854), reported seeing figures of saints in every house during his visit to Punta Gorda in 1839. Sampson, one of the earliest teachers, was known to have enjoyed the religious part of his duties the most. According to his daughter, (Arana, 2002), he dedicated his entire life to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.

Cultural agents

The Garifuna teachers were not only effective, religious emissaries of the Catholic Church but also agents of American and European culture (Sanford, 1974). Although the Catholic Church, and more specifically the Jesuits, was interested in their religious goals, their cultural influence as Americans cannot be overlooked, (Hitchen, 2002). Having been initially trained by American Jesuit priests, the Garifuna young men serving as

teachers were also inadvertently agents of American secular culture. In effect, they were part of an anti-Protestant and anti-British counter movement. Hitchen (2002) asserts that the financial independence of the church and the British government's reluctance to invest in education limited British cultural influence. The Garifuna teachers traveled and work throughout the entire country as both Catholic and educational missionaries. They played a significant role in the development of the church-state system in Belize and the spread of Catholicism.

One aspect of western culture in which the Jesuits taught their students was music. One of the most respected and well known of the early Garifuna teachers, Samuel Salvatore Daniels was remembered most for his love of music. He was taught and mentored by Father Tenk. Daniels also excelled in playing the piano and organ. He spent countless hours within and outside of school time mentoring and teaching his students how to sing church hymns. One student, Sarah Palacio, recalled the numerous practices and performances she was involved in at the bequest of Daniels and how committed he was to the choir, (Arana, 2002). This was confirmed by other students who considered music his greatest contribution to education.

Nation builders/community development

The teachers and their family attained nation-building skills - languages, understanding of other ethnic groups, cultural competence, and wider knowledge of the entire country). While their parents became adept at languages to become the best teachers, the children became multicultural.

Education Pioneers

Not only did Garifuna teachers spread primary education throughout Belize but they were also involved in the initial spread of secondary education to the other districts. Two graduates out of the ten young Garifuna men selected by the Jesuits to attend St. John's College in 1949 became principals of the first two out-district high schools—Lynam Agricultural School in the Stann Creek district and Muffles Colleges in the Orange Walk district.

Education Today

Education in Belize is provided by the church-state system, a partnership between the Ministry of Education and the religious denominations, a legacy of British colonialism. The Ministry of Education sets policies, develops curricula, pays salaries, and establishes standards and conducts standardized testing at the primary level. The National Education Council, of which the churches are a part, along with the government appointed Chief Education Officer, manages the education system of the country. Jurisdictions over schools are maintained by managing authorities of the government, churches, and private entities.

The Belizean educational system is comprised of two years at the pre-school level, eight years of primary school, four years of secondary school, two years of sixth form (freshman and sophomore years) or junior college, and a final two to three years of undergraduate studies. Primary education is available for all children. There are several secondary schools in each district (Belize's equivalent of a state or county). Sixth forms (junior colleges) make up the bulk of tertiary education with two universities offering undergraduate degrees.

For financing, schools are categorized as government schools which are fully funded by the government, government-aided schools are partially funded, and private schools which receive no government assistance. The government pays 100% of teachers' salaries, 60% of maintenance costs, and 70% capital costs. Government-aided secondary schools get 70% of their salary expenses paid for by the government.

Conclusion

For many Garinagu, education has been a way out of isolation, disdain from the Creoles, poverty, powerlessness, and joblessness. It has also been a source of pride where they revel in the fact that Garinagu were some of the best teachers and catechists; thanks to the Catholic Church. The accomplishment of Garinagu in attaining high positions in education, the civil service, and religious life are touted as evidence of the benefit of education and the 'instrumentality of the Catholic Church' (Cayetano, 1990). Whereas that may be so, western education and Christianity must also be forms of cultural and religious imperialism in which the values, culture, traditions, beliefs, and worldview of one group of people are imposed on another group. Carnoy (1974) saw the school as an institution that keeps individuals and societies from defining themselves. Garinagu teachers and students learn about Christianity as opposed to the *dugu*; organ music instead of the Drums. So, while on one hand, Cayetano (1990) sang praises for education, he lamented over its irrelevance and its lack of developmental orientation on the other. It needs to be kept in mind that education in a European colony, in this case, British Honduras (now Belize), was designed to serve the purpose of the mother country. Although implemented by the Catholic Church, the education of the Garinagu and particularly teachers was for the purpose of proselytizing. The benefit for Britain was the

development of the colony's economy and social structure so as to maintain the former's hold. According to Carnoy (1974), "Education was used to develop regions to meet European needs." Cayetano should not have been surprised that the education system was not for the development orientation of the Garinagu. The role of colonial and neocolonial education and missionary work must be analyzed critically and objectively to understand the benefits and negatives of the experience.

In analyzing the Garifuna interaction with the church-state education system over the past one hundred and sixty years (1852 – 2013) a number of factors must be recognized: (1) the Garinagu were not mere victims of cultural imperialism and religious oppression. The Garinagu saw benefits in education and in Catholicism; (2) Garinagu, particularly as teachers, have played a critical role in the development of education in Belize. They were the core of the teaching force that spread education throughout the entire country of Belize; (3) the Catholic Church played a major role in the cultural identity and economic life of the Garifuna people. The Church primary role was the promulgation of the Catholic faith. In so doing it forced its religious beliefs and values on the Garinagu people. In hiring Garifuna as teachers, the church provided the Garinagu opportunities for social mobility and acceptance.

How well education has served the Garifuna may be best analyzed using the questions posed by Memmi (1967):

"By what else is the heritage of a people handed down? By the education which it gives to its children, and by the language, that wonderful reservoir constantly enriched with new experiences. Traditions and acquirements, habits and conquests, deeds and acts of previous generations are thus bequeathed and recorded in history."

Part 3: Theoretical Framework and Conceptual Framework

My epistemological beliefs have been strongly influenced by social justice education. Therefore, social justice education will be the theoretical lens through which I will examine culture-based education. Mthethwe-Simmons (2014) associated critical theory, critical race theory and multicultural education theory with social justice education theory. Critical theory and its subsequent offshoots; postcolonialism and critical pedagogy will be discussed in the context of culture-based education. “Critical theory is interested in why human society has ... become what it is today, unequal, unjust and largely uncaring.” (Buchanan, 2010). Postcolonialism explains how we got where we are today as a former colony. Critical pedagogy offers practical solutions to address the inequality and injustice that have its roots in colonialism. I agree with Bronner (2011), who demanded that “critical theory must respond to the new possibilities for liberation that arises from changing historical circumstances.” He also pointed out that there should be a concern not only with how things are but also how they might be and how they should be. Whereas each of the above are associated with social justice education, the strength of that association is measured by the actions they take to transform the status quo (Mathethwa-Simmons, 2014). According to Hackman (2005), social justice education must include “...a prolonged emphasis on social change and student agency in and outside the classroom” along with an examination of the systems of power and oppression. Social change or transformation and agency constitute the goal of social justice education. All the activities associated with examining the systems of power and oppression make up the process.

Social justice education is both a goal and a process (Hackman, 2005). The goal of social justice education is the full and equal participation of all groups where their needs are jointly met such that there is an equitable contribution of resources and social responsibility. Everyone is empowered. The process is democratic, student-centered and participatory. It involves dialogue that allows participatory involvement in the examination of power and the systems of oppression. Theories such as critical, critical race, and multicultural, postmodern, and post-structural from which social justice emanates have the same goal of exposing and transforming oppressive policies and practices (Mthethwa-Sommers, 2014). The implication for social justice education theory and its associated theories will be applied to the conceptual framework discussed later in this chapter.

Critical theory

According to Gibson (1986), critical theory maps the inequalities and injustices in education. He went on further to say that critical theorists concern themselves with the source of inequalities and the way they are maintained and reinforced. These inequities in the form of racism, classism, sexism and others are reproduced by institutions such as schools (Mthethwa-Sommers, 2014). Critical theory would argue that the monocultural and neocolonial nature of the Belizean education system is socially constructed, humanly determined, and interpreted and thus subject to change through human action. For too long the Garinagu, and indeed other minority ethnic groups, have been excluded from curricular decisions regarding the content and direction of education. Critical theory acknowledges this frustration and powerlessness and attempts to understand how ‘victims’ can be emancipated from such control. The emphasis on the English and

Spanish languages focuses on the premise that the nation needs to be prepared for opportunities in the global market. Instrumental rationality favor capitalism at the expense of local language thereby marginalizing and devaluing them. This kind of thinking represents instrumental rationality preoccupation with means as opposed to ends (Gibson, 1986). This approach also looks at the purpose of education as purely economic (de Marrais & LeCompte, 1999).

Postcolonial Theory

The point that a critical theorist must look backward to move forward (Bronner, 2011) lends credence to postcolonial theory. Postcolonial theory explains how colonialism affected dominated cultures and societies. It examines "...the processes and effects of, and reactions to, European colonialism..." (Ashcraft et al, 1998). Postcolonial theory provides an understanding of how the colonizer thought and acted towards colonized people. Colonized people are viewed and treated as inferior and childish needing the protection of and the transmission of knowledge from the civilized west (Young, 2002). While there has been resistance to this domination it has undoubtedly affected the psyche of those subjected to it. Colonized people, according to Memmi (1965), became despondent and apathetic having had their history destroyed by colonialism. This might explain the lack of interest in the democratic process today. Because the colonized is excluded from power he/she is not interested in having a feeling of control. As the colonized, "he was removed from participation in the development of his own country (Carnoy, 1974). The colonized, having been excluded from citizenship, lacks patriotism and are "-the last to awaken to national consciousness." Having taken on the values reinforced by the religion of his colonizer, he accepts his lot as an oppressed

having accepted an external locus of control. Without a history (a past) and subjected to an education system outside his control, the medium of instruction is in the language of the colonizer. He lives in a world where the bureaucracy, court system, highway markings, and street signs are in the language of the former colonizer. The colonized lives a life of linguistic dualism; his native tongue and that of the colonizer. Probably the most obvious example of the lingering power of colonialism is the need to be able to communicate in the language of the colonizer to get a job or succeed in life. In effect, the colonized lives in a world created for him by the colonizer (Memmi, 1965). This unveiling of colonization meets the first requirement of social justice education as described by Mthetwa-Sommers (2014). It provides an understanding of how colonization affected the colonized.

Critical Pedagogy

Postcolonialism contextualizes that we live in a world full of contradictions and inequalities of power and privilege brought about by colonialism. Critical theory allows for subjecting the political, social, and economic foundations underlying society to examination/analysis. Critical pedagogy, an outgrowth of critical theory, specifically targets education as a societal institution for critique. It goes a step further by involving students as agents in the work of transforming their own societies (de Marrias & LeCompte, 1999). According to McLaren (2003) and Adjei (2007) education is knowledge. Whoever controls knowledge controls power. This is the knowledge that was used to legitimize the colonization of one group of people by another. That kind of knowledge can only be overcome by what McLaren (2003) describes as emancipatory knowledge. Emancipatory knowledge explains how power and privilege distorts and

manipulates social relationships. For example, the social relationship between the colonizer and colonized was established by eradicating the latter's connection to his history and culture. This form of knowledge serves as the basis for "social justice, equality, and empowerment" is defined by Shor (1992) as critical-democratic pedagogy for individual growth and social change. The goals of this pedagogy, among others, include the development of 'habits of inquiry, and a critical curiosity about society, power, inequality, and change.' Dei and Kempf (2006) used the term anti-colonialism to describe 'the implications of imperial structures on the processes of knowledge development ... and the pursuit of agency, resistance, and subjective politics.'

Omission is one of the ways in which knowledge, in the form of culture, is controlled and replaced with another. The music, dance, religion, food, ways of learning and other form of cultural expression are banned and replaced with those of the colonizers. According to McLaren (Darder et al, 2003), the "-ability of individuals to express their culture is related to the power ... in the social order." Critical theory also explains how it is possible for one group of people to dominate another without the latter resorting to coercion. This is what Gramsci (Darder et al, 2003; Wink, 2005) described as hegemony. Woodson (2008) eloquently articulated it in his quote, "When you control a man's thinking you do not have to worry about his actions." This is so important because it influences how the oppressed think themselves into helplessness (Darder, et al, 2003). The oppressed ability to make sense and meaning is taken over and, in turn, adapts the worldview/ideology of their oppressor. Teaching the student so that he understands the reasons for his oppressed condition and then examining those structures that underpin the dominant society constitute critical pedagogy (Freire, 2000). The reforming educational

ideas of Paolo Freire has influenced the concept of community-based education (Corson, 1998). Community-based education shares the culture-based education purpose of allowing people to be agents in their own education. Teachers need to be aware of their own ideology and that of the education system, how it affects them, and their own teaching.

The question for educators, then, attempting to institute social justice education to undo or mitigate the effects of oppression and the systems of power is, “How can education be structured such that teachers and students can understand their condition, critique it, and change it? Below is a conceptual framework that is intended to address the various elements in Brann’s question.

Conceptual Framework

The ‘questions for education’ posed by Brann (1979) will serve the purpose of developing a conceptual framework from which the theoretical framework can be applied. The answers to the ‘questions for education’ identify some of the variables affecting the outcomes found in most educational programs. The ‘questions for education’ from Brann (1979) are: “**Who** should learn **what** so as to become **what** and do **what**, and **how** and by **whom** and with **whom** is it supposed to be taught?” Brann’s questions can be further fleshed out as follows:

“**Who** should learn ...” Who are the learners (students)? Ethnicity? Age range? Gender? Class level?

“...learn **what**...” *Curriculum. Content. Knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes (culture).*

“... so as to **become what** and **do what** ...” *Purpose. Why was the program established? What does the program hope to achieve? What other outcomes are expected for the learners?*

“... **how** (should **who** learn) ...” *Instruction. What pedagogical approaches and strategies are utilized to achieve objectives?*

“...by **whom**...” (should **who** be taught?)

*“...With **whom...**” Who else should be involved in this effort? Parents? Local community?*

These “questions for education” (Brann, 1979) are answered from the lens of Freirean critical pedagogy. Paulo Freire was a Brazilian who’s first known for his work in an adult literacy program for peasants. This was where his educational ideas developed. The purpose of education was **to become** empowered individuals who were aware of their condition (critically conscious) capable of transforming their lives (do what). His curriculum (the what) was based on what his students felt was important and relevant to real issues in their lives. He taught, and they learned using problem-posing where the teacher is a leader of the problem-solving enquiry rather one who provides answers. empowering them to make decisions about their own education. He promoted the idea of a democratic classroom through dialogue where the teacher and students sat in a culture circle as equal partners in the learning process.

The Questions for Education and Social Justice Education

Purpose

If the purpose of colonial education was to dominate, oppress, and indoctrinate, it would be expected that education, after Belize’s independence, would be quite the opposite. Education’s purpose would be to liberate the mind from "mental slavery" and afford individuals and societies the opportunity to affirm their cultural identities.

Education should be anti-colonial with the purpose of subverting the mindset imprinted by relations imposed via colonialism (Dei & Kempf, 2006). The media of instruction would, at the very least, include their home languages at some point in the students' education. There would be an emphasis on teaching the history and culture of the newly

independent citizens where their sense of identity is valued. Several scholars and thinkers have promoted this idea including Henry Giroux, Paolo Freire, Peter McClaren, John Dewey, Carter Woodson, and many others. According to Dewey (1966), education should be experiential, reflective, and allow students to construct knowledge through interaction with their environment. Horton (Darder et al, 2003) believed that education should begin with the people themselves to be effective. This is a concept previously described by Woodson (2008) as developing in the Negro the power to elevate himself. Kohl (Darder et al, 2003) committed himself to community interaction and empowering his diverse students. Jonathan Kozol, like Paolo Freire, believed in exposing his students to the consequences of poverty, racism, and various forms of oppression (Darder et al, 2003). Freire (1970) advocated developing conscientização, or critical consciousness, which is the ability to perceive contradictions, and then to find to eliminate them. Or in other words, students should develop the awareness to understand the conditions under which they live, how they came to be, and yet be able to change those conditions for the better. Scholars like those mentioned above, particularly Paolo Freire, have played a major role in shaping a liberating purpose for education.

“School knowledge should have a more emancipatory goal than churning out workers (human capital) and helping schools become the citadel of corporate ideology. School knowledge should help create the conditions for student determination in the larger society.” (Darder, et al, 2006)

Curriculum: Learn What?

The curriculum ought to be focused on empowerment (collaborative creation of power) by acknowledging and respecting the linguistic, cultural, intellectual resources children bring to school – “help students understand and engage the world around them but also enable them to exercise the kind of courage to change the world.” The idea of

using the curriculum to link critical theory with pedagogical practices to bring about changes in the education system is described by McLaren (2016) as cultural politics. The curriculum is more than just the traditional program of study when one of its purposes is to dignify the history, language, and cultural traditions of its students. While teaching the content, the curriculum, ‘-we cannot neglect the task of helping students become literate’ (Shor, 1987). In this case literate means “the critical understanding of politics in the world.” Teaching the Garifuna language as content without the history of how the language loss came about, in part by cultural imperialism, will not empower the students.

Instruction: How should Who Learn?

The main method of instruction (pedagogy) is engaging students in the “critical questioning of their beliefs and assumptions” via what Freire (1970) described as “problem-posing.” Problem-posing challenge students to take an active and critical approach to the condition “with which” and “in which” they live and transform those conditions and themselves, so they can live as humanized beings. Materials are presented to the student for consideration, the teacher reassesses her own deliberation in light of that considered by the students. Both teacher and students together listen, discuss, and work on solutions.

Teacher: By Whom (should Who be taught?)

The teacher will be a critical educator who employs emancipatory knowledge, critical pedagogy, anti-colonial education, and other forms of transformative pedagogy to help their students “... understand how social relationships are distorted and manipulated by relations of power and privilege.” For example, she views herself as a collaborative

partner with her students in the learning process both as a teacher and student as opposed to the sole authoritative dispenser of knowledge (Freire, 2000).

The critical-minded educator examines the curriculum (knowledge) both for the ways it misrepresents or marginalizes views of the world and for the way it provides a deeper understanding of how the students' world is constructed. But first, the teacher must be aware of his/her own practice and how he/she is seen. Having examined her own consciousness and become aware of the historical reality of education, the teacher is committed to allowing students to become 'beings for themselves', free, independent, and dignified or in Freire's (2000) words, 'humanized.' She engages her students in thinking critically about their condition, how they got where they are, and how they can transform their lives. The critical teacher is aware of the ideologies that inform her own teaching and continuously question those teaching practices which have become natural to her. On the other hand, Freire (Shor, 1987) cautioned teachers to "- reveal reality for his/her students" so that they can think critically and clearly for themselves. In other words, he/she needs to ensure that the content of the course is not sacrificed because of the teacher's political beliefs. He/she should be true to his/her progressive position and teach democratically. He/she should not, on the one hand, espouse progressive politics and teach using authoritarian methods on the other hand. Nevertheless, the critical educator understands that the teaching of content and literacy include the "reading of the world" or being conscious of the events and dynamics that shape the world in which he/she lives. For example, what good will be served if language is one of the contents taught in a culture-based education program without having the student understand how that language has become endangered.

Part 4: Culture-based Education Programs

Support for education and programs that affirm the cultural identity of the people they serve and allow them to determine their own future has had proponents worldwide for quite some time. There is the demonstration school in Rough Rock in Arizona that is considered the first aboriginal school in the U.S., the Richmond Road School in New Zealand where the different languages of the children became valued, and the Nigsa Elementary School in British Columbia that offers courses in the Nigsa language (Corson, 1998). In the region indigenous people are establishing programs to preserve their cultures and languages. The Quecha in the Andes of Peru have slowed language shift to Spanish, In Belize, there is the International Bilingual Education (IBE) program in Dangriga, which incorporates the teaching of the Garifuna language and cultural activities into its curriculum and two other programs under the auspices of the Mayan people in Toledo (Nunez-Gonzalez, 2016). The culture-based program, the subject of this study, at St. Peter Claver School in Punta Gorda town, was started in 2016 to retrieve the Garifuna Language (Darius Avila, personal communication). Again, the questions for education as asked by Brann (1979) provide the subtopics for a review of the literature on culture-based education.

Purpose of Education (So as to become what and to do what)

As early as 1953, the United Nations recommended that it was “culturally, psychologically, and pedagogically appropriate” to provide education in the mother tongue of the people its serve (UNESCO, 1953). Demmert (2011) cited the UN "Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in describing culture-based education. The UN article states that education, for children, should be provided in the peoples own

languages and, in a manner, appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning. According to Corson (1998), a community-based education program allows people to become meaningfully involved in shaping their own future and in promoting interest in their language. He added that assumptions, practices, and outcomes in the dominant culture and conventional education should be challenged. In contrast to Corson (1998), the Bakamoso approach in Botswana combines the effort of maintaining and preserving the identity and cultural worldview with an understanding of the dominant language, culture, and western-based education (Batibo, 2009). Children will capitalize on the varied cultural and linguistic resources in their environment and strive to improve the quality of life of indigenous peoples (Watahomigie & McCarthy, 1994). These views regarding the purpose of education appear to be in alignment with similar programs worldwide.

In reviewing the literature on culture-based education, there is very little attention paid to the liberating purpose of education as described by Paolo Freire and other social-justice-education-associated proponents. This is a serious shortfall that needs to be addressed. Without a liberating philosophy of education, culture-based education programs do not adhere to the characteristics of social justice education described by Mthetwa-Summers (2014).

Types of Programs

The purpose of a culture-based education program is determined by the degree of cultural and language loss which, in turn, determines the type of intervention needed. For example, in the case of the Bokamosa project, a lot of emphases is placed on relating the home environment (including biodiversity) to what is taught in school. On the other hand,

where much of the cultural knowledge and language has been lost, the emphasis is on practicing what is learned at school in the home. The type of intervention program can also be determined by the ethnic make-up of the school population. Earlier in this paper, Demmert (2011) was cited as identifying three types of culture-based schools designed to meet varying needs. The first, the generic program, meets the academic needs of all children. The second, the multicultural approach, cater for the academic as well the cultural needs of all ethnic groups. The final design, the culture-specific, is structured to meet the needs of a specific ethnic group of learners.

Curriculum (learn what)

A curriculum consists of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values that are deemed important for students to learn. In the case of Native American students, Demmert (2011) noted that the knowledge and skills of the tribe in question were taught as part of the curriculum including traditions and ceremonies. Knowledge about the students' specific locality, their people, and language made up the curriculum. Watahomigie and McCarthy (1998) used a “thematic” curriculum where the content is organized around the language and social environment of the children. Corson (1998) emphasized the teaching of the local language and local culture as the basis for the program. In the case of Hawaiian programs, the content focus was on language, history, and culture classes, traditional knowledge (astronomy and navigation), traditional stewardship, and the use of culture-based materials to enrich the curriculum. One program, the Rough Rock Demonstration School, started off with adult education, an arts and craft enterprise, a laundromat, a furniture factory, and a medicine man training project (McCarthy, 1998).

There appears to be a consensus among all proponents of cultural-based type education programs about the importance of language learning to the objectives of their work. Bauman (1980) asserts that language should not be relegated to being taught only as a content area but as a medium of instruction as well. Given the historical context in which indigenous and minority people find themselves, language learning is more than just schooling. Indigenous and colonized peoples were subjected to education systems aimed at destroying their languages and ways of life. The teaching of indigenous languages, if any and for the most part, was for proselytizing. Any effort to include indigenous language into the curriculum has also been and continues to be superficial at best. (Hermes, Bang, & Marin, 2012). According to McCarthy (1998), it is also "... an act of self-determination and resistance." This assertion is in line with the articles of the United Nations. Language serves as the categorizing mechanism for determining the types of most culture-based type education programs including immersion programs for those who have lost the mother tongue.

Instructional Strategies (How should who learn)

Culture-based education programs have employed several strategies to achieve their objectives of maintaining or revitalizing the languages of their constituencies. Strategies ranged from those used in the class by directly interacting with students to those of a broader nature such as camps or immersion schools. The quality of instruction is affected by the language and culture in question, language teaching strategies, language fluency of the teachers involved, and the use of the language in everyday practical situations (Perusuh & Masuku, 2002).

“Teacher should teach from the students’ experiences, provide a strong context for the understanding of the issues students face, emphasize critical thinking, validate the students own cultural experiences, and human universals.”

Within the camps or immersion schools, the instructional process can include projects such as movie making, master/apprentice method (fluent speaker/language learner), and regular classes where the language is taught as a subject.

The medium of instruction must be factored into any discussion of instructional strategies in cultural-based education. As early as 1953 UNESCO recognized the psychological, sociological, and educational importance of the mother tongue. Respectively, the child's mind "works automatically for expression and understanding," allows him to identify with the community to which he belongs and permits learning through a language familiar to him (UNESCO, 1953).

The child comes to school with knowledge of his/her physical environment and the interactive experience he/she has had with the adult world. The knowledge, skills, values, and beliefs are a product of that experience. It is imperative that the knowledge gained from that experience, including an understanding of the natural world, is incorporated into the school curriculum (Batibo, 2009).

A method of teaching cited by Demmert (2011) that appears to resonate with cultural-based teaching is the project method. The project method allows children to learn by doing and following in a cooperative setting. That rich experience can be arrested by attending western-type schools.

Instructional Materials

One of the issues that have emerged from the literature review is the need for relevant instructional material. Combined with instruction is the development of instructional materials and the retrieval of cultural material and knowledge. The Ojibwe organized movie camps where they developed videos of transcripts, translations, and other kinds of information about their language (Hermes, Bang, & Marin, 2012). In

designing their videos and other content material, however, the Ojibwe realized that “meaning making” was an essential element in the language teaching process. The learning of words devoid of meaning and social practice was not as effective as making the language alive. This required an inclusive and participatory process where ideas and suggestions were shared with elders to create scenes and stories documented as movies. This allowed the language learners to hear words used in everyday communication so that they, in turn, can use them in conversation. This process described as a community-based research design methodology involve teachers and the community as producers of instructional materials rather than consumers. This empowers them to produce f language rather than recreate it (Hermes, Bang, & Marin, 2012).

Teachers By Whom should he/she be taught?

Not much was said about the quality and characteristics of teachers in cultural-based education or similar programs in the literature. Perusuh and Masuku (2002) noted that teachers who were specialized in English as a Second Language (ESL) were not mindful of the rich cultural and language background of their students. Deyle & Swisher (1997) recommended that non-native teachers should be prepared to understand and be knowledgeable of students, families, and communities. They pointed out that students form positive attitudes towards learning when their language and culture are valued in schools by their teachers. Considering this, teachers should be bilingual and conversant with the language (Peresuh & Masuku, 2002). In addition, teachers should know the structure of language, its function, and how children learn language (Hale, Karuss & Watahomigie, 1992).

Whereas the roles, qualities, and characteristics of a teacher were not found addressed directly in culture-based literature, a profile can be developed from congruent theories. As a teacher counselor, Lee (2018) posited three levels such a professional should possess: (1) level 1, awareness of self, (2) level 2, interpersonal awareness, and (3) level 3, system awareness. Freire (Shor, 1987) asserted that “the teacher must be fully cognizant of his/her practice.” The teacher must be critically conscious, a state of mind where he/she is aware of the world around him/her and the place he/she locate in that world (Freire, 1970. In his relationship with his students, he/she needs to understand that he/she is a facilitator familiar with their social contexts, and critically conscious of the “political nature of education (Shor, 1987; Lee, 2018). He/she understands how power, whether it be economic, social, cultural, or political – shapes his/her relationships and understanding of the world (Mthetwa-Sommers, 2014). This awareness or critical consciousness is necessary for partnering with his/her students in combating systemic injustice.

Community Involvement (With Whom)

Programs with a focus on making their schools “organic to their local culture” and preserving their languages are founded on community support (Corson, 1998). Some of the activities and services include home visits, organizing parent groups and language exchange centers, parent peer teaching, and linking school with family activities. These kinds of activities strengthen the relationship between local people and the school. Parent involvement strengthens teacher-student relationships, empowers parents to grow in confidence, and remove harmful stereotypes (Corson, 1998). According to Singh (2011),

“families and communities are expected to find ways to become involved” in a culturally appropriate education program.

Challenges and Obstacles

Reviewing the literature also brought to light the challenges and obstacles faced by the those involved in culture-based education. One of the many challenges facing culture-based education proponents is the question of speaking the language taught in the programs at home (Perusu & Masuki, 2002). Beyond this is the major problem of assimilation created by the view of some governments that the world is a marketplace for business. This according to Corson (1998) creates a “sameness” based on economics rather than through the bonds of culture and language. This is the “most assimilationist force the world has ever seen.” This focus driven by economics is referred to as the socio-economic factor and reinforced by those who see the English language as having the additional financial and political advantages (Brock-Utne, 2001). On the other hand, you have those who want to preserve the people’s culture, sense of respect, and identity’ which is described as the psychological factor.

Another challenge is the fact that some school curricula are highly centralized and do not cater to the immediate environs which form part of a child’s experience. Thus, in the words of Perusu and Masuku (2002), it is “-elite culture oriented, and insensitive to the cultural and linguistic concerns of the various linguistic concerns.” There is a trend to fight this long-standing neo-colonial practice against those who continue to ignore the call for community-based and or culture-based education programs. These are but a few of the challenges of administrating culture-based type education programs.

The literature review examined the development and scope of culture-based education to provide foundational knowledge of program being employed to bring about educational change after years of cultural imperialism. Brann's "questions for education" provided a conceptual framework and social justice education-related theories, mainly Freirean critical pedagogy, served as the theoretical framework for analysis. The review explained how the growing interest of preserving the Garifuna language and culture transformed into the establishment of the culture-based program under study. The literature review also revealed the origin of the Garifuna people, their identity development as they traversed Honduras, Guatemala, and eventually Belize. The review ended with a comprehensive examination of the purpose, management, curriculum, student composition, staffing, and community involvement in culture-based education systems.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Preamble/Introduction

This study examined the process of teaching and learning the Garifuna language, arts and craft, music, and dance at the St. Peter Claver School in Punta Gorda, Belize.

The main objective of this study was to understand the teaching and learning experiences of stakeholders associated with the program. Specifically, the study sought to answer how the participants got involved in the program, their understanding of the purpose of the program, what the program means to them, how they determine the success of the program, and their attitudes and feelings about the program. This chapter is divided into several sections addressing the research design, data collection techniques, research analysis and ethical considerations.

Research Design

The qualitative case-study approach was chosen to conduct this exploratory study because it is best suited to answer the research questions appropriately and adequately.

Yin (2014) argues that case studies are useful when the main research questions are “how” and “why.” In this study I wanted to gain a detailed understanding of how the Garifuna Language and Arts and Crafts Program operates. The case-study method allows for in-depth analysis using the examination of documents and artifacts (Yin, 2014).

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2010), “*case studies are appropriate for ... exploratory studies, which examine a topic where there has been little previous research ...*” as was the case in this study. I also used the case study because the focus of the study is more to describe and explain the program that was studied as opposed to predict

its outcome (Merriam, 2009). As a result, the objectives of the study were achieved by (1) gathering in-depth information about the teaching-learning practices, (2) obtaining deeper insights into the participants understanding of the program's purpose, (3) capturing the complexities of the multi-ethnic participation in the program, and (4) identifying the challenges and obstacles being encountered by the program. These purposes served by the case-study approach align well with the objectives of this research and the author's plan to contribute to the understanding of culture-based programs.

I then identified the key participants whose in-depth knowledge of and experience could provide me with the information and insights to address the main research question. Preliminary checks revealed that the program was being conducted in Infant 1 to Standard 2 (Grades 1 to 2) which amounted to eleven classes taught by the same number of teachers for a total of approximately 240 children participants. One of these eleven teachers had been involved in the program from its inception and continued to play a leading role in its implementation. I also found out that four persons, while not classroom teachers, had played similar roles. Collecting data using multiple sources is the trademark of a well thought-out qualitative study (Creswell, 2016). Thus, I decided to include the parents who proved to be a great source of information. A total of eleven parents were interviewed as part of two focus groups.

On-site interviews (both one-on-one and focus groups), observations, and documentation were the main data collection techniques for the study. Interviews were conducted based on questions listed in the Interview Protocol. I interviewed Directors of the Secretariat, school officials, teachers, students, and parents. I observed teachers and students in the classroom when teaching and learning were in progress. Documentation

such as concept paper, prospectus, curriculum, and teaching plans were collected as secondary data provided by participants.

Data was analyzed from the three main collection techniques resulting in triangulation and a “convergence of evidence” that strengthened the case study; minimizing the problem of validity and reliability (Yin, 2013). This is in line with Yin’s (2013) first principle of data collection. In addition to the triangulating the results of the three methods of collecting data, I also compiled the data separately. This will enable other researchers to inspect the data for themselves.

I visited all classes on the research site, except one, to observe teaching and learning in progress. There was no participation on my part in any of the programs activities—planning, execution, or evaluation. I served exclusively as a nonparticipant observer to monitor how the teaching and learning process was administered.

Direct observation

This study took place within the context of St. Peter Claver School, as it occurred inside the classroom and thus lent itself to direct observation. I observed the teaching-learning process, the interaction of teachers with students, students interacting with students, attitudes and behaviors of teachers and students, time spent on various activities, and the culture of the program in general. Observation allowed me to see whatever curriculum and instructional strategies were employed.

Observation Protocol

I used an observation protocol (see Appendix B) to record detailed field notes of my observations (Creswell, 2016). The protocol included information on the observation such as location, date, and time of day with columns for descriptive notes and reflective

notes. It also included details of what I directly observed and, sense, along with my impression of the questions. My objective was to ensure that readers understood the setting, the use of space, participants, and the general context. With the observation protocol in hand and at the site, I conducted a general and brief overview with the intent to see what would catch my attention. I then focused on understanding the central research question and the central phenomenon.

At that point I then recorded my field notes and followed the recommendations of Creswell (2016) by addressing the “descriptive” side of the protocol based on a) what can be recorded using the five senses, b) a chronology of events, c) and the research sub-questions. I also drew a picture of the settings and wrote a story based on the central phenomenon. As much as possible, I transformed my notes into a narrative that described what I saw. According to Creswell (2016), data collection, analysis, and interpretation need not occur separately for qualitative research.

On the reflective side of the observation protocol, I took notes about issues, concerns, or problems that arose during observation. Creswell (2016) suggests that these notes may help with the method section, ethical issues, and limitations as well as with organizing the data into themes and headings of the final report. I found observation to be an excellent complement to other forms of collecting information – interviews, and documentation (Creswell, 2016).

Finally, I constructed a checklist including the following: permission to visit the site, my role as observer, an observation protocol—identify what to observe first, minimize disturbing the setting, make multiple observations over time, develop rapport with individuals at the site, change observations from broad to narrow, take limited notes

at first, take both descriptive and reflective notes, describe observations in complete sentences, thank the participants at the end of the session, and refrain from deceiving participants.

My Audio-visual materials consisted of recorded images and or sounds such as photographs, videotapes, digital images, painting, and pictures. Some were previously recorded audio-visuals posted on the internet by the sponsoring agency for the program under study. I took photographs that include pictures of learning centers that teach the Garifuna language in schools. I took care in selecting audio-visuals to eradicate influence on data collected and or imposing meaning on participants (Creswell, 2014). No visual recordings were taken of children since that was not part of the expedited review agreement with the Institutional Review Board. Finally, to further increase the validity of the information, I maintained a chain of evidence to allow any external observer to follow the derivation of evidence from the initial questioning phase to the drawing of conclusions at the end of the study.

Interviews

Yin (2013) considered interviews as “one of the most important sources of case study evidence.” I was careful to maintain a friendly, nonthreatening approach while conducting interviews by paying attention to how I asked questions, as opposed to why, and being sensitive to interviewees’ feelings about the use of recording equipment. Interviewing, as a data collection tool, allowed me to get details I may not have been able to get otherwise. I was also able to control the type of information received by asking specific questions (Creswell, 2014). For example, I would not have gotten a clearer picture of what the interviewee meant by “mirrored it from the Spanish curriculum” (see

below) if I had stuck to only the written research subquestions. Similarly, I found it necessary to ensure that I understood what the interviewee was saying, below, in regards to the curriculum being delivered orally with no writing involved.

Interviewer: How important?

Participant-A1: I see it as very important. I think that other cultures should also bring something like that on board. ... We mirrored it from the Spanish curriculum. It worked for Spanish. It's working well, in my opinion, for Garifuna. I believe that children learn language very well especially at that young age and it's working.

Interviewer: When you say you mirrored it from Spanish, what do you mean exactly?

Participant-A1: When the Secretariat came to us we went home and start thinking about how we could teach it to the infants. So I looked at the Spanish curriculum. So I came up with a plan with similar words. In the Infant division we started orally, and so. When I came up with the words for the curriculum at the time it was only the infants. They liked when we presented it

Interviewer: So, there was no writing?

Participant-A1: The children, in the beginning, did not write but after a while we saw that the brighter children. We did make cards and phonics teach you that. We put the words on the cards. We noticed that the brighter children caught on. Some of them can read the words but it is not the objective for them to learn to read and write the language.

Interviews can, in addition to corroborating data from other data-gathering means, verify information from other interviewees (Yin, 2013). For example below, the second interviewee confirmed the initial resource material cited by the first interviewee used in the program:

Participant-A1: He gave us a set of Garifuna dictionary and the *Wanile* which is a book, a thick book that is written I think from Honduras. So I use those to translate the words. At first the English word and then I translated them to Garifuna with the help of Teacher X. Since I do not speak Garifuna and *Wanile* is from Honduras the words are slightly different from Belizean words and so I don't know that and so I took them to Teacher X

Participant-A-2: "... We worked closely with the Spanish curriculum and just tried ... in Garifuna. We got stuck as we went along because we don't have the resources we would have wanted so that we could have made it close to the Spanish curriculum that we were following. While working [he] introduced us to a book, *Wanile*. I think it came from Honduras. We found ourselves copying what *Wanile* has with help from the Garifuna dictionary.

I did two types of face-to-face interviews: one-on-one interviews and focus group interviews. I conducted one-on-one interviews to gather information from the program director, a member of the teaching staff, two coordinators, and a former teacher in the program. The children were interviewed in two focus groups of eight to ten. Parents were also interviewed in two groups of four to six although twelve were actually invited. Creswell (2014) pointed out that the best information can be obtained when the interviewees are similar and cooperative as is the case with the twelve teachers. Conducting focus-group interviews also had the advantage of saving time and resources (Creswell, 2016). The teachers were split into two separate focus groups. Both types of interviews were conducted using open-ended questions.

Having selected interviewing as a means of collecting data, I invited participants, developed an interview protocol, set up audio equipment, arranged for a quiet setting for intimacy and privacy, and finally conducted the interviews. The one-on-one interviews were conducted in different locations based on venue and participant availability. Two interviews were held in my university office, one at the school library, and another at a home. The focus group interviews were all held in the school library. I used a quality digital recorder on a cellular phone to conduct and record both types of interviews. I dressed appropriately, maintained courtesy, and worked on keeping the interview focused and timely as recommended by Creswell (2016). The interview was immediately followed by a post-check of the audio-recording, saved to Box (cloud drive) to ensure

that it would not be lost, thanked the interviewees, respected any follow-ups, and transcribed the interview.

The protocol, prepared in advance of the interviews, is two pages in length with spaces between questions to allow me to insert quotations in case the audio-recorder failed or to complement the process. Six questions were asked but additional questions were added or modified to obtain as much information as possible where interviewees experienced difficulty in understanding. The six questions were:

1. How did you get involved in this program?
2. What do you understand to be the purpose of this program?
3. What does this program mean to you? How important is this program to you?
4. How do you determine the success of this program?
5. What attitudes do you see others have towards this program?
6. To whom should we talk to find out more about this program?

The questions were used consistently throughout all the interviews. The protocol consisted of the introduction, the content questions, the probes, and the closing questions (Creswell, 2016). The interview was closed by thanking interviewees, by assuring them of the confidentiality of the interview, and by clarifying any other issues such how interviewees will benefit from the study. As with the observation protocol, I also formulated a checklist to ensure the utmost efficiency. The checklist included; a list of participants, types of interviews, arrangements for comfortable and quiet setting, interview protocol, open ended questions, questions that reflect sub-questions, a list of probes, tested and working audio equipment, and consent forms. During the interview I listened closely and spoke less, kept participants focused, withheld my opinion, and exited the interview by thanking interviewees.

Documentation

According to Yin (2013), documents are useful in corroborating and augmenting evidence from other sources keeping in mind that such documents are subject to biases. Apart from biases, documents may prove difficult to locate and obtain. I asked to see lesson plans, teaching aids, and whatever resources the teachers used in my visits to classrooms. They were not difficult to obtain. Where I was unable to get copies, I took pictures. The benefits of documents are that they archive the thoughts and actions of participants and do not require transcription as in the case of interviews and observations (Creswell, 2014). Documentation included: teaching materials—lesson plans, syllabi, teaching resources—; prospectus and concept paper of the program as presented by the directors; copies of meeting minutes, agendas, announcements, and correspondence (including emails and memoranda) relevant to the study.

Communication was an essential part of the data collection effort. The major form of communication was SMS texting. Texting allowed for setting up classroom observation visits, confirming previously scheduled interviews, and for reminding teachers, librarians, school administrators, and other participants. I also used messaging to follow up with additional requests and questions. I obtained cellular phone numbers for all relevant informants and participants. Collecting data without this form of communication would have proven much more challenging.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore how sponsors and beneficiaries view the Garifuna Language and Arts and Crafts in School Program at St. Peter Claver School in Punta Gorda. To achieve this objective, the researcher coded text

data, images, and pictures, developed themes passages, used computer software, implemented validity checks, and conducted intercoder agreement (Creswell, 2016). More specifically the researcher followed these steps; prepared the data for analysis, engaged the general procedure of data analysis, coded the data, organized the coded data into themes, and validate interpretation using multiple means. During this entire process the researcher remained reflexive, conscious of how his background shaped his interpretation of the data.

The process of coding began with the researcher compiling transcripts, field notes, and scanned documents into a text file for analysis. According to Creswell (2016), coding is defined as "the process of analyzing qualitative text data by taking them apart to see what they yield before putting them back in a meaningful way. The researcher prepared the data for analysis by first setting up the transcript to have 1-inch margins on both the left and right sides. The header included the source of the information, the date, names of participants, site, and document source. He then read through the texts, recording memos, thoroughly analyzed the text, and bracketed and assigned code labels to segments of texts (Creswell, 2016). The researcher used the exact words of the participants or voices he heard. This, according to Creswell (2016), one builds codes and themes that echo well with participants. In reading through the text, the researcher divided it into segments of information in the form of paragraphs, reduced and listed the data into about 30 – 50 codes. He then searched for overlapping and redundancy and cut the number down to 20 codes that became broad themes. Eventually, he whittled the number of codes to five or seven which served as the major themes or labels in the study.

The qualitative researcher personal interpretations were intertwined into the process of asking questions and analyzing the data. Hence, the researcher needed to validate his findings (Creswell, 2016). The question is, are the findings accurate? Validity is essential if others are going to trust the conclusions of the study. Eight varying validity strategies were described by Creswell (2016) but he recommends employing only two or three. This researcher used three--triangulation, member checking analysis, and reflexivity. Triangulation involves using information from different sources – children, parents, teachers, and members of the program’s organizing committee. The researcher used information from interviews, observations, and documentation. The participants, the individuals involved in the study, also serves to validate information. The researcher returned to the participants to check if the themes or stories are accurate. This is called member checking. The third validity measure was reflexivity. The researcher reflected on his experiences and background to see what possible impact they had on how he related to the information. These biases are shared as part of this report.

Ethical Considerations

As a human-subject investigator, I was required to complete online training through UMass Amherst, Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI). I took and passed the Social Behavioral and Education Research Investigators and Key Personnel – basic course. I also submitted a request for the approval of my human-subject research through e-protocol. Once I had satisfied the requirements of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), including satisfactorily answering all questions, submitting the various forms, and completing the online training, I was issued an IRB Certificate of Human Subjects Approval along with IRB-stamped consent forms.

Two letters of permission were written as part of the ethical considerations for this study. The first letter was written to the Battle of the Drums Secretariat, the non-governmental organization that initiated the program. The second letter was sent to the principal of St. Peter Claver School, the institution where this study was conducted. Along with the request for permission I informed the gatekeepers why their school and program were selected, what would be accomplished, a schedule of time to be spent, potential for disruption, how the results would be used, and what the participants would gain from the study. Permission to interview and observe the students was also sought and received. Access forms were also sent to parents of the children involved in the GLACPS.

Informed consent letters were distributed to all eleven teachers with classroom responsibilities in which the GLACPS was being conducted. Later two additional letters were extended to the pre-school teachers whose classes were recently added to the program. Letters of invitation were also delivered to four persons, including the president of the Battle of the Drums Secretariat, who played key roles in the program. In addition, letters of invitation were extended to the parents involved in the focus groups. The informed-consent letters included the right to withdraw, the purpose and procedures of the study, assurances of confidentiality, known risks, expected benefits for participants, and space for signatures.

This study was deemed to be of minimum risk to all participants and was granted an expedited review by the IRB. Informed consent was sought for all persons who participated in the study. There were no perceivable risks to the well-being of participants—psychological, economic, or social. The possibility and magnitude of harm was no greater than normal teaching as was the case for teachers and normal learning

while in the classroom as was the case for the students. Interviews with the children were conducted where the interaction were within the view of at least one authorized adult.

A final ethical consideration is the breach of confidentiality. Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can identify any subject will remain confidential. It will be disclosed only with permission or as required by law.

Confidentiality will be maintained by keeping all records in a safe location and coded. Identities will be hidden using symbols known only to the researcher, and the only persons who will see the videos and or written notes will be members of my dissertation committee at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.

In these ways, I am ensuring that all ethical considerations are addressed. These considerations included IRB training, submitting protocols, and securing permissions and consent. Finally, I informed participants and informants of their rights during interviews and observations.

Positionality

This section of the methodology acknowledges the fact that I interacted closely with my participants and informants during the research process. Although it did not impact the findings, it did influence the process. According to Bourke (2014), This process of self-analysis is called reflexivity; it involves self-scrutiny on part of the researcher. Here I discuss my interest in the phenomenon I have investigated, my background and experience, my role in the data collection, and the relationship I have with some of the participants.

I was drawn to the study of the Garifuna and Language Arts and Craft Program in Schools, (GLACPS) for two compelling reasons: (1) a strong sense of cultural identity as

a Garifuna and (2) a burning desire, as a Social Justice Education scholar, to advocate for change in the Belizean education system.

The first reason can influence my interactions with the participants who, in many cases, were of different ethnicity. As a Garifuna, observing the teaching and learning of the Garifuna culture and conducting interviews, put me in a position very close to the participants. I observed that both the participants and I were affected by the fact that I am a Garifuna whether they were of the same ethnic group or not. The participants, particularly the teachers, knew that I was a fluent Garifuna speaker. Most of the teachers were also past students of mine at the local university. There were times when I observed some level of anxiety by teachers as they conducted classes in my presence. I made it a point not to display any reactions to wrong pronunciations but gladly assisted after classes when asked for help. It was critical to be mindful of my own biases as I conducted this study. I constantly reminded myself that the purpose of the study was to understand the program from the perspective and experience of the participants and not mine.

The second reason is closely connected to the first. The strong sense of cultural identity led me to question why the transmission of culture (cite source) as a sociological function of education is not true for Garifuna people and other minorities in Belize. Social Justice Education has provided me not only the academic background to understand the socio-historic context that led to this situation but also the tools to be an agent of change.

My philosophical worldview of education is based in social justice education and informed by critical theory. This study is influenced by sub-theories such as postcolonial theory, multicultural education, and critical pedagogy. It also falls under what Creswell

(2014) describes as a transformative worldview, which links research to “political and social action” to confront inequities. This program fits into what I envisioned as an intervention to achieve some level of indigenous cultural transmission in the education system. In other words, this research study is not an objective-free undertaking. The fact that I had been thinking of a similar intervention and subsequently conducted a review of the literature did influence this research. I began this study envisioning what such a program should look like, including teacher characteristics and parental involvement. However, I kept to the original plan of employing a qualitative case study to first understand an existing program from the perspectives and experience of its participants. Thus, the literature review was written later in the dissertation to compare established findings and thinking, deductive, with general conclusions and theories formulated from researched patterns and trends, inductive.

Conducting the study about Garifuna culture as a Garifuna with participants of multiple ethnic identities made it difficult to be an unconcerned participant. According to Neumann (2011, p. 168), acknowledging this and being open about it, is best. Thus, I was able to manage my biases by being aware of them.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

Culture-based education programs are emerging in Belize to revitalize and preserve ethnic and indigenous cultures in response to language loss and assimilation. The loss of language, a main cultural prop, can lead to greater incidence of the non-observance of traditions and cultural identity (Fishman, 1991). While such efforts need to be applauded, research into the management, curricula, instruction, and their effectiveness, particularly from the viewpoints of its sponsors and beneficiaries, has yet to be conducted. Without such studies, the programs may not realize their full potential or benefit from proven best practices. The purpose of this exploratory case study was to understand the program from the perspectives of its stakeholders. To accomplish this, the following two central research questions were asked: (1) What does the Garifuna Language and Arts and Craft Program in Schools (GLACPS) mean to its sponsors and beneficiaries at St. Peter Claver School? (2) How do the sponsors and beneficiaries view the Garifuna Language and Arts and Craft Program in Schools at St. Peter Claver School? To answer these two major research questions participants were interviewed and responded to five sub-questions. These were: (1) How did they get involved in this program (2) What did they understand to be the purpose of this program (3) What did this program mean to them? How important was this program to them (4) How did they determine the success of this program, and (5) What attitudes did they see others have towards this program?

Six themes emerged from the data: (1) program description and structure, (2) genesis (3) purpose and meaning, (4) attitudes and perspectives, (5) measuring success, and (6) the way forward. The findings are reported by theme and illustrated through the use of examples of verbatim quotes collected from interviews conducted. This allows the voice of participant stakeholders to be prioritized as much as possible in the results. Stakeholders statements explain how things happened, deepened understanding, and provide evidence for interpretation (Croden & Sainsbury, 2006). The first two themes, unlike the others are mainly the result of observation and documentation. The themes from the research questions are tabled below:

Research Questions/Themes	Subthemes 1	Subthemes 2
1. Program description	Genesis	
	Participants	
	Curriculum	
	Instruction	
	Teaching Materials	
	Secretariat	
2. What did they understand to be purpose of the program	Coordinators	
	Secretariat	
	Teachers	
	Children	
	Parents	
3. How important was the program to them? Meaning.	Teachers	Garifuna
		Non Garifuna
	Coordinators	
4. How did they determine the success of the program?	Secretariat	
	Teachers	
	Parents	
5. What attitudes did they see others have towards this program?	Attitude of admin/sec	As seen by teachers
		As seen by coordinators
	Attitude of Teachers	As seen by other teachers
		Parents
		Secretariat
	Attitude of Parents	As seen by teachers
		Coordinators
	Attitude of Children	As seen by teachers
	As seen by parents	
6. The Way Forward	Battle of the Drum	
	Secretariat	
	Coordinators	
	Teachers	

Figure 3 - Research Questions and themes

Program Description

The idea of teaching the Garifuna language and culture emerged from a concern by Darius Avila, the president and founder of the Battle of the Drums Secretariat, “out of a deep concern for the deterioration of the Garifuna culture” and of the celebration of Garifuna Settlement Day on November 19. He recognized at the time that the three major players in the local education system were Garinagu; the school principal, the Catholic school local manager, and the district education manager (Ministry of Education). He reported that “They were more than willing to move with the idea. So, with all these three major players in the education system ...they moved ahead.” He then met with the teaching staff where he found out that, “one-third were Garifuna teachers and two-thirds were non-Garifuna teachers.” The non-Garifuna teachers were of Maya (Mopan and Q’eqchi) and East Indian heritage. Through individual and whole group staff meetings, and with the influence of a very supportive teacher, the concerns of the staff were addressed.

“she was very interested and so she studied, got the word pronunciation properly, and help to structure the whole program. That is how you know it could have been establish and nurtured. In addition to that, ... we put in place the support system in terms of ... the documents and ... the equipment they were going to use. In addition to that, we had a coordinator and the coordinator’s role is to visit the school and provide support.”

“...this program started up as one of our strategic objectives ... the Garifuna language retrieval. So, the idea is that in terms of speaking of retrieving the language the target is to primary school children.”

The Garifuna Language Arts and Crafts in Schools Program was originally meant to be a Saturday class for children of Garifuna heritage established in January 2008. Daily sessions were added starting with Infant One in October 2012 when issues with attendance posed a problem.

Participants

The participants in the daily program included the thirteen teachers and close to 300 students from Infant 1 to Standard 2 (4th Grade) along with their parents, a librarian, two coordinators, and one representative from the Battle of the Drums secretariat. Four of the thirteen teachers are Garinagu. Of the four Garifuna teachers only one was not conversant in the language. The average number of Garifuna children in a class, ages 5 to 9, was between 3 – 5 or 15 to 20 per cent out of an average of 18 students per class. None of the children involved in the program were reported to be Garifuna speakers. Teachers, students, and parents got involved in the daily program by virtue of class assigned to them as teachers, grade level as students, and the grade level of their child respectively. Involvement in the Saturday class by both teachers and students was completely voluntary. All teachers in the Saturday program were Garinagu whereas only three were only three of the thirteen in the daily program. It is important to note that the Saturday program was inactive during the life of this research.

How the Curriculum Was Developed

This is two participants' account of the first meeting with teachers of the school where the GLACPS program was established. Here is what they had to say:

“... and they thought it would be best to start with the younger children”

Participant #1

“When the Secretariat came to us, we went home and started thinking about how we could teach it to the infants. So... looked at the Spanish curriculum... came up with a plan with similar words. (Teacher, pioneer 1)

“We tried to develop a curriculum because, like I said, Mr. Avila left everything in our hands We worked closely with the Spanish curriculum and just tried We got stuck as we went along because we don't have the resources, we would have wanted so that we could have made it close to the Spanish curriculum that we were following.” (Teacher, pioneer 2).

This prompted the teachers to discuss which class level to teach the Garifuna Language in Schools Program, focus on their curricular decision, and the challenges they would face incorporating such a program with limited resources. This reinforced the fact that the Secretariat indeed came initially with “only just the idea” leaving the “how” to the teachers.

The chart below is a sample of the Ministry of Education’s curriculum guide from which the Garifuna curriculum was copied or ‘mirrored.’

AREA OF STUDY: SPANISH

UNIT/THEME: HOMES – Types of Houses

INFANT I

AREA OF STUDY OUTCOMES
Pupils should:

- SL1a – discriminate and identify sounds
- SL1b – identify main ideas
- SL1c – interpret gestures/body language
- SL2a – use simple structures and vocabulary correctly and appropriately
- SL2b – ask simple factual questions
- SL2c – make simple factual statements
- SL2d – pronounce common words and phrases comprehensively

CROSS-CURRICULAR OUTCOMES
Pupils should:

CONTENT ORGANIZED INTO MANAGEABLE SETS	SUGGESTED TEACHING/LEARNING STRATEGIES	SUGGESTED STRATEGIES/ACTIVITIES FOR ASSESSMENT
<p>Types of Houses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Listening ▪ Discussion ▪ Classify ▪ Display <p>▪ Listening:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. rhymes b. stories c. poems d. songs e.g. Campanita de Oro 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Speaking – interpret pictures through sequencing, share/discuss opinions, have presentations related to drawings and personal experiences, names objects in their immediate home environment, listen/recite poems ▪ Listening/viewing - listen to poems, rhymes, stories, songs, singing/miming Spanish songs/folklore, observe/name flora and fauna in their neighborhood, view/appreciate TV programs, naming pets around home 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Observation ▪ Interviews ▪ Booklets (pictures) ▪ Portfolio

Figure 4 - Curriculum Guide Sample from Ministry of Education

Instruction

Instruction in the GLACP was strictly oral. There was absolutely no writing on the part of the students. A teacher summed it up this way,

“We don’t do a lot of words. We do between three to five for the week. And that gives them time to work with it because it’s only 15 minutes for the day. We also

do other little activities that are oral activities or picture related. Pictures that they show us they know.”

While there was no writing involved. I observed that the children were able to read the words representing the pictures on each postcard. I entered the classrooms bidding the children the time of the day, good morning or good afternoon, in Garifuna. Generally, the students looked forward to their Garifuna class and were excited to show off their command of words, and their songs and poems. The quality of response varied from class to class but for the most part, I would receive a resounding, “Recibiwati.” The class sessions typically begin and end with a song, poem, or jingle. The body of the lesson includes teacher choices from a few of the following strategies:

Role-playing or acting out.

Teacher have children work in pairs. One child says the word and the other respond appropriately either in words or actions.

Teacher: Tell the other person beside you.

Children: Beiba bougudi (Go outside).

Teacher: Come inside

Children: Beluhuma

Teacher: How do we call him?

Children: Beluhuma

Teacher: That’s come inside. Let’s repeat it again

Children: Beluhuma - come inside

Teacher calls out a verb/action word. Children repeat the word and perform appropriate action to demonstrate understanding.

The child is sent outside by the teacher. He/she is beckoned inside in Garifuna by an assigned classmate.

Here is another classroom example:

Teacher: very good I want two girls. Over there you are going to do coming from school and here is the teacher. Ok. Go ahead.

Children: buití binafi (good morning).

Teacher: I will be the teacher. Ok just pretend you are going to school, and you meet your teacher what will you say.

Children: buiti binafi.

Teacher: There are two people walking on the side walk and you want to tell them excuse what will say? No Marinelda, let them say it.

Children: Ruba umanu (excuse me).

Teacher: "... when you pass you will say, 'Seremei.'"

Children: Seremi

Teacher: No, you will say it and she will say it. Come here, (student's name). He is coming to the store and he meet a little old lady. What will he tell the little old lady?

Children: Buiti guyoun (Goodnight).

"Look ... up/down."

Teacher describes the scenario, e.g. meet and greet,

Show and Tell

In this scenario the teacher shows the children picture (fish, boy, girl, body parts) or in one case actual utensils and students call out the name in both English and Garifuna. In the case of the body parts, and in addition to calling out from the postcard, children/teacher touched or motioned to their body parts as they identified them in both English and Garifuna. In another class, the teacher called out the words in English, without any visuals, and the children responded in Garifuna. One teacher separated the children by ethnic groups and by gender and have them call out words together as a group.

On one occasion, after reviewing words and translations, children were asked to color pictures depicting Garifuna words (church, house, etc.)

Translation competition

One class is divided into teams who challenge each other in groups/sets of twos' in a knockout format.

Typical Class Activity.

In this class, days of the week was the topic for that week. I watched and listened as a Maya child said all the days of the week in Garifuna. “Days of the Week,” was sung in English to the tune of Clementine and repeated song in Garifuna. The teacher pointed at each student with the first saying the first day of the week in Garifuna followed by another child with the second day and so on. For the next activity, the teacher gave seven children cards, each with a day of the week. The students went up to the front of the class, lined up in the order of the week, and gave their week in both English and Garifuna. The class ended as it began, with the days of the week song.

Jingle/song

Another activity were action songs or jingles: “Buiti binafi” (good morning), “Iseri irumule (This is a New Year).

The focus group interviews of both teachers and children and the documents (lesson plans, word lists, curriculum) I gathered served to confirm the instructions I observed in the classrooms.

Joint Planning

There is also evidence, as seen below, that teachers were jointly following a plan.

Extract from the lesson observed below reflects some similarity to the one above.

“When we have to plan for the week so when we discuss the Garifuna, I’d give them the words for the Garifuna and then I’d train them now.” (Teacher, Pioneer 2)

Teaching Materials and Resources.

Teachers had to create and develop their own resource materials. Talking about this issue an interviewee said,

“We did make cards and phonics teach you that. We put the words on the cards.”

Another interviewee, when asked about teaching materials and resources, said:

“We find ourselves copying what Wanile have with help from the Garifuna dictionary.”

The pictures below illustrate the teaching materials constructed by the teachers.



Figure 5 - Teaching Materials

The teachers found ways to address the shortage of teaching materials and strategies by coming together to jointly solve their challenges through brainstorming, use of Garifuna dictionary, and a visit to Gulisi (a Garifuna cultural school).

“... we have to brainstorm as teachers. You find myself, Ms., and Ms. ... we come together, and we’ll discuss... and look at the curriculum for Language Arts. ... we say it’s a good idea we do opposites. We take these vocabulary words to make short phrases and things like that.”

“... we have few books. Our main book is the Garifuna dictionary. We have three books I don't really know where they come from but it's just a guideline for us.” (coordinator 2)

We did not have much. It was after we visited Gulisi that we got some ideas from there ... the teachers were very nice to us and they shared some of the little jingles and so on they have with us. We started with that and as we go along we add ours. (Coordinator 2).

In terms of teacher support, one of the program coordinators reported that,

“... have a recorder and each class has a speaker that they can listen to a recording of the vocabulary.” (Coordinator 1).

The curriculum for the Saturday program has “... is for beginners, intermediate and advance program. So that program that Mr. Norberto put together for us was the program we work last year. That program works very well because when you look at it is not only the translation, we look at more at one and one. Which is conversational, we look at the musical part of it which Peter Castillo was doing it and Mr. Norberto did the music part too. It spread a little bit more last year; which was the Saturday class so that was added on to the Drumsing.” (Coordinator 2)

Purpose and Meaning

Secretariat

In its organizational documents, the Battle of the Drums Secretariat listed its objectives as:

1. To introduce the teaching of various aspects of the Garifuna language.
2. To enhance students' knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of the Garifuna language.
3. To introduce the making of traditional Garifuna Arts and Crafts to students.
4. To enable students to see the value in making traditional Arts and Crafts.

In its Vision, Mission and Core Values paper, Secretariat went on to outline its organizational goals as follows:

1. To develop, promote and implement a program which will assist in preserving the Garifuna Language and Garifuna Arts and Craft
2. To mobilize and organize Garifuna artisans in Belize.
3. To train teachers as effective facilitators working collaboratively with the artisans.
4. To expose students and teachers to direct experience with artisans, musicians, cultural activists and activities and events.
5. To work collaboratively with the Ministry of Education, Schools Management, UNICEF, Garifuna Artisans, knowledgeable Garifuna and other resource persons in the promotion and attainment of the vision and mission of The Battle of the Drums Garifuna Language Art and Craft in Schools Program.

Coordinators

Other responses to the question included:

“The main objective of the language in school program is more for the Garifuna retrieval and for Garifuna children to get the basic part of Garifunaduou.”
(coordinator 1)

“The purpose ... is to improve the Garifuna language. We notice that the Garifuna language is deteriorating. It has not been spoken at the homes. We don't see the interest in the parents. We are losing the language and our purpose is to bring back the language through the children.” (coordinator 2).

Teachers

The participants shared their understanding of the program below:

One interviewee said that *“The purpose of the program ... is to retrieve language ...”*

(teacher, pioneer 1)

And another commented, *“... Mr. Avila ... said it was for the purpose of the retrieval of the Garifuna culture and to keep it alive.”* (teacher, pioneer 2).

A teacher from a focus group summed it up this way,

“I believe is the revival of the Garifuna language ... they think that children and the community is losing their language. A way for them to bring it back ... is incorporating it into the schools.”

Each of the four main participants agreed that the purpose of the program with Garifuna language retrieval being the focus.

However, for some Garifuna teachers, their personal connection to that purpose revealed a deeper motive and the meaning of the program as they saw it. (as you can see below):

As we were talking about it, my Mom and I realized two things. One, it has to bring back more than the celebrations, it had to be in realizing who you are as an individual person as a Garifuna. Two, ... realize who you are ... recognize you as a people so with that come like history, language, all what it has to be a Garifuna. (Battle of the Drums Leadership)

“My children need to learn their culture and language. We were not teaching them at home. So, on me learning, I will be able to pass it on to my own children. Set a goal for myself even before I had children. You have to learn in order to be able to teach.” (Participant #1).

One Garifuna teacher saw this as an opportunity for her child to learn the language, something she did not teach.

“When this program came about, I saw it as a second chance for our children, not for me per se, a second chance for my child to be able to learn something about his culture and other children as well.” (Participant #2).

A non-Garifuna teacher viewed it this way:

“I have a daughter, especially who is Garifuna mix. And I do not understand a word in Garifuna ... she is in standard 3. She learns a little bit about her culture that I could not teach her. That for me is a personal reason of doing (this). (Non-Garifuna Teacher).

Children

The children identified practical reasons:

“So that you can speak Garifuna.”

“if one of your grandmothers is Garifuna you will be able to speak Garifuna to her.”

“We should be able to translate for someone else.”

Attitudes and Perspectives

What attitudes did they see others have towards this program?

The Secretariat

Well, there are those people who are very impressed with what we've done and how far we've come with the program ... especially the Battle of the Drums Secretariat. They have shown a lot of appreciation towards the teachers who were there from the inception of the program (teacher, program pioneer 1).

The administration

There were some negative comments about the program.

“However, there are some people who you would have thought would have embraced the program more than they did. For example, we had an administrator of Garifuna descent who said that reading was more important than Garifuna. If we are not through with our reading, we should just leave Garifuna aside.” (teacher, program pioneer 1).

Nonetheless, the majority of the participants felt that the administration was supportive.

Yes, ... they (administration) are so excited ... because during the concert the assistants (principals) went around supporting the children and applauding them and affirming them ... I get support from the principal as well. (Coordinator 1) I think our administrators are very supportive. “... I just have to say, ‘I'm here to do supervision....’ I don't have any problem with the administrator. They are very cooperative.” (Coordinator 2).

“I see the administrative embrace the program and other teachers don't say any negative comments they are supportive ... “(Teacher, Focus Group).

There is a general agreement that the administrators are friendly and supportive of this program.

Attitude of Teachers

In response to the research question, how do you see teachers' attitude toward the program, a respondent remarked,

“There are I guess, like with everything, some people who embrace it ... and there are other who will not do what they are supposed to do linger with it or feel that it is not important.” (teacher, program pioneer 1).

This teacher has made a similar observation noting that not everyone is on board with the program at the same level of enthusiasm and passion. She offered this explanation,

“... most of the teachers in the infant division are not Garifuna teachers and I think that kind of threaten them a little bit. ... for instance, teachers who are for the first time, teaching in town may not be familiar with the Garifuna language and now they come and find out that they have to teach the language (teacher, program pioneer 1).

After observing the classes and discussing with the teachers I found out that (grades 1 – 2 Garifuna teachers; one Maya; one Creole. Grade 2 – one Maya, one Creole, and one Garifuna – nonspeaker; Grade 3 – one Garifuna, one Mestizo, one Maya; and Grade 4 – two Mestizo and one Maya. Not only are some teachers non-Garifuna but it may be the first time that they are teaching outside of their own communities. The interviewee saw this as a difficult situation to be in and thus described it as threatening/uncomfortable to the teachers.

One Garifuna teacher was particularly critical of a colleague’s attitude.

“I find one teacher who is Garifuna, “I can’t say it. It too hard. I can’t do it.” Leave (left) her right there (teacher, program pioneer 2).

The teacher added that,

“(Non-Garifuna) Do it and do it well. Then they have those who are Garifuna who are hesitant. ‘They (children) can’t say it. It hard.’ (mockingly). “... It was a teacher ... I don’t think she taught the class and she wasn’t here for long.” (teacher, program pioneer 2).

The only negative I got back ... came from a teacher. The person told me that the teacher said that they want to force them to teach Garifuna at the school and they are non-Garifuna.” (teacher, program pioneer 2)

The brackets are inserted by the researcher. This interviewee, a Garifuna, was did not take the inability or unwillingness of the Garifuna teacher to teach Garifuna lightly and expressed her apparent disgust by mocking her response. On the other hand, she observed that Non-Garifuna teachers were not only willing but did it well. The interviewees overall were working with the program. As one participant put it and echoed the sentiment ...,

“I can see that most of the teachers are receptive because they are learning as well. ... they love the language ... and they look forward to see me especially when I help them.” (Coordinator 1)

Non-Garifuna Teachers

The interviewees were also in agreement over the general response of non-Garifuna teachers:

“They are not Garifuna. You notice you see that their attitude towards it. They love it. They are trying ... it helps a lot because with their attitude wanting to teach and wanting to learn to pronounce these words” (Coordinator 1)
“... I see a good revival because the teachers themselves are not Garinagu ... most of the children ... are not Garifuna. What they are learning you can see that they are really into it; both the children and the teachers.” (Coordinator 2)

Some teachers were also parents, both Garifuna, and non-Garifuna, and this interviewee statement reflected the sentiments of her colleagues,

“... as a parent and as a teacher I think is very nice for kids learn about the different culture and language. And my son also just started infant one, so he keeps telling me words in Garifuna, “mommy you know this?” (Teacher, focus group)

Teachers Not Involved in Program

When asked about the involvement of teachers in the school but outside of the program, the participant questioned replied that,

“they think we should involve them some more because even when we have our role plays, when we do our dramatizations, and such thing usually only the infant

division there. So, they were saying we should invite them so that they can also be more involved in what we were doing. And most of the time they only hear. They are not like really seeing what we were doing?” (teacher pioneer 1)

The teacher opined that basically the entire school should be involved whether the program is being conducted in all the classes or not.

The interviewees view teachers and students as having a positive attitude towards the programs. They appear somewhat surprised at the enthusiasm of the non-Garifuna students and teachers to the teaching of the Garifuna language.

Secretariat

The Battle of the Drums Secretariat for its part recognized the challenges that can account for the attitudes towards the program. Introducing a new program to teachers who had their full-time work set out for them, is asking a lot.

“While we get general good support from our own Garifuna teachers, sometimes we would get a little pushback from them. I wouldn’t say all of them may be one or two and maybe it has to do with their own frustration at one not knowing how to speak the language themselves and two in having to learn how to teach it just like any other individual. We also have the pushback from the non-Garifuna teachers because ... this is not a program that is a Ministry of Education program and so in a sense this is additional pieces of work for them. Apart from preparing a regular curriculum they must do this and is challenging.”

Attitude of Parents

“I think the parents really embraced the program and even the parents of the children who are not Garifuna. They will come and say that they are amazed that the children learned such words. “... we have never heard a negative remark from parents. They’ve always been positive.” (teacher, program pioneer 1). “I have parents who will come to me and say that they like that their child is learning few words in Garifuna because they travel and when other people hear their children other words they are like amazed and they are mixed. So, at that time their father didn’t speak Garifuna Fluently. So, when the child reaches home the child will say a word and the father and the mother who are from a different culture would repeat the word and they enjoy. So, every week that parent will come to me and ask me the word. (Teacher, focus group).

The above is a teacher's recollection of a discussion with a non-Garifuna parent of a child with a Garifuna father. In addition to her child learning Garifuna, the Garifuna father is also learning from the child. The three members of that household are obviously enthused about the program. It is very meaningful for them. Responses of parents:

"... when we had the meeting with the parents for the first time ... the parents did not hesitate." When you meet them, you will hear them saying, 'You should have heard my son counting in Garifuna.' (teacher, program pioneer 2)

"... the American came, Maya parents and few Garifuna parents were there (Garifuna concert) and I could see that they were happy that their children are learning a new language. That's the attitude I see. Parents I meet ... when ... going to the stores, 'Oh, teacher ... I love what you are doing at school teaching our Garifuna language.' I can see they are happy because even the American, the Q'eqchi, the Mopan Maya (parents) would address me in my language." (coordinator 1).

"They would be like wow how did. I mean you have this student and you don't even speak Garifuna."

Most parents were viewed, regardless of race or ethnicity, as demonstrating a positive attitude toward the program. This view was shared by the majority of interviewed participants.

Attitude of Garifuna Children

"Garifuna children ... would be more hesitant and would take it as a joke and will laugh especially when they are saying the word wrong ... the one that would mess up the pronunciation of the word ... our Garinagu children are not eager to learn Garifuna." (Coordinator 2).

"... the Garifuna children ... are the ones who are ashamed, shy and don't want to speak out (teacher, pioneer 2).

The two interviewees seem disappointed at the attitude and behavior of Garifuna children to the learning of the Garifuna language. They appear to have expected that the children, being Garifuna themselves, would have taken this opportunity seriously, adept at pronouncing the words, display some pride, and speaking out. The children's behavior was the complete opposite.

Parents' Perspectives

Non-Garifuna Mom (U):

I think is a very good thing they are learning about another culture. They are some of them that they are Garifuna, but they don't even know their culture. I find it very good because my child is a Garifuna, but I can't teach her, and she doesn't go round others that might teach her. I want her to learn so when I heard she is learning Garifuna I felt good because she is learning about her own culture.

One individual, a Non-Garifuna Mom, stated,

My youngest child could sing in Garifuna... and count but in Q'eqchi she can't do that. So, there you could see that she knows more in Garifuna. they are more interest in the Garifuna than the Maya because when I talk to them in Q'eqchi (Maya) they tell me it's a funny language and that they don't understand. But the Garifuna yes, they are more interested to know.

And another non-Garifuna Mom commented,

*"... one person I know that knows about it too. She is happy too because if there is someone that is talking about them, they could know what they are saying."
Like that children are learning a few words
We are amazed
We are learning new words*

Parents certainly have questions about the program and its purpose. The first parent expressed her concern this way:

I have one concern. Why Garifuna language out of all the other languages in Belize? Belize in a whole is diverse. So, my question is why Garifuna language? Would that take us abroad? Would that take us internationally? Don't we want to go abroad? To take us internationally or taking us back into our heritage? I understand. Build it is good but what about building for the future? I say like the Spanish. I would say that I would like they implement the Spanish like that. Because from my personal experience as in the work place that is needed. I have experienced it. That would take us internationally. Plus, in high school and UB it's a must that you pass and take that in order you become ... (?)... like math and English.

A Q'eqchi father commented,

Yes, like how I say it's something good. But ... eventually, will it be needed to learn? For example, like how they need to learn Spanish and they don't get it and now they are teaching them a next language that is harder to understand writing and dialogues. They are adding more ... but it's not something bad."
"I know about the program long time but I dunno when it start." I gone da the one at the park." (concert).

Parents became more aware of the GLACP when their children began sharing with the words, they had learned in class. Parents could not recall receiving any communication or invited to any meeting or activity related to the Garifuna language program. One parent did admit knowledge of the concert held at the local park where their children sang Garifuna songs, recited poems in Garifuna, and danced to Garifuna music as part of the Garifuna Settlement Day celebrations.

Children's perspective

Child (accompanied by a parent): because I could talk Garifuna to my Grandpa and Grandma.

Determining Success

There are no formal tests to measure or evaluate the success of the program in terms of whether the children are learning the Garifuna language. Rather the participants interviewed point in the ability of the children to participate in activities such as the Garifuna Language contest, sing songs, recite poems, and to greet each other.

Teachers

"And they have different activities that the Battle of the Drums would invite us to and the children would put on shows to show what they have learned. So, we do talent shows. We do end of the year activities. Also, people from the Battle of the Drums they come in to observe and record lessons. So, I guess they do their own evaluations as well." (Teacher, Pioneer 1)

Yes, we see some progress. At least if we want to sing a song or say a poem in Garifuna, they are able. Especially the children who are in the program. They

might not be able to translate each word for you back in Garifuna as much as you'd like to but ... They are certain things they can do. (Teacher, Pioneer 2) Children participate in activities ... you could tell whether the children are learning and grasping because when they get to talk it out and answer questions." Kids 'are excited and happy about it.' (teacher 1, focus group). Students ... "took it (preparation for activities) over", "got help from three teachers", "... so motivated and so enthusiastic...", "... did everything to learn just to sing the song." (teacher 2, focus group) "I believe that when you reach Std 2 level we could build on what the children learned already from the vocabulary they learned in Infant 1, infant 2, and Std 1. Build that up in Std 2 where they could have short phrases and sentences, so we don't waste a lot of time building extra vocabulary. No, let's build on the vocabulary they have and expand on it. That is what I'm working on presently." Teacher Participant.

This teacher, familiar with what has been taught from Infant 1 (grade 1) to Standard 1 (grade 3), recognizes the need for new content and a change in teaching strategy. She is taking the initiative to further develop the curriculum and teaching plans.

Coordinators

*The program is successful. I'm seeing that is rewarding. I'm seeing that the teachers and children are very much involved, and they are open to this program. I can see that the children from preschool now this September preschool roll in. The teachers are willing to help them, and the children are so excited, and they are so full of enthusiasm and motivation to learn. That is what I am seeing. It's working and been successful because of the children acceptance to learn. Their willingness to learn. To me I become an icon ... because even on the street children are saying **buiti binafi**, ... **Buiti guyon. Ayo**. They would be communicating with me in the Garifuna language. So, I can see it is going to work. It will reach its goal because our goal is from pre-school to standard two because, at the end of standard 2, they are able to communicate. (Coordinator 1). Yes, it is very successful. What we need is to make it more publicized, I think. What I am looking at the kids today. Look at it our Garifuna language in school program bringing out the translation contest and with the translation contest is more than what we teach because it has more to it. Through that, I think that it's making more of the child itself you know as I look at it. (Coordinator 2). So, like I said we have never done a structured evaluation. Every year we ... get all the teachers and we ... talked about what are some of the weakness, strength and how can we improve. Based on that we ... address basically the weak and then we build on strength. I would like to see a structure evaluation, or a particular tool... being used you know. (Battle of the Drums Secretariat, Leadership).*

There are two main ways in which teachers view the success of the program. The first is in terms of how the children learn to pronounce the words, give their meaning, sing songs, recite poems, and participate in cultural activities and competitions. The second is by pointing out areas that are constraining the success of the program and or where they believe improvements can be made. The second can also be considered as obstacles or challenges.

Parents

“It’s good because they get to learn an additional language.”

“He bring home word he have to study.”

You learn from him? (interviewer)

Yes, learn from him. I neva know that word, buay! (Garifuna mother)

Parents view the program to be successful. Children sing songs, recited poems, and shared the words they learned at school with them. The (Garifuna) parents admitted that they learned words they never knew before (gadaru – sea turtle). The non-Garifuna parents basically summed it up this way:

Future of the Program

I think that if we should have somewhere where we could have a school for ourselves or an area where we can build up, I feel like we can star. Because Garifunanness is so rich. Is just like the English and it doesn’t make a difference to me. It’s just like English or Spanish. (Coordinator 2).

Yes, we visit Gulisi to see our strategy because our goal is to have our own School our Garifuna School. (Coordinator 1)

Something like this could be replicated in other cultures as well. It also means if we could do this here in PG town then it can also be replicated in other Garifuna Communities because what we are seeing and suffering from is not seeing only in PG town but in other Garifuna Communities. So, in a way we are like a model for other. In a matter of fact ... vision is not to only have it here in Punta Gorda Claver school but to have a similar program in one school in each of the Garifuna Communities including Belize City anywhere we have a large number of Garifuna people. I would want to see a program there running. So, like I said it’s a model to replicate. (Battle of the Drums Secretariat, Leadership)

The vision for PG town as it relates to the program is to have or build a Garifuna school. Where it will be pattern with these things, of course, recognizing our

demographics in the Toledo District right. So, primarily we will pitch a high level of education so that we can target Garifuna and none Garifuna students alike. There will be a private school we will have a full curriculum that answers to the requirements of the ministry of education, but we will also infuse the teaching of the Garifuna language among other things that relate to the Garifuna role in our program. So, while we will continue to maintain the program in the St. Peter Claver School, we will have our own school which will be full choice. Of course, it will be a battle of the Drums Garifuna school pattern with all the activities primarily some other things recognizing our own demographics here. In terms of the vision of the program for the future related to the program, it is my vision that we should we have a program like this in every Garifuna community. Where at least one school will be running the program. So, as early this year while we had started the program it was not only St. Peter Claver School, we had simultaneously in Barranco. (Battle of the Drums Secretariat, Leadership)

Conclusion

The Garifuna Language Arts and Craft Program in Schools at St. Peter Claver School is a culture-based education initiative launched on October 11, 2012, for the purpose of preserving Garifuna language and culture. Since then it has expanded from Infant 1 (Grade 1) to Standard 2 (grade 4) with the instruction of the Garifuna language taught daily for fifteen minutes by an ethnically diverse staff of teachers to an equally diverse body of students. During the past eight years, students, teachers, and other stakeholders have experienced what it is like to be participants in a unique program where most of them are learning a language together (Freirean experience). This chapter has provided the reader with an insight into the perspective of a wide cross-section of these participants -- students, teachers, parents, administrators, and program sponsors -- about the program. From them, the readers learn about the purpose of the program, perceived challenges and obstacles, their aspirations, the attitudes and feelings about themselves, others, and other aspects of the initiative.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Introduction

“While you are a Garifuna by birth, I am a Garifuna by choice” retorted the non-Garifuna teacher’s in response to prominent Garifuna educators questioning her legitimacy to teach Garifuna. She further defended her feeling of legitimacy by countering that she is the mother of Garifuna children, who wants them to learn, and that she, too, will learn. The prominent Garifuna educators, tasked with training the teachers, had noticed that most of the teachers were not of Garifuna heritage nor were they speakers of the language. This quote underlines one of the key findings of this study. It reflects the exceptionality of this program that appears to be an anomaly to similar programs.

Despite many challenges, there is hope. Results dispute the accepted wisdom that teachers must be fluent in a language to teach it. From the author’s personal experience, his wife learned Garifuna at the same time she taught her children. Hard work not only beats talent but a non-speaker of Garifuna, a Garifuna by choice, with a sense of purpose may be able to succeed where a Garifuna by birth struggles. Despite the challenges, the overwhelming positive attitudes by the teachers (both Garifuna and non-Garifuna) have towards the teaching of the Garifuna language has kept the program alive. Deyle and Swisher (1997) noted that students form positive attitudes of themselves when their teachers value their language and culture. This may be the crux of the matter determining the success of this entire program.

The attitude toward the program was largely positive and overwhelmingly supported despite the unique challenges. Success of the program was informally evaluated based on the participation of the children in culture-related activities. However, there was consensus among the program's leadership, Secretariat and coordinators, that improvements and changes are needed and forthcoming. Discussion of finding and recommendations are now presented.

Summary and Findings

Program description

Genesis

The GLACP was initiated by the Battle of the Drums Secretariat, a nongovernment organization whose main purpose is to preserve Garifuna culture. The Garifuna Language and Arts and Craft Program in Schools began as "...just as an idea" for which "... they wanted help to put the program together" (teacher interviewee). Another teacher added that the Secretariat left everything in their hands. Well, not quite. The Secretariat did secure the leadership of an influential teacher, provided a coordinator, and conducted its first training program. The Secretariat was also able to convince the local Catholic school management, government district manager of schools, the school principal, and met with the teachers (Garifuna and non-Garifuna) to establish the Garifuna language program. Despite whatever the Secretariat did, that was a lot to ask of the teachers considering that the findings are different from those described in the literature. The teachers were left with the task of developing a curriculum, choosing their instructional strategies, and creating their own teaching materials. Most importantly, they had to learn the language! Perush and Masuku (2002) suggested that teachers should be

bilingual and conversant with the language. Most of the teachers are non-Garifuna, teaching a language in which they are not fluent or do not speak at all to a diverse target population of children which is 15% to 20% Garifuna. Teachers should also know the structure of language, its function, and how children learn language (Karuss and Watahomigie, 1992). None of the above was evident in this case.

As has been reported the Garifuna language session is only 15 minutes. The session is a stand-alone period that it not connected or integrated with any other area in the curriculum. It can be argued that 15 minutes is better than no time at all. The author observed that, while time was a factor in some instances, the quality of instruction played a major role in the learning and teaching of the Garifuna language. More than one enthusiastic teacher had the children active with a variety of activities which include poems, role-playing, singing, and calling out words in one 15-minute session. Nonetheless, the pros and cons of five 15-minutes sessions per week as opposed to three 25-minutes per week can be explored. It was observed that, in fact, most sessions extended beyond the scheduled 15 minutes. How the 15 minutes were used appeared to have been more crucial than how much time was available.

The curriculum reflected in the weekly plan consisted of a list of words. Instruction is strictly oral using locally developed material and resources based on the Ministry of Education Spanish curriculum and, “Wani le: Mabuleida wamei le tarufadahabei waguchu woun” (Garifuna language instruction text). There was absolutely no writing observed except for words written on word cards used for instruction. Instruction, while varied, was limited to words and phrases. More can and should be done here. There is space, albeit 15 minutes a day and in spite of children’s varied ages, for

critical pedagogy to occur where the children could be engaged in thinking critically about their condition, how they got where they are as non-speakers of their own language, how their language has become endangered, and how they can participate in their own cultural preservation. In any case, this is a very short time for teaching any content. It needs to be addressed.

Teachers

One of the most interesting findings was that most of the teachers were not Garifuna speakers and they were able to successfully deliver the program. Only four of the thirteen teachers involved in the teaching of the Garifuna language were Garinagu. Three of the four Garifuna teachers were fluent in the language. This was in stark contrast to what was found in the literature.

A prominent African educator cited by Brock-Utne (2001), referring to a European language, declared that, “Instruction is given in a language that is not normally used in his immediate environment, a language neither the learner nor the teacher understands and uses well enough.” While this was said about European languages in relation to African languages, it may well be said about the teaching of Garifuna today in Punta Gorda, Belize where English is the medium of instruction. While the European languages were the foreign language in Africa, it can be said that Garifuna is the foreign and second language at St. Peter Claver School, Punta Gorda. The literature also pointed out that the teachers in the culture-based education programs were of the same indigenous ethnicity and mother tongue as the students. This is not the case in the GLACP at St. Peter Claver School.

Paolo Freire (2000), as cited in the literature review, described the teacher as a critical educator and as a collaborative partner. As a critical minded educator, the teacher would be aware of how the current primary curriculum marginalizes the Garinagu's view of the world and what needs to be done in the Garifuna language curriculum to address that. Most important and foremost, would be her awareness of her own consciousness of Garifuna historical reality and her own practice. As a collaborative partner, she would work democratically with her students in developing an understanding of the world and mutually coming up with solutions, for example, as to how language loss can be resolved. Deyle and Fisher (1997) recommended that teachers should understand and be knowledgeable of students, families, and communities. This understanding of these roles was not evident from data collected in the study, although it might exist, but future research may determine if that is the case.

Teacher involvement in GLACSP, from year to year, is out of the control of the teachers themselves and the Secretariat. St. Peter Claver School is part of the Catholic Management which transfers and rotates teachers from school to school within its management. Since the interviews and observations were conducted for this study, four out of the original thirteen have been transferred within the school itself or to another school. One of the four that left spoke Garifuna. None of the four teachers who have replaced them speak Garifuna and are of another ethnicity. The new teachers coming have no choice, regardless of their language ability, but to become a participant in the program. The task of the program coordinators and school administrators, therefore, starts all over again. Students, from the past year or years, may now be with a teacher who has no knowledge of the language. This presents a challenging situation.

Two points of interest emerged from this study regarding the number of Garifuna students in each class. While the author has been aware of the changing demographics over the years, the reality of the situation hit home upon seeing the situation up close. Garinagu are now the minority population in the town as reflected by the percentage of Garifuna children in the classrooms. Despite this, a language program in Garifuna was established. Not only was the program targeting this small population but other ethnic groups as well. How could this be? Apart from the explanation gleaned from the leadership of the Secretariat about being strategic in their approach, the author believes it can also be attributed to the growing appreciation of the community for its diverse cultural heritage and history.

Purpose and Meaning

This study found that the participants and stakeholders are cognizant of the language and culture preservation purpose of the GLACP. It did not appear, however, that they shared the deeper understanding that it is also about, “who you are and what it means to be a Garifuna” as expressed by Darius Avila, president of the Battle of the Drums Secretariat. This, the researcher believes, is the essence of the entire effort; to restore a sense of ethnic and cultural identity by preserving language or reversing its shift. It may help if the participants were to understand the role of colonialism and colonial education has played in language endangerment. Both colonialism and colonial education have negatively affected the Garifuna sense of self as well as other colonized people across the globe.

As mentioned in the literature review, successful RLS (reversing language shift) is only part of a larger ethnocultural goal. The preservation of language is not pursued for

its own sake (Fishman, 1991). He asserts that those seeking the preservation of language need to be aware that they are advocating a value position, one that they should not be ashamed of. That in promoting their language, they are advocating a ‘societal reform effort’ against the status quo, one that is the monocultural and, by omission, hold their culture and language in contempt. Including Garifuna, a language made invisible in the current education system is an “act of self-determination and resistance.” This is a social justice and equity issue very much like that of Basque community in Spain and the French in Quebec. Both advocated for some form of language autonomy. The Basque community were granted a level self-regulatory authority over local cultural matters. In the case of the French, their efforts have resulted in the Francization of several their operations.

Language maintenance is but the first step in regaining some level of autonomy. Language is “an irreplaceable cultural knowledge and the cornerstone of indigenous community and family values” (Reyhner, 1996, P. 3). Preserving languages affects “all aspects of a community from child-rearing practices and intergenerational communication,” and in the case of the Basque and French communities, “economic and political development.” For example, Garinagu’s rich culture of music, dance, food, and spirituality attract tourism. Without the language, the music, dance, and songs the attraction, authenticity is lost and so is the economic benefits.

Attitudes and Perspectives

Teachers

The program has a special purpose and meaning for a couple of Garifuna teachers who are also parents. For them this was an opportunity to make up for what they felt they

had failed to do as a Garifuna parent. One teacher lamented that her child could not speak Garifuna because she did not speak it to him. In these revelations, one got the feeling that there was some release from guilt. This opportunity to make up for their children's inability to speak Garifuna appears to play a role in connecting them with the purpose of the program. It provided them with a motivational purpose, a sense of relief, and an edge of satisfaction.

Children's attitude

Non-Garifuna

The enthusiasm of the non-Garifuna children to learn the language was also an unexpected result. This was especially true for the Garifuna teachers who could not explain why this was the case. Evidence of this enthusiasm was confirmed during my observation of their classroom participation. According to them, the non-Garifuna children showed more enthusiasm for learning the Garifuna language than the Garifuna children themselves. The author believes that is a case of excitement that comes with learning something new. In addition, this willingness to learn may be indicative of the positive attitudes towards Garifuna displayed by their parents and teachers. Figuratively, the children have become Garifuna by choice.

Garifuna Children

On the other hand, in both one-to-one and focus group interviews teachers reported that some Garifuna children appeared to be ashamed to speak Garifuna, mispronounced words and took this learning opportunity as a joke. A possible explanation for this might be the socio-historical context of the Garinagu experience. These attitudes and behaviors did not originate from the children themselves and

probably not even from their parents. The Garinagu are historically a marginalized people who have been discriminated against since their arrival in colonial Belize. The reader may recall from the literature review, that the British initially refused Garinagu's entry to Belize (then British Honduras) fearful that they would influence enslaved Africans used to cut logwood. When eventually allowed to stay in the colony, they were limited only to the south of the Sibun River. Visits to Belize Town could not exceed 36 hours. The British nurtured animosity through discrimination and mistrust between the Garinagu and other groups within the colony as part of their wider divide-and-conquer strategy. And generally, as a master strategy of domination and oppression, the purpose of the British education system was to denude the Garinagu of any sense of cultural identity. This played out in the classrooms where Garinagu children were severely punished and at times subjected to corporal punishment for speaking Garifuna. Over time the Garinagu developed a sense that anything Garifuna were to be shunned in preference to what was British. This has had a negative effect on the Garifuna psyche.

The shame and the joking are outward displays of internalized oppression or self-hate. The same might be said of the negativism found in a very small numbers of teachers. These teachers, as described by Carnoy (1974), are western-trained by educators who themselves were trained in the U.S. or some other western nation through some form of 'technical assistance' and 'cooperating nationals.' They may have taken on the attitudes of western education towards their own culture and people. Unconsciously, they have given up their birthright as Garifuna.

Parents' view of program

Most parents, regardless of ethnicity, expressed support for the GLACP. A couple of parents did question the value of teaching the Garifuna language as opposed to the English language. It is important to take note of this finding. Understanding the concerns will enable the Secretariat, school administration, and teachers to work with parents and other stakeholders. There was a report of a former administrator of Garifuna heritage who felt that reading (of English) was more important than learning Garifuna. This attitude is consistent with previous research and broadly in line with the postcolonial literature. This possibly reflects the extent to which the parents have bought into the narrative that 'English is today studied for its commercial ... value ...' and '... that without English they cannot get Government service' (Gandhi, 1968). It is also explained as the economic purpose of education (de Marriat & LeCompte, 1999). Gandhi decried that 'all these are ... signs of our slavery and degradation.' Corson (May 1999) laments that citizens are forced to live their lives within societies in which this ideology is dominant. This phenomenon was identified in the literature review as a known challenge faced by culture-based education advocates. The Secretariat and other stakeholders should address this issue in their meetings, workshops, and retreats.

The fact that most parents from other ethnic groups accepted and supported the teaching of the Garifuna language to their children signals a major change in attitudes and bodes well for the program and interethnic relations. This is a sign that the clutches of interethnic animosity created by colonialism are loosening. Unfortunately, the parents' understanding of and participation in the GLACP appears to be nonexistent or minimal at best. Given the low number of Garifuna speakers, the participation of supportive non-

Garifuna parents should be pursued and nurtured. Those who are Garifuna by birth will need to seek out those are Garifuna by choice and work with them as allies.

Limitations of the Study

This research has been primarily concerned with understanding how the various stakeholders closely involved with the program view the GLACP. Time and resources did not allow for collecting data on the views of the school administration or other members of the community. The findings of the research are also restricted mainly to the in-class daily session during the regular school week. The Saturday program was on hold for the duration of the research.

No connection with the learning of the Garifuna language was made with academic achievement. This may not be an issue here given that Garifuna is rarely spoken by the children if at all.

The participation of men was limited. Teachers were females except for one male who was unavailable due to illness for interview. Coordinators and parents, except for the Secretariat personnel, interviewed were all women. Future researchers may want to consider ways of including men in their studies.

Verbal responses were not as forthcoming from the children even though their interviews were conducted as focus groups. Interviews were conducted in focus groups with children of mixed ethnicity. Specific interviews with the Garifuna children could have unearthed additional data that did not emerge in the mixed focus groups.

In retrospect, teachers should have been asked about what they understood their role to be in the GLACSP in addition to their perspective of the program and the attitudes of other stakeholders. Whereas two of the research questions asked how important the

program was and what it meant to them, it did not reveal the teachers understanding of their role in such a program. This issue needs to be followed up on in further research. It is crucial to the success of any culture-based education program.

Recommendations

Genesis

First, the curriculum should be extended beyond language learning. It was clear that the Garifuna language was only being taught as content. As part of the liberatory education process, and in line with Freirean critical pedagogy, the deterioration of the Garifuna language can be posed as a problem, students should be provided with a contextual understanding (history, impact of colonialism) of how we are where we are, and what have been lost. Curriculum should also include the knowledge, skills, and the contributions of the Garinagu. Teachers and students can collaborate and come up with solutions as change agents. This should be done at a level the children can understand.

In view of the findings reported in the previous chapter, and what is consistent in the literature, fluency is an important element in the teaching of any language. It is advisable, therefore, that fluency in Garifuna by teachers, ethnicity notwithstanding, continues to be emphasized. More pronunciation training should be made available, access to pre-recorded pronunciation of words, and closer collaboration with coordinators.

The Secretariat should assess the level of language loss so that the level of intervention can be determined. It appears that much of the cultural knowledge and language have been lost. As a result, there should be an emphasis on practicing what is

learnt at school in the home. Several parents were happy to announce that their children came home and shared what learned at school. This practice needs to be encouraged.

Purpose and Meaning

There is a need for the Battle of the Drums Secretariat to articulate the purpose of the GLACSP to all its stakeholders in effort to develop conscientização, consciousness and awareness. The Secretariat should organize retreats for itself, training workshops or opportunities for its teachers, and meetings with parents and members of the community.

Teachers

Based on the researcher's field observations, literature review, and knowledge of the teacher education curriculums at the local tertiary institutions, there is a dire need to train teachers in; (1) Garifuna Cultural Identity Development, (2) Colonialism and Education/Garifuna and Education, (3) Culturally Responsive Teaching and multicultural education, (4) Reversing Language Shift/Language Preservation and Maintenance (Theory and Practice).

Measuring Success

In a review of its documents, it is noted that the GLACP has five organizational goals which include: (1) establishing a language program, (2) mobilizing Garifuna artisans, (3) training teachers, (4) providing cultural experiences, and (5) collaborating with other organizations. What is missing is how achievement of the goals were determined. It must be clarified on what basis the goals were set so that measurements can be conducted along the way towards the goals. An understanding of the current situation is needed.

Informal observations tend to demonstrate that there is an increased participation in cultural activities in the community. Tracer studies sponsored by the Secretariat could provide hard data that can be used to justify additional funding by external agencies if, in fact, the program is responsible.

Additional research can be conducted to establish the language levels of Garifuna in the community.

Government Policy

In Chapter 2 it was discussed that the policy of the government relies on the interest of ethnic groups to promote the teaching of their language in schools. I believe that the Ministry of Education should do more for a variety of reasons; (1) The Ministry of Education should realize the injustice visited upon the Garifuna people and other indigenous groups in Belize and (2) Garifuna culture has become a vital source of income for Belize in the form of cultural tourism. Preserving and promoting Garifuna culture is of benefit to the Belizean economy.

If there are plans for expansion and replication of the program elsewhere it is essential that evaluation of the current program is conducted.

Conclusion

This research experience has left the researcher with a sense of hope amidst what appears to be an indomitable task. The challenges that lies in the path of those who work tirelessly to preserve their language and cultures are so many. History, current trends, and statistics tend to favor the extermination of minority and indigenous languages worldwide. According to the U.N. more than half of the world's languages will be extinct by 2100. Yet, the U.N. has declared 2019 the International Year of indigenous

Languages. And yet with all the challenges and difficulties, the GLACSP trudges on supported by a multi-ethnic community.

Colonialism has probably had the most negative effect on language extinction. One of its lasting effects/legacy is the mistrust and animosity among ethnic groups in colonized nations. Belize is no different. Up to this day, it is not uncommon for Creole speaking Belizeans and successors to the British colonizers, to rebuke minority groups such as the Maya and Garifuna for speaking their language to one another in public. Both the Maya and Garifuna, in turn, scold each other for speaking language the other cannot understand. Therefore, it is very significant that today the language of one ethnic group is strongly supported by all others. This is very encouraging despite all the challenges the program is facing.

The implications of this GLACP have the potential to extend beyond the current scope and the vision of its creators. By implementing a Garifuna language program in a multi-ethnic institution such as St. Peter Claver School, the door may have been opened to the concept of including local languages in Belizean schools. The author can recall one or two parents asking, “Why is it that it is only Garifuna being taught in the school?” The Ministry of Education lukewarm attitude towards the inclusion of indigenous may change. A precedent has been set.

It is not lost on the researcher that the Garifuna, once the educator of the Maya, is reclaiming her language and cultural identity with the assistance of the latter. There is wisdom in securing the support of other ethnic group in the teaching of Garifuna given the demographics shifts in our country.

REFERENCES

- Afghari, A., Tavakkoli, Z., Rakhshandehroo, F., & Izadpanah, M. A. (2012). The relationship between culture exposure and the identity types of learners of English as a foreign language. *World Journal of English Language*, 2, 14+.
- Alexander, J. C. (2003). *The meanings of social life: A cultural sociology* Oxford University Press, USA.
- Bachman, L. F., & Clark, J. L. D. (1987). The measurement of Foreign/Second language proficiency. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 490(, Foreign Language Instruction: A National Agenda), 20-33.
- Ball, J. (2004). As if indigenous knowledge and communities mattered: Transformative education in first nations communities in Canada. *American Indian Quarterly*, 28(3), 454-479.
- Baraldi, C. (2012). Intercultural education and communication in second language interactions. *Intercultural Education*, 23(4), 297-311.
- Batibo, H. (2009). Transmitting indigenous knowledge through the school curriculum in a diminishing bio-cultural environment: The case of Botswana. *Learning and Knowing in Indigenous Societies Today*. UNESCO, Paris, France,
- Battle of the Drums Secretariat. Battle of the drums Garifuna language arts and crafts in schools programs. 2012.
- Belize population and housing census 2010: Country report* (2013). (Census. Belmopan, Belize: Statistical Institute of Belize.
- Bell, L. A. (2007). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. (pp. 1-14). New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Bennett, C. (2001). Genres of research in multicultural education. *Review of Educational Research*, 71(2), 171-217.
- Boykin, A. W., Albury, A., Tyler, K. M., Hurley, E. A., Bailey, C. T., & Miller, O. A. (2005). Culture-based perceptions of academic achievement among low-income elementary students. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 11(4), 339-350.
- Brock-Utne, B. (2001). Education for all: In whose language? *Oxford Review of Education*, 27(1), 115-134.
- Buchanan, Ian, (2010). *A dictionary of critical theory*.

- Burnaby, B. (1996). *Aboriginal language maintenance, development, and enhancement* Northern Arizona University Press;.
- Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for indigenous youth: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 941-993.
- Césaire, A., & Pinkham, J. (1972). *Discourse on colonialism* Monthly Review Press New York.
- Cohen, A. D., & Swain, M. (1976). Bilingual education: The "immersion" model in the north american context. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(1), 45-53.
- Corson, D. (1998). Community-based education for indigenous cultures. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 11(3), 238-249.
- Creswell, John W.,. (2016). *30 essential skills for the qualitative researcher*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.
- Curtis, A. C. (1998). Creating culturally responsive curriculum: Making race matter. *The Clearing House*, 71(3), 135-139.
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. D. (Eds.). (2003). *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York, New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Demmert Jr, W. G. (2011). What is culture-based education? understanding pedagogy and curriculum. *Honoring our Heritage: Culturally Appropriate Approaches to Indigenous Education*, , 1-9.
- Demmert Jr, W. G., & Towner, J. C. (2003). A review of the research literature on the influences of culturally based education on the academic performance of native american students. final paper.
- Deyhle, D., & Swisher, K. (1997). Chapter 3: Research in american indian and alaska native education: From assimilation to self-determination. *Review of Research in Education*, 22(1), 113-194.
- Dutcher, N. (2001). *Expanding educational opportunity in linguistically diverse societies* Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Dutcher, N., & Congress, L. (2004). Language policy and education in multilingual societies: Lessons from three positive models. *Barcelona: Forum*,
- Engle, P. L. (1975). *The use of vernacular languages in education: Language medium in early school years for minority language groups* Center for Applied Linguistics Arlington, Va.

- Fernando, C., Valijarvi, R., & Goldstein, R. A. (2010). A model of the mechanisms of language extinction and revitalization strategies to save endangered languages. *Human Biology*, 82(1), 47-75.
- Geertz, Clifford, Darnton, Robert, (2017). *The interpretation of cultures : Selected essays*
- Gloria, A. M., Rieckmann, T. R., & Rush, J. D. (2000). Issues and recommendations for teaching an Ethnic/Culture-based course. *Teaching of Psychology*, 27(2), 102-107.
- Gray, J., & Beresford, Q. (2008). A 'formidable challenge': Australia's quest for equity in indigenous education. *Australian Journal of Education (ACER Press)*, 52(2), 197-223.
- Greene, M. (1986). In search of a critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 427-441.
- Gruenewald, D. A. (2003). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher*, 32(4), 3-12.
- Gupta, A. F. (1997). When mother-tongue education is not preferred. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 18(6), 496-506.
- Hale, K., Krauss, M., Watahomigie, L. J., Yamamoto, A. Y., Craig, C., Jeanne, L. M., et al. (1992). Endangered languages. *Language*, 68(1), 1-42.
- Hein, G. (1999). Is meaning making constructivism? is constructivism meaning making? *The Exhibitionist*, 18(2), 15-18.
- Hermes, M., Bang, M., & Marin, A. (2012). *Designing indigenous language revitalization*
- Herron, C., Cole, S. P., Corrie, C., & Dubreil, S. (1999). The effectiveness of a video-based curriculum in teaching culture. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83(4), 518-533.
- Hezel, F. Loss of culture: How real is the threat? *Micronesial Counselor*, (56), February 11, 2017.
- Hoffman, D. M. (1996). Culture and self in multicultural education: Reflections on discourse, text, and practice. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(3), 545-569.
- Hudson, L. M., Bergin, D. A., & Chryst, C. F. (1993). Enhancing culturally responsive pedagogy: Problems and possibilities. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 20(3, Diversifying Teacher Education), 5-17.

- Iseke-Barnes, J. M. (2004). Politics and power of languages: Indigenous resistance to colonizing experiences of language dominance. *Journal of Thought*, 39(1), 45-81.
- Ismail, S. M., & Cazden, C. B. (2005). Struggles for indigenous education and self-determination: Culture, context, and collaboration. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 36(1, Indigenous Epistemologies and Education: Self-Determination, Anthropology, and Human Rights), 88-92.
- Kanaïaupuni, S. M. (2007). A brief overview of culture-based education and annotated bibliography (culture in education briefs series). Honolulu: Kamehameha schools. *Research Evaluation*,
- Kanu, Y. (2002). In their own voices: First nations students identify some cultural mediators of their learning in the formal school system. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 48(2), 98-121.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 465-491.
- Landreman, Lisa M.,,. (2013). *The art of effective facilitation : Reflections from social justice educators*
- Lenski, S. D., Crumpler, T. P., Stallworth, C., & Crawford, K. M. (2005). Beyond awareness: Preparing culturally responsive preservice teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2, Ethnographical Inquiry into Teacher Development), 85-100.
- Lewthwaite, B., & McMillan, B. (2010). She can bother me, and that's because she cares": What Inuit students say about teaching and their learning. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 33(1), 140-175.
- Lipka, J. (2002). Schooling for self-determination: Research on the effects of including native language and culture in the schools. ERIC digest.
- Lopez, L. E. *Reaching the unreached: Indigenous intercultural bilingual education in Latin America*. Retrieved February 12, 2017, from unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0018/001866/186620e.pdf
- Magga, O. H., Nicolaisen, I., Trask, M., Dunbar, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2005). Indigenous children's education and indigenous languages. *Expert Paper Written for the*,
- May, S., & Aikman, S. (2003). Indigenous education: Addressing current issues and developments. *Comparative Education*, 39(2), 139-145.

- McAlpine, L., & Herodier, D. (1994). Schooling as a vehicle for aboriginal language maintenance: Implementing creé as the language of instruction in northern québec. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue Canadienne De l'Éducation*, (2), 128.
- Mccarty, T. L., & Watahomigie, L. J. (1998). Indigenous community-based language education in the USA. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 11(3), 309-324.
- McIvor, O. (2009). Strategies for indigenous language revitalization and maintenance. *Encyclopedia of Language and Literacy Development*, , 1-12.
- McKeough, A., Bird, S., Tourigny, E., Romaine, A., Graham, S., Ottmann, J., et al. (2008). Storytelling as a foundation to literacy development for aboriginal children: Culturally and developmentally appropriate practices. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 49(2), 148.
- McLaren, Peter,, (2016). *This fist called my heart : The peter McLaren reader. volume 1 volume 1*
- McLaren, P. L., & Giroux, H. A. (1990). Critical pedagogy and rural education: A challenge from poland. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 67(4, A Look at Rural Education in the United States), 154-165.
- Meek, B. A. (2012). Teaching indigenous languages. *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics* () Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Ministry of Education. (2012). Improving access, quality and governance of education in belize: Education sector strategy 2011 - 2016.
- Modiano, N. (1968). National or mother language in beginning reading: A comparative study. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 2(1), 32-43.
- Modiano, N. (1968). National or mother language in beginning reading: A comparative study. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 2(1), 32-43.
- Mthethwa-Sommers, S. (2014). *Narratives of social justice educators. [electronic resource] : Standing firm Cham : Springer International Publishing : Imprint: Springer, 2014.*
- Nas, P. M. (2002). Masterpieces of oral and intangible culture. *Current Anthropology*, 43(1), 139-148.
- Nunez-Gonzalez, G. (2016). Intercultural bilingual education in belize: A critical evaluation. (Doctoral, Nova Southeastern University).
- Peresuh, M., & Masuku, J. (2002). The role of the primary language in the bilingual-bicultural education in zimbabwe. *Zambezia*, 29(1), 27-37.

- Phuntsog, N. (1999). The magic of culturally responsive pedagogy: In search of the genie's lamp in multicultural education. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 26(3, Advancing Educational Opportunities in a Multicultural Society), 97-111.
- Powers, K. M. (2006). **An exploratory study of cultural identity and culture-based educational programs for urban american indian students.** *Urban Education*, 41 no. 1 20-49
- Reyhner, J. A., Gilbert, W. S., & Lockard, L., (2011). *Honoring our heritage : Culturally appropriate approaches for teaching indigenous students.* Flagstaff, Ariz.: Northern Arizona Univ.
- Richardson, T. (2011). Navigating the problem of inclusion as enclosure in native culture-based education: Theorizing shadow curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 41(3), 332-349.
- Ruiz Alvarez, S. J. (2008). *Preservation strategies of the garifuna language in the context of global economy in the village of corozal in honduras.*
- Schafer, M. J. (1999). International nongovernmental organizations and third world education in 1990: A cross-national study. *Sociology of Education*, 72(2), 69-88.
- Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change.* U.S.A.: The University of Chicago.
- Singh, N. K. (2011). Culturally appropriate education theoretical and practical implications. *Honoring our Heritage: Culturally Appropriate Approaches to Indigenous Education*, , 11-42.
- Smith, G. A. (2007). Place-based education: Breaking through the constraining regularities of public school. *Environmental Education Research*, 13(2), 189-207.
- Smith, L. T. (2005). Building a research agenda for indigenous epistemologies and education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 36(1, Indigenous Epistemologies and Education: Self-Determination, Anthropology, and Human Rights), 93-95.
- Snyder, C., Peeler, J., & May, J. D. (2008). Combining human diversity and social justice education: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 44(1), 145-161.
- Takayama, B. (2008). Academic achievement across school types in hawai'i: Outcomes for hawaiian and non-hawaiian students in conventional public schools, western-focused charters, and hawaiian language and culture-based schools.

- Tyler, K. M., Uqdah, A. L., Dillihunt, M. L., Beatty-Hazelbaker, R., Conner, T., Gadson, N., et al. (2008). Cultural discontinuity: Toward a quantitative investigation of a major hypothesis in education. *Educational Researcher*, 37(5), 280-297.
- Ujam, F., & El-Fiki, S. (2006). Promoting an endogenous approach to education at the local community level. *Intercultural Education*, 17(3), 259-279.
- Ujam, F., & El-Fiki, S. (2006). Promoting an endogenous approach to education at the local community level. *Intercultural Education*, 17(3), 259-279.
- UNESCO, P. B., Chiba, M., Kube, S., & Nakashima, D. (2009). Learning and knowing in indigenous societies today.
- Unesco., . (1978). *The use of vernacular languages in education*. New York: Arno Press.
- United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 61/295, 107th plenary meeting Cong. (2008).
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (Paris),. (1953). *The use of vernacular languages in education*. Paris: Unesco.
- Villani, C. J., & Atkins, D. (2000). Community-based education. *School Community Journal*, 10(1), 39-44.
- Walter, S. L. (2008). 10 the language of instruction issue: Framing an empirical perspective. *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*, , 129.
- Watahomigie, L. J., & McCarty, T. L. (1994). Bilingual/bicultural education at peach springs: A hualapai way of schooling. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 69(2), 26-42.
- Wickens, C. M., & Sandlin, J. A. (2007). *Literacy for what? literacy for whom? the politics of literacy education and neocolonialism in unesco- and world bank-sponsored literacy programs* American Association for Adult & Continuing Education.
- Wotherspoon, T. (2006). Teachers' work in canadian aboriginal communities. *Comparative Education Review*, 50(4), 672-693.
- Wurm, S. A. (2002). *Strategies for language maintenance and revival*
- Yadav, R. (1992). The use of tele mother tongue in primary education: The nepalese context. *Contributions to Nepalese Studies*, 19(2)
- Yeung, S. A. (2011). *Multicultural Education in Hong Kong Primary Schools: Promoting Equitable Learning Opportunities*,

Young, C. (2002). First language first: Literacy education for the future in a multilingual philippine society. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5(4), 221-232.

Young, P. A. (2008). The culture based model: Constructing a model of culture. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 11(2), 107-118.