

The problem with the teaching of English in *kura*

Despite that rhetoric which supported English language instruction in *kura*, the following decades are characterised by uncertainty about how to provide for English instruction. In my own study of twenty-five *kura* education Review Office (ERO) Reports written between 2005 and 2009, only three provided information on the teaching of English. The comments were minimal and did not provide information about the type of transitional Māori-to-English pedagogy nor the level of achievement reached by learners in either conversational or academic English. The ERO Report for the first of the three *kura* claimed that ‘there are high expectations that students, staff and whānau will be multilingual in te reo Māori, Spanish and English’ (ERO, 2007, 10). The second *kura*’s ERO Report stated; ‘students in years 5 to 8 are learning the skills of reading and writing in English as a separate subject (ERO, 2006a, p. 12), while the third provided only slightly more information, saying that ‘whānau and staff fully support students to achieve full competency in the English language with the provision of formal English language programmes from year six’ (ERO, 2006, p. 14).

Despite there being detailed compliance indicators for ERO reviews (ERO, 2007), the *Framework for Review and Evaluation in Te Aho Matua Kura Kaupapa Māori* (ERO, 2008) does not say how the Education Review Office will assess the compliance indicators. In fact the *Framework* (ERO, 2008) does not refer to English at all, a startling omission in light of the Office’s statutory requirement to ensure that all New Zealand children receive English language instruction. The paucity of Education Review Office reports on English language instruction within *kura* highlights what Berryman and Glynn (2004) described as *ad hoc*, inconsistent and inadequate Māori-to-English transitional practices across the *kura* sector. Berryman and Glynn (2004) found that the inconsistent application of Māori-to-English transitional practices was indeed the reason for the lack of evidence to identify which of those practices, if any, were effective.

In the absence of consistent Māori-to-English transitional practices across the *kura* sector, *kura* parents are transferring their children to Intermediate School Bilingual Units prior to enrolling them in English-medium secondary schools. May and Hill (2003, p. 23) provide evidence of this growing trend among *kura* parents who are withdrawing their children after only two or three years at *kura* in the belief that ‘too much’ Māori may undermine English language proficiency. Berryman and Glynn (2004) described the transfer from *kura* to English-medium secondary school settings as the most challenging transition for any Māori-medium learner. The actions of these *kura* parents, however well intentioned, only serves to make the Māori-to-English transition even more difficult for their children because their (CALP) Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (Cummins, 1984) in te reo Māori is often insufficient to support their CALP development in English (Ministry of Education, 2004). The major concern raised by May & Hill (2004) in respect to the actions of this growing number of *kura* parents, is that transferring from *kura* to English-medium too early, without any formal instruction in academic English, is likely to contribute to eventual education failure, rather than promote bilingual success.

Since the inception of *kura*, the issues concerning English language instruction

remain unresolved. Recent research on the key attributes of successful *kura* by Tākao et al., (2010) reports that, ‘Even amongst these *kura* there is no single agreement on when English language instruction should be introduced’ (p. 34). This indecision around when to introduce English in the *kura* is rooted in the view that biliteracy is a sequential process. Proponents of sequential biliteracy posit that literacy in the second language should not be introduced until the learner has competence in the stronger language (Wong, Fillmore and Valadez, 1986; Hakuta, 1986; Collier and Thomas, 1989). The continuing debate on the timing of English instruction in *kura* is further exasperated by the lack of agreement on which language is in fact the *kura* child’s stronger language. Is it the Māori language acquired at the *kohanga* and *kura*, or the English language that May, Hill and Tiakiwai (2006) describe as the first language in the *kura* child’s home? The uncertainty around the timing of English language instruction in *kura* has resulted in an unnerving silence towards the English language within the *kura* movement, which has prevented the development of effective Māori-to-English transitional practices and marginalised the original aspirations of the *kura* founders in producing bilingual graduates.

Current approaches to English language instruction in *kura*

The ‘*English will happen automatically approach*’ was widely accepted throughout the *kura* movement during the 1990s when the issue of English language instruction in *kura* was met with ambivalent silence and, in some cases, even hostility. Many in the *kura* community were literally ‘in two minds’ about English, despite the fact that almost all are first language English speakers (MOE, 2004, p. 22). In acknowledging that English pervaded every aspect of society, it was strongly believed that the *kura* learner would simply soak up the English language as would water to a sponge. This analogy resulted in the commonly held view that acquiring conversational English and learning academic English was not a core function of the *kura*. In practice, this approach amounted to little or no teaching of English in *kura* which led to the widely accepted view that *kura* parents bore the responsibility of organising English language instruction for their children outside of the ordinary hours of *kura*. Even after the turn of the century, May & Hill (2003, p. 23) reported that many *kura* were reluctant to directly address the issues associated with the provision of academic English instruction because many still believed that English language acquisition would ‘happen automatically’ for the *kura* learners.

However, the ‘*English will happen automatically approach*’, especially in respect to academic English, is not supported in the literature. While it is possible for *kura* children to acquire what Cummins (1984) calls Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) in English, May et al., (2006, p. 4) point out that *kura* ‘students need to be taught how to read and write in English [as] they do not just “pick up” these skills automatically, even though English is widely spoken outside the school’. This supports Cummins’ (2000) earlier warning that if English language instruction is ignored, with the expectation that ‘it will develop anyway’, *kura* learners may experience significant gaps in their knowledge of, and access to, academic registers in English, particularly in areas related to writing. The issues raised by May & Hill (2003; May, Hill and

Tiakiwai, 2006) support Cummins' (2000) criticism of the *kura* assumption that the transfer of academic skills from Māori to English happens 'automatically' without any need for formal instruction. To clarify the place of teaching English in *kura*, Cummins (2000) confirms that the transfer of academic skills across languages will only occur when learners are given opportunities to read and write extensively in English as well as in te reo Māori.

Since 2005, the '*English will happen automatically approach*' has been replaced by the '*separate language approach*' due to mounting concern within the *kura* movement at the increasing number of *kura* parents transferring their children to English medium settings to enable them to develop English language proficiency (May and Hill, 2003, p. 23). The *kura* practice of separating English and Māori to focus on developing Māori as the stronger language before adding English as another language, is justified with reference to the international literature. (See for example, Skutnabb-Kangas and Cummins, 1988; Cummins, 1993; Bernhardt, 2000). Language separation is a key principle in many international bilingual/immersion programmes and a number of writers (for example, Cloud, Genesse and Hamayan, 2000; Baker, 2001; and Lindholm-Leary, 2001) recommend the strict separation of the two languages by having different teachers assigned to each language or using time, space, and/or subject area to delineate language separation. Creese and Blackledge (2010) used the term '*separate bilingualism*' and Swain (1983) used the phrase '*bilingualism through monolingualism*' to describe the ascribing of boundaries to separate languages which, according to Gravelle, (1996, p. 11) depicts the language learner as "two monolinguals in one body". This is the approach adopted by *Te Aho Matua* (2000) which states that, 'Kura Kaupapa Māori accepts that there is an appropriate time for the introduction of English at which time there shall be a separate English language teacher and a separate language learning facility' (p. 742). Recent research by Tākao et al., (2010) on the key attributes of successful *kura* links the '*separate language approach*' to 'Best Practice' in *kura* by stating that, 'Significantly, for all these *kura*, there are zones, often separate from the main schooling areas, where English is taught or able to be spoken' (p. 33).

The '*separate language approach*' works from the premise that the Māori language developed in the *kura* is the learner's stronger language, both conversationally and cognitively. However, this does not appear to be the case as research by May and Hill (2003, p. 22) identifies English as the first language of most learners enrolled in *kura*, a finding supported by Bauer (2008). This creates the pedagogical dilemma, identified by Rau (2004, p. 63), with the *kura* providing initial literacy instruction in the *kura* learner's weaker, second language. For advocates of the '*language separation approach*', the issue of which language is the stronger language is problematic. If the home language is used as an indicator of stronger language, then English can be considered to be the *kura* child's stronger language. However, if the *kura* language of instruction is used as an indicator of stronger language, then Māori is considered to be the *kura* child's stronger language. Although the goal of *kura* is that Maori be developed as the children's stronger language, this may not be happening. Bauer (2008, p. 41) 'suggests that for the most part, children are developing passive skills in the reo, and if they have active reo skills, they are not taking them out of the educational domain into the home'.

Sceptical of a reported increase in te reo Māori use, Bauer (2008, p. 43) argues that ‘the overall picture is one of decline rather than increase in the younger age groups’.

There is now a growing body of literature rejecting the ‘*separate language approach*’. In a study of effective instructional practices for linguistically and culturally diverse students, Garcia (1991) reported that the use of the stronger language at early stages of immersion was critical to later success in transitioning to the target language. These findings are supported by Irujo (1991) who found that many immersion programmes allowed stronger language use during the initial stages of immersion. Anton and DiCamilla (1998) also reported that stronger language use enabled learners to construct effective collaborative dialogue in the completion of meaning-based target language tasks while Turnbull (2001) highlighted the effectiveness of stronger language use to explain difficult concepts. Creating space in *kura* for instructional strategies that incorporate simultaneous strong language and target language use to accelerate ‘other’ language acquisition will allow both teachers and learners to explore the benefits of what Cummins (2007) calls two-way cross-language transfer and what I call trans-lingualism. To create such a space in *kura* for the use of what I call trans-lingual metacognitive teaching strategies, I have developed as the topic of my doctoral study, the *Trans-acquisitional Approach* (henceforth, referred to as *TA*) for *kura* learners who have a reasonably good grasp of Māori and English.

The transformative potential of the *Trans-acquisitional Approach*

In an attempt to break the impasse created by the current *kura* approaches to English language instruction, I recommend an extension of Williams’ translanguaging model (2002) into the *Trans-acquisitional Approach* (from this point referred to as the *TA* approach). ‘*Trans-acquisition*’ is the term I use to acknowledge the reciprocal transfer of knowledge between languages that is intrinsic to the process of language learning. The *TA* approach integrates the principles of Task-Based Learning and Teaching (Ellis, 2003) to systematise simultaneous input in one language while output is occurring in another language through three conditioning phases covering six sequential stages that focus on a trans-acquisitional task as the core component of the learning experience. The *TA* approach rejects the three monolingual assumptions that underpin the pedagogical practices of *kura* that keep te reo Māori and English separate, and that allow for no recourse to the use of English as the *kura* learner’s ‘other’ language and give no place for translation between the two languages.

Cummins (2007) highlights the paradox of the monolingual assumptions which are inconsistent with current theory in cognitive psychology and applied linguistics and for which research provides minimal support. In the past, the monolingual assumptions were so widely accepted that research was deemed unnecessary to substantiate them as ‘absolute truths’ (Jacobson and Faltis, 1990, p. 4). These monolingual assumptions underpin the ‘direct method’ which has influenced second language acquisition pedagogical practices for more than 100 years (Cook, 2001; Howatt, 1984; Yu, 2000). The ‘direct method’ underpins the *kura* immersion model which replicates the way that children learn their first language (Yu, 2000, p. 176) by emphasising the instructional use of te reo Māori as the *target language* at the exclusion of English, the *kura* child’s

stronger language (May and Hill, 2003, p. 22; Bauer, 2008, p. 41) to promote thinking in te reo Māori and minimise English language interference.

It is common place in Māori-medium education for learners to want to translate an English expression into Māori and vice versa. For Lewis (1997, 2000) this question is a signal that when a second language learner can't find expression in his/her target language, reverting to his/her stronger language in search of a translation is a legitimate language learning strategy. Translation is thus an instinctive part of the way the mind approaches learning another language. This shows that the second language learner has an instinctive understanding that languages have 'meaning equivalents' as opposed to meaningless 'word-for-word translations' (Lewis, 1997, 2000). The *TA* approach maximises the *kura* learner's innate tendency to revert to the stronger language for meaning and message equivalents. Developing the ability to be able to link lexis and structures of Māori to their equivalents in English is the goal of the *TA* approach which enhances the development of *trans-literacy* skills.

The *TA* approach can be described as language fluidity and movement, synonymous with a pedagogy that emphasises the overlapping of languages rather than the separation of languages (Williams, 2002; Garcia, 2009). As an extension of Williams' (2002) idea of translanguaging, the *TA* approach engages the learner's meta-linguistic skills to maximise reciprocal language transfer by systemising simultaneous input in one language and output in another language through three conditioning phases covering six sequential stages that focus on a trans-acquisitional task as the core component of the approach. The *TA* approach represents a flexible bilingual pedagogical approach to language learning and teaching that supports the findings of Creese & Blackledge (2010) who suggest that as learners engage in flexible bilingualism, the boundaries between languages become permeable. In rejecting the notion of language separation, trans-acquisition supports Hornberger's (1989, p. 287) theory that biliteracy and bilingualism do not develop along a single directional continuum. There is mounting evidence that confirms how transfer between languages and literacies accelerates both strong language and target language development (Odlin, 1989; Dworin, 2003; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders and Christian, 2006; Riches & Genesee, 2006; Lowman et al, 2007). Teaching for transfer where literacy in both languages is taught simultaneously (Cummins, 2007, 2008 (a), (b), (c), McCaffery, Villers & Lowman, 2008) is the major pedagogical strategy in the *TA* approach.

Throughout the six stages of the *TA* approach, the *kura* learner's metalinguistic processes are activated to receive information in te reo Māori (or English) using the passive language skills of listening and/or reading, to be then expressed in English (or Māori) using the active language skills of talking and writing. Garcia (2009) and Williams (2002) describe this process as a natural way of simultaneously developing and reinforcing two languages, while at the same time, extending the learner's understanding of subject matter. Not to be confused with translation, the reciprocal transfer of semantic knowledge between the two languages promotes greater understanding of the message in both languages. The *TA* approach reinforces the interrelationship between te reo Māori and English by maximising what Cummins (1984, 1991) calls the language learner's *Common Underlying Proficiency* (CUP) which acts as a central, unified processing

system where both languages are stored to access on demand (see also Bernhardt and Kamil, 1995). *Trans-acquisition* maximises the benefits of reciprocal language transfer by using trans-lingual strategies to teach the *kura* learner how to compare and contrast the Māori and English concepts, understandings, attitudes, knowledge and skills stored in his/her CUP metalinguistic processing system (Cummins, 1984).

The *TA* approach promotes metalinguistic awareness which Tunmer and Herriman (1984) describe as the ability to reflect upon and manipulate the structural features of language to mediate meaning and form while receiving input in one language and expressing output in another language. The approach also systemises what Hagenon (1998) labels as reflective learning, so that consideration, analysis, appraisal and synthesis become habitual behaviours within the simultaneous processing of two languages to develop trans-literacy skills as input is processed in one language to produce out-put in another language. As an approach, *Trans-acquisition* emphasises authentic communication by requiring *kura* learners to interpret, express and negotiate meaning in both Māori and English. By this means, the *TA* approach supports the linguistic outcomes of Māori-medium education where it is accepted that strength in both Māori and English, will inevitably equip learners adequately for both worlds (Nepe, 1991).

Conclusion

My purpose has been to address the pedagogical issues surrounding English language instruction in *kura* so as to create space for change and growth. From the outset, the vision of those who founded *Kura Kaupapa Māori* was inclusive of English alongside te reo Māori to produce balanced bilingual graduates, capable and confident in both worlds. Despite the tensions around English language instruction in *kura*, the English language remains pivotal to achieving the vision of the *kura* founders to revitalise te reo Māori and raise Māori academic achievement. While the vision in respect to English language instruction remains the same, it is obvious that the current approach of language separation to embed te reo Māori as the stronger language first must be changed to achieve the vision. This article has argued for the re-thinking of current *kura* pedagogical practices for English language instruction to herald in a new paradigm of relational trans-lingualism such as represented by the *Trans-acquisitional (TA)* approach. The transformative potential of the *TA* approach to develop English literacy while maintaining Māori language fluency is the key to breaking the silence on English language instruction in *kura* and marks the beginning of new possibilities for all *kura* stakeholders including the Ministry of Education.

References

- Anton, M. & DiCamilla, F. (1998). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 54, 314-342.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. Clevedon England, Buffalo N.Y: Multilingual Matters.
- Bauer, W. (2008). Is the Health of the Māori Language Improving? *Te Reo*, 51, 33-73. Retrieved 10th January 2010, from <http://www.asia-studies.com/2TRS.html>
- Bernhardt, E. B. (2000). Second language reading as a case study of reading scholarship in the 20th century. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. Pearson, & R. Barr, (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, Vol. 3* (pp. 791-811). New York: Longman.
- Bernhardt, E. B. & Kamil, M. L. (1995). *Interpreting Relationships between First Language and Second Language Reading: Consolidating the Linguistic Threshold and the Linguistic Interdependence Hypotheses*. *Applied Linguistics* 16, 1, 15-34.
- Berryman, M. & Glynn, T. (2004). Whānau participation: Māori immersion students' transition to English. In *the Ministry of Education, Language acquisition research: Papers presented at a Ministry of Education forum held in 2003* (pp. 143-148). Wellington: Ministry of Education Research & Evaluation Unit.
- Cloud, N., Genessee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000). *Dual language instruction: a handbook for enriched education* Clevedon England, Buffalo N.Y: Multilingual Matters.
- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (1989). *How quickly can immigrants become proficient in school English? Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 5, 26-38.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 402-423.
- Creese, A. & Blackledge, A. J. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching. *The Modern Language Journal, Volume 94, Issue 1*, pp. 103-115.
- Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1991). Conversational and academic language proficiency in bilingual contexts. In J. H. Hulstijn and J. F. Matter (Eds.), *Reading in two languages*. (pp. 75-89). AILA.
- Cummins, J. (1993). Empowerment through biliteracy. In J. Tinajero & A. Ada (Eds.), *The power of two languages: Literacy and biliteracy for Spanish speaking students* (pp. 9-25). New York: MacMillan/McGraw-Hill.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon England, Buffalo N.Y: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221-240.
- Cummins, J. (2008a). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In B. Street and N.H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, (2nd ed.), Vol. 2: Literacy*. Boston, MA: Springer Science. Retrieved 22 October 2008 from: <http://www.springerlink.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/content/r2043335771317h7/fulltext.pdf>

- Cummins, J. (2008b). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in Bilingual Education. In J. Cummins and N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education*, (2nd ed.), Vol. 5: *Bilingual Education*. Boston, MA: Springer Science. Retrieved 22 October 2008 from: <http://www.springerlink.com.ezproxy.auckland.ac.nz/content/184828513q1vtl21/fulltext.pdf>
- Cummins, J. (2008c). Language and literacy teaching for immigrant students: A pedagogical framework. *Scientia Paedagogica Experimentalis – International Journal of Experimental Research in Education*, 43(2).
- Dworin, J. E. (2003). Insights into biliteracy development: toward a bi-directional theory of bilingual pedagogy. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 2, 171-186.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ERO Education Review Office (2006). *Te Aho Matua Review Report: Te Kura Kaupapa Māori o Te Hiringa*. Education Review Office, Wellington.
- ERO Education Review Office (2007). *Evaluation Indicators for Education Reviews in Te Aho Matua Kura Kaupapa Māori*. Education Review Office, Wellington.
- ERO Education Review Office (2008). *Framework for Review and Evaluation in Te Aho Matua Kura Kaupapa Māori*. February. Education Review Office, Wellington.
- Garcia, E. E. (1991). The education of linguistically and culturally diverse students: Effective instructional practices. National Centre for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning, United States Department of Education.
- Garcia, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. England: Wiley- Blackwell.
- Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W.M., & Christian, D. (Eds.). (2006). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of research evidence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hagenson, M. (1998). *The role of reflection in professional inquiry*. Unpublished paper for Centre of Professional Inquiry, Auckland College of Education, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hornberger, N. (1989). Continua of biliteracy. *Review of Educational Research*, 59(3), 271-296.
- Howatt, A. (1984). *A history of English language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Irujo, S. (1991). Review of *Forked tongue*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 150-156.
- Jacobson, R., & Faltis, C. (Eds.). (1990). *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling*. Clevedon, UK : *Multilingual Matters*.
- Lewis, M. (1997). *Implementing the lexical approach: Putting theory into practice*. Boston: Thomson.
- Lewis, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach*. Hove, England: Language Teaching Publications.
- Lindholm-Leary, K. (2001). *Dual language education*. Clevedon England, Buffalo N.Y: *Multilingual matters*.

- Lowman, C., Fitzgerald, T., Rapira, P., & Clark, R. (2007). First language literacy skill transfer in a second language learning environment: Strategies for biliteracy. *Set 2*, 24-28.
- May, S. & Hill, R. (2003). Māori-medium education: Current issues and future prospects. In *Language and precision research*. Paper presented at Ministry of Education Forum held in 2003. Wellington: Ministry of Education Research and Evaluation Unit.
- May, S., Hill, R. & S. Tiakiwai (2006) Bilingual Education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Retrieved 17th December 2010, from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/Māori_education.
- McCaffery, J., Villers, H., & Lowman, C. (2008). Biliteracy: Finding the words to write in two languages within a divers school setting. In refereed proceedings of the 2nd Language Education and Diversity Conference, Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Auckland.
- Ministry of Education (1989). *Kura Kaupapa Māori Working Group Report*. Wellington: MOE.
- Ministry of Education (2009) Education Counts. Retrieved 6th October 2009, from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/statistics/Māori_education/schoolong/6040/Māori
- Ministry of Education. (2004). *Language acquisition research*. Papers presented at Ministry of Education Forum held in 2003. Wellington: Ministry of Education Research and Evaluation Unit.
- Ministry of Education (2008) Te piko o te Māhuri: The key attributes of successful Kura Kaupapa Māori. Retrieved 3rd September 2011, from: http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0005/81158/954-KWA-English-21092010.pdf
- Nepe, T. M. (1991). *Te Toi Huarewa Tipuna*. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Auckland.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer: Cross-linguistic influence in language learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rau, C. (2004). *He mātai mātātupu : assessment for Māori medium literacy learning* University of Waikato, Waikato.
- Reedy, T.M. (1990). Overview Report of Kura Kaupapa Māori, Wellington: Reedy Holdings Ltd. Prepared for the Ministry of Education.
- Sharples, P. (1992). 'Kura Kaupapa Māori Secondary', Report prepared for the Ministry of Education, September.
- Skutnabb-Kanga, T. & Cummins, J. (1988) *Minority Education: From Shame to Struggle*. Clevedon: Avon.
- Smith, G. (2003). Kaupapa Māori Theory: Transformative Praxis and New Formations of Colonisation'. The Second International Conference on Cultural Policy Research, Te Papa National Museum, Wellington, January 23 – 26.
- Smith, G. H. (1997). *The development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and praxis*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Swain, M. (1983). Bilingualism without tears. In M. Clarke & J.Handscombe (Eds.), *On TESOL '82: Pacific perspectives on language learning and teaching (pp. 35–46)*. Washington , DC : TESOL.

- TAM, *Te Aho Matua*, (2000) Te Aho Matua o Nga Kura Kaupapa Māori, mai i Te Runanga Nui o Nga Kura Kaupapa Māori o Aotearoa. Retrieved 17th January 2010, from <http://www.kkmmaungarongo.co.nz/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/Te-Aho-Matua.pdf>
- Tākao, N., Grennell, D., McKegg, K., & Wehipeihana, N. (2010). Te Piko o te Māhuri: The key attributes of successful Kura Kaupapa Māori (September). Retrieved on 13th February 2011 from: http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0005/81158/954-KWA-English-21092010.pdf
- Tunmer, W. E. & Herriman, M. L. (1984). The development of metalinguistic awareness: A conceptual overview. In W. E. Tunmer, C. Pratt & M. L. Herriman (Eds.), *Metalinguistic awareness in children*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but ... *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 531-540.
- Williams, C. (2002). *Ennill iaith: Astudiaethau o sefyllfa drochi yn 11-16 oed = A language gained: A study of language immersion at 11-16 years of age* Bangor, ME: Ysgol Addysg Prifysgol Cymru
- Wong Fillmore, & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M. C. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. (Third Edition). New York: Macmillan.
- Yu, W. (2000). Direct method. In M. Byram (ed.) *Routledge encyclopedia of language teaching and learning*. 176-178. New York: Routledge.

About the Authors

Dr Airini has an adult education, policy and teaching background and is Head of School, Critical Studies in Education, Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland, 74 Epsom Avenue, Epsom, Auckland, New Zealand, 1150. E-mail: airini@auckland.ac.nz. Tel: Int+64+9 623 8826. Her research focuses on equity in education. She recently published research into university teaching and indigenous and Pacific student success in degree-level studies.

Dr Deidre Brown is Senior Lecturer in Architecture and Co-director of the Te Whare Kura: Indigenous Knowledges, Peoples and Identities research initiative at the University of Auckland. She teaches studio-based design studies and lectures in indigenous architectural topics. Her research interests include studio pedagogies, Māori and Pacific art and architectural history and indigenous intellectual and cultural property issues. Working in the Success for All project has enabled her to marry together many of these interests and programmes and work with others in this team, and in her faculty, to enhance the Māori and Pasifika student learning experience in a teaching intensive environment. E-mail: ds.brown@auckland.ac.nz

Dr Elana Curtis (Te Arawa) is a Senior Lecturer and Public Health Physician and is Director Vision 20:20, Te Kupenga Hauora Māori, Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences, The University of Auckland, 261 Morrin Road, Glen Innes, Auckland, New Zealand. E-mail: e.curtis@auckland.ac.nz. Tel: Int+64+9 373 7599. Her research focuses on indigenous health and elimination of indigenous and ethnic minority health disparities. Recent research activity has extended into tertiary education factors impacting on indigenous and ethnic minority health workforce development.

Odie Johnson has a background in Teaching and Career Education. While working at the University of Auckland Careers Services she was involved in the analysis of this research project. Odie has since returned to teaching.

Fred Luatua is a Careers Consultant with the University of Auckland Careers Services, 22 Princes St, Auckland, New Zealand. Email: f.luatua@auckland.ac.nz. Tel: Int +64+9 373 7599 ext 88645. His specialist focus is on Pasifika students' success at the university. He is a graduate of the AUT Graduate Career Development Programme and much of his earlier work was with Career Services NZ and case management for Work and Income.

John McKenzie is a principal lecturer at the University of Canterbury College of Education (School of Literacies and the Arts) with a passion for children's literature. He initiated the National Diploma in Children's Literature; was a founding member of the Australasian Children's Literature Association for Research; has been a consultant for the University of Pretoria (South Africa); and is currently involved in supporting new initiatives for the National Book Council of Singapore. His current research interest is the representation in film and picture books of the island/coast as space from an eco-critical perspective.

Professor Akira Ninomiya has been the vice president of the Open University of Japan from April of 2011. He was previously professor of comparative and international education at Hiroshima University and has undertaken comparative studies on school discipline policies, school cleaning, nature of schooling from the perspectives of curriculum and students guidance, class size policies, and also studies about the internationalization of higher education, international students issues, and university mobility. He has been involved in some OECD/CERI projects such as Schooling for Tomorrow. E-mail is animiya@ouj.ac.jp

Dr. Poon-McBrayer. Currently Associate Professor and Associate Head of Department of Education Policy & Leadership at the Hong Kong Institute of Education, Dr. Poon-McBrayer has been a teacher and teacher educator for over 30 years in Hong Kong, the United States, and Singapore. Her research interests span policies in inclusive education, multicultural issues, lifelong learning, and post-secondary support for students with disabilities.

Barbara Ormond is a Senior Lecturer in the Faculty of Education, University of Auckland. She lectures in the disciplines of History, Art History, Classical Studies and Social Sciences education preparing students to teach in secondary schools. She has led national assessment and curriculum initiatives for the Ministry of Education and New Zealand Qualifications Authority, holding positions such as National Moderator and Scholarship Examiner. Barbara has written articles on Art History and History pedagogy and assessment and a book on the iconography of visual culture in early modern England.

Dr Te Oti Rakena is Coordinator of Vocal Studies (classical) in the School of Music, National Institute of Creative Arts and industries, The University of Auckland, 6 Symonds Street, Auckland, New Zealand. E-mail: t.rakena@auckland.ac.nz. Tel: Int+64+9 3737599 ext 85856. He is an active researcher in the area of studio pedagogy, western and non-western singing and performance studies research. In 2010 he was awarded a teaching excellence award in innovation from the University of Auckland for integrating kaupapa Māori frameworks into the studio context.

Gillian Reynolds. Gillian has an extensive background in careers consultancy in tertiary education and in the government careers service. Throughout her career she has had an interest in effective careers delivery for Māori and Pasifika and models of best

practice that will be effective in the New Zealand context. She is currently Manager, New Zealand College of Chinese Medicine, 183 Montreal Street, Christchurch, New Zealand. Email: g.reynolds@chinesemedicine.org.nz. Tel: Int+64 3 3882333.

Pale Sauni is an experienced researcher with particular focus on Pasifika Health and Education. He has recently completed work in Crisis Mental Health Services, Physical Education, Digital Health and Literacy in the Pacific and currently in a 5 year Whanau Ora research project. Pale is the Pasifika Education Consultant for the Open Polytechnic of New Zealand, 3 Cleary Street, Lower Hutt, New Zealand, 5040. E-mail: pale.sauni@openpolytechnic.ac.nz. Tel: Int+64 4 914 5248.

Angie Smith is a Careers Consultant at The University of Auckland Careers Services (22 Princes Street, Auckland, New Zealand, 1010), with a particular focus on Māori students' success and their journey from "campus to career". She was involved in the research analysis of this project and dissemination of the results to audiences, both national and international, whose interest was the development of effective teaching and learning methods for indigenous and minority students. E-mail: a.smith@auckland.ac.nz. Tel: Int+64 9 3737599 x88717.

Tauwehe Tamati is a Senior Lecturer in the School of Te Puna Wananga at the Faculty of Education, The University of Auckland. Her current doctoral research focuses on the effects of the Trans-acquisitional approach to English language instruction in Kura Kaupapa Maori education in New Zealand. Her other research interests include Task-Based Learning and Teaching, Second Language Acquisition and Bilingual Education.

Dr Trevor Thwaites is Principal Lecturer in Music Education and Deputy Head of the School of Arts, Languages and Literacies in the Faculty of Education at The University of Auckland. He was project director for music in the development of *The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum* (2000) and has had significant involvement in the development of curriculum and assessment systems at a national level. His research interests include philosophy and politics of education, embodied knowing, and arts education.

Sonia Townsend is a Senior Tutor and the Teaching Learning Coordinator of Hikitia Te Ora (Certificate in Health Sciences), Te Kupenga Hauora Māori, Faculty of Medical and Health Sciences, The University of Auckland, 261 Morrin Road, Glen Innes, Auckland, New Zealand. E-mail: s.townsend@auckland.ac.nz

Dr. Masashi Urabe is associate professor of Tokuyama University, Japan. His previous research focused on the history and function of the school reports in Germany. This led to his Ph.D. from Hiroshima University in cooperation with the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany. His current research interests include comparative education in the global context and the ESD (Education for Sustainable Development).

The Pacific Circle Consortium for Education

The Pacific Circle Consortium is an organization dedicated to the improvement of teaching about peoples and nations within and around the Pacific Ocean, and in Asia. From 1997 to 2004, the Consortium was an official program of the Centre for educational Research and Innovation of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD/CERI). Currently, the Consortium is an independent organization.

The purposes of the Pacific Circle Consortium are to:

- Share ideas, resources, information, material and personnel among Pacific and Asian countries and educational institutions;
- Promote internationally co-operative research and development in education; and
- Undertake co-operative development of curriculum materials and educational support services.

Members of the Consortium

The membership of the Consortium is made up of individuals from many institutions. Recent membership is drawn from countries as diverse as New Zealand, Australia, Samoa, Fiji, Japan, Malaysia, Vietnam, South Korea, China, Hong Kong SAR, Taiwan, Thailand, the United States, Canada, Mexico, Ecuador, Latvia, and the United Kingdom.

Executive Committee of the Consortium 2011

Chair.....	Steve Thorpe, Southern Oregon University, USA
Incoming Chair	Shiowlan Doong, National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan
Outgoing Chair.....	Meesook Kim, Korean Educational Development Institute, Korea
Secretary	Carol Mutch, University of Auckland, New Zealand
Treasurer	Kathleen F. Berg, University of Hawaii at Manoa, USA
Editors	Elizabeth Rata, University of Auckland, New Zealand
.....	Airini, University of Auckland, New Zealand
.....	Alexis Siteine, University of Auckland, New Zealand
Executive Members ..	Cresantia F. Koya, University of the South Pacific, Fiji
.....	Laura Elena Ortiz Camargo, National University of Education Science, Mexico
.....	Bridget O'Regan, Ako Aotearoa, New Zealand
.....	Niusila Faamanatu-Eteuati, National University of Samoa, Samoa
.....	Anne Southwell, NSW Department of Education and Communities, Australia
.....	Marcia Rouen, Queensland Department of Education and Training, Australia
PCC Secretariat.....	Thanh Truc T. Nguyen, University of Hawaii at Manoa, USA

Requests for hard copy

Pacific-Asian Education is an international refereed journal for curriculum and general education studies within the Pacific Rim and Asian educational communities. Since 2008, *Pacific-Asian Education* is a free online journal available at <http://pacificcircleconsortium.org/PAEJournal.html>

For hard copies of individual issues contact:

Pacific Circle Consortium
 c/o University of Hawaii at Manoa
 CRDG, College of Education
 1776 University Avenue, CM 132
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
 USA
 E-mail: info@pacificcircleconsortium.org

Notes for contributors

Pacific-Asian Education is an international, refereed journal that addresses issues of curriculum and education within the Pacific Circle region and throughout Asia. The journal is interdisciplinary in approach and publishes recent research, reports of curriculum and education initiatives within the region, analyses of seminal literature, historical surveys, and discussions of conceptual issues and problems relevant to countries and communities within the Pacific Circle and Asia. Papers with a comparative or cross-cultural perspective are particularly welcome.

New manuscripts can be sent to:

The Editors
Pacific-Asian Education Journal
 School of Critical Studies in Education
 Faculty of Education
 University of Auckland
 Private Bag 92601
 Symonds St
 Auckland 1150
 NEW ZEALAND
 E-mail: paejournal@auckland.ac.nz

Guidelines for submitting manuscripts

Manuscripts: should be between 3000 and 7000 words and proceeded by an abstract of 100 – 150 words.

Intending contributors should submit **one hard copy and/or an electronic copy** of the manuscript to the Editor, and ensure that they retain an electronic and hard copy. Manuscripts should be typed in a standard 12 pt font, left aligned, double-spaced and on one side of the page only. Please do not submit as a pdf file.

Authors' names should be included on the title page but not on the manuscript. A brief (2-3 line) biographical note about each author should be provided on a separate page

and should include full contact details (i.e. postal address, phone and facsimile numbers, and e-mail address).

Manuscripts should meet high academic standards and be written in clear English. Avoid using complex formatting programmes and turn off bibliographical and endnote functions before submitting.

Intending contributors should consult the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.) to ensure that articles conform to the guidelines including the use of up to three levels of headings, citations, references, tables, figures, etc.

For books: FitzGerald, S. (1997). *Is Australia an Asian country? Can Australia survive in an East Asian future?* St. Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

For article: Baumgart, N., Halse, C. (1999). Approaches to learning across cultures: the role of assessment. *Assessment in Education* 6(3), 321-337.

For chapters: Long, M.H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second languages acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie & T. L. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-468). San Diego: Academic Press.

Tables must be typed on separate pages and not included as part of the text. The approximate location of tables should be indicated in the text.

Figures should be submitted on separate pages, in finished form, correctly labelled and their approximate location in the text clearly indicated.

In addition to consulting the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.), authors should note the following **conventions** must be used in preparing a manuscript for submission:

Either British English or American English spelling should be used consistently throughout the text.

Footnotes should not be used. Endnotes should be kept to a minimum.

All pages should be numbered consecutively.

Do not use more than three heading levels.

Do not use double spaces after full stops at the end of sentences.

Do not use full stops in abbreviations: USA not U.S.A.

When referring to the title of an organization by its initials, first spell out the title in full followed by the abbreviation in parentheses, e.g. Curriculum Development Council (CDC). Thereafter refer to it as CDC.

Refereeing of articles takes approximately three months although this may vary according to the availability and commitments of referees.

Proofs will not be sent to authors. It is important to be as careful as possible with the final manuscript.

Final manuscripts should be double spaced and accompanied by a 100-150 word abstract, a brief biography and full contact details. Authors should submit an electronic copy of their final manuscript and accompanying details. An e-mail attachment should be clearly labelled with the author's name, title of the article and the type of programme used. Editorial staff may modify the manuscript to improve the readability of an article.

Book reviews should be between 500-750 words and follow the format outlined in regular issues.

