Kei tua o te awe māpara/Beyond the mask: Māori language teaching in English-medium secondary schools in New Zealand

Author

Sophie Nock

About the author

Dr Sophie Nock is an Associate Professor in Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao/Faculty of Māori & Indigenous Studies at the University of Waikato, New Zealand. Sophie is of Ngāti Kurī descent, from the far north of the North Island. She has been primarily involved in the teaching and researching of te reo Māori, and has published in these areas. She is a Co-Principal Investigator and Associate Investigator on a number of research projects investigating housing concerns, health and wellbeing-related outcomes for kaumatua (Māori Elders). She is also a researcher on the Concussion Recovery Assessments in Adolescence & Childhood Project.

Abstract

The *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 14) states that "[all] who learn te reo Māori help to secure its future as a living, dynamic, and rich language". However, I will argue here that appearance and reality are very far apart. Close examination of the context in which teachers of the Māori language operate tells a very different story, one characterised by inadequate consultation with teachers and communities, a lack of consistency between the advice provided in the curriculum guidelines document and the resources made available to teachers, and a failure to ensure that adequate pre- and inservice training is provided. Finally, as a way forward to help strengthen policy and inform Indigenous language teachers, a reflection on lessons learnt in the New Zealand context and some useful Indigenous language strategies will be provided.

Keywords

te reo Māori, curriculum, language teaching strategies and resources

Significant language revitalisation efforts have been transformative in many communities; however, in order for these efforts to continue to be successful, they need to be led, shaped and directed by the people of those communities (Hinton et al., 2002; McLaughlin, 1988; Nettle & Romaine, 2000). Burnaby (2007) also agrees that "the Aboriginal community must be the central decision maker in any initiative on Aboriginal language maintenance" (p. 31).

Indigenous languages are gifts; they are sacred, and they are healers. The Assembly of First Nations (2007) states that "Languages are a gift from the Creator which carry with them unique and irreplaceable values and spiritual beliefs that allow speakers to relate with their ancestors and to take part in sacred ceremonies" (p. 3). Greymorning (1999) describes Native American languages as being sacred: "We have been given something sacred, and we recognize its sacredness" (p. 11); and Littlebear (1990, p. 8) talks about "our native languages nurturing our spirits and hearts".

The Māori and Indigenous people of New Zealand acknowledge their language as a treasure *(taonga*; Waitangi Tribunal, 1986), and it is subject to the protections guaranteed under the of *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* (Treaty of Waitangi), a treaty based on trust signed in 1840 by Governor Hobson on behalf of the British Crown and a number of Māori chiefs (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986).

Since 1987, te reo Māori has been an official language of New Zealand; however, its future is very far from secure. Interestingly, over two thirds of Māori students are currently attending schools in which English is the main language of instruction. Therefore, instructed language learning plays a significant role in the revitalisation agenda. Schools in New Zealand are now required to offer a language other than the language of instruction to pupils in Years 7 to 10 (11–14 years of age). Curriculum guidelines documents for several foreign languages have been available for many years, but the curriculum guidelines document for the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in English-medium secondary schools was not made available until 2009 (Ministry of Education, 2009).

While there clearly are some extremely competent teachers of the Māori language, the agency responsible for reporting on the quality of education, the Education Review Office (ERO, 2008), has identified problems with the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in some English-medium secondary schools. The problems relate not to teachers' proficiency in the language but to their limited pedagogical knowledge. May (2013) also alludes to this: "Even when teaching personnel and resources are ostensibly not such a major challenge, the subsequent effectiveness of pedagogy is not necessarily guaranteed" (p. 41). ERO (2008) has indicated this raises questions about the initial training of teachers of te reo Māori and the ways in which all schools manage and support them.

In the United States, a growing body of evidence points to the ways in which Indigenous language learners and teachers have struggled (Johnston, 2002; McCarty, 2008; Peter, 2007). These struggles include the diminishing number of fluent speakers, certified language speakers and learners who find the language learning process demanding (Greymorning, 1999; Hermes & King, 2013; Hinton, 2011; May, 2013). This is compounded no less by the frequent mismatch between the expectations and the reality of language learning. In Canada, Battiste (2000) talked about the struggle to promote and empower Aboriginal people: "The existing curriculum has given Aboriginal people new knowledge to help them participate in Canadian society, but it has not empowered Aboriginal identity by promoting an understanding of Aboriginal worldviews, language and knowledge" (p. 192). In 2012, to redress this and the legacy of residential schools, the Commission of Canada produced the report, *Truth and Reconciliation, Calls for Action*, which

states: "Aboriginal languages are a fundamental and valued element of Canadian culture and society, and there is an urgency to preserve them" (2012, p. 2).

This article will discuss Indigenous language revitalisation strategies: in particular, the importance of community involvement and consultation in curriculum guidelines documents; and second, the appropriateness of resources to support the language teachers and the curriculum guidelines document. Third, it will highlight some of the struggles that language teachers encounter and will provide some useful strategies to help teachers develop their language proficiency and pedagogy.

The history of the education system and the teaching of te reo Māori in Aotearoa/New Zealand

In the New Zealand education system, three different agencies have primary responsibility for different aspects of schooling—the Ministry of Education (MoE), the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) and the ERO. The MoE is responsible for oversight of the development and delivery of the national curriculum; the NZQA is responsible for developing policy and procedures relating to national educational assessment; and the ERO is responsible for reporting on the quality of education in schools, including evaluation of the effectiveness of teaching and learning.

Colonisation has enabled the imposition of an alien educational infrastructure of policies and laws (e.g. the *Education Ordinance Act 1847* and the *Native Schools Act 1858*), and also included a tradition of prioritising the English language for over 150 years. Battiste (2000) calls this: "Cognitive imperialism, also known as cultural racism, is the imposition of one worldview on a people who have an alternative worldview, with the implication that the imposed worldview is superior to the alternative worldview" (pp. 192–193).

In 1972, a group of young Māori academics called *Ngā Tamatoa* (The Young Warriors) delivered a petition with 30,000 signatures to the New Zealand government seeking the inclusion of the Māori language in the school curriculum (Brooking, 1988). In 1976, the first bilingual school in Rūātoki was established. Ngā Tamatoa members also played an important role in the establishment of the *Kōhanga reo* (language nest) movement, the preschool programs incorporating Māori language and culture. This was a political movement where Māori said, "No, our language will not die." Other significant events initiated by Ngā Tamatoa included the reintroduction of the Māori language into primary and secondary schools, the development of bilingual units in English-medium schools, the introduction of Māori Studies into polytechnics and universities, and the establishment of Māori tertiary institutions (Walker, 2004).

From the Kōhanga reo movement, parents demanded the establishment of the Māori-immersion schooling, *Kura Kaupapa Māori* and *Whare Kura* (primary and secondary immersion schools in which Māori philosophy and language played a central role), to ensure language retention for those children who attended Kōhanga reo. Kura Kaupapa Māori (Māori Immersion Primary School) support the "commitment to *Te Aho Matua*/ Māori principles for life as a working philosophy for all aspects of school life" (ERO, 1995, p. 3). Kura Kaupapa Māori are seen as providing a holistic Māori spiritual, cultural and educational environment where Māori values and beliefs are important features, an environment in which everything that takes place supports the revitalisation of te reo Māori and one in which the overall operation of the school rests with *whānau*/family.

In English-medium secondary schools (13–18 years of age), the approach and philosophy is very different: te reo Māori is only offered through a bilingual unit, or as a taught "subject" or "option"

with limited contact teaching hours; this, despite more than two thirds of Māori children attending these schools. Therefore, in essence, English-medium schools by default have a huge contribution to make to the maintenance, retention and the revitalisation of te reo Māori.

The curriculum guidelines document for the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in English-medium schools

Widespread efforts to modify curriculum and instruction in schools serving Native students have taken place very infrequently (Freng et al., 2007; Reyhner & Trent Jacobs 2002). In New Zealand, it was not until the early 1980s that an attempt to achieve consistency in New Zealand language documentation within the context of the emerging *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (MoE, 2007a) began.

All of the language syllabuses and curriculum guidelines documents that have been released by the New Zealand MoE (formerly Department of Education) from 1987 onwards claim to be communicative in orientation. While there are varying conceptions of what is meant by communicative language teaching (CLT), the outlines provided by Littlewood (1981, pp. 6, 77 and 78) and Nunan (1991, pp. 279–295), which centre on placing emphasis on learning to communicate by interacting in the target language in authentic contexts, are widely accepted.

These outlines are consistent with the following definition provided in the New Zealand curriculum document for the teaching and learning of French (MoE, 2002, p. 16): "Communicative language teaching is teaching that has a function over and above that of language learning itself. Any approach that encourages learners to communicate real information for authentic reasons is, therefore a communicative approach." It is relevant to note that an exploration of the synergies between Māori pedagogy and communicative language teaching (Crombie & Nock 2009) clearly indicated that they are complementary.

MoE resources relating to the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in English-medium secondary schools

Peter (2003) states that "learners need to be surrounded by 'good' materials … these resources derive from the curriculum and lessons. Resources should include books, visuals, tapes, multimedia, realia, and things from the environment" (p. 21). The title of this article, "Kei tua o te awe māpara/Beyond the veil", is about investigating beyond the veil of what the teaching and learning of the Māori language is really like in New Zealand. Are the resources consistent with the curriculum guidelines document? To answer this question I discuss my analysis of three internet-based resources provided by the New Zealand MoE and present my findings below.

Te Kete Ipurangi

Te Kete Ipurangi (Te Kete Ipurangi, n.d.a) is a bilingual online educational portal for teachers, school managers and the wider community. It provides the gateway to a series of lesson plans and a list of resources intended to support the teaching of te reo Māori and *tikanga Māori* (Māori culture; Te Kete Ipurangi, n.d.b). These include a list of books and articles on language teaching, some language learner task-types and sample tasks, examples of learner and teacher assessment checklists, learner goal setting and learner strategies, high frequency vocabulary lists, lesson plans and a grammar progression outline.

So far as the detail of the lesson plans are concerned, there are several points that emerge strongly. The lesson plans:

- are generally sentence-based and non-communicative;
- rely heavily on translation;
- do not clearly indicate what the main teaching points are intended to be;
- do not accommodate any revision of familiar language and integration of that language with newly introduced language;
- include activities that are sometimes cumbersome and time consuming while appearing to make little overall contribution to learning;
- include, in some cases, language that is inappropriate in general or inappropriate in relation to the Achievement Objectives (MoE, 2007b) with which it is said to be associated.

It would appear that these lesson plans are intended to be a supplementary rather than a primary resource. In the majority of the lesson plans, the Māori language that appears used is translated into English. Each lesson plan is associated with one or more of the achievement objectives (AOs) in the curriculum document to some extent, but there are considerable inconsistencies. To illustrate this, I provide two examples below.

Example 1

At Level 1, the MoE's lesson plans include one labelled *Likes and dislikes: He tino pai*. In the curriculum, likes and dislikes are included at Level 2 (2.3) – *Communicate about likes and dislikes, giving reasons where appropriate.* It is, however, noted in the lesson plan that it is intended to relate to an AO that *does* appear at Level 1 (1.6) – *Understand and use simple politeness conventions (for example, ways of acknowledging people, expressing regret and complimenting people).* The language included in that lesson plan is limited to the following expressions: *he (tino) pai* and *kāo,* expressions that might more appropriately be associated with a different AO that appears at Level 1 (1.7) – *Use and respond to simple classroom language (including asking the word to express something in te reo Māori).* There *is* a lesson plan that is intended to relate to that AO. However, the linguistic focus of that lesson plan is very different from the linguistic focus suggested by the AO itself. Table 1 shows the examples associated with that AO in the original draft of the curriculum guidelines document compared with the language in the lesson plan.

Table 1: Comparison of language associated with AO 1.7 in a MoE lesson plan and the type of language the curriculum writers had in mind.

Achievement objective	Examples included in early version of the curriculum document	Language included in MoE's lesson plan
1.7: *Use and respond to simple classroom language (including asking the word to express something in te reo Māori).*	*Haere mai.* (Come here.) *E tū.* (Stand up.) *E noho.* (Sit down.) *Whakarongo mai.* (Listen to me.) *He aha te kupu Māori mō X?* (What is the Māori word for X?)	*Kei te pēhea koe ___?* *Kei te pai (koa/hiamoe etc.) au.*

Example 2

At Level 2, there is a lesson plan that purports to relate to an AO at Level 2 (2.3) – *Communicate about likes and dislikes, giving reasons where appropriate.* The lesson plan is headed *Communicating likes: He aha tō hiahia? – What would you like?* However, the lesson plan is actually about what students want (in a restaurant setting) rather than what they like or dislike. Table 2 presents the examples associated with that AO in the original draft of the curriculum document compared with the language in the lesson plan.

Table 2: Comparison of language associated with AO 2.3 in a MoE lesson plan and the type of language the curriculum writers had in mind

Achievement objective	Examples included in early version of the curriculum document	Language included in MoE's lesson plan
2.3 *Communicate about likes and dislikes, giving reasons where appropriate.*	**Question** A: *He pai te rari ki a koe?* *[Do you like lollies?]* **Responses** B_1: *Āe* (Affirmative answer) B_2: *Kāo.* (Negative answer) B_3: *Āe. He pai. [Yes. They are nice. I like them.]* (Extended affirmative answer) B_4: *Kāo. Kāore i te pai. [No. I don't like them.]* (Extended negative answer) B_5: *Āe. He pai rawa atu. [Yes. They are very nice. I like them a lot.]* (Intensified affirmative answer) B_6: *Kāo. Kāore rawa atu i te pai. [No. They are not very nice. I don't like them at all.]* (Intensified negative answer) **Reason** A: *He pai te āporo (kākāriki) ki a koe? [Do you like green apples?]* B_1: *Āe. He pai, nā te mea, he reka. [Yes. I like green apples because they are sweet.]* (Extended affirmative answer with reason) B_2: *Āe. He pai rawa atu, nā te mea, he reka. [Yes. I really like green apples because they are sweet.]* (Intensified affirmative answer with reason) B_3: *Kāo. Kāore i te pai, nā te mea, he kawa. [No. I don't like green apples because they are sour.]* (Extended negative answer with reason) B_4: *Kāo. Kāore rawa atu i te pai, nā te mea, he kawa. [No. I really don't like green apples because they are sour.]* (Intensified negative answer with reason)	*He aha tō hiahia? [What do you want?/ What would you like?]* *He ___ tō hiahia? [What do you want?/ What would you like?]* *ki te mīti heihei, ngā pī, me te kīnaki. [meat of the chicken, peas, relish/gravy] etc.*

Some teachers are likely to find that some of these lesson plans fill in gaps in their program/s, something that may be particularly useful for relief teachers. Some are likely to provide teachers with some useful ideas, but overall there is a limited contribution towards assisting teachers to

move towards the approach recommended in the curriculum guidelines document or to build coherent progression into their programs. The final result is the provision of a limited number of lesson plans that provide a partial realisation of some of the AOs (although sometimes not the ones with which they are said to be associated in the lesson plans).

Ka Mau te Wehi

Ka Mau te Wehi (Te Kete Ipurangi, n.d.c) is a video-based teaching resource made up of short video clips in te reo Māori accompanied by translations, exercises and "talking heads", which are intended to explain aspects of the Māori language and culture in English. *Ka Mau te Wehi* is made up of 20 units of work and relate to levels 1 and 2 of the draft curriculum guidelines document (MoE, 2006; not the final version).

Any relationship between either the draft or final version of the curriculum guidelines document and *Ka Mau te Wehi* would appear to be largely coincidental, notwithstanding the *appearance* of a connection that is given by the existence of computer-based links between each video clip and all of the AOs listed at a particular level in the draft curriculum.

The characters in the video clips included in *Ka Mau te Wehi* are Māori (adults and young people who appear to be in their late teens) and the contexts in which the language is set are generally directly relevant to, or specific to Māori culture (e.g. Unit 3: *Nō hea tō whānau?* – Where is your family from? Unit 11: *Kapa haka* – Culture club; Unit 13: *Ko te hui-ā-whānau* – The family reunion; Unit 14: *Tō tātou maunga* – Our mountain.) However, the characters are sometimes wooden and self-conscious, and the language often appears to be contrived and situationally inappropriate; see, for example, Table 3, where there are no structures directly related to "Kei te haere ki te kura. / Going to school".

Table 3: Transcript, Unit 2: Kei te haere ki te kura – Going to school – Scene 1 video

	Māori	**English**
Dylan	Kia ora, kōrua.	Hi, you two.
Sione	Kia ora, e hoa.	Hello, friend.
Haami	Kia ora, e hoa.	Hello, friend.
Dylan	Kei te pēhea kōrua?	How are you two?
Sione	Kei te pai.	Fine.
Haami	Kei te pai.	Fine.
Sione	Kei te pēhea koe?	How are you (one person)?
Dylan	Kei te pai, e hoa.	Fine, friend.
Sione	Haami, nō hea tō whanau?	Haami, where's your family from?
Haami	Nō Porirua. Dylan, nō whea tō whānau?	From Porirua. Dylan, where's your family from?
Dylan	Nō Motueka.	From Motueka.
Sione	Nō hea?	From where?
Dylan	Nō Motueka. Nō Te Waipounamu.	From Motueka. From the South Island.
Sione	E kī rā! Nō Te Waipounamu koe.	Is that right! You're from the South Island.

Note: Sourced from Te Kete Ipurangi, n.d.d.

With the possible exception of the first three video clips, it is difficult to detect any clear principles relating to the introduction of new language and the revision of language that has already been introduced, or to see how these video clips are intended as a lead-in to communicative activities, since the activities that *are* included largely take the form of language exercises rather than communicative-oriented pair and group work and are often, as in the case of learning *waiata*, not centrally oriented towards practising a new language. Examples of the types of language exercises that occur are included below.

Example 1

Unit 3: Nō hea tō whānau? – Where is your family from? Activity 3

Students will learn the words for yes and no.
Play Unit 3 Scene 2 where Jo teases Hana about Haami.
Ask the students to identify the words for yes and no:

āe	yes
kāo or kāore	no

Introduce the students to the phrase in te reo Māori that asks "Do you like?" and show them how to answer that question:

He pai a Haami ki a koe?	Do you like Haami?
Āe. He pai a Haami ki au.	Yes, I like Haami.
Kāore i te pai a Haami ki au.	No, I don't like Haami.

Prepare ten questions about Aotearoa – New Zealand that require a yes or no answer. Ask the students to write the numbers from one to five down the margin of their Wehi books, and the numbers from six to ten down the middle of the page. Read out the questions and ask the students to answer the questions by writing āe – correct, or kāo – not correct: e.g. "Is the stretch of water between the North and the South Islands called Foveaux Strait?" (Te Kete Ipurangi, n.d.e)

It is relevant to note with reference to the above example that "ki au" (as included in the activity) should be "ki a au" or "ki ahau".

While *Ka Mau te Wehi* appears at first sight to be a useful resource in relation to the realisation of the curriculum guidelines document, it turns out on closer inspection to be considerably less useful than might seem to be the case. Even though there are links between each video-clip and the lists of AOs that appear at a particular level (e.g. Level 1) of the curriculum guidelines document, the actual relationship is, with a few exceptions, tenuous at best. The language is generally not presented in a way that obviates the need for translation. That language is often inauthentic, contextually inappropriate, and sometimes simply wrong. There is little attention given to the value of revision and careful integration of familiar and new vocabulary and constructions. The activities associated with the video clips, which rely heavily on the use of English, generally take the form of noncommunicative exercises. While there is a focus on "new words" in the language content lists, structural and discoursal aspects of the language are not included and, on those few occasions

where explanation of language focus points is provided, that explanation is generally considerably more complex than is required at the stage of learning at which it occurs.

Te Hiringa i te Mahara

The last of the MoE resources analysed (now available only in archived form) is *Te Hiringa i te Mahara* (The Power of the Mind) and includes "relief teacher packs" and "supplementary resources" (Te Kete Ipurangi. n.d.f). This resource is intended for teachers of te reo Māori and for teachers in general who wish to include Māori language and culture in their programs (Gardiner & Parata, 2007, p. 2). This dual focus is problematic since the needs of teachers of te reo Māori will inevitably be fundamentally different from those of teachers whose aim is to integrate some aspects of *Kaupapa Māori* (Māori philosophy) into school programs overall.

The relief teacher packs include some basic introductory material relating to sounds, basic greetings, numbers and ages, place names and locations or origins, and words and sentences involving family relationships (including use of possessive markers). These materials include sound recordings, handouts, basic line drawings, some colourful cartoon characters and a few photographs. There are often also extension activities that involve personalisation and activities that students are likely to enjoy (e.g. finding winning lottery tickets by matching numbers and words). However, the primary emphasis is on individual words (sometimes in the form of word lists with translations) and sentences. The supplementary resources section consists of a series of lesson plans, which largely involve reading and listening comprehension and/or written or spoken responses to questions based on visual stimuli (e.g. a Performing Arts Festival poster). The exercises are often of the same type as those included in the relief teacher packs (e.g. crossword puzzles, wordfind puzzles, gap filling, unjumbling words, multiple choice). In general, these resources appear to assume that students will have already been introduced to much of the language included and/or required and therefore involve language practice rather than the introduction of new language.

Example 1

Flax plants or harakeke are regarded as being a _____ or whānau. In the centre is the RITO which is considered to be the pēpi or _____. The RITO is protected by the _____ or mātua on either side. The outer flax leaves are known as the _____ or tīpuna. The grandparents or _____ are always cut when the plant is used for weaving. The parent or _____ leaves are left to protect the RITO or _____.

Example 2

Fill in the missing letters to complete the English translations of the expressions in the first column.

Māori	English
He rawe!	E__ce__le__t!
Hei aha!	Ne__e__ m__nd! F__r__et i__!
Taihoa!	__l__w d__w__! W __it u__!
Auē!	O__ n__! (expression of grief, pain)
Kia tere!	H__r__y u__!
He pōrangi koe!	Y__u'r__ __ra__y!
Kia kaha!	B__ s__r__n__! G__ f__r i__!
Kaitoa!	G__ __d __o__! S__rv_s you right!

Example 3

Match each Māori expression to its English translation. The first one has been done for you.

Māori	**English**
He pōrangi koe!	*You're crazy!*
He rawe!	Slow down!
Auē!	Be strong!
Kia kaha!	Excellent!
Taihoa!	Never mind!
Kia tere!	Oh no!
Kaitoa!	Good job!
Hei aha!	Hurry up!

Example 4

Complete each sentence below using the English words given. Make sure that your sentence makes sense. The first one is done for you. More vocabulary is provided.

a) Kei runga te pene i te tūru. (on, chair, pen)
b) Kei _____ te _____ i te _____ . (in, box, book)
c) Kei _____ te _____ i te _____ . (in, student, bus)
d) Kei _____ te _____ i te _____ . (outside, school, bus)
e) Kei _____ te _____ i te _____ . (under, chair, pen)
f) Kei _____ te _____ i te _____ . (under, ruler, book)
g) Kei _____ te _____ i te _____ . (in front of, school, bus)
h) Kei _____ te _____ i te _____ . (on, table, chair)
i) Kei _____ te _____ i te _____ . (behind, student, teacher)

Kupu Ingoa Wāhi:
runga – on
raro – under
roto – in
waho – outside of
mua – in front of
muri – behind
taha – side
taha mauī – left side
taha katau/matau – right side
bus – pahi

Many of the activities that students are likely to enjoy (e.g. finding winning lottery tickets by matching numbers and words) involve considerably more creativity than is, in general, evidenced in the textbooks available for learners of te reo Māori. However, while these resources are likely to be useful in the context of relief lessons, their heavy reliance on translation and lack of any overall progressive framework makes them largely inappropriate as anything other than a very occasional addition to the main teaching of te reo Māori as a subject.

While it is noteworthy that the MoE has produced these resources, unfortunately, they fall short of what Peters (2003) alludes to, that "good" material needs to be derived from the curriculum and lessons; additionally, resources need to provide different contexts for the realisation of the AOs outlined in the curriculum guidelines document. The three internet-based resources made available by the MoE provide some support for teachers of te reo Māori, largely as supplementary

materials. They appear locked into approaches to language teaching, learning and language description that reflect a theoretical and methodological orientation that was particularly characteristic of the mid-20th century (linguistic structuralism and audio-lingual methodology) and, in some cases, that orientation towards grammar translation that was in its heyday considerably earlier.

Resources and strategies for teachers of Indigenous languages

Crombie (2010) has observed that what really matters so far as a curriculum guidelines document is concerned "is the processes involved in bringing it to life in the classroom" (p. 220). A number of publications have signalled how this might best be done in the case of the curriculum guidelines document relating to the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in English-medium schools. In the first of these, Johnson (2003) demonstrates how a core integrated skills lesson for new language could be developed that relates to the first part of one of the AOs (*Communicate about likes and dislikes, giving reasons where appropriate*). She includes a lesson plan that outlines the expected outcomes, the language focus points, the topics, socio-cultural aspects and text-types included (i.e. posters, simple email messages and a questionnaire), as well as learning and assessment activities and resources (i.e. posters, flashcards, cue cards, game boards, game cards, task sheets). She then works through the lesson stages. Every stage of the lesson (planning, design and delivery) clearly illustrates principles that apply in the design of other lessons.

In the second, Johnson and Houia (2005) explore the development of spiral lessons in which the focus is on practising a newly introduced language in communicative contexts and integrating it with existing language competencies. Another article of interest, by Johnson and Nock (2009), advises teachers on how to create lessons for young learners (Years 1–8) using the curriculum guidelines document for the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in New Zealand schools. The focus is on an AO that appears at level 1: *Use and respond to simple classroom language* (MoE, 2007). Communicative approaches and examples of ways in which teachers can design communicative language lessons that are fun and are appropriate for very young learners are provided. Each stage of a sample lesson and lots of controlled and freer practice activities are included (e.g. a word game and a crossword puzzle).

Further strategies include utilising narratives as a traditional teaching strategy, as Lee (2009) proposes: "Pūrākau, a traditional form of Māori narrative, contains philosophical thought, epistemological constructs, cultural codes, and worldviews that are fundamental to our identity as Māori" (p. 1). Prior to the arrival of Europeans, Māori lived in a tribal kinship society, with extended family groupings sometimes numbering up to 20 or 30 people:

> The basic social unit in Māori society was the whanau, an extended family which included three generations. At the head were the kaumatua and kuia, the male and female elders of the group. They were the storehouses of knowledge, the minders and mentors of children. (Walker, 2004, 63)

It was these kaumatua, the Elders of the tribal kinship who were the primary caregivers and educators of the children and the grandchildren while the parents were the hunters and gatherers. Pūrākau was a staple in the life of a Māori child and was an essential component of their education and upbringing; it was through pūrākau that Māori knowledge, history, culture, language, values and genealogy were transmitted.

Hinton (2003, p. 90) also supports using storytelling as one kind of "lesson proper", particularly for the teacher-learner with limited fluency. Engage the assistance of an Elder to help develop a unit

or units, or for a special occasion, invite the Elder to come to class and tell the story. There are multiple strategies that can be utilised when storytelling, including the use of realia and pictures to convey meanings, culture, simple sentences and vocabulary; practising the words heard, drawing pictures or getting the students to role-play the story. With a similar thought, Cantoni (1999) advocates using Total Physical Response-Storytelling to teach American Indian languages, utilising vocabulary already taught and providing opportunities for students to listen, recall, role play, read and write.

Many researchers in the area of language revitalisation will agree that the supply of culturally relevant, culturally appropriate and communicatively creative resources is a critical component in supporting Indigenous language teachers (Burnaby, 2007; Hinton, 2003; Lee, 2009; Peter, 2003). The development of these resources needs to continue and with the support of the community, the schools and their leadership, as well as policy makers.

From a textbook point of view Nock (2017) discusses the New Zealand context with regard to textbooks for the teaching of te reo Māori, and after closer analysis it appears these textbooks are lacking in the very essence that Peter (2003) talks about: "learners need to be surrounded by 'good' materials … these resources derive from the curriculum and lessons" (p. 21). The textbooks Nock analysed fail to reflect any real cohesion with the curriculum guidelines documents, and no key progress or revision has happened despite the major developments that have occurred over the last 40 years. Therefore, as textbooks are no different from other resources, they also deserve support from the communities, schools and policy makers.

Lessons to be learnt from the te reo Māori curriculum guidelines document experience

Curriculum guidelines document

A review of experiences relating to the curriculum guidelines document for the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in English-medium school settings has highlighted a number of issues relating to the design of language curriculum guidelines documents more generally. The first of these relates to the fact that the word "curriculum" is used in a variety of different ways, and so it is important the way it is used should be clearly indicated. As Finney (2001, p. 70) observes:

> The term *curriculum* is open to a wide variety of definitions; in its narrowest sense it is synonymous with the term syllabus, as in the specification of the content and ordering of *what* is to be taught; in the wider sense it refers to all aspects of the planning, implementation and evaluation of an educational program, the *why, how* and *how well* together with the what of the teaching-learning process.

Decisions about *what* should be taught are complex—as Takurua and Whaanga (2009) observe, teachers, who are already overworked and who have varying degrees of experience and expertise, are left completely unsupported to make decisions about *what* language to teach in relation to the AOs (MoE, 2007b), and *when* to teach it. Their decisions on what to teach and when may impact on their students' ability to meet assessment expectations at higher levels. These assessment expectations are set by the New Zealand Qualification Authority (n.d.), the agency responsible for developing policy and procedures relating to national educational assessment, and an agency external to the MoE.

What this indicates is that *genuine* consultation with teachers and communities, consultation that includes responding appropriately to what they say, is of critical importance, as is the necessity of attending to the advice of those professionals who are appointed to design curricula. McLaughlin

(1988), in addressing Navajo literacy, wrote: "community members must be involved collaboratively in making curricular and administrative decisions" (p. 22). Otherwise, the inevitable result will be the inconsistency, the added pressure on teachers to decide on the suggested language focus points, and suggested vocabulary (the what) and *when* to teach these, and a lack of transparency that characterises the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in English-medium schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Design of resources

Just as important as the curriculum guidelines documentation itself is the design of teaching and learning resources. Language students need a wide range of *authentic materials, activities* and *text-types*. Students' learning experiences need to be contextually and culturally appropriate and communicatively oriented, and students need to be given opportunities to use the language introduced productively, that is, to practise using it in contexts that allow for experimentation and genuine personalisation. Above all, the language introduced to students needs to be appropriate in terms of the wants, desires and expectations of the communities, of the people, and in terms of this article, appropriate in terms of the AOs in the curriculum guidelines document.

If all of this is to happen, curriculum guidelines documents need to include a wide range of high-quality teaching resources designed by teams of professional language educators with proven experience and expertise. To aid and support this, our communities are a huge resource; some examples of Aboriginal language development strategies are to engage and invite Elders to become involved, and engage the community and incorporate culturally appropriate behaviours into materials and teaching strategies for Aboriginal children (Assembly of First Nations, 1990; Leavitt, 1991; Stairs, 1991).

Resources need to make a significant contribution towards assisting teachers—the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) 1990 survey emphasised that teachers usually work in isolation and have to create most of their resources themselves and therefore are under huge pressure to produce resources. Resources also need to be communicative, avoid having to use translations, accommodate any revision of familiar language or the integration of newly introduced language, and they need to be able to bring the curriculum guidelines document alive in the classroom. In order to move towards the approach recommended in the curriculum guidelines document or to build a coherent progression into their programs, teachers in New Zealand need support and training.

Teacher training

McDonough (2002) has noted that not only teachers but also teacher trainers require appropriate training, and Borg (2006) has commented on the fact that experience should not be confused with expertise. The people with proven expertise in the specific area of language education should be conducting language teacher education. As previously mentioned, the ERO (2008) identified limitations in the pedagogical knowledge of some te reo Māori teachers, and has raised questions about the initial training of teachers of te reo Māori and the ways in which all schools manage and support them. Language teachers in general need training that is specific to the teaching of languages, and they need to have confidence that the information and guidance they are provided with meets their real needs (Wang, 2007), needs which, as Smith et al. (1998) note, are technological and cultural as well as pedagogic.

In a discussion of a teacher-training model for Indigenous languages, Littlebear (1996) maintains that recording Elders not only advances a language, but that language documentation is essential to curriculum development: "Those who are serious about preserving their languages must act now. They have to start tape-recording and video-taping their elders, to begin developing curriculum for language development" (p. 236).

He explains the importance of collecting language data to provide assurance that a body of language is available for teachers and that teachers are provided with the necessary classroom knowledge to use this body of knowledge effectively.

Hinton et al. (2002) attest and support the opportunity for the teacher-learner (a teacher who is also learning the language at the same time as the students) to be given a chance to develop their own language fluency before being thrust in front of the students. This may involve the help of an Elder as a mentor to develop conversational fluency over a number of months or even years. Additional and personal development by the teacher-learner to work with linguistic documentation to increase their vocabulary and their grammatical accuracy is highly recommended.

Thus, in the New Zealand context, there is an immediate need for effective inservice training for teachers of te reo Māori and for effective preservice training for all prospective teachers of the language. I believe that an opportunity for open debate on the types of knowledge and skills that trainers should be able to demonstrate and how oversight of that training be managed is needed. Perhaps in the first instance a steering committee made up of language teachers and experts in language teaching and learning (from Aotearoa and beyond) could be set up. In the context of *genuine* consultation with communities and teachers of te reo Māori, this committee could ensure that every aspect of what is available is reviewed, revised and redesigned, starting from the curriculum guidelines document, and moving through materials production, the training of teacher trainers and teacher training itself.

Conclusion

The *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (MoE, 1993, p. 14) states that "[all] who learn te reo Māori help to secure its future as a living, dynamic, and rich language". Unfortunately, it is clear that in the New Zealand context, there is still a lot of work to be done. It is, however, important work to ensure that children in English-medium secondary schooling are provided with an opportunity to experience the Māori language as a living, dynamic and rich language, and that the teachers who attempt to provide opportunities for them to do so are adequately supported and trained. The situation as it relates to the teaching and learning of other Indigenous languages in other countries may be equally dire. This is a matter of serious concern at a time when so many languages are being lost to future generations.

References

Assembly of First Nations. (1990). *Towards linguistic justice for First Nations.* Assembly of First Nations, Education Secretariat.

Assembly of First Nations. (2007). *National First Nations Language Strategy*. Document presented at the Annual General Assembly, Halifax, Nova Scotia. http://www.malsmb.ca/docs/afn-languagesnationalstrategy2007.pdf

Battiste, M. (2000). *Reclaiming Indigenous voice and vision*. UBC Press.

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. Continuum.

Brooking, T. (1988). *Milestones: Turning points in New Zealand history*. Mills Publications.

Burnaby, B. (2007). Aboriginal language maintenance, development and enhancement: A review of literature. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing Indigenous languages* (2nd ed., pp. 21–37). Northern Arizona University.

Cantoni, G. (1999). Using TPR-Storytelling to develop fluency and literacy in Native American languages. In J. Reyhner, G. Cantoni, R.N. St. Clair, and E. Parsons Yazzie (Eds.), *Revitalizing Indigenous languages* (pp. 53–58). Northern Arizona University. http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/RIL_5.html

Commission of Canada. (2012). *Truth and Reconciliation Report Commission of Canada: Calls to Action.* http://nctr.ca/assets/reports/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf

Crombie, W. (2010). Classroom-based language revitalisation: The interaction between curriculum planning and teacher development in the case of Maori language. In G. Senft (Ed.), *Endangered Austronesian and Australian Aboriginal Languages: Essays on language documentation, archiving, and revitalization* (pp. 207–221). Pacific Linguistics.

Crombie, W., & Nock, S. (2009). Exploring synergies between Māori pedagogy and communicative language teaching. *Journal of Māori and Pacific Development, 10*(1), 29–51.

Education Review Office (ERO). (2008). *An evaluation of the quality of Māori language teaching in secondary schools.* https://thehub.swa.govt.nz/resources/an-evaluation-of-the-quality-of-maori-language-teaching-in-secondary-schools-manukau/

Education Review Office (ERO). (1995). *Kura Kaupapa Māori* (National Education Evaluation Reports, No. 10).

Freng, S., Freng A., & Moore, H. (2007). Examining American Indians' recall of cultural inclusion in school. *Journal of American Indian Education, 46*(2), 42–61.

Finney, D. (2001). The ELT Curriculum: A flexible model for a changing world. In J. C. Richards & P. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp. 69–79). Cambridge University Press.

Gardiner, W., & Parata, H. (2007). *He Aratohu – Integrating Kaupapa Māori into mainstream secondary school teaching and learning programmes*: *Practical guidelines for teachers of all subjects.* Ministry of Education. http://tetereauraki.tki.org.nz/THM-resource-archive

Greymorning, S. (1999). Running the gauntlet of an Indigenous language program. In J. Reyhner, G. Cantoni, R. N. St. Clair, & E. Parsons Yazzie (Eds.), *Revitalizing Indigenous languages* (pp. 6–16). Northern Arizona University. http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/RIL_2.html

Hermes, M., & King, K. (2013). Ojibwe language revitalization, multimedia technology, and family language learning. *Language Learning and Technology*, *17*(1), 125–144.

Hinton, L. (2003). How to teach when the teacher isn't fluent. In J. Reyhner, O. V. Trujillo, R. L. Carrasco & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Nurturing native languages* (pp. 79–92). Northern Arizona University.

Hinton, L. (2011). Language revitalization and language pedagogy: New teaching and learning strategies. *Language and Education*, *25*(4), 307–318.

Hinton, L., Steele, N., Vera, M., & Advocates for Indigenous California Language Survival. (2002). *Keeping your language alive: A common-sense approach to language learning and teaching.* Heyday Books.

Johnston, B. (2002). The rise and fall of a Dakota immersion pre-school. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *23*(3), 195–213.

Johnson, D. E. (2003). Putting the draft learning progression framework – Māori in the New Zealand Curriculum – to work: An illustration. *Journal of Māori and Pacific Development, 4*(2), 50–64.

Johnson, D. E., & Houia, W. (2005). The Māori language curriculum for mainstream New Zealand schools: Spiral lesson/ lesson sequence design. *Journal of Māori and Pacific Development, 6*(2), 42–60.

Johnson, D. E., & Nock, S. (2009). Using the curriculum guidelines for the teaching and learning of te reo Māori in Years 1–13 of New Zealand schools to create lessons for young learners. *Journal of Māori and Pacific Development, 10*(2), 32–46.

Leavitt, R. (1991). Language and cultural content in Native education. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 47*(2), 266–279.

Lee, J. (2009). Decolonising Māori narratives: Pūrākau as a method. *MAI Review*, (2), Article 3. http://www.review.mai.ac.nz/index.php/MR/article/view/242/268

Littlebear, D. (1990). Effective language education practices and Native language survival. In J. Reyhner (Ed.), *Effective language education practices and Native language survival* (pp. 1–8). Choctaw, OK: Native American Language Issues. http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/NALI1.html.

Littlebear, R. (1996). A model for promoting Native American language preservation and teaching. Appendix. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing Indigenous languages* (pp. 234–239). Northern Arizona University. http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/SIL_Appendix.html#3

Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

May, S. (2013). Indigenous immersion education International developments. *Journal of Immersion and Conte-Based language Education, 1*(1), 34–69.

McCarty, T. L. (2008). Bilingual education by and for American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of language and language education* (2nd ed., vol. 5, pp. 239–251). Springer.

McDonough, S. (2002). *Applied linguistics in language education.* Oxford University Press.

McLaughlin, D. (1988). Starting anew. *Journal of Navajo Education, 6*(1), 1.

Ministry of Education (MoE). (1993). *New Zealand Curriculum Framework.* Learning Media.

Ministry of Education (MoE). (2002). *French in the New Zealand curriculum.* Learning Media.

Ministry of Education (MoE). (2006). *Te Reo Māori in the New Zealand Curriculum* (draft). Learning Media.

Ministry of Education (MoE). (2007a). *New Zealand Curriculum Framework.* Learning Media.

Ministry of Education (MoE). (2007b). *The New Zealand curriculum: Achievement objectives by level.* Learning Media. http://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/content/download/1110/11995/ file/Charts1.pdf.

Ministry of Education (MoE). (2009). *Te aho arataki marau mo te ako i te reo Māori – kura auraki: Curriculum guidelines for teaching and learning te reo Māori in English-medium schools: Years 1– 13.* Learning Media.

Nettle, D., & Romaine, S. (2000). *Vanishing voices: The extinction of the world's languages.* Oxford University Press.

New Zealand Qualification Authority. (n.d.). New Zealand Qualification Framework. http://www.nzqa.govt.nz/assets/Studying-in-NZ/New-Zealand-Qualification-Framework/requirements-nzqf.pdf

Nock, S. (2017). Textbooks for the teaching of te reo Māori: Time for change? *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies*, *10*(1), 1–16.

Nunan, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum. *TESOL Quarterly, 25*(2), 279–295.

Peter, L. (2003). Assessing the Impact of toal immersion on Cherolee Language Revitalisation: A culturally responsive, Participatory Approach. In J. Reyhner, O. V. Trujillo, R. L. Carrasco & L. Lockard (Eds.), *Nurturing Native Languages* (pp. 7–24). Northern Arizona University.

Peter, L. (2007). Our beloved Cherokee: Preschool language immersion. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, *38*(4), 323–342.

Reyhner, J., & Trent Jacobs, D. (2002). Preparing teachers of American Indian and Alaska Native students. *Action in Teacher Education, 24*(2), 85–93.

Stairs, A. (1991). Learning processes and teaching roles in Native education: Cultural base and cultural brokerage. *The Canadian Modern Languages Review, 47*(2), 280–294.

Smith, L., Fiona C., Graham S., & Tunks, M. (1988). *Te Hiringa i te Mahara: A literature review and database analysis.* International Research Institute for Māori and Indigenous Education, University of Auckland.

Takurua, N., & Whaanga, H. (2009). Teaching Māori in English-medium schools in New Zealand: Teacher responses to aspects of the curriculum guidelines for te reo Māori in English-medium school settings. *Journal of Māori and Pacific Development, 9*(1), 14–31.

Te Kete Ipurangi. (n.d.a). Te reo Māori in English-medium schools. http://tereomaori.tki.org.nz/

Te Kete Ipurangi. (n.d.b). Teacher-tools, te reo Māori lesson plans. http://tereomaori.tki.org.nz/Teacher-tools/Te-reo-Maori-lesson-plans

Te Kete Ipurangi. (n.d.c). Reo Māori – resources. Ka Mau te Wehi. http://tereomaori.tki.org.nz/Reo-Maori-resources/Ka-Mau-te-Wehi

Te Kete Ipurangi. (n.d.d). Reo Māori – resources. Ka mau te wehi. https://tereomaori.tki.org.nz/Reo-Maori-resources/Ka-Mau-te-Wehi/Introduction-to-the-units/Unit-2-Going-to-school

Te Kete Ipurangi. (n.d.e). Reo Māori – resources. Ka mau te wehi. https://tereomaori.tki.org.nz/Reo-Maori-resources/Ka-Mau-te-Wehi/Introduction-to-the-units/Unit-3-Where-is-your-family-from/Scene-1-Haami-talks-to-Hana-at-school

Te Kete Ipurangi. (n.d.f). Reo Māori – resources. Te Hiranga i te Mahara. https://tereomaori.tki.org.nz/Reo-Maori-resources/Te-Hiringa-i-te-Mahara-resource-archive

Waitangi Tribunal. (1986). *Report of The Waitangi Tribunal on The Te Reo Maori Claim: Wai 11*. Brookers.

Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu mātou: Struggle without end*. Penguin.

Wang, W.-P. (2007). *Teaching English to young learners in Taiwan: Issues relating to teaching, teacher education, teaching materials, and teaching perspectives* (Unpublished PhD thesis). University of Waikato. New Zealand.