



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Faculty of Education

Te Kura Toi Tangata

Waikato Journal of Education

Te Hautaka Mātauranga o Waikato



Volume 15, Issue 3: 2010

Special Edition:
Being a Researcher
and Doing Research

WAIKATO JOURNAL OF EDUCATION TE HAUTAKA MĀTAURANGA O WAIKATO

Editors:

Clive McGee
Rosemary DeLuca

Editorial Board:

Beverley Bell	Toni Bruce
Margaret Carr	Bronwen Cowie
Rosemary DeLuca	Deborah Fraser
Richard Hill	Margie Hohepa
Judy Moreland	Sally Peters
Clive Pope	Noeline Wright

Waikato Journal of Education is a refereed journal, published annually, based in the Faculty of Education, The University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand. It publishes articles in the broad field of education. For further information visit the WJE website <http://edlinked.soe.waikato.ac.nz/research/journal/index.php?id=8>

Correspondence and articles for review should be addressed to: Research Manager, Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, Faculty of Education, The University of Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, 3240, New Zealand. Email: wmier@waikato.ac.nz

Business correspondence: Orders, subscription payments and other enquiries should be sent to the Administrator, *Waikato Journal of Education*, Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, School of Education, The University of Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton, 3240, New Zealand, Email: wmier@waikato.ac.nz

Subscriptions: Within NZ \$40; Overseas NZ \$50

Copyright: © Faculty of Education, The University of Waikato

Publisher: Faculty of Education, The University of Waikato

Cover design: Donn Ratana

Printed by: Waikato Print

Call for papers

The Waikato Journal of Education provides an avenue of publication for quality articles on education. This peer-reviewed journal welcomes a range of topics including interdisciplinary, philosophical and applied research approaches.

Submissions are now invited for consideration for publication in the November 2011 issue. Please submit an electronic copy and a separate page with author/s contact details by **30 April 2011** to WMIER Research Manager, Carolyn Jones (cjjones@waikato.ac.nz), Faculty of Education, University of Waikato, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240, New Zealand.

ISSN 1173-6135

WAIKATO JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

TE HAUTAKA MĀTAURANGA O WAIKATO

VOLUME 15, Issue 3: 2010

Minding the Aesthetic: The Place of the Literary in education and research TERRY LOCKE	3
Lecturer–student Views on Successful Online Learning Environments ELAINE KHOO, MICHAEL FORRET AND BRONWEN COWIE	17
Teaching Te Reo Māori as a Second Language in Primary Schools: Two Case Studies RICHARD HILL.....	35
Reading at Risk: Why Effective Literacy Practice is not Effective SHEILPA PATEL	51
Developing Decision-Making in Rugby DARRYL PARRANT AND ANDREW J MARTIN	69
Professional Discipline: Analysis of New Zealand Teachers Disciplinary Tribunal Decisions KATE DIESFELD	87
Restorative Practice and Behaviour Management in Schools: Discipline Meets Care WENDY DREWERY AND MARIA KECSKEMETI.....	101
Towards Understanding Models for Statistical Literacy: A Literature Review SASHI SHARMA, PHIL DOYLE, VINEY SHANDIL AND SEMISI TALAKIA'ATU	115
Conceptions, Language, Culture and Mathematics and the New Zealand Curriculum JUDY BAILEY AND MERILYN TAYLOR.....	131
Reasons for Joining the Teaching Profession: Primary Student Teachers GOVINDA ISHWAR LINGAM	141
The Others and/in Me JOAN VALENZUELA	157

TEACHING TE REO MĀORI AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS: TWO CASE STUDIES

RICHARD HILL

Faculty of Education

University of Waikato

ABSTRACT *The provision of second language education in New Zealand primary schools has been, until recently, a rare addition to programmes. Its wider implementation in New Zealand primary schools has always been limited by low numbers of fluent bilingual teachers, and a perception that in a predominantly English speaking country such as New Zealand there is no need to teach additional languages in primary schools. The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) provides the first opportunity to formally include second language education in primary schools, and to establish the learning of second languages as a worthwhile pursuit in New Zealand. However, the success of such a policy change will depend on the ability of the Ministry of Education and course providers to upskill teachers in their ability to speak additional languages and teach them. This article reports on the outcomes of a Ministry-funded project designed to strengthen the second language teaching approaches of upper primary school teachers who teach te reo Māori. It provides case studies of two of the teachers who completed this course, and finds that while there are clear benefits to be derived from such teacher professional development courses, these courses need to focus on long-term objectives and be channelled to those teachers and students who stand to benefit the most from professional development courses.*

KEY WORDS

Second languages, curriculum, te reo Māori, New Zealand Curriculum, learning languages

INTRODUCTION

The introduction of *The New Zealand Curriculum* in 2007 (Ministry of Education, 2007), elevates the learning of second languages to the status of a separate learning area for the first time, with a particular focus on teaching second languages to students in Years 7-10. In a country such as New Zealand, where a high proportion of teachers are monolingual English speakers, and untrained in second language pedagogies, achieving a successful outcome for this initiative will hinge on the ability to create suitable professional development programmes to accommodate teachers' needs. This will likely be a significant challenge.

This paper presents the cases studies of two primary school teachers who took part in a Ministry of Education professional development (PD) course for primary school teachers wishing to teach te reo Māori (the Māori language) as part of the

new learning languages learning area. It will focus on their experiences and achievements when taking this course. The key issues that will be discussed here include firstly, whether PD courses are useful in developing the ability of teachers who are not fluent in the target language, or trained in appropriate language pedagogies. Secondly, what are some of the key considerations when devising such PD courses?

THE NEW NEW ZEALAND CURRICULUM (2007)

The outgoing *New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (see Ministry of Education, 1993) was the official policy for teaching, learning and assessment in New Zealand schools from 1993 until 2008. In this document, the study of second languages was joined—or, more accurately, elided—with the study of first languages to form the language and languages essential learning area. In short, there was no separate recognition of second language learning in the previous curriculum document. Elsewhere in this document, learning additional languages was referred to a number of times, in terms of the promotion of second language learning and te reo Māori, the promotion and recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi, and for the importance of the multicultural nature of Aotearoa/New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 1993).

The sentiments expressed in this earlier curriculum document regarding learning languages represented forward thinking on the part of the Ministry of Education (Benton, 1996, pp. 10–11). It was clearly pluralistic in sentiment in its acknowledgement of the benefits of the learning of languages, and it seemed to be providing New Zealand ethnic minority groups the right to pursue their languages with Ministry of Education funding. Pasifika students, for instance, were promised the opportunity to develop their own languages “as an integral part of their schooling” (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 10).

However, despite this forward thinking, the 1993 curriculum framework will be remembered for being largely rhetorical in nature and never living up to its own principles (May, 2005). A central limitation of this document is that it offers *everything to everyone*, but does not describe just what *will actually* be provided by schools. There was also no pressure on schools to provide language programmes for ethnic minority groups (Peddie, 1997). Interestingly, by teaching solely English, schools effectively fulfilled the requirements stipulated by this document. As a consequence, many of its redeeming features of extending the learning of second languages in New Zealand schools have remained unrealised, as schools have been left largely unregulated in their implementation of it (see Franken & McComish, 2003; McCaffery, personal communication, 2003; McCaffery & Tuafuti, 1998, for discussion on ESOL provisions in New Zealand primary schools, and education in the Pacific Island languages).

Perhaps as a means of addressing these problematic issues, in the ‘new’ *New Zealand Curriculum* (2007) the learning of second languages has been elevated to a separate language learning area. The language and languages essential learning area of the previous curriculum is now divided into two: **language** (including English/te reo Māori), and **languages** (including second language teaching, foreign language teaching and minority language teaching). It is now compulsory for schools to offer

second language programmes for year 7–10 students, but interestingly, it is not compulsory for students to study them.

Teaching languages

The success of any policy on teaching second languages will depend on the skills of the teachers who implement it. There is no shortage of literature that discusses the principles of teaching second languages to children (Ellis, 2005; Gibbs & Holt, 2003; Lightbown & Spada, 1999; Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2000). It is clear that teachers need to be multi-skilled in a number of specialist areas. McComish (2004), for instance, in her literature survey on teaching te reo Māori as a subject, cites six principles as necessary skills for teaching languages:

1. *Theoretical knowledge* of the nature of second language teaching.
2. *Teaching skills* in terms of the knowledge of activities designed to encourage communication, including judgement of the balance between accuracy and fluency, and knowledge of how to respond to learners.
3. *Communication skills*, concerning teacher input and the provision of a good model for students that is understandable and that prompts responses from students.
4. *Subject knowledge* about the subject they teach, including phonetics and phonology, grammar, lexis, and discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, language curriculum and syllabus design, SLT methods, testing and evaluation.
5. *Contextual knowledge* relating to the society, its communities, schools, classrooms and individual students' personal backgrounds.
6. *Pedagogical reasoning skills*, or the ability to transform the content knowledge into pedagogically powerful and yet adaptive forms to cater to the variations in ability and background presented by the students.

These themes, which would form the content of most second language teaching courses (McComish, 2004), represent a large and challenging body of knowledge for New Zealand primary school teachers to learn. While they will already have many general teaching skills, New Zealand primary teachers often have only a very small proportion of knowledge of second language learning theory, subject knowledge and pedagogical reasoning. This is because such pedagogical knowledge in second language teaching is largely not addressed or taught in initial teacher education in New Zealand. Moreover, an even greater challenge in relation to teaching a second language lies in the ability to speak the target language (content knowledge). Given the largely monolingual English nature of the teaching force, this challenge would appear particularly daunting. As such, the pedagogical and content knowledge required in second language teaching must form an integral element of any course designed to upskill generalist teachers who are not yet fluent speakers of the target language.

The choice of teaching approach is also an important consideration for course providers. Communicative language teaching (CLT) has been a common feature of second language teaching approaches for over 25 years (see Widdowson, 1990),

and has been endorsed in this country as an appropriate approach to use in schools (see McComish 2004; Ministry of Education, 2002). As its name suggests, CLT emphasises the principle of language being a means of communication. This approach therefore acknowledges the interdependence between language and communication, and adheres to the philosophy that learners must not only learn the forms and functions of language, but also should be able to select the most appropriate language form for any given context (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). It stands to reason then that this approach will be one with which the primary school teachers of this professional development course should become familiar.

A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COURSE TO TRAIN TEACHERS IN SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

In 2005, after a number of Ministry of Education-funded research projects and reports (including Ferguson, 2002; Gibbs & Holt, 2003; Peddie, Gunn, & Lewis, 1999), the Ministry of Education funded four pilot professional development programmes around New Zealand to explore methods of supporting teachers to teach second languages, and thus enable them to successfully implement the new learning languages curriculum area (see Murrow, Kalafatelis, Fryer, Hammond, & Edwards, 2006 for an evaluation of the four pilot programmes). The details of the programmes are listed below.

1. Programme One – a 10-week full-time course in Māori
2. Programme Two – four 2–3 day workshops
3. Programme Three – two 5-day workshops
4. Programme Four – four 2–3 day workshops

As can be seen, three of the four programmes comprised a total of around 8-10 days of course time over approximately two terms. One course however (Programme One), offered considerably more time (10 weeks or 50 days). All of the programmes also used CLT as their guiding approach.

Programme Two – description

Programme Two is the focus for this research project (four wānanga or workshops, each of 2–3 days). The programme included 25 primary school teachers from one region of New Zealand. There was a mixture of Māori and Pākehā participants in the group. Of these, none was a fluent speaker of te reo Māori. However, several did have some knowledge of some Māori phrases and vocabulary, although this knowledge was rudimentary.

This current research monitored the progress and perceptions of four teachers in this PD course, two of whom are discussed in this article. The main aim was to gain an understanding of the issues involved in upskilling teachers to teach second languages effectively in mainstream English settings. Importantly, it also aimed to provide insight into what type of course is required in order to best meet the needs of this type of teacher in the future. To achieve these aims, both during the course and after its completion, the researcher sat in on the course writing notes,

interviewed the four teachers on three occasions (once as a focus group and twice individually), and visited them in their schools to observe them teaching.

THE TEACHERS

Anahera

Anahera trained to be a teacher once her own children were adults. She grew up in a Pākehā community in town, and when growing up, had not much exposure to Māori children. However, once married, Anahera moved to a predominantly Māori community, where she still resides. A Pākehā, Anahera has now been a teacher for six years, and holds a Diploma of Teaching and a Certificate in Children's Literature. When asked to rate herself on a continuum line of knowledge of te reo Māori, Anahera marked herself very close to the "no knowledge" end of the scale. Her Māori language proficiency might therefore be described as rudimentary prior to taking the course. She also indicated that she did not have any second language qualifications.

Anahera works in a two-teacher (mainly Māori) school in a country location, teaching predominantly the junior children, but also taking responsibility for teaching the senior children on occasions. She took part in this professional development to further strengthen her ability to teach te reo Māori, and thus assist her students with their learning of te reo Māori. As the school is predominantly Māori, and was bilingual in the past, Anahera feels she should support Māori language learning in the school.

Hēmi

Hēmi, a Māori teacher in his 30s, has also had six years' teaching experience. He grew up in a rural Māori community. His home life was surrounded by te reo Māori. However, because Hēmi's mother could not speak te reo Māori, Hēmi did not learn enough Māori to maintain the fluency he gained as a child. He describes his proficiency as such: "I can only pick out certain words. I find some people easier to understand than others. Body language, facial expression and hand movements are cues I use to try and grab what they are trying to say to me."

Hēmi has a Diploma of Teaching and is in the process of completing a bachelor's degree. He works in an English medium intermediate school teaching year 7 children who are predominantly Māori. He took part in this professional development in order to assist him in speaking te reo Māori more fluently.

COMPONENTS OF THE SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAMME

The te reo Māori professional development course (Programme Two discussed above) was designed by an educational research group within the polytechnic that services the region. It was funded by the Ministry of Education and aimed to assist the teachers to develop strategies to help teach te reo Māori as a second language. This included the following elements:

- The integration of te reo Māori across the curriculum,
- Learning about teaching methodologies, including communicative language teaching,
- Planning language lessons and units of work,
- The use of Māori language teaching resources,
- Developing grammar and vocabulary sets to assist in planning, and
- The weaving of Māori tikanga (Māori customs) pertaining to local tribes into classroom teaching.

The course was divided into four 2-day wānanga over three terms of the school year. As the aim of the course was to teach communicative language teaching techniques, the course was arranged in a way that exposed teachers to many classroom applicable methods. In short, the teachers learned te reo Māori in activities which had direct classroom application. The types of activities included

- Listening activities—such as using locatives to place objects on a picture,
- Trivia games,
- Counting games,
- Waiata (songs),
- Teaching *mihi* (greetings),
- Tips for using communicative activities,
- Constructing lesson plans,
- Vocabulary games (i.e., the game *Fish*),
- Language experience using the taste sense, and
- An information-gathering hunt around town (using te reo Māori).

A final, and essential element that was woven through this course was a high level of classroom support offered to teachers in their schools following each wānanga. Course facilitators, themselves teachers, supported teachers in their schools and were involved in observing, assessing and modelling techniques to the teachers.

Examples of activities in the four wānanga

1. The teachers took part in a fun game to teach counting. They did this using clapping and other sequences of hand movements whilst reciting the Māori numbers. This was followed by the learning of a local waiata and its actions, and a group sharing of language games they use in their schools.
2. The course facilitator was using a *mihi* (personal description) as an example, to exemplify how to teach using the CLT approach. The facilitator then discussed how to respond to a student's completed work. The teachers were given a "noticing activity" that had them identify the correct sentence constructions (amongst some incorrect constructions). During another session, a second course facilitator guided the group through a lesson plan template that would successfully integrate language aims with curriculum aims.

3. A “language experience” (see Ministry of Education, 2003) activity on the taste sense was arranged. The teachers were provided with a number of plates of different tasting items (for example, tartaric acid, vinegar, pesto, olives, sweets). The task was for the teachers to describe the tastes.
4. The teachers were sent on an information hunt. Equipped with a camcorder, each group had a set of questions to answer. They were required to find the information from people within the town’s central shopping district using te reo Māori only. The groups recorded the journey on the camcorder to show to the class at the end of the day.

CASE STUDY ONE – ANAHERA

In taking part in this professional development, Anahera was hoping to both increase her knowledge of the language, and to gain skills in teaching the children te reo Māori in her school. She states

I want to be able to mainly develop confidence in my own ability. The whole point of it is to bring it back and share it with these people, these children and the staff. All of us answer the telephone in Māori. Starting with those little things. If we are going to be proud of having the te reo, we should have those things; answer the phone and that sort of the thing. You just learn off others.

Another reason for coming to the course was because of her awareness that she teaches in a school with a rich Māori tradition, and as such, there is an expectation that she moves toward fulfilling the aim of strengthening the Māori component in the programme.

Anahera describes her teaching philosophy as something that is constantly being modified. She highlights the need for children to feel safe emotionally and physically. Furthermore, from a spirituality perspective, Anahera feels that it is important that the children are proud of who they are, and have a strong self-esteem.

It doesn’t matter where they come from as long as they have a sense of self-esteem and pride, they’ll do well, and these kids do well here because we tell them they can be anything they want to be.

Prior to the course, Anahera described her approach to teaching te reo Māori as being incidental in nature. It included conducting *karakia* (prayer) each morning, *waiata*, the teaching of different phrases each week, and the learning of simple language skills such as numbers and colours. She describes the incidental nature of the integration of te reo Māori into lessons:

We try to include and integrate it rather than have a separate Māori lesson because we don’t want to see it as a separate thing. It should be part and parcel, inclusive in the programme, and that is really how we do it. We haven’t got the resources to say, “Pens down, it’s Māori time now.” We don’t want to see it as being a specialist thing rather than a natural thing.

After completing the course, Anahera was very enthusiastic about the many benefits she had gained. For Anahera, taking part in this course has resulted in a significant rise in her confidence. Whereas prior to the course, Anahera was quite shy about using te reo Māori, she now felt very comfortable using it, and in fact, would not hesitate to approach the most fluent of the Māori community—the *kaumatua* (elders) to ask for guidance. Furthermore, Anahera's overall knowledge about te reo had increased, resulting in her feeling more attuned to the Māori language. She also felt that her knowledge about methods of teaching language had increased.

Anahera listed the following areas as key areas of growth:

- Knowledge about classroom applicable games,
- How to integrate te reo Māori across the curriculum, and
- How to integrate the skills of listening, writing and oral language into her lessons.

Overall, Anahera found teaching after the course to be a more enjoyable and fulfilling experience than prior to the course. She had also been motivated enough to begin to read widely about bilingual pedagogies.

Teaching approach

When asked about what has changed in her teaching approach, Anahera discussed three areas. First, the overall quantity of te reo Māori has increased a great deal in her own teaching programme. The quantity of Māori language teaching has grown to an hour each day. Second, the te reo Māori teaching strand was far more dominant in Anahera's integrated programme. A typical lesson would now focus on a Māori sentence structure, and she integrated the skills of *whakarongo* (listening), *tuhituhi* (writing) and *kōrero* (oral language) into each. This approach was never a consideration prior to Anahera taking this PD course. Third, Māori cultural aspects of *karakia* (prayer), *waiata* (singing), *kapa haka* (dance), and group discussions about themes such as the weather were now incorporated into the programme on a daily basis through the Māori language. This marks a significant transformation in Anahera's teaching approach.

The lesson observation

Anahera provided an opportunity to be observed teaching te reo Māori after the PD course. This was one of a series of lessons based on creating miniature *korowai* (Māori cloaks), and accompanying them with a *mihi* (personal introduction).

1. With the children sitting in a horseshoe shape in the centre of the room, Anahera commences the lesson by reading a big book called *Taku Kuia* (My Grandmother) to the children.
2. At the completion of this, one of the students repeats the reading of the same book aloud to the group. This takes 10 minutes.
3. The children are then handed out the draft *mihi* sheets that they have been working on prior to this lesson, and the *korowai* that most students have

completed. The children's task is to complete their personal *mihi* that will attach to their *korowai*.

4. After 10 minutes completing this independent work, the children return as a group to share their work before transitioning to the final language activity.
5. In this activity the children are issued pictures of Māori scenes and artefacts (derived from calendars) and asked to write an accompanying description.
6. The lesson concludes after this activity.

Throughout this lesson Anahera is circulating and assisting her students. She frequently uses te reo Māori as she does so. The children are highly engaged throughout.

Analysis

The use of *korowai* and *mihi* in this lesson represents an interesting mix of integration of art and several Māori language and cultural themes. Throughout the process of the lesson the children were highly engaged in pursuing the learning themes, including the pursuit of te reo Māori. There was also a great deal of language output occurring throughout these activities in the form of written (writing *mihi*) and oral language (sharing to the class), as the children were engaged in creating their pieces of writing.

While, in general, this lesson was very successful at incorporating a mixture of language and cultural themes, from a second language teaching perspective, there were several features that require comment. The use of an interesting and visually attractive big book early in the lesson was an enjoyable element for the children, and a great resource. However, it was quite challenging for the children's level of understanding. In order to scaffold the new language elements, several more steps could have been inserted during this stage of the lesson and a focus on some of the new language structures within the text could have been included. As a consequence, this part of the lesson was essentially a listening activity which lacked any communicative element.

The second part of the lesson (the *mihi*) was a continuation of past class work on *mihimihi*. The children confidently completed this. The sharing afterwards also assisted in oral language and pronunciation practice. This part was engaging, relevant and provided enough challenge for the children. In stating this, it was independent work and, like the earlier part of the lesson, lacked a communicative thread. Some small alternations would have given it more meaning and greater practical application.

The final part of this lesson (the use of photographs to create some descriptive text) was a good concept, but it suffered from the same issue as the big book activity earlier in the lesson. This activity was not scaffolded to a high enough degree, and, as a consequence, the children's rudimentary Māori language ability meant that it was quite a challenge to complete, requiring the extensive use of Māori language dictionaries.

In summary, there were some good ideas inherent in this lesson. It was enjoyable and relevant to the children, who would have gained knowledge of the Māori language, and a reinforcement of their culture. However, the material was at

times too difficult for the students and the level of scaffolding not sufficient. Importantly though, the lesson did require the students to communicate. This is important for learning a second language, and is a key element of the communicative language teaching approach.

CASE STUDY TWO – HĒMI

Hēmi, like Anahera, described his reo Māori teaching approach as being incidental in nature prior to the professional development programme.

My instruction is delivered in Māori—just those incidental things. The *kia oras*, giving them the hurry up. All those little instructions and demands are delivered in Māori in my class, but I don't have a set time when I teach te reo unless we have to. Our school at times gets a bit of a language bent where different languages are taught at different times. We have so many other things to concentrate on and that is not an excuse for not teaching te reo, it's just I don't.

During the early part of the PD, Hēmi's personal aims included gaining confidence and skill to be able to teach te reo Māori in his classroom, based on the needs of the children. He also wished to learn to become a more proficient speaker of te reo Māori. However, he soon realised that this objective would not be met to the initial degree anticipated because teaching teachers how to speak Māori was not the central feature of the PD course.

Soon after the course had concluded, Hēmi was asked about the benefits he had gained. He highlighted the following areas:

- How to deliver a lesson incorporating te reo Māori,
- Methods and techniques that are practical and relevant and classroom ready,
- The content was accessible to non-speakers of Māori, and
- Using specific techniques, such as listening games, pronunciation techniques, etc.

Hēmi also felt that the course was highly beneficial for him personally, particularly in terms of giving him the confidence to teach and speak Māori to his students. Prior to this course, Hēmi was far more reluctant to try teaching te reo Māori. He states,

My confidence has [increased] tenfold. And the things that I came out armed with were really practical for me. And I understood what I was teaching.

Not only this, Hēmi has found that his students were also more highly engaged in learning te reo Māori. This is interesting because his class includes students from a wide range of backgrounds, including those who attended Māori bilingual schools, Māori non-speakers and Pākehā students. Hēmi's only reservation about having attended the course was that it was too short, and needed to be extended to build on his initial gains.

Teaching approach

Following the course, Hēmi stated that he was far more likely to use te reo Māori phrases when he managed the class. He also integrated more *waiata* into his lessons than previously. However, despite this, Hēmi was disappointed that because of the tight curriculum he could not find regular times in which to teach te reo Māori. He stated that only once every 10 days did he find time to teach te reo Māori.

According to Hēmi, since the course concluded, his teaching approach has changed to incorporate the following aspects into his lessons.

- Listening, speaking and writing skills components,
- Activities requiring a mixture of groupings from individual, pairs and group work,
- A balance between active learning where the students stand up and converse, and more sedentary activities for students to complete while sitting down, and
- More integration of *waiata* into his lessons to help make them enjoyable and interesting.

Hēmi also stated that he was more aware of the nature of learning languages and how sensitive and reluctant students can be when putting themselves in potentially threatening positions.

Lesson observation

Hēmi modelled a lesson for the researcher based on the theme of “body parts”. This is the sequence of events:

1. The first activity was a vocabulary-building game based on the popular game of *Pictionary*, with the theme of “body parts”. The students were grouped in small groups, and one member was called to Hēmi to receive a Māori word. He/she then returned to the group to draw a picture for them. The first group that called out the correct Māori word won a point.
2. This game lasted for 15 minutes with all students being highly involved.
3. Following this activity, a second game was commenced using the same theme (body parts). In this game an outline of a body was hung on the wall. The teacher called out a body part and a designated student had to stick the label onto the appropriate part of the body outline. This activity took 10 minutes to complete, and the students were still engaged but not to the same extent as earlier.
4. Following this activity, the class sang the action song “Māhunga pakihwi puku hope waewae” (Heads, shoulders, knees and toes) for five minutes.
5. The students then completed a photocopied worksheet requiring them to label the body parts on the sheet (five minutes).
6. Finally, a jigsaw puzzle was completed. This had the students match Māori vocabulary with the corresponding English name. It was completed before sharing occurred.

Analysis

This lesson, like that of Anahera, offers many positive attributes.

- It provided a fun and interactive means of learning the vocabulary for body parts.
- The children enjoyed the active game-like situations Hēmi created for them.
- All the activities followed the same theme and thus supported the likelihood of the children learning the new vocabulary around body parts.
- There were a number of short, brisk activities which together worked to assist in supporting the learning.
- There was a mixture of group, whole class and individual work involved here.
- Oral language (listening and speaking) was the main focus, with written language playing a minor part.

However, despite this, there are several areas that require comment.

1. All the activities had one end, which was to learn vocabulary. The ability to communicate using these new lexical items was absent from this lesson. If CLT is the central approach, then the ultimate aim of language lessons should at least include consideration towards enabling learners to express themselves in a meaningful way. Therefore, a focus on the communicative nature of language could have been further explored in or around this lesson.
2. Most activities Hēmi used seemed to be uplifted directly from the PD course content. This is fine, as that was the intention of the course creators, that the activities the teachers learn would have relevance to classroom applications. What is not clear, however, is the degree to which Hēmi has acquired teaching skills to enable him to apply them to other language learning themes. It is the transferability of the skills he has learned that is still at question here. If the teachers are not transferring skill, then the PD course loses its value and becomes one of providing some “fancy tricks” for teachers to implement in classrooms, but which will inevitably lose momentum as the demands of managing an increasingly complex workload continues. Therefore, in this case, there is a question over the extent to which Hēmi’s learning will translate to long-term effective second language teaching of Māori in the classroom.
3. A final issue concerns the quantity of time Hēmi spends teaching te reo Māori. When interviewed, Hēmi revealed that he finds time to teach te reo Māori only once in 10 days, due to the crowded nature of his teaching timetable. This indicates that the positive outcomes of this particular PD have been constrained by other commitments, thus inevitably limiting the wider- and longer-term effectiveness of the initiative.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

These two case studies show that professional development can successfully raise teachers’ abilities to teach second languages in the mainstream classroom.

However, there are many factors that can intervene to either support or restrict the long-term goal of the PD programme. Both teachers in this study advanced in their confidence and their ability to teach te reo Māori. Anahera improved to the greatest extent. She also seemed to have a greater motivation to continue to develop, which was obvious throughout the course and after its conclusion.

Hēmi also increased his confidence and knowledge of language teaching techniques. However, his growth was less marked, and not sufficient enough to enable him to adapt the skills he had learnt in the PD to daily teaching demands. Furthermore, as he seldom found time to implement his new knowledge (due to pressures on his classroom timetable), Hemi's long-term growth in this new area remains questionable.

Communicative language teaching was one key area that this course set out to introduce. Once again this objective was only partially achieved. Anahera's teaching of a *mihi* could easily have been adapted to be more communicative in nature, as could Hēmi's vocabulary-building games. However, both lessons lacked the overarching direction to make the students' language learning reflect communicative purposes. Therefore, the inclusion of a course objective such as teaching CLT techniques may require more time and practice for a course to offer more than just "fancy tricks" to the teachers.

These results raise a question of the applicability of CLT approaches to teaching curriculum content. The CLT approach is typically implemented as a second language teaching approach where language development is the focus. However, in primary school contexts, teachers are attempting to integrate language content with curriculum content. As such, the reality may be that a modification of the CLT approach may be better suited to these contexts where the subject matter of classroom studies may not lend themselves to a communicative outcome in all instances.

The varying outcomes experienced by the two teachers from this study highlight another issue: the duration and timing of the PD intervention. Both teachers felt a longer course would have provided greater growth in their abilities to teach te reo Māori as a second language. This being the case, this research would suggest that a longer-term programme (such as the 10-week PD offered in another region) might offer a greater chance of success for teachers in this regard. Both Anahera and Hēmi desired further assistance, even though they were very positive about the support they received, both in class and whilst in their schools, during the PD intervention.

This raises, once again, the wider issue concerning the task of teaching New Zealand generalist primary teachers the necessary pedagogical and content knowledge when they are themselves not able to speak te reo Māori. At the end of the course, both teachers still had "emergent"-level knowledge of te reo Māori because learning a second language takes a concerted effort over time—more than could be provided in this course. As such, both teachers struggled to teach anything beyond basic language forms. In a specialist area such as second language teaching, either additional time needs to be given to assist in this essential learning, or alternatively, only teachers who can already speak the target language, or show they are highly committed to learning and teaching (as Anahera was), should be allowed

to take part. This would improve the chances of the teachers becoming better equipped to teach Māori as a second language. This would also provide a greater chance of the new curriculum's aim to teach second languages effectively being realised in New Zealand classrooms.

REFERENCES

- Benton, R. (1996). Language policy in New Zealand: Defining the ineffable. In M. Herriman & B. Burnaby (Eds.), *Language policies in English-dominant countries* (pp. 62–98). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Ferguson, S. (2002). *Report to the New Zealand national curriculum, 2002*. Wellington, New Zealand: Australian Council of Education of Research.
- Franken, M., & McComish, J. (2003). *Improving English language outcomes for students receiving ESOL services in New Zealand schools, with a particular focus on new immigrants*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Gibbs, C., & Holt, R. (2003). *The teaching of international languages in New Zealand schools in years 7 and 8: An evaluation study*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland University of Technology.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- May, S. (2005). Bilingual/immersion education in Aotearoa/New Zealand: Setting the scene. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(5), 365–376.
- McCaffery, J., & Tuafuti, F. (1998). The development of Pacific Islands bilingual education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Many Voices*, 13, 11–16.
- McComish, J. (2004). *Literature survey on second language learning and teaching as it relates to te reo Māori as a subject in schools*. Wellington, New Zealand: Lift Education.
- Ministry of Education. (1993). *The New Zealand curriculum framework*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2002). *Learning languages: A guide for New Zealand schools*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2003). *Effective literacy practice in years 1 to 4*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum for English-medium teaching and learning in years 1–13*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Murrow, K., Kalafatelis, E., Fryer, K., Hammond, K., & Edwards, H. (2006). *Te reo Māori in the mainstream professional development pilot programmes for primary school teachers – an evaluation*. Wellington, New Zealand: Research New Zealand and Aatea Consultants Ltd.

- Peddie, R. (1997). Why are we waiting? Languages policy development in New Zealand. In W. Eggington & H. Wren (Eds.), *Language policy: Dominant English, pluralist challenges* (pp. 121–146). Canberra, ACT, Australia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Peddie, R., Gunn, C., & Lewis, M. (1999). *Starting younger: The second language learning project evaluation. Final report*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Wong-Fillmore, L., & Snow, M. A. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language*. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from ERIC Clearing House on Language and Linguistics website: ERIC document ED-99-CO-0008.

