



Peer-reviewed Paper

Raising Pasifika children's achievement and literacy levels: Assumptions and risks

Patisepa Tuafuti

The University of Auckland

Vaitulutulusinaolemoana Pua

The University of Auckland

Sonya van Schaijik

The University of Auckland

The purpose of this paper is to examine and critique policy makers' assumptions about raising Pasifika children's achievement and literacy levels. The paper has emerged from our disappointment in relation to the introduction in New Zealand of the 'National Standards' assessment tool, and the 'pausing' and/or 'stopping' of production of the Tupu Series Pasifika reading materials. Our concerns are in relation to the danger and risks that these decisions create for our Pasifika children. The children's parents and communities have motivated us to voice our concerns about the introduction of the unfounded/untried National Standards assessment tool in English and the attack on vital materials for our children's bilingual education. This paper begins with a brief discussion of the Tupu series and National Standards double saga, followed by our blended views of theoretical and experiential ideas. It concludes with the suggestion for Pasifika educators, and for those who teach our Pasifika children, that we all need to challenge the policy makers' decisions and/or discourses to ensure that our children's and their parents' voices are heard.

Definitions

'Tupu Series Reading materials' refers to reading materials in Pasifika languages published by Learning Media. 'Tupu' means to 'grow' in all Pasifika languages.

The term 'limits' in this paper refers to rigid ideological positions and understandings of policy makers.

'Additive bilingual education' refers to positive programmes with goals of biliteracy, academic success and language maintenance. 'Additive bilingualism' is being able use both languages (a Pasifika language and English) without losing and/or replacing a Pasifika language with English (Cummins, 2000; McCaffery and Tuafuti, 2003; Tuafuti and McCaffery, 2005).



Introduction

Raising Pasifika children's achievement and enabling access to language/bilingual education continue to fuel debates in the New Zealand educational arena for Pasifika parents and teachers. Assumptions used as basis for the ceasing and/or stopping of the Tupu Series reading materials production appear to range from a renewed focus on the low levels of English literacy of Pasifika children, to viewing the prescribed National Standards assessment tool in English as the answer to fixing the problem of low educational achievement. The 'fixities' or rigid views inherent in such assumptions show the context and power relations of a system that predisposes English speaking children to access and success, and restricts minorities such as Pasifika children by not validating their language, cultures, prior-knowledge, beliefs and values. Thus our parents see our children, Pasifika children, predestined by the powerful to be failures or children with 'low levels of literacy.' This commonly used phrase, in fact, refers to low levels of 'English' literacy.

The assumptions underlying these 'fixities' highlight issues of social injustice and how rigid ideological positions limit understandings of possible causes of bilingual Pasifika children's low levels of English literacy. Such 'fixities' from education policy makers are apparent in the powerful statements, such as *[T]he national standards are here to stay'... '...the fact is that Pasifika students' literacy levels are consistently and significantly lower than those of other groups.'*

These 'powerful' discourses are a refusal to acknowledge national and international research on the importance of languages in people's lives, and the realities of the Pasifika multilingual homes and educational contexts in New Zealand. We as Pasifika educators are intellectually stressed and extremely tired of listening to flawed and discriminatory discourses about us and our children. Sometimes we just want to sweep such issues and powerful statements 'under a carpet' and 'turn the other cheek.'

Based on our frustrations and concerns for our children and their parents, we met to discuss our ideas informally and drafted this paper through asking ourselves questions: have the pre-mentioned powerful fixities or assumptions worked to solve the problem of Pasifika children's low levels of (English) literacy in the past? Does ignoring the issues solve the problem? Our response was NO! As Pasifika educators, we have commitments, responsibilities and obligations to our Pasifika children and their parents and hence we must disrupt the limited views of policy makers regarding bilingual families and draw attention to the hidden agenda behind powerful but flawed statements on literacy.

Throughout the process of writing this paper, we asked more questions to guide our collaborative writing process:

1. Do such powerful discourses mean that all Pasifika children need to learn English and English only?
2. What do the terms 'success' and 'literacy' mean in those discourses?
3. What about Pasifika languages, cultures, identities and continuity of communities in Aotearoa/New Zealand?



4. What benefit to identity, languages, and family cohesion do such discourses and this view of 'success' refer to?
5. If the **Tupu Series** reading materials did not align with the government's priority outcome of every child achieving literacy and numeracy levels that enable their success, then what resources would?
6. Who makes the decisions of choosing these resources?

Pausing and/or stopping of the production of the Tupu Series occurred within a few months of the change in the Pasifika Plan 2009-2012 and the introduction of National Standards. We strongly believe that these acts by the policy makers are a double attack on Pasifika children and their parents. Why do such flawed decisions based on a deficit view of Pasifika bilingualism still exist in the 21st century? How will National Standards solve the problem of low achievement in English literacy? With all the questions stated above weighing heavily on our minds, we were conscious that we were the advocates for our quiet and silenced Pasifika children, their parents and community.

The combination of thoughts and responsibilities that have made this paper come to life is generated from our diverse lived experiences as Samoan speakers. Although we are all Samoans, we grew up and were educated differently. Thus the weaving of different but important threads of knowledge has helped us to co-construct, deconstruct and reconstruct our thoughts to ensure that our representation of the voices of Pasifika children and their parents is well founded.

We begin the discussion with a brief background of the Tupu series reading materials, followed by a brief review of concerns about National Standards. Next we review theoretical perspectives on existing dominant discourses by the policy makers, some of which have influenced the ideology of some influential Pasifika educators and parents. We then provide a review of what research says about the roles of first languages, literacies and additive bilingual education in Pasifika children's academic success.

The Tupu Series reading materials

A series of learning materials for students who belong to Pasifika communities in New Zealand (and other students learning a Pasifika language in New Zealand ECE services and schools), known as the Tupu Series, has been produced since 1988. In their report to the Ministry of Education on priorities for Pasifika early childhood education, Meade, Puhipuhi, and Foster-Cohen (2003) discuss why the Tupu series reading materials are significant resources in Pasifika early childhood education and the community. The reading materials are written by Pasifika writers, illustrated by Pasifika artists and published in five Pasifika languages: Samoan, Tongan, Niue, Cook Island and Tokelauan. Stories and music in Pasifika languages by Pasifika actors and musicians are recorded on audiocassettes and are available to all schools and ECE Centres.

In October 2010, the Ministry of Education (MoE) announced that they would stop production of the Tupu series materials from the end of 2010. The Ministry based its decision on 'their' fact that the materials did not fit with their priorities of 'numeracy' and 'literacy.' A number of complaints and concerns from Pasifika educators and families about the MoE decisions have been discussed publicly



on the *Human Rights* website; on the *Teachers Union* website; on the *Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOLANZ)* website; in the *Leo Pasifika* or *Pacific Voice* magazine; and on the *bilingualaoteaoroa* website. Support messages from international experts on bilingual education and languages are also available on the *bilingualaoteaoroa* website, which is organised and managed by Sonya van Schaijik.

Several Pasifika families expressed their concerns personally through letters to the Minister of Education, but disappointingly the same responses were given to each one of them: firstly, that the Tupu series materials did not fit with their priorities of literacy in English; and secondly, that 'Pasifika students' (English) literacy levels are consistently and significantly lower than those of other groups.' Copies of these letters and responses from the Minister are available on the wiki pages of *bilingualaoteaoroa*.

Judy McFall and John McCaffery of the University of Auckland organised a petition to parliament calling for the continued production of the Tupu series reading materials and *Leo Pacific* launched the petition in December 2010. Many Pasifika educators and various Pasifika communities have shown their support through signing the petition, voicing their concerns on radio programmes and in Pasifika language newspapers, and sharing their thoughts in various community meetings.

National standards

The introduction of National Standards assessment has ignited hot debate amongst Pasifika educators and policy makers. Statements from *Leo Pasifika* (2010, 4(1)) on National Standards highlight many issues that would affect our Pasifika children and their families due to the unrealistic levels of National Standards. *Leo Pasifika* is the Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs (MIPA) magazine, and the September/October 2010 edition discusses the Tupu series and National Standards issues and how they would influence our Pasifika children and their parents. The arguments highlight policy makers' lack of knowledge about additive bilingual education and bilingualism, and their reluctance to pay attention to extensive research on bilingualism and bilingual education that is already available to the Minister through the MoE research division together, with a growing number of bilingualism and bilingual education commissioned reports.

An open letter written by assessment experts to the Minister of Education also highlights concerns and contains a warning about National Standards. A copy of this letter by Martin Thrupp, John Hattie, Terry Crooks and Lester Flockton, dated 23 November 2009, is available on the Education Review website. The letter highlights the flaws in the National Standards system and raises concerns that the system will likely have dangerous side effects, such as repeating the historical labelling of many minority children, like Pasifika, as failures. In addition John Hattie (2009) in his paper titled *Horizons and whirlpools: The well-travelled pathway of national standards* states more positive answers and challenges for the policy makers and advises that further development work is absolutely vital before schools are asked to implement National Standards. Other concerns and suggestions for positive ways forward for Pasifika education in relation to policy



makers and decision making processes are discussed in May (2002) and McCaffery and Tagilau McFall-McCaffery (2010).

Despite the Pasifika community petition, support messages from experts on assessment, literacies and bilingual education, and a huge amount of research on the importance of languages in academic success and people's lives, the Minister and MoE still have shown no attempts to explore the issues of the Tupu Series reading materials and National Standards, or resolve the complaints.

What does research say? Our blended framework:

Our responses to the issue of the 'pausing' of the Tupu Series reading materials and National Standards lie within the complexity of theoretical and cultural traditions and perspectives on power and social justice. Our blended framework is underpinned by the significant poststructuralist ideas that help us to critically question why there are still these types of 'limits' to policy makers' understandings about Pasifika children's educational achievements.

Theorists such as Michel Foucault, and others who began the post-structuralism movement in the 1960s, have taught us about the importance of acknowledging one's limits and doing something about them, because limits are the core beliefs that need opening up to other possibilities in order to make a difference to peoples' lives (Foucault, 1972). Poststructuralist ideas do not exist without structuralist ideologies. The structuralist prescriptions put forward by the policy makers – that National Standards rather than the Tupu series reading materials will raise Pasifika children's achievements – need to be disrupted and challenged. These limits or fixities in the thinking informing current policy relating to Pasifika education are dangerous because they contribute to low achievement and destroy our children's identities and life-long bilingual skills; and intergenerational connections.

To disrupt structuralist limits, we as Pasifika educators need to use poststructuralist ideas to explore the world behind the words and the meanings behind the quietness of our Pasifika parents/community. We drew on some vital discussions from Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) research. CDA theory is the study of language in its relation to power and ideologies (Fairclough, 1995; Gee, 1999; Pacini-Ketchabaw & Armstrong-de Almeida, 2006). We utilised CDA theory as an analytical tool to explore the Minister and MoE explicit discourses in relation to the Tupu Series and National Standards. We interpreted and discussed the injustice in the relationship between the dominant monolingual power and our Pasifika parents and communities. The current powerful discourses in relation to the Tupu Series and National Standards have repeatedly reminded us of our Pasifika children's history of low achievement in the New Zealand educational system, which to us as Pasifika educators is not the children's failure but the failure of the educational system.

We also used CDA theoretical perspectives to question and critique influential Pasifika educators and communities' decisions to support the ceasing of the Tupu Series. Pasifika language ideologies that have resulted from colonisation and monolingualism perpetuate monolingual beliefs which are commonly practised by our Pasifika educators and families. Because these ideologies are embedded, without realising it influential Pasifika people have voluntarily



practised the coercive power (See Cummins, 2000; Foucault, 1972; and May, 2000 for further discussion on relationships between language, power, dominant monolingual discourses and silenced minority groups).

If the Minister and MoE have based their decisions on the belief that Pasifika languages and cultures do not have value or legitimacy within the literacy component of the New Zealand educational system, then we as Pasifika educators need to find ways to express the value and legitimacy of our languages and cultures for the sake of our children and future Pasifika generations. Hence, we determinedly make an effort to alert policy makers and influential Pasifika educators and families to 'limits' to thinking and policy decisions and to bring their attention to current research in languages and critical literacies.

We are our languages and literacies.

Our languages and literacies belong to us as Pasifika people.

Language, power and bilingualism

Languages)are never free from political power and economic debates, as May (2001) reminds us:

...debates about language education are never simply about language or even education but are always situated within a wider context of power relationships and an ongoing contest for recognition, rights and resources (p.372).

One side could argue that English is the international language of communication and trading, thus every child must develop high levels of literacy in English as quickly as possible. The other side could argue that there are more than 150 research reports since the work of Lambert in the 1960s, which consistently highlight that children who continue to develop their abilities in more than one language have social, cultural, economic and cognitive advantages over monolingual children.

The latest national project *on Language Enhancing the Achievement of Pasifika' (LEAP, 2007)* by Johanne McComish, Professor Stephen May and Dr Margaret Franken summarised the work of Peal and Lambert (1962) and others. The summary includes a discussion of four key areas from research highlighting why bilingual learners in additive bilingualism and biliteracy programmes outperform monolingual children. These are: cognitive flexibility, metalinguistic awareness, communicative sensitivity and field independence. (McComish, May & Franken, 2007).

Baker, (2000) also reviews Peal and Lambert's (1962) research on French/English bilingualism and concludes, "bilingualism provides greater mental flexibility, the ability to think more abstractly, the capacity to think independently of words, and superiority in concept formation" (pp.66-69). Peal and Lambert's argument was that a well founded and "enriched bilingual and



bicultural experience benefits the development of intelligence” (Baker, 2000, p.69). Although their work was based on the French/English Canadian bilingual programmes, our argument is that the relationship between language and cognition for bilingual learners is not about ethnic groups and/or race.

A huge body of research on additive bilingual education and relationships between power and knowledge highlights that bilingual children have academic success when connections are made:

1. between literacies and children’s identities
2. between children’s first language (L1) and their second language (L2)
3. with children’s L1 & L2 basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP)
4. between pedagogical practice and children’s prior knowledge, allowing children to voice their languages in class rather than hiding them
5. with use of collaborative empowerment models to voice parents’ aspirations and expectations
6. for genuine ‘shared vision’ partnerships between the powerful and powerless, instead of tokenism. (See Aukuso, 1999; Cummins, 1981, 1987,1996, 2000; Esera, 2001; Hunkin-Tuiletufuga, 2001; Lambert, 1977; May, 2001 & 2002; May, Hill and Tiakiwai, 2004; McCaffery, 2000; McCaffery & Fuatai, 2002; McCaffery, Tuafuti et al. 2003; McCaffery & Tagilau McFall-McCaffery, 2010; Spolsky, 1989; Tuafuti & McCaffery, 2005; and Tuafuti, 2000, & 2010).

Conceptualising literacies

Kutz (1997) states that in the “early medieval period, the term literacy was seen as related exclusively to knowing Latin, and to be literatus was to be able to read and write that language” (p.8). Green (cited in Nicoll and Wilkie, 1991) claims that “reading and writing are the greatest tools of learning that human beings possess and when they are used with listening, talking and thinking, literacy is in action” (p.vii).

Any definition of the term literacy is debatable. The concept of literacy is not singular but plural, relative to different languages, cultures, traditions and values. Theories on critical literacies conclude that there is no one definition of literacy. Critical literacies are about bringing children’s languages, texts and traditional, cultural and background knowledge to life in classrooms, thereby challenging exclusionary viewpoints implicit and explicit in ‘text’. In a comprehensive discussion of what literacy is, Baker (1995) writes that to some cultures literacy is about reading, writing and promoting abstract thought, rationality and critical thinking; while to other cultures, literacy is about oral language, memorisation, and transmission of beliefs and values that illuminate the knowledge of heritage and ethics. In certain religions, literacy can be about the delivery of rules of religion and conduct, or how to act with integrity (see also Baker, 2001; Baker & Prys-Jones, 1998; Nicoll & Wilkie, 1991; Diaz & Harvey, 2007; Knobel and Healy, 1998; Gibbons, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Tuafuti, McCaffery, 2000; McCaffery & Fuatai, 2002; Tuafuti, 2000).

These are conceptual differences about literacies, and it appears that viewing the two conceptual systems as excluding each other may have caused



misleading decisions when it comes to fostering Pasifika children's achievements. The consequences are that some children succeed in one system (home language and cultural knowledge) and fail the other (school English; or vice versa). Some fail in both systems. The view that literacy is just about reading, writing and promoting abstract thought can be used to undermine the latter system, which is about transmission and learning of cultural values and beliefs through home literacies. Pasifika languages are about identities. Identities are linked to people as whole beings with a past, a present and a future. Language/s keep peoples connected to their lands, families and their world-views.

The International Reading Association (2010), the world's foremost organisation on literacy, has made the following declaration:

The International Reading Association urges that initial literacy instruction be provided in a child's native language whenever possible. Research in the field of bilingual education and literacy leads to the conclusion that while initial literacy instruction in the second language can be successful, it carries with it a higher risk of reading problems than does beginning with a child's first language...

Despite research affirming the significance of making links between literacies and identities and the recommendation that children's English literacy depends highly on the levels of their first languages literacies, Pasifika language retention is still at risk in New Zealand (Bell, Davis & Starks, 2000; May, 2002b; Taumoeofolau, Starks, Davis & Bell, 2002). Additionally, McCaffery & Tuafuti (2003) and May, Hill & Tiakiwai (2004) have findings from research projects that identify educational gaps and failures in English literacy of Pasifika and Maori children in mainstream school settings.

Tagoilelagi-Leota, McNaughton & Farry (2005) in their research on transition from an ECE immersion setting to mainstream classroom have noted the slow progress of home language literacy due to English-only programmes. Such research shows that not only have Pasifika children started to lose their first language/s but also their literacy levels in English remain low. Those who make decisions about raising achievement of Pasifika children must take the issue of the two different conceptual systems of literacies seriously. It is not a case of either English or home languages. Strong identities and strong biculturalism are founded in successful bilingualism. Our children and families should not have to make a detrimental choice for the futures of their children.

Literacies' Challenges

The question that policy makers and advisers ask should not be 'how do we improve Pasifika children's English literacy?'; but rather 'how do we improve Pasifika children's L1 and L2 literacies?' International and national literature is clear: investing in Pasifika children's languages, cultural beliefs, values and their individual and communal lived-experiences is one strategy to overcome the low achievements of our children.



‘O le tama a le manu e fafaga i fuga o la’au ao le tama a le tagata e fafaga i upu ma tala.’

The above Samoan proverb says that the young of animals are fed with pollens and berries but the young of humans are fed with words and stories.

Feeding our children with words and stories goes beyond a monolingual definition of literacy. Literacies to us as Pasifika people are about our language, cultural values, beliefs, identities, our stories and lived-experiences. These literacies need to be blended with literacies as they are understood in mainstream education in order for our children to succeed academically while still maintaining our languages, cultural beliefs and values. For example, educators can use the knowledge and cultural literacy practices and texts that our children are familiar with, to acquire and/or promote reading, writing and abstract thinking skills. The documenting in books of Biblical verses that are memorised for White Sunday celebrations, as well as commonly told legends and stories of everyday New Zealand life, can be successfully utilised in classrooms to enhance reading comprehension and critical thinking. Le Tagaloa, Tui Atua Tamasese and other Samoan indigenous writers emphasise the importance of making links in health and education to our people, their lands, extended families and cultural practices. We are sure that there are similar writings by other Pasifika ethnic groups that highlight the significance of making such connections.

What are our parents and/or communities doing in response? Making ‘nothingness’ into something.

Some of our parents have already joined the debates and are articulating their concerns over the National Standards and the stopping of the Tupu Series production. Some we know are listening to the radio regularly for updates on how to respond to reporting that their children are “not meeting the standards.” Others may have watched the news and discussions on television, or have been informed through reading national and regional newspapers. Others may have no idea of what is going on.

Even silences and unspoken words have huge meanings (see Dauenhauer, 1980; Hall, 1981; Jaworski, 1993; 1985; Sunkim, 2002; and Tuafuti, 2010). Speaking without speaking, or doing nothing, is not a new phenomenon to Pasifika parents. An example from Tuafuti’s current study on listening and hearing parents’ voices in relation to the development of Samoan bilingual/immersion units in New Zealand, might begin to explain what we are trying to articulate:

An extract from interviews with parent(s)

Matua/parent: Na sau la ma tama mai le a’oga i le isi aso fai mai ua ave ese ia mai le vasega bilingual ae ave i le vasega special ma te le manana’o i se vasega special ma te manana’o i la ma tama e a’o lana faasamoa.....

Our child came home from school one day and told us that s/he was moved from the bilingual unit into the special class...we don’t want a special class we want our child to learn the fa’asamoa..



*Fesili/Question O le a la le lua mea na fai?
So what did you do?*

*Matua/parent: E leai se mea.. ia o le a le mea a fai ...na o le ita a ma
nofonofo.. o le pulea'oga le mea... e leai se paoa o se isi
Nothing... what could we do.... just get angry and do
nothing.....it's the principal...we have no power...*

In 1995, a national survey of Maori and Pacific language demands for educational services found that over half of the 550 Pasifika respondents wanted their children to succeed academically. Although, as Hunkin-Tuiletufuga (2001) reports, some Samoan parents have come to believe that English is the only language of success, this understanding cannot go unchallenged.

During the debates over National Standards and the 'pausing' of the Tupu Series, some of our parents might appear to be doing nothing, but we can hear them loud and clear. MoE, advisers and policy makers may perceive that our parents have somehow agreed to assessment of their children's learning using National Standards, or have agreed to the stopping of production of the Tupu Series reading materials. However, we read and comprehend the worlds between the words and say that behind the 'nothingness' of parents' responses, a dangerous silence speaks loud and clear with meaningful messages and recognition of disempowerment. The parents in the study quoted above claim that they did 'nothing,' but they did do something: they got angry. Being angry and not confronting an issue was a sign of frustration, though it might appear as if they could not be 'bothered'. Showing respect for teachers and authorities was the only position they felt was left for them, thus they said nothing, although they disagreed with the school's decision and wanted their child in the bilingual class.

It is our responsibility as Pasifika educators to make the 'nothingness' of parents' silences into our business, and to be 'bothered' on their behalf. If we want to understand our Pasifika parents, we need to hear the languages of the minds, the thoughts and feelings, and give that 'nothingness' volume.

We ask ourselves: were there issues in the past about Pasifika education policies and strategies that we could hear but didn't 'bother' with because we were focused on our educational work? We have no doubts that there were a few. But now, at this point in time, listening to the discourse associated with National Standards and stopping of the Tupu Series production, we are extremely bothered. We have made an effort to challenge the explicit powerful discourse evident in these decisions because we cannot shift 'limits' in thinking behind the policy-making that remain hidden. We can assume and interpret these 'limits' by analysing the powerful nature of the deficit discourses that accompany these decisions. As passionate advocates for Pasifika languages, we cannot just sweep such powerful and discriminating discourses about our children under the carpet. As Pauline Gibbons said in her keynote speech at the 1998 Community Languages and English Speakers of Other Languages (CLESOL) conference at Massey University, Palmerston North: "language is too powerful to be left in the hands of the powerful."



Conclusion

We are not trying to be too philosophical; neither are we looking at bald facts. Instead we are searching for meaning and understanding because we can feel the pain in our veins as our heritages (the life blood) are drained from our children and us. Our research and advice are ignored and we feel that we have been handcuffed on the sidelines in our efforts to raise our children's achievements, and to support their parents and communities. We feel that we have been victimised by the 'limits' of policy makers: by the simplistic, coercive and powerful colonising responses to educational, economical and social changes.

So what can we do as Pasifika educators? Stephen May (1999, 2000 & 2002) and McCaffery and Tagilau McFall-McCaffery (2010) provide some answers to such questions. One thing that we could say as a group is that if the education authorities wish to speak, plan and strategise about Pasifika children's achievements, then they must listen to the children, their parents and communities *after* they have been well informed and are able to make informed choices.

We fear that our Pasifika languages and culture cannot survive for another 50 plus years if we continue using and admiring the language of the colonizer at the expense of our own languages. We cannot foster and develop effective additive bilingual programmes unless everyone involved in the education of our children comes to understand the issues of languages and identities, and the influences of coercive power. We need to challenge and disrupt the discourses of the powerful, which tell us we are powerless. We need to unite and work together to move the huge heavy rock of ignorance and discrimination that is blocking ways forward for the Ministry of Education, the families and Pasifika peoples' progress as citizens of New Zealand. We can make something of 'nothingness.'

We would like to conclude this paper with some encouraging words from our Head of State Le Afioga-Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Ta'isi.

Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese's Taisi (2009, p. 91) says that if people "seriously want better outcomes for Pacific young people and their families, then policy settings that influence them need to be congruent with their world."

Policy settings are for human beings, and need to be congruent with the worlds of those human beings. People should draw on the strengths, understandings and meanings of their worlds and have their own role models leading. If this approach is adopted, Pacific peoples will offer rich new paradigms, greater diversity and colour in practice, and the warm connections of humanity with land, sea and spirituality. *E iloa le lima lelei o le tufuga i le soofau—the mark of good statecraft is shown in blending idiosyncrasy* (p.9).



References

- Aiono-Iosefa, S. (2001). *Ko e pusi haaku*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Aukuso, S. (1999). *O le Taiala Samoan bilingual unit: A case study of the dual medium programme in the New Zealand context* (Unpublished Master's thesis). The University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundation of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2000). *The care and education of young bilinguals: An introduction for professionals*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. and Prys Jones, S. (1998). *Encyclopaedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, V. (2000). *Kakau he vaikaukau*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Bell, A., Davis, K., and Starks, D. (2000). *Language of the Manukau region: A pilot study of use, maintenance and educational dimensions of languages in South Auckland*. Manukau City: Wolf Fisher Research Centre, University of Auckland.
- Blackledge, A. (2001). *Literacy power and social justice*. Staffordshire: Trentham Book.
- Collier, V. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, 509-531.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting success for language minority students. In C.S.D.O. Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Los Angeles, CA: California State Department of Education.
- Cummins, J. (1987). Bilingualism, language proficiency and metalinguistic development. In P. Romel, M. Pali, & D. Aarson (Eds), *Childhood bilingualism: Aspects of linguistics, cognitive and social development* (pp. 57-73). Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy. Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Dauenhauer, B. P. (1980). *Silence: The phenomenon and its ontological significance*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Esera, I. O. F. (2001). *Acquisition of English proficiency by students from Samoan speaking homes: An evaluative study* (Unpublished master's thesis). Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Truth and power: selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Fuemana-Foa'i, L. (2001). *Tau kukukuku he ako*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Gee, J. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Working with ESL children in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.
- Hall, E. (1981). *The silent language*. Los Angeles, CA: Dell Publishing Group.
- Hattie, J. (2009, October). *Horizons and whirlpools: The well-travelled pathway of national standards* (Unpublished paper). University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Hunkin-Tuiletufuga, Galumalemana, (2001). *Pasefika languages and Pasefika*



- identities. contemporary and future challenges. In MacPherson et al (Eds.), *Tangata o te moana nui: The evolving identities of Pacific peoples in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- International Reading Association. *Second-Language Literacy Instruction*. Retrieved November 5, 2010, from <http://www.reading.org/General/AboutIRA/PositionStatements/SecondLanguagePosition.aspx>
- Jaworski, A. (1993). *The power of silence: Social and pragmatics perspectives. Language and language behaviours*. Newbury Park: Sage Publication.
- Jone-Diaz, C. J., and Harvey, N. (2007). Other words, other worlds: Bilingual identities and literacy. In L. Makin, C. J. Diaz & C. McLachlan (Eds.), *Literacies in childhood: Changing views, challenging practice* (pp.203-216). Sydney, New South Wales: MacLennan & Petty.
- Knobel, M., and Healey, A. (1998). *Critical literacies in the primary classroom*. Newton, New South Wales, Australia: Primary English Teachers Association.
- Kutz, E. (1997). *Language and literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton Cook Heinemann.
- Lambert, W. (1977). The effects of bilingualism on the individual: Cognitive and sociocultural consequences. In P. Hornby (Ed.), *Bilingualism: Psychological, social and educational implications*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Learning Media. (2010). *Tupu Series*. Retrieved November 5, 2010, from <http://www.learningmedia.co.nz/our-work/case-studies/tupu>
- Le Tagaloa, A. F. (1996). *O Motuga-Afa*. Alafua Western Samoa: Lamepa Printing Press.
- May, S. (1999). *Critical multilingualism: Rethinking multicultural and anti-racist education*. London: Farmer Press.
- May, S. (2000). Accommodating or resisting minority language policies: The case of Wales. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 3(2), 101-128.
- May, S. (2001). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism, and the politics of language*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited
- May, S. (2001b, October). *Bilingualism or language loss? Pasifika communities and bilingual education*. Keynote address presented at the first Ulimasao National Pasifika Bilingual Education Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.
- May, S. (2002). Where to from here? Charting a way forward for language and education policy in Aotearoa/New Zealand. A paper presented at the CLESOL conference, Wellington, New Zealand.
- May, S., Hill, R., & Tiakiwai, S. (2004). *Bilingual/Immersion education: Indicators of good practice. Final report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- McCaffery, J. (2000). *Critical literacy: A NZ response*. Paper presented at the 18th World IRA Congress on Reading, Auckland, New Zealand.
- McCaffery, J. and Tuafuti, P. (1998). The development of Pacific Islands bilingual education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *Many Voices* 13, 11-16.
- McCaffery, J and Fuatai, N. (2002). *Read write succeed*. Keynote address presented at the Ulimasao First National Pasifika Bilingual Education Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.
- McCaffery, J., Tuafuti, P., in association with Maihi, S., Elia, L. N., & Aukuso, S. (2003). Samoan children's bilingual language and literacy development. In R. Barnard & T. Glynn (Eds.), *Bilingual children's language and*



- literacy development* (pp. 80-107). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- McCaffery, J. and Tagilau McFall-McCaffery, J. (2010). O tatou ö aga'i i fea? 'Oku tau ö ki fe? Where are we heading? Pacific languages in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *AlterNative*, 6, 86-121.
- McComish, J., May, S., & Franken, M. (2007). *LEAP: Language enhancing the achievement of Pasifika*. Wellington: Learning Media.
- Meade, A., PuhīPuhī, H., & Foster-Cohen, S. (2003). *Pasifika early childhood education: Priorities for Pasifika early childhood education research. Report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. *Parents: National Standards*. Retrieved on November 5, 2010, from <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/Parents/YourChild/ProgressAndAchievement/NationalStandards.aspx>
- Ministry of Pacific Island Affairs. *Leo Pasifika*. Retrieved November 5, 2010, from [http://www.minpac.govt.nz/Leo Pasifika MPIA](http://www.minpac.govt.nz/LeoPasifikaMPIA)
- NZEI-TE RIU ROA New Zealand Education Institute. *National Standards: Will National Standards make a difference to your child's learning?* Retrieved November 5, 2010, from <http://www.handsupforlearning.org.nz>
- Nicoll, V., and Wilkie, L. (1991). *Literacy at home and school*. Rozell, New South Wales: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., and Armstrong de A. (2006). Language discourses and ideologies at the heart of early childhood education, *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 9(3), 310-341.
- Peal, E., and Lambert, W. (1962). The relation of bilingualism to intelligence, *Psychological Monographs*, 76, 1-23.
- Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sunkim, M. (2002). *Non-western perspectives on human communication*. Manoa, HI: University of Hawai'i Manoa.
- Tagoilelagi-Leota, F., McNaughton S., and Farry, S. (2005). Bilingual and Biliteracy development over the transition to school. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(5), 455-479.
- Taumoefolau, M., Starks, D., Davis, K., & Bell, A. (2002). *Linguistics and language maintenance: Pasifika languages in Manukau, New Zealand*. *Oceanic Linguistics*, 41(1), 15-21.
- Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students* (NCBE Resource Collection Series Number 9). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse.
- Tuafuti, P. (2000). Bridging the dichotomy between modern and traditional literacies in Samoan and English. *Many Voices*, 15, 10-14.
- Tuafuti, P., and McCaffery, J. (2005). Family and community empowerment through bilingual education. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(5), 480-503.
- Tuafuti, P. (2010). Pasifika additive bilingual education: Unlocking the culture of silence. *MAI Review*, retrieved February 4, 2010 from <http://review.mai.ac.nz>
- Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese. (2000). *Talanoaga ma Gaopoa*. Apia, Western Samoa: Lamepa Press.
- Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese. (2002, September 22). *In search of meaning, nuance and metaphor in cultural competencies*. Paper presented at the Health Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.
- Tui Atua Tupu Tamasese Ta'isi. (2009). *Suesu'e Manogi: In search of fragrance*. Apia: The National University of Samoa Centre for Samoan Studies.