

**Maori syllabus and curriculum documents: a critical analysis**

**Part 1: *Tihē Mauri Ora***

**Winifred Crombie**

Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao (School of Māori and Pacific Development)

*Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato* (University of Waikato)

**Diane Johnson**

Te Kura Kete Aronui (Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences)

*Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato* (University of Waikato)

**Hine Kahukura Te Kanawa**

Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao (School of Māori and Pacific Development)

*Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato* (University of Waikato)

[crombie@waikato.ac.nz; dianej@waikato.ac.nz; mtekanawa@waikato.ac.nz]

**Abstract**

This paper presents, within the context of ongoing debates on syllabus design, a critical analysis of *Tihē Mauri Ora*, a syllabus document produced by the *New Zealand Ministry of Education* to support the teaching and learning of the Māori language in schools in New Zealand. It includes a number of suggestions in relation to any future documents prepared with similar intent.

**Introduction**

Within the general field of applied linguistics, a significant area of research focuses on the complex range of factors that influence the design and implementation of language syllabuses. A major debate in which researchers are engaged relates to the nature of the language syllabus itself. Of fundamental importance here are two central questions:

- How should a syllabus specify language learning objectives?
- Can, or should, a syllabus include graded grammatical specification?

It is largely in this context that *Tihē Mauri Ora* is discussed here.

***Tihē Mauri Ora!*: intended audience**

*Tihē Mauri Ora!* (Ministry of Education, 1990) is a New Zealand Ministry of Education syllabus document published in 1990 and intended for use with students in the New Zealand education system from Junior classes (age 5+) through to Form 2 (age 12+). The writers were presented, in preparing this document, with an extremely difficult task. First, there are no specific minimum requirements in relation to the teaching of Māori language and culture in mainstream schools in New Zealand. Secondly, the background of children in relation to knowledge and understanding of Māori language and culture differs considerably as does that of their teachers. Finally, the educational contexts in which children are introduced to Maori language and culture vary widely: from mainstream classes in which the predominant language is English, through bilingual (Māori and English) classes to, more recently, Māori immersion educational settings. In each of these settings, the cultural and linguistic

expectations are very different. Thus, the syllabus designers have had to produce starter packs for teachers whose knowledge and understanding of Māori language and culture are minimal as well as a range of materials appropriate for different educational settings. In spite of all of these difficulties, one overall aim is that “future programmes should be structured to move towards achieving the aims and objectives of [the] syllabus” (Ministry of Education, 1990, p. 11). In this context, it is not surprising that the aims, and the majority of the objectives, are expressed in very general terms.

### ***Tihē Mauri Ora!*: aims and objectives**

The overall aims in relation to the production of the syllabus are articulated in the Foreword by the then Secretary for Education. These are to provide:

- a coherent and consistent framework for the teaching of Māori language in primary schools;
- a basis for the inclusion of appropriate Māori language and culture in all studies and activities across the curriculum.

The aims of the syllabus itself are:

- to enable children to understand and acknowledge tikanga Māori;
- to enable children to grow in their ability to understand and speak Māori;
- to provide opportunities for children to read and write Māori where appropriate (p. 17).

Teachers are urged to encourage their pupils to apply their knowledge of Māori language by:

- communicating their needs, feelings, and ideas clearly and with confidence in spoken Māori;
- reading and understanding written Māori;
- writing in Māori for a variety of purposes (p. 17).

Within the context of national curriculum planning, it is the objectives or outcomes that are subject to assessment. There should be ways of determining whether, and to what extent, the stated objectives have been achieved. This has important implications for the ways in which objectives are articulated. However, in the absence of national agreement that achievement by the end of Form 2 (Year 8) should be within a certain, definable range, and in the absence of minimum competency standards for teachers in the area of Māori language and culture, the syllabus designers were faced with an impossible task in attempting to specify objectives. The result is the following list of objectives:

- apply the Māori language in their everyday language environment by:
  - understanding spoken Māori;
  - pronouncing people's names and place names correctly;
  - expressing simple greetings and farewells, and useful phrases;

- communicating their needs, feelings, and ideas clearly and with confidence in spoken Māori;
  - reading and understanding written Māori;
  - writing in Māori for a variety of purposes;
  - expressing themselves creatively in speech, writing, or performance.
- 
- feel comfortable with tikanga Māori as they participate in a variety of Māori functions and cultural activities;
  - understand and appreciate Māori values and attitudes;
  - understand and respect cultural differences in New Zealand;
  - understand Māori when it is used in bilingual schools as a medium of learning and instruction (p. 17).

Some of these objectives are specific and measurable (e.g. 'expressing simple greetings and farewells and useful phrases'); some are very general (e.g. 'communicating . . . needs, feelings, and ideas clearly and with confidence in spoken Maori'). Some of the objectives, most notably the final one, appear to be beyond the scope of the syllabus itself.

What this indicates is the need for national agreement on achievement standards in the area of Māori language and culture in different contexts (mainstream, bilingual and Māori immersion). This, in turn, suggests that at least three different curriculum statements for Māori language and culture are required, each of which is appropriate to a different setting. Such an agreement would have implications for teacher education. In its absence, however, those who are given the task of producing national guidelines (in the form of curriculum statements or syllabuses) are put in an impossible situation. It is this, above all, that appears to underlie some of the inconsistencies in *Tihē Māuri Ora!* However, in spite of these inconsistencies, *Tihē Mauri Ora!* has very considerable strengths, particularly in the area of Māori culture, strengths which reflect the determination and commitment of those who were involved in its production.

### ***Tihē Mauri Ora!* and the communicative movement in language teaching**

One section of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* is headed *A Communicative Approach* (p. 23). Here it is observed that "children learn best when they see a real point in what they are saying and doing – they need to communicate real information for authentic reasons" (p. 18). In this statement, the authors align themselves with the communicative movement in language teaching, a movement that has always, irrespective of the changing definitions and attitudes that have been associated with it over time, emphasised the fact that learners should be encouraged to engage in communication in the target language, communication that has a function over and above that of language learning itself. Once again, there are problems associated with the wide range of expertise of those who are expected to implement the syllabus. In the section headed *Individual Differences* (p. 28), the syllabus writers note that "although teachers should have a mastery of the language above the level at which it is being taught, teachers and students can learn successfully together". In fact, however, teachers who do not have a high level of proficiency in the target language, who lack an in-depth understanding of the culture and who have little, if any, training in language teaching pedagogy will have serious difficulties in attempting to create an appropriate context for

communicative language learning. As the syllabus writers themselves observe, “enthusiasm is very important, but it needs to be backed up by knowledge” (p. 28). Thus, *Appendix 6 of Tihē Mauri Ora!*, which provides a list of resources for the improvement of teachers' skills, valuable though it is, cannot be regarded as a substitute for the education and training that are required to deliver an effective programme of language and culture.

At the core of the communicative movement in language teaching is the concept of ‘communicative competence’ which, as originally defined by Hymes (1971), included four central areas: knowledge of rules (formal possibility), understanding of the constraints on the application of these rules in particular contexts (implementational feasibility), appreciation of contextual appropriacy, and understanding of the performative role of utterances (i.e. the functions that language performs in particular contexts). Thus, formal accuracy is one aspect only of communicative competence. However, although Hymes stresses that rules of grammar would be useless without what he referred to as ‘rules of use’, Carroll notes that “there are rules of grammar without which the rules of use would be inoperable” (Carroll, 1980, p. 8).

It is acknowledged within the communicative movement in language teaching that language learning involves much more than control of language systems. It involves control not only of rules, but also of strategies and procedures. It involves listening and speaking as well as reading and writing. Recognition of the range of factors involved entails recognition of the fact that it is unrealistic to expect error-free production at all times. Thus, what is emphasised is the use of language for genuine communicative purposes, an aim which must be reflected throughout the curriculum: in the syllabus, in the materials and in the methodologies employed.

Communicative approaches to language teaching are centrally concerned with teaching language in order to facilitate the use of real language for authentic purposes. In this respect, they are really no different in terms of overall aim from most other approaches to language teaching. There is, however, a difference, one that relates primarily to beliefs about how best to achieve this overall aim. The vast majority of language teachers accept that classroom-based language tuition will inevitably be artificial in some respects. However, those who subscribe to the ideals of communicative language teaching generally aim to keep such artificiality to a minimum and avoid language exercises that are out of context and essentially meaning-free. Neither this, nor recognition that the needs of individual learners must be taken into account, means that careful planning of the language learning environment is redundant. Nor does it mean that accuracy must be sacrificed in the name of fluency. Certainly, it is unwise to expect too much of young learners in tutored language learning contexts. Certainly, memory and formulaic language play an important role in tutored language learning, particularly in the early stages (Skehan, 1998). However, empirical research does not support the contention that there is no need for a focus on forms in the language classroom (Celce-Murcia, 1991, pp. 460 - 461). The problem is that in the early stages of the development of communicative approaches, a significant number of language teachers believed that it did. Furthermore, there were a few applied linguists who, notwithstanding the research evidence, were prepared to endorse this position. For this reason, the communicative movement in language teaching initially undermined confidence in established practices at the same time as appearing to promise a bright new future in

which students would progress rapidly and confidently towards high levels of proficiency without the need for form-focused instruction. The reality proved to be very different.

What went wrong? In part, what was really an evolutionary movement was interpreted by some as a revolutionary one. The communicative movement in language teaching offered opportunities. There were opportunities for applied linguists, for publishers and for those language teachers who were tired of the endless battle with the complexities of language. In spite of the cautionary note sounded by a number of prominent educationalists and applied linguists, communicative language teaching took on a life of its own and began to be associated with extravagant claims and counter-claims. In some extreme cases, communicative language teaching came to be associated with an outright rejection of the lessons of the past. Over time, however, the initial hype began to be replaced by caution.

In the context of the communicative movement, the problem so far as *Tihē Mauri Ora!* is concerned is that it was produced over a ten year period during which, partly as a result of much painstaking research and partly as a result of the experiences of teachers in the language classroom, the attitudes of many of those who advocated a communicative approach to language teaching changed considerably. It became increasingly clear that creating a learning environment that encouraged learners to attempt to use real language for authentic communicative purposes need not imply an outright rejection of form-focused instruction. Nor need it involve a rejection (implicit or explicit) of the staging of learning that is characteristic of national education planning. Thus, communicative orientation could be reconciled with clearly articulated language content. That the writers of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* had difficulty in reconciling the communicative movement with form-focused instruction and the staging of language learning is evident in a number of places.

### ***Tihē Mauri Ora!*: the language component, staging and form-focused instruction**

So far as the writers of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* are concerned, there can be no doubt that culture cannot be fully appreciated in the absence of language: “the key to successful work based on taha Māori is the centrality of te reo Māori” (p. 14). Thus, teachers should not regard the language component of the syllabus as an optional extra. Nevertheless, whereas themes, settings and suggested topics are presented at three levels (pp. 36 - 41), language is not.

Some teachers may approach the themes, settings and suggested topics largely through the medium of English. If they do, an important aspect of the syllabus - the integration of language and culture - will have been lost. Others may seek to approach these themes and topics more gradually, building up language competence as they progress. If they do, they will need to make decisions in relation to language content. This will not be a straightforward matter. Certainly, the themes, settings and suggested topics have certain lexical and conceptual implications. However, apart from some vocabulary and some stereotypical, formulaic expressions (such as, for example, certain types of greeting), it will be difficult to decide what language should be introduced when, where and how. Looking at the list entitled *Grammar as Function* in *Appendix 3* (pp. 44 - 49) will help to some extent. However, apart from some question and answer forms, what we really have here is a decontextualized list

of phrases and sentences (see extract from 'Grammar as Function' in *Appendix 1* here).

Since communicative language teaching (using real language for authentic purposes) is not consistent with the imitation and repetition of sample sentences, teachers will need to find ways of providing students with access to the language code. Even if all of the teachers were fluent speakers of the language and had no other educational goals to achieve, a range of language planning decisions would have to be made. The fact that this syllabus provides little assistance in this respect suggests that the syllabus writers were influenced, to some extent at least, by the work of Krashen who has argued that, so long as the attitude and atmosphere are appropriate, language can be 'acquired' in classroom contexts by the simple device of talking meaningfully in the target language, making sure to challenge the students by using language that is a little in advance of their current level of competence (see, for example, Krashen (1981)). Exactly how this is to be achieved has never been explained. Nor has the binary divide between 'acquisition' and 'learning' ever been justified. In any case, Krashen's claims, and the research upon which they were supposedly based, have been repeatedly discredited. Thus, for example, McLaughlin (1978, p. 56) notes that "Krashen's theory fails at every juncture" and Gregg (1984, p.94) observes that "each of Krashen's hypotheses is marked by serious flaws: undefinable or ill-defined terms, unmotivated constructs, lack of empirical content and thus of falsifiability, lack of explanatory power". However, most of the painstaking work that has gone into rebutting claims of this sort has taken place since *Tihē Mauri Ora!* was initially planned and much of it has actually appeared since *Tihē Mauri Ora!* was produced. Furthermore, Krashen's approach has continued to have considerable appeal partly, no doubt, because it has come to be associated with his advocacy of minority languages, and partly because it is reassuring for those teachers who lack a secure background in language teaching pedagogy. Bearing in mind that *Tihē Mauri Ora!* was prepared throughout the 1980s, and bearing in mind that there is little point in designing a syllabus that teachers will not accept, this appeal may have been something that the writers of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* felt that they could not afford to ignore. Even so, there is evidence that they were sceptical of the more extravagant claims that had been made by Krashen and those with similar views. Thus, for example, they note that:

At school the target language *may* have to be learned, not acquired [emphasis added] (p.18).

Furthermore, they include extensive reference to language functions as well as lists of vocabulary and grammatical information. In spite of this, there remains some resistance to the idea that a staged introduction to language can be helpful:

.....as the language used for learning mirrors the child's interests and development, a fixed sequence in teaching is neither desirable nor possible - a cyclic approach which reruns language experiences with increasing confidence, fluency, and accuracy is best (p. 23).

There appears here to be a careful avoidance here of any reference to language systems. What is to be rerun is 'language experiences'. Certainly, particularly in the case of young learners, it is absolutely necessary to accommodate teaching to needs and interests. Furthermore, planning needs to be constantly revised in the light of

experience. In this respect, it is true to say that ‘a fixed sequence in teaching is neither desirable nor possible’. However, this should not be taken to mean, as some teachers may have thought, that there is no place for planning and sequencing in tutored language learning.

All good teaching involves revision as well as extension. From this perspective, it may be better talk in terms of a spiral rather than a cycle, thus emphasising the desirability of demonstrable progression. In fact, this is clearly what the syllabus writers had in mind when they observed that “teachers should revisit what has gone before, then move on to some yet unexplored aspect until, at least, the whole is complete” (p.12).

A syllabus that relates to both language and culture needs to include both in any levels framework that is produced. However, whereas *Tihē Mauri Ora!* introduces themes and settings in relation to three levels of achievement, it does not treat language in the same way (see extract from section dealing with themes, settings and suggested topics for level two in *Appendix 2* here). To have done so need not have implied that the levels needed to be treated as hard and fast (any more than is the case in relation to themes and settings). Indeed, the writers themselves observe that:

The programme for children is presented in three taumata (levels of learning and achievement). . . . These levels are not hard and fast. Teachers and children will move through them at the rate their competence allows (p. 34).

The fact that language content as such is essentially unstructured in *Tihē Mauri Ora!* seems to run counter to some of the observations that are included in the syllabus itself:

Future programmes should be *structured* to move towards achieving the aims and objectives of this syllabus [emphasis ours] (p. 11).

At school . . . language grows in *a more deliberate and organised way* [emphasis ours] (p. 18).

The writers observe that:

Teachers need to be aware . . . that *a gap may develop between what children want to talk about and their ability to express themselves. Teachers should be ready to modify their teaching approaches to take this into account* [emphasis ours] (p. 34)

In fact, in the area of language learning, the existence of a gap between desire and ability is inevitable rather than possible. The problem is, however, that that gap is unlikely to narrow significantly unless attempts to reduce it are systematic.

The lack of any suggested systematic approach to language content in *Tihē Mauri Ora!* may relate not only to the influence of Krashen and his associates, but also to the fact that the syllabus was designed to be all things to all people. Clearly, different types of learner in different educational settings need different types of syllabus. Introducing a real sense of progression into a syllabus that is designed for very

different learners in very different educational settings taught by teachers from very different backgrounds would have been extremely difficult. However, if the New Zealand Ministry of Education should ever commission a range of curriculum documents for different educational settings, there would be a real opportunity to revisit the issue of how best to deal with the need for staged, progressive and cumulative language learning. As we will indicate in a future article, a Māori curriculum statement designed largely for students in Māori-immersion contexts has now been produced. However, that curriculum statement does not fully address the issue of the need for staged, progressive and cumulative language learning. This may be because it is designed to be very similar to the English curriculum statement, a curriculum statement that was designed primarily for native speakers of English.

### ***Tihē Mauri Ora!*: syllabus design and language content**

Central to debates on communicative competence has been the question of how best to deal, in the context of language programmes, with the complex nature of communication. Vocabulary and structure had traditionally been treated as central aspects of language learning, and syllabuses that introduced structures progressively (structural syllabuses) had become the norm. However, other areas of communicative competence clearly needed to be taken into account and methodologies that treated structure in mechanistic ways needed to be replaced.

It was in this context that educationalists began to focus on different ways of organizing language syllabuses. Among these were proposals relating to task-based syllabuses, skills-based syllabuses, situational syllabuses and topic-based syllabuses. For a discussion of these, and others, see Yalden (1987). When each of these approaches to syllabus design was first introduced, it tended to be associated with an abandonment of structural progression as a central aspect of syllabus planning. Over time, however, the more extreme versions of these syllabus design proposals have been replaced by less extreme versions which acknowledge the importance of attending in meaningful ways to all aspects of language, including structure.

In *Tihē Mauri Ora!* there is evidence of the integration of a range of different approaches to syllabus design. One of the most significant of these is the notional syllabus. However, although one important aspect of the notional syllabus (the functional component) plays a significant role in *Tihē Mauri Ora!*, another (the notional component) receives much less attention. This is unfortunate because, in neglecting the notional component, the syllabus designers effectively downgraded the significance of structure in the context of the communicative agenda.

The notional syllabus proposal grew out of research on language education conducted under the auspices of the *Council of Europe* in the 1970s. It presented a challenge to a purely structural approach to the concept of syllabus. Wilkins (1973; 1974 a & b; 1976) proposed that a notional syllabus should have three main strands: *functions* (illocutionary forces of speech acts, such as ‘apology’ and ‘complaint’) *notions* (meanings that are encoded in the lexico-grammatical systems of languages such as, for example, habitual aspect encoded in the present simple in English) and modal meanings (such as, for example, *possibility* and *certainty*). The concept of a notional syllabus revolutionised language teaching in many parts of the world. However, in common with other aspects of the communicative movement more generally, it also

destabilised the language teaching profession, reducing confidence in existing approaches at the same time as introducing a raft of new problems relating to theory and practice: see, for example, Widdowson (1979), Crombie (1988), McNamara (1996). In particular, it was often implemented in an uneven way, the functional component having greater appeal than the notional and modal components for those who were in search of something fundamentally different.

One of the most significant problems relating to the notional syllabus was that of determining to what extent the notional component of the syllabus differed from structural syllabuses (syllabuses which introduced different grammatical structures gradually in addition, of course, to other aspects of language, including vocabulary). Widdowson (1979), for example, argued that although there was a fundamental difference between a structural syllabus and the notional component of a notional syllabus, that difference related primarily to organization rather than to content. Whereas a structural syllabus might list, at a specific point, a single structure associated with a single meaning (e.g. present simple in English for habitual actions or for future arrangements), the notional component of a notional syllabus might include, at a particular point, one or more ways of expressing concepts such as habitual action, *or future arrangements*, concepts that could be associated with a range of different structures. In other words, structural syllabuses tended to approach meaning through structure, whereas notional syllabuses tended to approach structure through meaning. As Widdowson observed:

Notional syllabuses are represented by their proponents as an alternative to, and an improvement on, structural syllabuses. . . . The two types of syllabus differ most obviously in the manner in which the linguistic content is defined. In the structural syllabus it is defined in formal terms, as lexical items and grammatical patterns manifesting the system. . . . In the notional syllabus, language content is defined . . . as notions which are realised by formal items (Widdowson, 1979, p. 247).

Thus, the notional component of a notional syllabus is in many ways very similar to aspects of a structural syllabus, something that has not always been clearly understood. This very fact, however, means that a syllabus which involves notions, modal meanings and functions (as well as other aspects of language) can be useful. What is likely to be less useful, however, is a syllabus that prioritises functions over other aspects of language. This is particularly so given that the functional component of a notional syllabus has limited applicability. It can be very useful where functions, such as, for example, greetings are expressed idiomatically or semi-idiomatically. It is, however, less useful and can even be even misleading where this is not the case. As Crombie (1988, p. 285) observes:

Almost any utterance can have almost any illocutionary force [function] depending on the context in which it is used. So an utterance such as 'It's hot in here' may function as a request (to open a door or a window), as a complaint, as a warning (in a paint factory, for example) etc.

Associating a particular example with a particular function can lead students to believe that it will always, irrespective of context, be associated with that function.

As a result, students may, instead of coming to terms with the economical, generative systems of language, associate particular examples with particular functions in a way that is characteristic of phrasebook learning. This is not to say that functions do not have an important part to play in language syllabuses. In fact, recent proposals relating to the role of exemplars and memory in second language contexts (Skehan, 1997) support the view that this can be the case. Indeed, the formulaic or semi-formulaic character of the functional component of many early attempts to implement the notional syllabus concept may provide a partial explanation for the initial enthusiasm of many teachers for this type of approach: formulaic language is as an effective aid to memorisation, particularly in the early stages of language learning. Nevertheless, most of the problems that can be associated with introducing language in terms of functions remain. In particular, there is a tendency to focus on those functions (such as, for example, *greetings*) which are essentially formulaic in nature at the same time as ignoring the vast lexical and syntactic variety that can be associated with others (such as, for example, *compliments*). Thus, the extremely important role that an appreciation of syntactic regularity can play in facilitating language learning may be sacrificed in favour of encouraging students to memorise sentences which are said to exemplify certain functions, even though many of these sentences can just as readily exemplify different functions in different contexts.

In *Appendix 3* (pp. 44 - 49), *Tihē Mauri Ora!* has a list headed *Grammar as Function*. This terminology is curious in that it is notions rather than functions that can be directly related to grammar. As has already been indicated, functions are contextually derived. Thus, with the exception of formulaic expressions such as greetings, it is impossible to determine what function an utterance has if it is out of context.

The section of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* headed *Grammar as Function* is made up of lists of phrases and sentences. Among these we find, for example, 'Tata tonu au te ngaro'/'I nearly got lost' as an example of 'possibility, ability'. Apart from the fact that possibility and ability are modal in character, this particular sentence could, in different contexts (like nearly all of the others) realise a whole range of different functions. It is not, for example, difficult to imagine contexts in which this sentence might function as a complaint or as a warning. Out of context, however, it does not have any function: function (except in the case of formulaic language use) is the product of the interaction between language and context. Another example of this is the sentence 'Māku e whakaweto te pouaka whakaata!'/ 'I'll turn the TV off!'. This sentence is listed under the heading of 'threat'. Certainly, in an appropriate context, this sentence could function as a threat. However, it could equally function as an inducement, an offer or some other function or combination of functions.

Why, then, do the examples listed in *Appendix 3* of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* appear to realise the functional headings under which they are listed?

First, a significant number of the sample phrases and sentences are formulaic and, in such cases, form and function coalesce. Thus, 'Tēnā koe!' can be listed out of context under the functional heading 'greeting' precisely because it is always used as a greeting.

Secondly, a number of the headings in this section relate to aspects of the core lexical or grammatical meanings of the phrases and sentences listed. Thus, for example,

under the heading of ‘like, dislike and preference’, we find the sentence ‘He pai ki a au te heihei’/‘I like chicken’. Thus, readers will have little difficulty in associating this sentence with ‘likes’. However, this is because ‘like’ is a translation of part of the core meaning of the sentence. It is not because ‘like’ is a function. In terms of function, this sentence, depending on context, could function, for example, as a suggestion or a complaint. Thus, for example, as a response to a question about what would be good for dinner, a sentence such as this would be likely to be interpreted as a suggestion. In summary, the link between some of the headings and the phrases and sentences listed under these headings relates to core meaning rather than function.

Overall, the section headed ‘Grammar as Function’ in *Tihē Mauri Ora!* is a list of decontextualized phrases and sentences grouped under headings of various types. The next section, headed *Grammar as Structure* (pp. 50 - 65) is a list made up largely of parts of speech, phrase types and sentence types. Although some of the listed sample sentences in this section indicate the importance of, for example, aspectual meaning, there is no explicit interaction between grammatical form and grammatically encoded meanings as there typically would be in structural syllabus or in the notional component of notional syllabuses.

### **Conclusion**

So far as the culture component is concerned, *Tihē Mauri Ora!* presents a very helpful framework for learning. However, the language component of the syllabus is largely made up of lists of vocabulary and decontextualized examples that are not explicitly related to the levels framework or to the other aspects of the syllabus (the themes, settings and suggested topics). The reasons for this appear to relate less to theoretical issues than to the complexity of attempting to accommodate students and teachers from vastly different backgrounds. In fact, however, a curriculum statement based on, for example, eight levels of attainment, could be designed to meet the needs of a wide range of different types of student so long as it was accepted that there would inevitably be different expectations in relation to different educational settings. Thus, whereas the early levels would be appropriate for all students, the middle levels would be appropriate for students in bilingual settings and the higher levels would be appropriate for students in Māori-immersion education settings. Of course, this would not mean that issues of teacher education could be avoided. Nor would it be preferable to having a range of different curriculum statements and syllabuses for different settings. However, it would go some way towards resolving the problems faced by the writers of *Tihē Mauri Ora!* On the assumption that this would be possible, we believe that the following guidelines might be helpful:

- an eight levels structure in which different levels of achievement were appropriate to different educational settings could be considered;
- the framework outlined by the Council of Europe (1996), a framework designed with minority as well as majority languages in mind, could be used as a guide to coverage in the area of linguistic skills and knowledge;
- objectives could be linked directly to levels and the cultural and language learning objectives could be integrated (as indicated in *Appendix 3* here which provides an example of one way in which this could be achieved).

## References

- Carroll, B. J. (1980). *Testing communicative performance*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching, *TESOL Quarterly*, 25 (3).
- Council of Europe. (1996). *Draft common European framework for modern languages*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Crombie, W. H. (1988). Syllabus and method: system or licence?, *System* 16 (3), 281-298.
- Gregg, K. (1984). Krashen's monitor and Occam's razor, *Applied Linguistics*, 5 (2), 79-100.
- Hymes, D. (1971). *On communicative competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- McLaughlin, B. (1978). The monitor model: some methodological considerations, *Language Learning* 28, 309 - 332.
- McNamara, T. (1996) *Measuring second language performance*. London and New York: Longman.
- Ministry of Education (1990) *Tihē Mauri Ora*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Skehan, P. (1997) Task-based instruction, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 17, 38-62.
- Widdowson, H. (1979). Notional syllabuses. In Widdowson, H. G. (Ed.), (1979). *Explorations in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkins, D. (1973). The linguistic and situational content of the common core in a unit/credit system. In *Systems development in adult language learning*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Wilkins, D. (1974a). Grammatical, situational and notional syllabuses. In A. Verdoort (Ed.). (1974). *Proceedings of the third international congress of applied linguistics* 2. Heidelberg: Julius Groos.
- Wilkins, D. (1974b). Notional syllabuses and the concept of a minimum adequate grammar. In Corder, S. P. & Poulet, E. (Eds.). (1974). *Linguistic insights in applied linguistics*. Brussels: AIMAV; Paris: Didier.
- Wilkins, D. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yalden, J. (1987). *Principles of course design for language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Appendix 1: Extract from 'grammar as function' in *Tihē Mauri Ora!***

<p><b>Thanks</b>  <b>Kia ora!</b> <i>Thanks!</i>  <b>Kia ora koe!</b> <i>Thank you!</i>  <b>Aroha ana!</b> <i>Thank you!</i></p> <p><b>Apology</b>  E aroha ana au mō tērā.  <i>I'm sorry for what happened.</i></p> <p><b>Weather</b>  Te makariri hoki o te rangi! <i>Is it ever cold!</i>  Tino pai te rangi, nē rā? <i>Lovely day, isn't it?</i></p> <p><b>Invitation</b>  Me haere tāua ki te mātakitaki. <i>Let's go and watch.</i>  Me kai tātou. <i>Let's eat.</i></p> <p><b>Permission</b>  Me māu koe i tōku paihikara. <i>You can take my bike.</i></p> <p><b>Belief</b>  <b>Ki a au,</b> kei te haere mai ia āpōpō.  <i>I think he's coming tomorrow.</i>  <b>Ki taku mōhio,</b> kei te haere mai ia āpōpō.  <i>As far as I know, he's coming tomorrow.</i>  <b>Ki tā</b> Eruera, kei te haere mai ia āpōpō.  <i>According to Eruera, he's coming tomorrow.</i>  <b>Te āhua nei</b> kei te haere mai ia āpōpō.  <i>He seems to be coming tomorrow.</i></p>	<p><b>Like, dislike, preference</b>  He pai ki a au te heihei. <i>I like chicken.</i>  Kāore au e pai ana ki te ika. <i>I don't like fish.</i>  <b>Ki a au nei,</b> he pai ake te heihei i te poaka. <i>I prefer chicken to pork.</i></p> <p><b>Desire</b>  Ko tōku hiahia kia haere mai a Hōne. <i>I want Hone to come.</i></p> <p><b>Hope</b>  Ko te tūmanako ōna e tuwhera ana ngā kūaha. <i>He hopes the doors are open.</i></p> <p><b>Anticipation</b>  Kei te rikarika atu rātou ki te kōnohete. <i>They are looking forward to the concert.</i></p> <p><b>Disappointment</b>  <b>Ka aroha kē</b> te pikitia. <i>A pity about the film.</i></p> <p><b>Approval, disapproval</b>  Ka pai! <i>It's great!</i>  He aha māu i mahi pēnā ai? <i>Why did you do that?.</i></p> <p><b>Concern</b>  Kei hea kē ō kākahu kaukau? <i>Where could your togs be?</i></p>
--	--

**Appendix 2: Extract from themes, settings and suggested topics at level 2 in *Tihē Mauri Ora!***

<b>Taumata Tuarua (level two)</b>				
<b>ĀHUATANGA (settings)</b>				
	<b>Kāinga (home)</b>	<b>Kura (school)</b>	<b>Papa Kāinga Māori (Māori settings)</b>	<b>Ētahi atu wāhi (other places)</b>
<b>KAUPAPA (themes)</b>	<b>TAKE (topics)</b>			
<b>Kai (food)</b>	. special food at home  example: Ngā Whakarite mō te Harakoa (getting ready for a party)	. making food at school  example: Te Mahi Hanawiti (making sandwiches)	. traditional food on the marae  example: Kei te Whakareri mō te Hākari (getting ready for the hākari)	. food outside  example: Kai Tunutunu i Waho (a barbecue)
<b>Mea kaingākautia (things one likes)</b>	. doing things with friends at home  example: Te Mātakitaki Pouaka Whakaata (watching television)	. doing things with friends at school  example: Te Mahi Manu Aute (making kites)	. meeting friends at the marae  example: Te Kōrerorero i te Marae (chatting at the marae)	. doing things outside  example: Te Kohikohi Kaimoana (gathering seafood)
<b>Ētahi huihui (getting together)</b>	. family reunions  example: Kia Hoki mai taku Tipuna (a grandparent comes home)	. sports events at school  example: Whakareri mō te Rā Tākaro (preparing for sports day)	. gatherings at the marae  example: I te Hui (at the Hui)	. special days in our community  example: Te Rā Mātakitaki (show day)

**Appendix 3: Suggestions for incorporating language learning objectives into a levels framework**

**Context: Food      Topic: Breakfast at home (1)**

**Language focus**

Structure	Function	Suggested Vocabulary	Suggested sound focus
<p>1. Imperative form eg <i>Pass me ....</i></p> <p><i>Homai..... maku.</i> <i>Homai koa.....</i></p> <p>2. Indefinite articles eg <i>a / he</i></p> <p><b>Examples:</b> <i>Homai he pereti maku.</i> <i>Homai koa he pereti.</i></p>	<p>Requests eg <i>Please, pass me a ...</i></p> <p><b>Examples:</b> <i>Homai he pereti maku.</i>  <i>Homai koa he pereti.</i></p>	<p>plate            <i>pereti</i> cup             <i>kapu</i> saucer         <i>hoeha</i> bowl            <i>kumete</i> knife            <i>naihi</i> spoon          <i>pune</i> fork             <i>paoka</i></p> <p>(Other regional or dialectal variants should also be used where appropriate)</p>	<p>Vowel sounds. Intonation pattern of imperatives and declaratives.</p>

**Skills development**

Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing
<p>For vocabulary and verb form recognition.</p> <p>Learners should be able to listen to a short text and recognise the vocabulary they have learned. They should be able to identify and respond to the verb forms they have been taught.</p>	<p>Word and utterance stress (ie equal stress on each syllable)</p> <p>Learners should be able to use the vocabulary they have learned and the verb forms being focused on in authentic situations, imitating appropriate word and sentence stress.</p>	<p>For recognition of target vocabulary.</p> <p>Learners should be able to read short dialogues containing the target vocabulary and demonstrate their comprehension of what they have read.</p>	<p>For accurate writing of vocabulary items.</p> <p>Learners should be able to write the vocabulary items they have learned.</p>

**Recycling**

Recycling
Ways of expressing thanks and acknowledgment.