

EMERGING EMPOWERMENT MODELS OF LITERACY - TIME TO FAREWELL TESL?

*John McCaffery, Senior Lecturer, Department of Language and Literacy,
Auckland College of Education*

The essential thesis of this paper is that literacy development for speakers of language other than English who wish to learn English as a target language, is a social, cultural and political process and not the pure natural linguistic process TESL/TESOL has often portrayed it to be. In this perspective the emerging empowerment models of literacy seem to be able to provide the most valuable contexts within which to organise programmes for such learners. The paper argues that the use of the terms TESL/TESOL and the associated primary language focused programmes must be expanded in much more inclusive frameworks which take account of the social, cultural and political contexts of literacy both in the school and in the wider society if our learners are to be truly empowered.

One of the most frustrating experiences for groups of new learners of English as a second language, is the way in which the rules keep changing as the majority group refines and debates the nature of the task facing these learners and the panacea best suited to them. First, learning English was portrayed as learning a finite set of grammatical rules and associated vocabulary in order to be able to read and write English. Later, the task was described as learning oral patterns from which grammatical rules could be deduced. Next, we saw the growth of grammatical and communicative competence. Vocabulary growth followed, becoming a prime determiner. Socio-linguistic investigations spelled out the increasing complexity of the language learning task. Situational syllabuses explored and tried to set phrases for every situation a learner could face. English for Special Purposes also became very popular. National/Functional Syllabuses explored the uses we put language to. Suggestiopedia, The Silent Way, an explosion of new approaches were explored. Task oriented approaches took a task based approach to the issue. Bilingual Education research presented the findings that many learners of English may well do better in programmes that also provided for their heritage languages maintenance and development. Today, writers are saying we have missed out the essential social cultural and political contexts of the task. Critiques of all these approaches abound and the groups we served must wonder what comes next.

Part of the deceit perpetuated on these learners has been the desire of the teaching profession to define at each stage the nature of the task and the limits on it *as absolute and only requirements for success in New Zealand society*. The nature of this argument can be set out as in the following ideology about literacy:

- 1 Literacy is essentially a social, cultural and political neutral process.
- 2 There is essentially one type of literacy that is needed for success in life.
- 3 Social inequalities can be overcome by successful language learning.

- 4 Once you can talk, read and write "proper", society's doors will open to you.
- 5 Those groups that don't succeed really don't deserve to succeed.
- 6 The sooner you start talking English and the more you do it, the better you'll get at it.
- 7 Home languages are important primarily as bridges to greater success in English.
- 8 Bilingual Education is not possible in New Zealand as there are too many languages involved.
- 9 Learning more than one language at a time is difficult and to be avoided if possible.
- 10 If you only talked like us all would be okay.
- 11 In New Zealand we do really well in helping second language learners with literacy.

All of these are untrue. Falsehoods perpetuated on people who trusted us to provide the best possible opportunities in life for them.

"In spite of the belief widely held in America, that education in and of itself can transform people's sense of power and the existing social and economic hierarchies, educational intervention without actual social change is, in fact, ineffective." (Steiner and Steiner 1977, 361)

"What would happen if the whole world became literate? Answer. Not so very much, for the world is by and large structured in such a way that it is capable of absorbing the impact. But if the world consisted of literate, autonomous, critical, constructive people, capable of translating ideas into action, individually or collectively - the world would change." (Galtung 1976 93)

"Literacy is neither the major problem, nor is it the main solution." (Graff 1986)

Consider for a moment why, for example, is it acceptable to employ people with Dutch, American, other European or Asian accents and nobody seems too worried. Employ a Pacific Islander with a Samoan English accent or a Maori with Maori English speech features and all of a sudden there is real concern being expressed about that person's competence. The real answer lies in the social, cultural and political domain. Maori and Pacific Islanders are often seen at the bottom of society's socio-economic groups, the bottom of expectations of education skill and competence. It's not language itself that determines success and empowerment it is society's attitude towards them. This comes as a shock to many who still believe language is *the* panacea.

The inescapable conclusion is that simply changing the way people speak will not in itself change the way society views them and treats them. We have had a rather naive belief in our own abilities to bring about social justice and we've oversold the power language proficiency has on its own. Other problems associated with this approach are more fundamental. Do people wish to change the way they speak at all? What if the way we speak is inextricably tied in with our sense of family and cultural identity? What if we speak the way we do to consciously or unconsciously define who we are and who we are

not? What effect do those beliefs have on school attempts to shift language usage? What real messages do schools give to these learners and their families?

Is it really "let's work together to add new ways of speaking and using language while still recognising your need to maintain and develop your home language for specific family and social cultural purposes."

Or more likely it is, "Give up the way you speak if you want to succeed at school and in the system. Your first language is okay but its no use at school and your English needs changing to be more like ours."

Why then do we seem unable to change and recognise what really needs to be done to make a difference. Personally, I believe it is this ideology as set out in 3.0, 1-11 that teachers hold about literacy that blinds us to reality.

This means in essence, that we believe New Zealand does very well with second language learners and literacy, so there is no real need to change what we are doing. In reality, the gap between second language learners and the average reader at 9 years and 14 years is 65+ points. The largest gap of any 30 countries in the 1992 IEA Research Project.

We blame the victims. If only their parents read stories to them at home and joined libraries and valued books. If only they didn't have a tendency to glue ear. If only they would join the PTA and come to parents meetings. If only they helped their children study at home ... If only you gain the credentials the exam systems offer, then employment will follow. If only ... We know now that as more and more gain the credentials, the requirements for employment simply rise accordingly. Eg; PhD to be an elementary school teacher in the USA. In reality, the system has to change also to better meet the needs of diverse groups of learners.

We believe there is such a thing as "literacy" and we seek it with a vengeance. Recent research by Shirley Brice Heath (1982, 1983, 1984, 1986), Stuart McNaughton (1987) and others is showing clearly that a range of literacies exist in any society. These literacies are inextricably tied into the social, cultural and political frameworks and purposes and serve their particular needs. The writers no longer believe it is possible to talk about literacy per say as some sort of universal panacea that is automatically good, accessible and useful to all members of society.

Mark Barratt (Empowerment and Literacy, an Auckland College of Education, School of Advanced Studies course, 1992) summarises the argument well:

"It has been assumed that literacy was a universal benefit, that it was essentially neutral and therefore research into reading and writing was concerned with refining theories and techniques. Top-down, bottom-up, phonics verses whole language, book experience, process writing ..."

Those who spearheaded the challenges to old views of literacy assert that:

- 1 Society is made up of persons who have social, economic, political or cultural interests.

- 2 Various interest groups exist within society with differential power.
- 3 The interests of certain groups are brought into conflict by capitalist, patriarchal and monocultural structures.
- 4 Some interest groups are systematically better placed to ensure that their interests are served rather than other groups because they have greater opportunities to exercise power by which to promote their interests.
- 5 Politics then is really about power and the structuring of power. Education along with all society's institutions will reflect the distribution of this power.
- 6 Power only exists within social relations and processes. It comes (and goes) with social roles and processes.
- 7 For people to be empowered it is not simply to give them something, or for them to acquire something. It is either to change some aspect of the structures they live and interact within, or for them to acquire some quality which is already valued within certain relationships and processes, or to make some quality they possess recognised as relevant for exercising power.

To understand the politics of literacy is to grasp the ways in which our everyday practices and views of reading and writing are linked to the distribution and exercise of power within social relationships, processes and institutions. Important aspects of the political character of literacy include:

- 1 Different literacies can be identified. Within society and a school setting different literacies are not equal, but form a part of the process of selecting students for life chances and rewards.
- 2 Mastery of the right literacies for school success appear to be correlated with class and/or race-ethnic background. (See Jones 1985, 1991)
- 3 Elite groups have the power to shape what will count as appropriate reading and writing practice within the curriculum and selection processes of the school. Literacy is part of the process by which these elites maintain their own advantage. This may well be an unconscious process.
- 4 Patterned illiteracy, then, is a political phenomenon. It has increasingly important ramifications in an age when the demands for minimum functional literacy are increasing rapidly.
- 5 Students are not encouraged to read and write in ways that promote understanding of how social processes and outcomes are built on the principal of inequality. Hence, typical literacy practices are important mechanisms for maintaining the status quo.

The points above when taken together with other current trends in our society, give clear directions for a school literacy agenda.

- 1 We need to think much more about literacy in association with curriculum because they are tied together.
- 2 Existing approaches to curriculum and literacy are part of the overall machinery of reproducing inequality.
- 3 Changes within the economy and in technology are intensifying the extremes of inequality.
- 4 We should not under-estimate the importance of addressing literacy and curriculum together in trying to reduce the prospects of creating an under-class and extremes of social misery in this country.
- 5 Concentrations of disadvantaged people within distinct areas create a real risk of ghetto schools emerging, especially when accompanied by zoning policies which permit flight to other schools. Ghetto schools partly reflect the existence of an under-class. They also quickly become a major contributing factor to the consolidation of an under-class.
- 6 Those who are the victims of inappropriate curricula and assessment procedures are at high risk of not learning anything that will serve them in adult life.

What is the alternative?

- 1 Many students would do well to withdraw as far as possible from the shackles of traditional credentialing selection practices and to work actively within their communities; with curriculum developers to produce curricula which give the promise of providing for all students the capacities that will serve them in tomorrow's world.
- 2 If we are seriously committed to empowerment in education, it makes more sense to make students competent in the educational goals we uphold in their own language - since it maximises the likelihood of learning - and to leave them to acquire English at the point and pace that they need it. This point holds for Māori as well as other language learners. (Mark Barratt Auckland College of Education reprint 1992)

The causes of education under-achievement by some minorities lies beyond language and literacy - so far so good.

Where beyond? There are those who have argued and continue to do so for a single causal reason for educational under-achievement and for single causal solutions. Some of these have been:

Parents Inadequacies

eg; Don't read to children at home. If only they'd speak English to the children at home.

Resources Inadequacies

eg; If only we had something it would make all the difference. If we had in-service ...

Programme Inadequacies

eg; If all schools had Māori programmes this would be different ... If we had a TESL programme we could make a difference.
What we need is a bag of tricks.

Health Inadequacies

eg; If we solved the glue ear problem ...

Social Class Inadequacies

eg; The real causes lie in socio-economic causes really. Until we solve that nothing can be done.

Everything's Inadequate

What we need is to try this new idea X being advocated by X. We've got to do; Peer Tutoring, Process Writing, Whanau Grouping, all at once and all yesterday.
Leads to wild swings and fads that fade or enthusiasts fade.

Cultures Inadequacies

eg; Group oriented approaches hinder children in an individual world.

Teacher Inadequacies

eg; If we had TESL training we could make a difference.
If the Colleges of Education better prepared teachers ...

Government Inadequacies

If government did something we would ...

Language Inadequacies

eg; If only they didn't speak Māori English
"Well they came without any language really, didn't they?"

Child's Inadequacies

eg; What really can we do with these kids. It's a lost cause really ...
We'll do what we can but ...
We need the Psychological Service you know ...

Such single-cause single-solution propositions are part of the problem in my view. They are appealing, slick, one liners that are also simplistic and inadequate. Over the years, though, we chased fads and fashions looking for the answer. I don't believe there can be simplistic answers for complex issues. I do believe, however, that we need to look for models that bring a wide range of factors into play and relate them in a coherent way that both describes and explains the position minorities find themselves in. These models also need to suggest what the implications of such models might be so we can get on and attempt to bring about the changes necessary.

Before doing so, I'd like to explore further some current models of Language and Literacy that I feel are very widespread. They are of necessity, simplified enormously to make the point.

The Deficit Model

Sees childrens' language brought from home as deficient and needing to be replaced with school language. Few teachers admit to holding this model but in reality, many act on its assumptions in

daily programmes. Constantly devaluing the child's home, culture, language, identity, work, achievements ...

The Transmission Model

Usually combined with the Deficit model. Sees teacher's job to transmit the knowledge and skills of language and literacy to empty (not necessarily deficient) vessels who are passive and wanting to be taught. Teacher initiates and controls interactions and does most of the talking. Says "I taught them, it's their fault they didn't learn." What do you expect?

The Warm Fuzzy Model

Values in a warm fuzzy way everything the child brings from home. Organises culture clubs, powhiri, self concept and identity work and enthusiasts for cultural recognition. Holds low expectations of children's achievements though. Demands little in way of achievement. Makes constant excuses for own and/or child's failure to deliver a quality work/programmes.

The Marxists' Model

We're dealing with a basic conflict between classes here. Schools exist to feed the capitalist industrial machine: fodder for factories. As long as this is the case, inequalities will contrive. Only economic structural change in society will change educational outcomes. (Economic Marxists. Cultural Marxists take a wider view.)

The Specialist Model

Believes that the needs of children can only be met by the provision/delivery of special services by an expert eg; Reading Recovery, TESOL, Psych ... Service, Reading Specialist ... Schools/Teachers who adopt this model look to someone else to solve their problems for them and disclaim responsibility as they are not "Experts". In TESL, a TESL specialist is needed. Children should be withdrawn from the class programme and their needs met there.

The New Right Model

Minorities want excellence. They don't want equity or soft options. They want to go to excellent schools like our children do. They want to compete on an equal footing, therefore, we'd be doing them a disservice if we didn't demand excellence of them. Therefore, we'll just will them to achieve like us. After all, failure is God's way of punishing those who don't believe in competition and market forces. This model also explicitly aims to dis-empower educators as a key strategy in empowering the ideology of competition. Sadly, individual members of groups who have succeeded often become advocates for such a shift.

"The potential outcome of these new right views on education would be further assimilation of Māori, and death for Māori language and culture." [Marshall, Peters & Smith 1990).

EMPOWERING MODELS OF VARYING DEGREES:

THE TESL/TESOL MODEL

Sees the issues as primarily language based. This child needs English, is the bottom line. Now believes in meeting childrens' needs through a language in the curriculum approach. Used to believe in

withdrawal programme. Advocates believe that, if only all teachers would accept that they are teachers of language all children's needs would be better met and problems solved. Has a wide range of adherents from all other model groups, some of whom see it as a way of carving out a career and ensuring a job for themselves. Therefore, the blacker we paint the picture the more resources and positions we'll get. Caught in this dilemma. Concedes that children's needs are wider than language and recognises cultural factors but don't really act on this. Pays lip service to recognising and meeting children's first language needs. Often appears to only be using children's first language as a way of improving world language. May not see what social and political issues have to do with children's language needs. Carries on the search for more effective (bags of tricks) language and literacy techniques, often without revisiting the structural contexts of social relationships and power, institutionalised issues, school structures and operating procedures.

The Bi-cultural School Model

Here schools modify some surface features of the way a school works by adding some Māori and/or Pacific ways of doing things. These may include:

A Māori language programme, some items of decor; Māori greetings at assemblies, some involvement of Māori parents; perhaps through an advisory committee; Māori topics in school programmes or a Māori dimension to most topics studied. This model seeks to add on Māori dimensions, without substantially having to change the way it is structured and operated and often ends up empowering capable Pākehā learners even more.

On a continuum, it's worth doing, of course, but it needs to be more than just old wine in a new bottle.

The Bilingual School/Unit Model

This model sees the learning of Te Reo Māori or a Pacific language by children in state bilingual (dual medium and immersion) schools and units as the priority. Most adopt the school curriculum and have parent and community involvement. Major problems with an unwillingness on the part of the other half of the school or the Education system eg; Education Review Office, to let go and empower the staff/community to have real choice in the; what?, how?, and who? of the programmes. Most units are severely constrained also by a lack of resourcing, fluent speakers, staff development and networks of support.

It's as if Government has said "We won't stop you but we won't help you either." A key example, is the desperate lack of trained fluent speakers so necessary for this work. Empowerment has not been a key goal in my view, rather, units are guided by the drive to sort out the social/cultural issues and teach the language as best as they can. Perhaps they aim too much to make the existing school system more palatable to Māori youngsters when autonomy and tino rangatiratanga are really what's needed. I believe this model will work if the system allows it and if it is resourced and empowered to a far greater extent than present. For Pacific Island children, this model offers most interest at present.

Gender Equity Models

Gender equity models being developed are addressing parallel issues to cultural equity. As the world's largest minority group, women have been widely discriminated against through social, cultural,

economic and political dis-empowerment. All of that which is relevant to gender equity (and the research is considerable now), can also be brought to bear on cultural issues.

The Kura Kaupapa Māori Model

This model provides a clear illustration of an empowerment model in action. Kura Kaupapa Māori (KKM) processes and policies aim not just to establish a more efficient means of bilingual (immersion) education but to empower whanau and children. It is based on an extension of Te Kohanga Reo and is now part of the state system. KKM aims to reverse all the process described as dis-empowering minorities and re-establish a new system with explicit empowerment goals at all levels of operation. From small beginnings in 1987, it has grown rapidly. International interest in the movement is enormous as empowerment programmes of this type are unique in the world scene. The model and underlying philosophy is well described in the writings of Graeme and Linda Smith (Auckland University).

KKM now has a fully established College of Education 4 year Bachelor of Education programme and is assisting Te Kohanga Reo to set up a similar training scheme for kaiako/Kaiawhina. Such moves are consistent with Māori desire to control all aspects of the system which they have created.

My personal view is that whatever initial problems they have getting established and validated, it is a model closest to ideal empowerment philosophy and practice and for this reason, as much as any other, it will succeed in empowering Māori students and whanau better than any other model to date.

OTHER MODELS OF EMPOWERMENT

"Liberation only comes when people reclaim their language and with it the power of enablement and visions." (Paulo Friere)

Freire is a Brazilian born (1921 now 70+), involved in liberation movements in South America. His key work is *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Freire 1985). His work has had tremendous impact on social cultural and political writers and researchers because of the way it links literacy and literacy practices to liberation. Reading and writing for Freire are more than coding and decoding. They are means of empowering the non literate or semi literate to use literacy to gain power over their worlds and destinies in situations everywhere where social, economic, cultural and political reproduction is the primary function of education and society. Literacy is seen essentially as a social cultural and political process. These views challenge widespread western orthodoxy that literacy is culture free and a universal good. He showed how literacy could enslave or empower and why this is so. He works predominantly with adults and his most successful campaign is to Nicaragua where in the space of some 5 years, a largely illiterate population became literate through the application of his ideas. Colin Lankshear (Massey University, ex Auckland University) worked in these Nicaraguan programmes and his writings are inspired by Freire's work. Freire takes literacy out of the culturally, socially and politically neutral (neutered?) corner and shows how it can be used by and with dis-empowered groups to gain greater control over their lives through these processes.

1. Conscientization - using literacy to look at their own lives and the situation they're in and developing the wish to change it, should they chose to.

- 2 Dialogue - using literacy to open discussion and debate over ways to improve peoples lives between the key parties involved but controlled by the dis-empowered themselves.
- 3 Praxis - using literacy for the critical reflection on the situation that must lead to action. Without action the other stages are without real benefit.

Freire argues that the main challenge faced by minorities is the way in which they came to dis-empower themselves and over time became brainwashed by the system into believing they are powerless. Freire aims to use literacy to turn this around by using the affective and the cognitive together to generate texts which express their situation, visions and their decisions on action. It is the absolute antithesis of the transmission model and the ultimate in drawing out and building on what the learner brings to the situation.

Along with other empowerment writers, he sees power as lying in the nature of the conditioned social relationships and these provide opportunity for change because there are always two parties in a relationship. If one will not play the game, the game must change.

To my knowledge, few writers have applied his ideas directly to literacy in schools with children, though the implications are obvious.

In Australasia, Colin Lankshear (Massey University) and Allan Luke (James Cook University, Townsville, Queensland) are leading the search for more empowering models for literacy. Allan Luke shows how getting the message is only part of the picture. What the learner does then is what's vital. He advocates teaching children to be critical readers of text, to talk back to them, to ask why that is so, from earliest age and he thereby seeks to change the nature of our use of the phrase 'critical analysis of text' as used in secondary school English programmes. Children need to be able to rewrite tests not just be opened up to exploitation and manipulation, to believe everything they read. Reading and writing is not just for enjoyment, it's also for survival. Children need to build up *crap detectors* through meta-cognitive discussion and guidance so they come to understand the way in which social, cultural, economic and political forces inherent in literacy come to control their lives.

Peter Freebody (Griffith University, Brisbane) is recommended by Luke as one writer working in this area. Other 'gurus' in the field include James Paul Gee, (University of Southern California) and Carolyn Baker (University of Queensland). This group of researchers and writers are well worth reading as they are leading this work in our part of the world.

The Cummins Model

Jim Cummins of the Ontario Institute for Educational Studies, is an Irishman who knows his country's history of attempts by the English to wipe out the Gaelic language and the Catholic religion and replace them. As an educational psychologist he is familiar with the psychometric approaches to cultural difference and one of the most outspoken critics of the hold psychology has come to have over children who come from minority groups. He is also, in my view, the most articulate, convincing and exciting advocate for bilingual education in the world today. His commitment to bilingual education came about not from world directly in the field but from extensive studies in educational under-achievement where he concludes bilingual education is the most empowering successful model we

have. His conclusion is that it is not bilingual education (including immersion education) in itself that is liberating and empowering but rather that the bigger goal of "Empowering Minority Students" (the title of his book 1989) can best be achieved through developing empowerment models of literacy. These models and practices seem to be found most in bilingual education programmes at present. His model shows why this should be so.

Interactions between minority students, their parents and community and society's institutions, especially schools, disable them, depower them by:

- Reflecting values of the wider society that holds certain minority cultures in a very low status. Especially those who have been in a colonised situation over long periods of time.
- Denying them the right to their cultural identity.
- Denying minorities the right to make decisions that effect their own lives.
- Using transmission and deficit models in language.
- Attempting to replace students' home language and culture with that of the majority through claiming education success can only come in this way.
- Holding stereotypes and low expectations of children.
- Using assessment measures that will confirm their failing situation and legitimise it.
- Designating minority children as learning disabled and at risk.
- Adopting remedial approaches to learning/teaching.
- Allowing learned helplessness to flourish.
- Encouraging passive uncritical acceptance of programmes.
- Teachers initiating and controlling interactions and talk with teacher-talk dominating the total percentage of talk in room. Up to 85%.
- Setting goals for student from present curriculum and instructional objectives, rather than building on what the student brings to the situation.
- Excluding parents from playing a role in children's education.
- Making students dependent on teachers for all learning.
- Suppressing any attempt to threaten the power and the privilege of the dominant group.

- Using learning processes and texts that dis-empower learners and make them dependent on them.
- Dis-empowering educators by retaining central control of curriculum and assessment from schools.

These institutionalised discrimination features permeate all aspects of school life, including interactions between educators and students. To break the cycle, he advocates the need for educators to adopt a deliberate empowerment philosophy that begins with individual action and responsibility as the beginning of a wave which will move out and take in the institutions eventually. Essentially he asks us to teach children to learn how to become learners independent of the teacher and the institution. He sees this happening through:

- Adopting additive approaches to learning new languages and ways of working rather trying to replace the students' home ones.
- Challenging the structures and processes that dis-empower/disable learners.
- Adopting collaborative approaches to working with children, parents and community.
- Becoming an advocate for students and community.
- Providing for experiential interactive approaches to learning based on children's shared backgrounds and experiences.
- Encouraging collaborative group orientated working styles.
- Using literacy as means to an end - 'Empowerment' not as ends in themselves.
- Using children's home language and culture as mediums of instruction in additive maintenance oriented bilingual programmes for all of elementary education at least.
- Producing literacy resources that arise from children's experiences.
- Encouraging active use of literacy as a means of sharing with non-group members aspects of experience and culture.
- Adopting assessment systems that focus on the competencies developed in through the programme with a diagnostic orientation.
- Finding ways for the institution to validate and credential students culture, language experiences and achievements.
- Promote the legal and policy status of minorities.

- Develop networks of educators committed to similar goals.
- Involving parents in children's literacy work to a far greater extent.
- Engaging in research to counter misinformation.
- Involving opponents in the processes of empowering bilingual education by demonstrating it works.
- Promoting and sharing successes.

In advocating these approaches, it seems to me Cummins still underplays the very strong social, economic, cultural and political forces that shape and determine the unstated assumptions on which most traditional education is based. I believe he does this because from his position (or yours or mine) it appears easy to become such an advocate and spread the word by osmosis, assuming minorities are even willing to accept our involvement.

Other writers I've referred to such as Freire, Lankshear, McNaughton, Luke et al seem to have a more realistic view of the way all parties, educators, parents and students are dis-empowered and the sort of system and literacy changes that are required to shift power in a society. They also provide deeper insights into how to address the dis-empowered state minorities seem to be trapped in by dis-empowering themselves further.

McNaughton (1989, 1990, 1991), in particular, provides many insights and examples of the way in which teachers can begin to shift the primary school literacy practices. McNaughton's work in recent times has been in two key areas:

- 1 The role of parents in the literacy education of their children, and
- 2 The social and cultural mismatches and differences that exist between prior to school literacy experiences and the ways in which schools begin initial literacy instruction. McNaughton argues that different groups bring different forms of literacy knowledge, skills and experiences from those held in esteem and practised in the New Entrant classroom. He argues that we need to know much more about what these groups practise and the one's practised by the school, in order to make decisions about reshaping initial literacy instruction to bridge the gap that research has shown to clearly exist.

I'm led to the conclusion that all approaches are needed and that we need a new more comprehensive model (or models), that brings the key ideas together to describe, explain and resolve future directions. Of key importance is to decide how to help everyone do something, not just those in bilingual education.

How might we develop such a model and what might it look like?

Step 1

Brainstorm the key elements of the education system that need to be brought into focus in partnership with parents and community eg; consultation processes, staffing policies, teacher education, literacy practices ...

Step 2

Use Freire's 3 step method to explore issues with members of minority groups themselves.

- a *Conscientization* ie What's wrong at present in these areas?
- b *Dialogue* ie; What do we think about this and how we might change it?
- c *Praxis* ie; develop action plans to do so.

Step 3

Translate these outcomes into comprehensive diagrams and models that reconstruct the systems we use with new priorities goals and, above all, new power relationships.

Step 4

Identify the weaknesses of the existing system and the avenues for exploiting these weaknesses.

Step 5

Begin implementing the new system in a simultaneous way through a network of support provided by the organisations who organised this conference.

In essence: This is what the Navajo at Rock Point did.

This is what the Mohawk in Canada did.

This is what the Welsh did.

This is what KKM has done. (Smith G 1988)

This is what the 'New Right' through the National Party has done
(without the consultation processes of course)

We need to recognise that current TESOL and Bilingual Education practices both contain elements that empower students but that neither on its own is a powerful enough co-ordinated set of philosophies, ideologies and practices to shift the system. It's therefore, time to farewell them both as separate saviours and time to bring the best elements of all aspects of existing models into play in a more comprehensive empowerment model.

To assist in this process, Helen Villers and I established at Auckland College of Education in 1992, a teachers' course on Empowerment and Literacy and an undergraduate pre-service version designed to explore these issues and flesh out the frameworks for both pre-service and in-service education. We work closely with Jannie Van Hees, New Settlers, Auckland College of Education, and know she is doing likewise in in-service work. All courses are operating very successfully and the teachers course has been accepted for inclusion into Auckland College of Education's new Diploma of TESSOL and Diploma of Bilingual Education as a C level paper. In this position, it brings new insights and wider frameworks to both perspectives. What the outcomes of these processes will be I don't know but it is clear that empowerment work is also possible outside bilingual education, providing it aims to foster it. How much and how far we can all go remains to be seen.

SOME QUESTIONS TO ASK ABOUT OUR ACTIONS:

- 1 In what ways will this decision/action/lesson ... empower or dis-empower children/parents/ community?
- 2 Am I/are we doing something for someone who could be helped to do it for themselves?
- 3 What is my role in this situation?
- 4 How would I know if I/we succeed?
- 5 What's the effect of staying silent when minorities (children/students) are attacked by the system of power relationships that is used by majorities to maintain control?
- 6 Have we got a commitment to partnership with our students/communities? Do they see it as an equal partnership?
- 7 Have we got a vision of where we want to get to in this work? Is it a shared vision with the people who are most affected?
- 8 Have we got a development plan that recognises where we actually are and then works back from the vision to plan how we achieve it?

REFERENCES:

- Benton, R A (1987) How Fair is NZ Education? Wellington: New Zealand Royal Commission on Social Policy
- Cazden, C (1988) Interactions Between Māori Children and Pākehā Teachers. Auckland: Reading Association Monograph
- Clay, M M (1986) Engaging with the School System: A Study of Interactions in New Entrant Classrooms. NZ Journal of Educational Studies 20.1, 20-38
- Cummins, J (1989) Empowering Minority Students. Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education
- Freire, P (1985) Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Middlesex: Penguin
- Freire, P (1985) The Politics of Education. Bergin and Garvey Publishers
- Freire, P (1978) Pedagogy in Process: The Letters to Guinea-Bissau. New York: Seabury Press
- Freire, P (1976) Education, The Practice of Freedom. London: Writers and Readers Publishing Co-operative

- Freire, P & Macedo, D (1987) Literacy: Reading the Word and the World. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Gee, James Paul (1993) The Social Mind: Ideology and Social Practice. New York: Bergin Garvey
- Hirsh, W (1987) Living Languages: Bilingualism and Community Languages in New Zealand. Auckland : Heinemann in association with the Office of the Race Relations Conciliator
- Jones, Alison (1991) At School I've got a Chance. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press
- Jones, Alison (1985) What really happens in the Classroom. In Smith G H Akonga Māori: Māori pedagogy and learning. Auckland: Auckland College of Education - Maori Studies Department
- Lankshear, C (1990) The Politics of Literacy. Unpublished papers presented at ILY Conference. ACE, August 1990
- McCaffery, J (1989) ESL and Bilingual Education: Some and Different in New Settlers and Multicultural Education. Vol.6, No.2. 28-42
- McCaffery, J (1992) NZ Minority languages in Education in Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Oxford Pergamon Press,
- McNaughton, S (1988) Being Skilled: The Socialisation of Learning to Read. New York and London: Methuen
- McNaughton, S (1988) Culture Literacy and Classroom Practices. Unpublished papers for Advanced College of Education Ed 300,
- Nepe, Tuki (1990) Te Toi Huarewa Tupuna, Kaupapa Māori, An Education Intervention System. University of Auckland, M A thesis, unpublished
- Rata, Elizabeth (1991) Māori Survival and Structural Separateness. University of Auckland, MEd thesis, unpublished
- Smith, G H (1990) Kura Kaupapa Māori. Contesting and Reclaiming Māori Education in Aotearoa. In Douglas Ray and Doe Poonwasse (eds) Tomorrow can be better. New York: Garland Publishing