DRAFT

Cultural considerations in student evaluation with specific references to
Pacific Island Countries*

Konai H Thaman**

*"The provision of professional services to persons of culturally
diverse backgrounds by persons not competent in understanding
and providing professional services to such groups, shall be
considered unethical"*
(Korman, 1974)

Introduction

The teaching/learning environment provided by most formal educational
institutions in Pacific Islands is culturally undemocratic: that is, it does not take
into consideration the way most Pacific people think, learn and communicate with
one another. This is true not only of the values that underpin education systems
but also content of the school curriculum, the methods that most teachers use,
and the way in which student learning is assessed and evaluated. This paper will
focus specifically on the use of standardised testing to assess student learning
and the purposes for which the results of assessment is being used in most
Pacific Island Countries (PICs).

Definitions

For the purposes of this presentation, evaluation of student
learning refers to *the process of finding out what students have learned (or not
learned) as a result of instruction.* It involves gathering information about what
students think, feel and can do (measurement), placing an interpretation on the
information (assessment) and then making a decision or judgement regarding
action. Assessment is an integral part of evaluation and refers to placing some

standard or judgement of worth on the information gathered. Evaluation is the overarching concept that depends upon, as well as bring together, both *measurement* and *assessment* for the sake of planning and/or changing some aspects of curriculum and instruction in order to improve student learning.

Although evaluation usually requires more information than that derived only from student assessment (Smith & Lovat, 1990), the focus of this paper is student assessment, and more specifically standardised testing.

Culture is defined here as a way of life of a people which include their language, values and knowledge systems. Most Pacific Island cultures have existed for thousands of years with indigenous education predating schooling and the predominantly Eurocentric formal education systems created by missionaries and colonial administrators. Education for my purposes worthwhile learning, and indigenous education is worthwhile learning that is linked to Culture, the aim of which is cultural survival and continuity. The content and pedagogies of Indigenous education were sourced from Culture itself, and the assessment of learning was related to learners' appropriate behaviour and performance in different cultural contexts. Geertz 's (1973) definition of culture as a historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbolic form by means of which men (sic) communicate, perpetuate and develop their knowledge about and attitudes towards life is the closest to Pacific people's perceptions of their ways of life. Geertz identifies some useful dimensions of culture, including: i) a judgmental or normative dimension (being the values and standards of the group); ii) a cognitive dimension (the categories of mental and social attributes expressed through language); iii) an affective dimension (relating to the collective emotions, common feelings and sources of motivation of the group); iv) a skills dimensions (which are the capabilities of group members to adapt to social and economic demands of their environment); and, v) a technological dimension (which describes the products and artefacts of a group and includes the manner

in which these are used). Social scientists tell us that Culture influences people's values and beliefs, role expectations and the way in which people interact and communicate with one another. Culture therefore has a central role in the teaching/learning process as it provides a way of understanding and predicting teachers' and students' behaviour, the cultural contexts of learning as well as the evaluation of such learning. are also important considerations.

In most Pacific Island Countries (PICs) standardised testing has been commonly used to assess students providing information about their behaviour and performance on a variety of learning tasks. Standardised testing results are also used to make inferences and predictions about student behaviour in a variety of contexts including their potential to succeed in higher education. Today, in an increasingly globalised Pacific, where many people are concerned about democracy, human rights, equity etc., the challenge for assessment systems is to ensure accuracy of information and the appropriateness of decisions for different groups in society, is a challenge that is not always easy to address because of the acknowledgement of cultural diversity and the standardisation element of student assessment create a dilemma when considering equity. Rigid adherence to one may imply the rejection of the other; hence it is important to have strategies that take into account the different cultural contexts of learners in the assessment of their learning (Fasi, 2006:3).

Culture, teaching and learning

Culture, social scientists tell us, shapes people's beliefs and attitudes, their roles and role expectations as well as the way they interpret and make meaning of their own and other's behaviour (Eagly and Chaiken, 1998). Sociologists, for example, assert that role expectations, learned and internalised through the process of socialisation, help guide people's behaviour and social interactions, and conflicts occur when people from different cultural backgrounds use their own individual cultural cues to define and interpret others' behaviour. Similarly, communication problems often arise from a lack of knowledge and understanding of cultural norms and cues, deemed important for interpreting the behaviour and conduct of those involved in the communication process, such as,

for example, between teachers and students (Riley, 1985; Widdowson, 1987; Ninnes, 1991; Taufe'ulungaki, 2000). An important factor that usually influence and affect teachers' and learners' role expectations, is what Sociologists refer to as *role boundary*, which, when breached and unfulfilled, often results in conflict situations I school (Coleman, 1996). The notion of role boundary seems to akin to the pan-Polynesian concept of *vaa/wah*, which refers to both a physical as well as a metaphorical space that defines and sanctions inter-personal as well as inter-group relations (Thaman, 2002).

A key factor in the teacher-student communication process is pedagogy, which often mediates the role boundary between teacher and student. However, as Cortazzi (1990) suggests, pedagogy itself is shaped by the cultural values and ideologies of the society in which it originates. This means that teachers often transmit and reinforce the cultural values that are embedded in the teaching approaches that they use (Barrow, 1990; Leach, 1994; Kelen, 2002). It is therefore important that in the cross-cultural classroom, a teacher's professionalism as well as cultural sensitivity are equally important considerations for learner success and need to be addressed by those who assess students and their learning.

Learning as well as the assessment of learning in a language that is foreign to most learners, may be the most obvious example of a culturally undemocratic learning environment. As most of you know, language is a key player in the development of thinking and understanding as well as the transmission of cultural knowledge to future generations. It is from the value and belief systems of cultural groups that rules of behaviour or communicative conventions, which include language, are developed together with teaching and learning strategies that are consistent with cultural expectations (Taufe'ulungaki, 2002:18). For example, a study I conducted in Tonga in the 1980s showed how the values associated with Tongan culture were reflected in teachers' perceptions of their role. Unfortunately, for most Pacific Island students, learning in a foreign language is the rule rather than the exception as the structure as well as the processes of schooling do not reflect the values of Pacific cultures but rather of ex-colonial cultures (Thaman, 1992).

4

It considering assessment we need to be reminded that while culture may not determine how people think and learn it does however, affect what they consider important to think about and emphasise. In relation to learning and thinking, Taufe'ulungaki (2002) suggests that most Pacific island students are right-brain dominated with tendencies to emphasise creative, holistic, circular, and people focused thinking, together with learning strategies that include observation, imitation, and trial and error rather responding to verbal instruction, the dominant strategy used in the classroom. The main form of assessment of learning of Indigenous education was appropriate behaviour and performance in real life situations rather than practice in the simulated or contrived setting of the classroom. Consequently mastery of context-specific skills is an important indicator of successful learning in most indigenous societies as opposed to pen and pencil responses to decontextualised and generalisable principles, common in formal education (Taufe'ulungaki, 2003). The influence of Culture also discourages (Pacific) students from speaking out and being competitive, traits that are often interpreted by teachers as indifference and not being able to act decisively (Hoy, 1993). It is important therefore for teachers and others not to assume that outspokenness, assertiveness or clarity in expressing career goals in a foreign language, among Pacific high school leavers is a sign of interest in learning anything or vice versa .

Standardised testing and cultural diversity

The Pacific Island region is one of the most culturally diverse regions of the earth, with the most diverse being Papua New Guinea (over 800 different cultures and languages). In the context of such cultural diversity, one wonders as to why the role and nature of schooling in general and the way student learning is assessed through standardised testing in particular, have not been seriously re-examined: instead, standardised testing is becoming increasingly important as a means of selection, ranking and prediction in most PICs. This is despite the fact that according to a senior staff member of the SPBEA standardised testing has been judged invalid and inappropriate for the majority of Pacific students especially those from indigenous and rural

communities.   One of the more serious consequences of this is inappropriate placements and selections, a situation that is not dissimilar to that which Gopaul-McNicol and Armour-Thomas (2002) discussed in relation to some contexts in the USA, where there was a disproportionate number of children from culturally diverse backgrounds who were channelled to low track classes (Fasi, 2006).

Re-thinking assessment especially standardised testing in order to take into account cultural diversity is therefore a huge challenge. This is so especially in light of the fact that standardised tests do seem to be serving the purposes for which they were designed rather well. Many educational leaders and assessment gurus therefore see considerations of Culture as irrelevant to academic teaching and learning, as they assume assessment to be culture-free (Fasi, 2006; Tuifaga, 2006). Moreover, the scarcity of opportunities for higher education together with the fierce competition for economic survival and the apparent impact of globalisation especially on higher education are forcing many education authorities to implement stiffer selection measures in order to give the opportunities to those identified by the selection process as the "most appropriate". However, perhaps we need to remind ourselves of an important purpose of assessment and that is to ascertain the extent to which students have learned academic content or skills and the way in which classroom tests and assignments interact with the learning needs of students from different cultural backgrounds, and to better adapt our assessment techniques to suit this purpose (Fasi, 2006:2)

For example, it is well known that students learn faster, grasp and demonstrate skills easier and express themselves better and clearer in their mother tongue or the home language. Thus the best approach to teaching and therefore assessment is to use the student's mother tongue. The use of English (and/or French) as the medium of instruction as well as the language of student assessment has been mentioned earlier. The main form of student assessment consists of tests written in a foreign language. This makes it very difficult for most students to pass or gain higher grades despite many teachers attempt to code switch between English and a local language (often against national language policies which state that the medium of instruction should be English or French).

Code switching often allows some students to understand the content of lessons, but they would still need to write their answers to examinations and standardised test questions in a foreign language. Consequently many students are destined to fail, particularly those who come from rural areas where English or French is not a functional language and where the medium of instruction in schools may be a local language or a common language such as Pidgin or Bislama.

This is most evident in high schools and certainly in tertiary institutions, where there are no provisions for students who do not come from English speaking backgrounds. In the case of the University of the South Pacific (USP) for example, this is the reality of more than 90% of learners. As a university teacher it is always sad to watch students struggling to make sense of examination questions let alone composing meaningful answers in a language in which they are not fluent, a situation that I totally empathised with since my own school and university experiences were similar. This situation is most unfortunate and not dissimilar to asking American and Australian students to write their examination answers in Fijian or Tongan. As Fasi puts it: "examination papers in the Pacific Islands always have the fingerprints of exclusive assessment all over them" (Fasi, 2006:3)

Towards more culturally inclusive assessment: the challenge

Considering learners' cultures in assessment is part of an on-going attempt to provide culturally inclusive student evaluation. It requires an understanding and application of the equity principle and accepting the rights of different cultural groups to define and maintain their different ways of life as well as an obligation to respect others' ways of life (Gopaul-McNicol and Armour-Thomas, 2002). To say that this creates a challenge to our current education systems and the status quo, is to put the matter mildly. As Boyd (1996) points out, the moral commitment to the maintenance and promotion of cultural pluralism is often threatening to members of a culturally dominant group. Promoting a more culturally inclusive assessment in the Pacific reg ion is therefore a big challenge to the established, dominant and dominating standardised assessment systems, often prompting many evaluation and

assessment experts to ask questions such as: i) How far does one go in considering culture in student assessment? ii) Which elements of culture should be included and/or recognised as contributing to a fair, valid and reliable assessment? iii) Which or whose culture should be given priority?; and, iv) What are the implications for academic standards and the credibility of education systems? (Fasi, 2006: 4).

In formal education, as in other formal sectors in PICs there has always been a tendency to generalise the findings of research in the West to Pacific contexts. When findings from such research are used to guide the construction and administration of assessment procedures, there is bound to be an element of ethnocentrism that is likely to influence the whole assessment enterprise. It is not difficult to see how inappropriate educational placement can be when it is the result of mis-diagnosis through discriminatory assessment practices, something that can be traced to the mistaken generalisations and assumptions, associated with culturally biased research conceptual frameworks and methodologies. When assessment is used as a tool to facilitate planning and resource allocation, it is considered helpful. However, when it is used to reinforce and/or extend social inequities by influencing the distribution of benefits and sanctions to some or in denying opportunities for optimal growth and development for others, then assessment is unhelpful. We know that many decisions based on test results are not always accurate nor are they made in the best interests of test takers (Fasi, 2006).

For example, in a study to investigate the language in which Tongan bilinguals learn mathematics and the relationship between the language of instruction and students' achievement in mathematics, it was found that students with high mathematical abilities are often disadvantaged by the use of the English language both for instruction as well as assessment. The results of the study showed how the language of assessment plays a significant role in the failure, poor results and inaccurate classifications of some mathematically able students. When the effect of the language is removed, the true ability of the student is revealed and any selection based on this result would be fairer, more

valid and more reliable than one based on language-bias assessments (Fasi, 1999).

Of particular concern to many Pacific educators today is the unsatisfactory level of academic performance of many Pacific Island students at tertiary institutions not only in the region but also in New Zealand and Australia. The selection of these students was based on their performance in high stake examinations and their failure is often attributed to a change in their learning environment rather than their academic unpreparedness. It is not unusual to find some students who were top of their classes and scored highly in external examinations, suddenly finding themselves failing (subjects) and struggling to make reach minimum pass marks. On the other hand, some students who achieve only the minimum entry requirement to university have been known to excel in their studies. These students seemed to have learned to adapt to their new learning environments. This situation does raise questions and concerns about student selection procedures. Perhaps using student scores in external examinations as the major basis for scholarship selection is not the best way to go as other considerations such as students' social skills, cultural competency, ability to adapt to new environments, maturity, etc are just as important for student success in a new learning environment, such as a university. An important issue therefore is how to assess the behaviour and performance of individual students separately from assessing their academic abilities. There is a need to strike a balance between maintaining so called academic standards at the same time being responsive to the social and cultural demands of new learning environments. The balance of my presentation refers to some efforts at the regional level to address the conflicting expectations between the cultures of most learners and formal education including the evaluation of student learning and the notion of school success.

Addressing culture in student assessment

Some interesting work is being carried out at the SPBEA which involve a (paradigm) shift of focus from traditional psychometric measures and assessment of learning approaches towards a more client-friendly assessment

that tries to include as much as possible, client based outcomes, focusing on what the client can rather than cannot do. The work involves making both external and internal examinations more student-centred. Teachers and schools are encouraged to use assessment as a tool to enhance learning by working closely with students on assessment activities, tailoring them as much as possible to suit students' needs and contexts. An increasing amount of assessment tasks are designed, implemented and assessed by teachers, who are encouraged to give immediate feedback to students on their strengths and weaknesses, allowing them to make improvements. The intention of the Board is to ensure that assessment is brought closer to the student's world, by making it as much a part of the student's everyday normal life as any other activity. Teachers are also encouraged to utilise available local resources and to give due consideration to the circumstances surrounding the students and the cultural contexts that may have affected their performance. In this way the individual student and her (cultural) context is taken into consideration, at least at the internal assessment phase (Fasi, 2006).

Fasi, a senior staff member of the SPBEA recounts the story of a visit to Samoa in 2005 to moderate the internal assessment for Design Technology, a year 12 Pacific Secondary School Certificate (PSSC) subject that contains elements of Industrial Arts and Home Economics. An important aspect of students' projects was documentation in the form of a journal in which students describe and evaluate their activities. The linguistic demand of this aspect of student work is quite challenging, as students who take the course are usually those whose English language skills are minimal. It was apparent that the Samoan students had completed the documentation in their own (Samoan) language and much to the surprise of their teacher, who was rather apologetic about what the students had done, Fasi accepted the students' reports and asked their teacher to assess their work but to write his report in English for Fasi's benefit. Fasi expressed his admiration for the teacher and the students for having the courage to use and be proud of their own language. This story illustrates a genuine attempt on the part of an assessment expert to contextualise assessment and to take into consideration the culture (and language) of the learners (as well as the teacher), and is indeed a paradigm shift for the regional body.

Working towards better contextualising not only of assessment but also teaching is also being encouraged among teachers and teacher educators, who are often the ones tasked with bridging the cultural gaps faced by many school as well as tertiary students in the Pacific. Examples drawn from the students' familiar environments are always more relevant and meaningful for students than those in their text books, most of which are produced in and imported from foreign countries (including Australia) and often contain content more familiar to students in industrialised, urban and semi-urban, Western contexts. For example, mathematics questions often contain references to vehicles such as cars and other things that are not normally part of students' lives in coral atolls and/or interior regions of high volcanic islands. Students often find it difficult to relate not only to the content of subjects but also to the examination questions in those subjects. Those who plan curriculum as well as design assessment instruments are encouraged to take students' cultural realities into consideration in order for them to have a sense of ownership of their learning as well as their assessment (Thaman, 1992).

Encouraging culturally inclusive teaching and learning is a major focus of teacher education at our university, especially the work associated with the UNESCO Chair in teacher education and culture. As well as undergraduate and postgraduate courses in which students are exposed to different Pacific cultures and their educational ideas, our staff and students, who come from different PICs are encouraged to study and document their own epistemologies and knowledge systems. A recently published book on Fijian epistemology is an example of the type of research and publication that we are encouraging (Nabobo, 2006). The knowledge that is documented and shared among teachers and teacher educators in our region provides is particularly useful for those unfamiliar with the home cultures of the students that they teach. More detailed information about these types of activities are available from our university website, www.usp.ac.fj and from the UNESCO Chair website (www.usp.ac.fj/unesco-chair).

Another regional initiative, the Rethinking Pacific Education Initiative (RPEI) is also committed to culturally inclusive teaching, learning and

research. Established in 2001, the impetus for RPEI was the continuing failure of Pacific schools to provide meaningful and relevant education for most Pacific students often resulting in student underachievement and high drop out rates (ADB, 1996; Taufe'ulungaki, 2001). Today the network consists of educators and researchers from throughout the Pacific region, including Australia and New Zealand, who, through advocacy, research, and training, RPEI are trying to shift the focus of teaching, learning and research, to Pacific learners and the communities that send them to school. This means empowering policy makers, teachers as well as communities by involving them in educational decision-making in meaningful ways, which often means realising the culturally inappropriate ways of formal education structures as well as processes.   This is a big ask, given the realities and impact of foreign aid in education in our region, which often discourages Pacific people from expressing critical concerns especially about the aid they receive or the work of well meaning foreign consultants (Sanga and Taufe'ulungaki, 2005).

Implications of culturally inclusive evaluation

Developing and using more culturally inclusive methods of evaluating student learning have a number of implications for Pacific education. Three immediately come to mind. The first relates to policy matters. There is a need to have in place policies that acknowledge the importance of the cultural contexts of teaching and learning before we can expect curriculum planners, teacher trainers and assessment personnel to work towards developing culturally inclusive curriculum, instruction, and assessment methods. The second relates to views of parents and guardians. For various reasons including a colonial legacy, many parents tend to see English as a superior language and are often reluctant to see their own vernacular languages emphasised in school even though many know that their children would learn better in their mother tongue (Thaman, 1981). Finally, there are the requirements of tertiary studies, looming in the horizon when school curriculum and assessment are discussed. Would the USP for example, take students whose education and assessment were conducted in a vernacular language, as is the case now with the Te Wananga o Aotearoa (Maori University of New Zealand)? To what extent is teaching in

Pacific tertiary institutions taking into consideration the cultural contexts of learners, and what measures, if any, are in place to ensure that Pacific cultures and knowledge systems are incorporated into the curriculum of higher education, especially teacher education? It was not until 2004 that the Pacific regional university put in place a policy on Pacific arts and culture, which among other things, called for the mainstreaming of Pacific Knowledge Systems in the programs of the university. PKS is also a priority area in the USP's Research Strategy. Ensuring compliance with these two instruments is the real challenge facing our university today.

Pacific assessment experts advise that those who want to be more culturally inclusive in their assessment of students may start with what they call 'assessment accommodation'. This relates to where and how assessment is presented, the timing or scheduling of the assessment, and how the student might respond. Addressing assessment accommodation raises a number of questions. These include the following: i) Is the symbol system in which the competencies are represented familiar to the person being assessed? ii) Is the value system implicit in the competencies shared by the person being assessed? iii) Is the language system used to communicate the competencies familiar to the person being assessed? iv) Are there alternative language systems for assessing the competencies of interest? v) Are there motivational factors within the primary settings which are likely to enhance or hinder performance on the competencies assessed? vi) Are there opportunities for assessing the competencies of interest in more than one primary setting? vii) Is the format in which the competencies are embedded familiar to the person assessed? (Fasi, 2006)

As well as helping identify individuals who are likely to succeed in education or are at risk (of underachievement) assessment also needs to inform and guide curriculum implementation in order to ensure that quality education is available to all learners. According to the SPBEA, the prevailing assessment systems in PICs do not yet fulfil these functions, and therefore the consideration of three areas is particularly important at this time. The first has to do with putting in place policies that can facilitate inclusive assessment. Educational

reforms should not only call for higher expectations and more rigorous educational standards, but also a re-thinking of assessment systems, which include interrogating the basic assumptions upon which they are based, and moving towards systems designed to be more inclusive of students from diverse cultural backgrounds. Policy makers also need to make available appropriate resources as well as create the right conditions for developing knowledge and skills that are worthy of assessing. This means improving teacher capacity to assess students from culturally diverse backgrounds, providing high-quality curriculum materials and making available funding and other support systems. And finally, it is important that changes to the current assessment systems involve stakeholders as much as possible, in discussions relating to the design, maintenance and impact phases of the assessment process. Consultations with education ministries, employers, higher education officials, parents, community leaders, churches, school boards, school administrators, teachers etc. should be carried out in order to obtain their views and inputs (Fasi, 2006).. This approach is also encouraged in the multi-level assessment model proposed by Gopaul-McNicol & Amour-Thomas (2002), which was developed as a response to cultural diversity. In this model a number of information sources were used to assess students' competence and combines both quantitative and qualitative measures including direct observation of students in different settings, as well as interviewing them, their parents and other people who are important to them.

Conclusion

It is obvious that assessing culturally diverse groups of learners using standardises testing is flawed. Not only is it a very culturally undemocratic method of evaluation but also used as the only foundation for decisions about the future of learners either at the next level of education or in the work place, is unjust. Culturally diverse groups of learners call for more inclusive and diverse approaches to student assessment and although this approach may be time consuming the end results may be fairer and more culturally democratic. To accept this as a goal of education in PICs is to have a goal that is worth pursuing.

REFERENCES

Asian Development Bank (1996) *Report on socio-cultural issues and economic development in the Pacific Islands.* Manila, Philippines, Asian Development Bank.

Barrow, R. 1990. Culture, values and the language classroom. In Harrison (ed) *Culture and language classroom*, Hong Kong, British Council, Pp3-10.

Berry, J. 1980. Cultural universality of any theory of human intelligence remains an open question. *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 3, 584-585

Boyd, D. 1996. Dominance concealed through diversity: Implications of inadequate perspectives on cultural pluralism *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(3), 609-630.

Coleman, H. 1996 *Society and the language classroom.* Melbourne, Cambridge University Press.

Cortazzi, M. 1990 Cultural and educational expectations in the language classroom. In Harrison, B. (ed) *Culture and the language classroom*, Hong Kong, British Council, pp54-65

Eagly, A.H. and Chaiken, S. 1998. Attitude structure and function. In Gilbert, D., Fiske, S.T. and Lindzey G. (eds), *Handbook of Social Psychology* 4th edition, New York, McGraw Hill, pp.269-322

Fasi, U.L. 1999. Bilingualism and Learning Mathematics in English as a Second Language in Tonga. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Reading, UK.

Fasi, U.L. 2006. Culturally inclusive assessment. Paper presented at the RPEI/IOE Curriculum Workshop, USP, Suva.

Gopaul-McNicol, S. & Armour-Thomas, E. 2002. *Assessment and Culture: Psychological Tests with Minority Population.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Gordon, E.W., & Armour-Thomas, E. 1991. Culture and cognitive development. In L. Okagaki & R.J. Sternberg (Eds), *Directors of development: Influence of the development of children's thinking* (pp. 83-90). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Harris, S. 1980. *Culture and learning: tradition and education in Northeast Arnhem Land.* Department of Education, Darwin.

Johannson-Fua, S. 2006. Preliminary research findings from Tonga. Personal communication.

Kelen, C. 2002 Language and learning orthodoxy in English classroom in China. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 34(2):223-237 Leach, F. (1994) Expatriates as agents of cross cultural transmission. In Thomas, E. *International*

perspectives on culture and schooling: a symposium proceedings. University Institute of Education, London, pp.371-391

Korman, M. 1974. National Conference on levels and patterns of professional training in psychology: Major themes. *American Psychologist,* 29, 301-313.

Little, A. 1995. Question of culture and education. *Prospects* 25(4):777-784

Ninnes, P. 1991. Culture and learning in Western Province, Solomon Islands. Unpublished MA thesis, Flinders University, Adelaide.

Pene, F., Taufeulungaki, A. and Benson, C. 2002. *Tree of Opportunity*. Suva, Fiji, Institute of Education, USP.

Ramirez, M. and Castaneda, A. 1974. *Cultural democracy, biocognitive development and education.* New York, Academic press.

Riley, P. 1985. *Discourse and learning*, London, Longman

Sanga, K. & Taufe'ulungaki, A. 2005. (Eds). *International Aid Impacts on Pacific Education.* Institute for research and development in Maori and Pacific education, Victoria University, Wellington, NZ.

Taufe'ulungaki, A.M. (2000) *Vernacular languages and classroom interaction in the Pacific.* Module two, Pacific Cultures in the Teacher Education Curriculum Series, Suva, Institute of Education/UNESCO Chair, USP.

Taufe'ulungaki, A.M. (2002) Pacific education; are there alternatives? In Pene, F., Taufe'ulungaki, A.M. and Benson, C., *Tree of Opportunity.* Suva, Institute of Education, University of the South Pacific.

Taufe'ulungaki, A and Johannson-Fua, S. 2005. Hardship, poverty and education in Pacific Island Countries. Project proposal, IOE, Suva.

Teasdale, R. and Teasdale, J. (eds). (1992) *Voices in a sea-shell: education, culture and identity.* Suva, UNESCO/IPS.

Thaman, K.H. 1981. Community expectations of secondary schooling. Directions

Thaman, K.H. 1988. *Ako* and *faiako*: cultural values, educational ideas and teachers role perceptions in Tonga. Unpublished PhD thesis, the University of the South Pacific, Suva.

Thaman, K.H. 1992. Towards a culture-sensitive model of curriculum development for Pacific Island Countries. *Directions* 13(1): 1-11.

Thaman, K.H. 1993. Culture and the curriculum. *Comparative Education* 29(3):249-260

Thaman, K.H. 1999a.   Students' cultural orientation. In Landbeck, R. and Mugler, F. *Hints for teachers,* Suva, University of the South Pacific, pp19-22

Thaman, K.H. 1999b. Different Eyes: schooling and indigenous education in Tonga. In Leach, F.E. & Little, A.W. (Eds). *Education, Cultures and Economics.* Falmer Press, 69-77

Thaman, K.H. 2000. Towards a new pedagogy: Pacific cultures in higher education. In Teasdale, R. and Rhea, M. (eds) *Local knowledge and wisdom in higher education,* Pergamon Press, pp.43-50

Thaman, K.H. 2002 *Vaa*: a Pacific foundation for education for inter-cultural understanding. Paper prepared for a UNESCO/APCEIU regional workshop on Education for international understanding, Suva.

Thaman, K.H. (Ed). 2003 *Educational Ideas from Oceania.* Suva, Fiji, Institute of Education, USP.

Thaman, K.K. 2005, Indigenous education and indigenous knowledge systems: a personal refelction. *International Indigenous Journal* 1(1):23-24

Tuifaga, L. 2006. Culture in the considerations of literacy and numeracy in EFA. Personal communication.

Widdowson, H.G. 1987. *The roles of teacher and learner*. *ELT Journal* 41 (2):83-88