7. Globalised language and culture policy borrowing for Aotearoa: Colonisation, history and language power

Sharon Harvey

Abstract This chapter examines the introduction of intercultural competency into the New Zealand learning languages curriculum released in 2007 and based largely on the work of the Council of Europe. An important question is raised as to whether such theoretical models emanating from Western Europe can address the historical power imbalances that have resulted in extreme forms of oppression and the silencing of Indigenous languages and cultures in previously colonised countries.

Keywords language education policy | Aotearoa New Zealand | indigeneity | colonization | subject languages

INTRODUCTION

Much of the policy work on language and culture education emanating from the Council of Europe has 'gone global' with the Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe, 2001) having been adopted by many countries (Valax, 2011). Alongside, the theory of intercultural competency (ICC) accompanying the CEFR has been folded into language curricula in a range of countries. The apparently winning combination is widely considered to be one answer to the education of tolerant and interculturally competent citizens, and particularly those who are internationally mobile.

This chapter examines the concept of global language policy with a focus on ICC and its particular reception into the national curriculum of Aotearoa. The country has a history of colonisation and, concomitantly, an historical and contemporaneous power imbalance between the Indigenous language, te reo Māori, and the language of the coloniser and now globalised language – English. To add to this

specificity, Aotearoa New Zealand can be considered 'super diverse' (Royal Society of New Zealand, 2013), in that 160 languages are spoken in the community and more than 25% of its population have been born outside the country (Statistics New Zealand, 2020).

In charting the introduction of ICC into Aotearoa through the national curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007a), a question is raised as to whether language and culture policies emanating from other places can be unproblematically transposed into new linguistic contexts without considerable renovation and repurposing. This might be particularly the case where Indigenous languages co-construct and, in New Zealand's context, legislatively frame the linguistic landscape (Te Puni Kōkiri, 2016; Te Tiriti o Waitangi: The Treaty of Waitangi, 1840). In an attempt to rethink education in 'new times' (Luke, 1998), Olsen's (2017) call to education scholars researching Indigenous matters is applied here, specifically to the field of languages education. Olsen (2017, p. 209) writes: 'What is indigenous ought to remain in the centre'. This idea is mobilised to critically consider how languages education, particularly with respect to intercultural competency, should be different in Aotearoa and perhaps in all countries with a history of colonisation.

To underscore the potential problem for non-European countries, researchers have noted that various of the discourses contained in the CEFR policies, accompanying documents and supporting scholarship can be seen as hegemonic in their sanguinity (see as an example, Porto, 2019). By contrast the historicities and accompanying entanglements through which languaging assemblages (Demuro & Gurney, 2019) gain and lose power and become enmeshed in each other may be anything but straightforward. Valax writes that

> the claims made in the CEFR itself in relation to its purposes are, at best, optimistic. They are also problematic when considered in relation to growing unease about what Canagarajah (2005, p. xiv) describes as the 'one-sided imposition of homogeneous discourses and intellectual traditions by a few dominant communities'. (Valax, 2011, p. 47)

In exploring the policy reception of intercultural competency within languages education curriculum and policy in Aotearoa, it is worth considering whether there might be further ways to conceptualise and teach intercultural communicative competency in tandem with languages education. Colonisation and the resulting unequal relations of power vested in different languages (Indigenous and other) have not been an area that the Council of Europe has particularly broached. Presumably this is because the authors are writing for the European context and these are not sufficiently salient issues in that part of the world. However, for settler

countries like Aotearoa, colonisation and the resulting vast inequalities between the language of the coloniser and the colonised has had a deleterious impact on Indigenous languages, their numbers of speakers and levels of speaker proficiency. This, coupled with the dominance of English and the historical tendency to copy the format of languages education from Great Britain (Northey, 1988), alongside ongoing immigration, has irreversibly changed the linguistic ecology of the country, including that of languages education.

As noted, in the Aotearoa context, the Indigenous language is New Zealand Māori. In addition, languages Indigenous to the New Zealand Realm which have been seriously affected by colonisation and, more recently globalisation, are Tokelauan, Cook Islands Māori and Niuean. Other Pacific languages represented by sizeable diasporic populations continue to be impacted by language loss over several generations through the societal primacy of English. In Aotearoa these are, most notably, Samoan (see, for example, Wilson, 2017) and Tongan.

Professor Mike Byram, the key architect of intercultural communicative competency and its application and integration into language teaching and learning has from time to time noted his wish to see the ICC model (Byram, 1997) and subsequent theorising critiqued and perhaps challenged. This chapter is offered in that spirit, one that recognises the huge contribution ICC has made to language education across the world. It is also offered in recognition that we must keep reflecting on and interrogating these matters, particularly with the insight gathered in local sites of language teaching and learning. This chapter is written as a contribution to the 'conversation' that will help us 'think what we are doing' (Arendt & Canovan, 1998, p. 1, as cited in Biermann & Townsend-Cross, 2008, p. 149). As Suresh Canagarajah suggests in an interview with Melina Porto 'We have to keep moving and rethinking' (Porto, 2020, p. 7).

BACKGROUND ON THE CEFR AND ICC

The Council of Europe Framework of Reference for languages (Council of Europe, 2001) (CEFR) was launched in 2001 as part of a determined move to create European Union level policy to underpin and support languages education across the region. This was because language education was and is seen as an important tool for developing European citizenship and integration. The Second World War had highlighted the large-scale chaos, trauma and violence divisive diversity and racism could produce. For post-Second World War Europe, the educational project became one of working towards long-term peace. Language education, with the purpose of creating and supporting widescale multilingualism and international mobility, was considered to be an important way to educate for tolerant

citizenship in Europe and further afield. The Council of Europe's mission in focusing on language education, in effect putting it in the centre of the educational project rather than having it on the sidelines, was to ensure that language proficiency in more than one language and reflexive intercultural competency was seen as the norm and that one language was not considered superior or more important than another. Subsequently the Council of Europe explained their values around language and culture through research and related policy:

> the rich heritage of diverse languages and cultures in Europe is a valuable common resource to be protected and developed, and that a major educational effort is needed to convert that diversity from a barrier to communication into a source of mutual enrichment and understanding … (Council of Europe, 2001)

Traditional approaches to language pedagogy with a linguistic, functional and technical focus were not considered sufficient to fulfil the new goals (Byram, 2014). Learning 'the language' was not enough. Rather, there needed to be a recognition of the symbiotic relationship between language and culture. Reflexively understanding one's own culture and how it plays out in any interaction, particularly between those of different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds, became an important part of the new theory contributing to language education in Europe (Council of Europe, 2001). Therefore, a key component of the developing of thinking around language learning by the Council of Europe was that language teaching would need to become infused with culture teaching. The idea was that culture teaching would go beyond traditional, tandem 'culture classes' focused on the 'target culture', comprised mainly of what Claire Kramsch (1989) and others have referred to as the 'four f's': foods, fairs, folklore and statistical facts.

Much of the theorisation around the new approach was developed by Professor Michael Byram who first published his model of intercultural competency as it related to language teaching in 1997. While the CEFR itself comprises a number of language proficiency descriptors over six levels which can potentially serve for any language (Council of Europe, 2001), the important, even indispensable accompaniment is Byram's (1997) model for developing intercultural competency within the language classroom. Melina Porto (2019), a former PhD student of Byram's, has described the model as follows:

> The model of intercultural competence (Byram, 1997) laid out the different dimensions of knowledge, skills and attitudes, beyond the linguistic, that language education should address. In terms of knowledge or savoirs, intercultural

competence comprises, for instance, knowledge of the ways of life in a given society or context including work, education, traditions, history, dress codes and food, among others. Attitudes have a place and involve the attitudes of curiosity and inquisitiveness, or savoir être, which are complemented with the skills of interpreting and relating those saviors, or savoir comprendre, and the communicative skills of discovery and interaction, or savoir apprendre/savoir faire. Finally, critical cultural awareness, or savoir s'engager, is paramount in this model and involves not only critical thinking but also social transformation through critical self-reflection, intercultural dialogue, and action (Holmes, 2014; Houghton, 2012) by both learners and teachers. (p. 143)

It should be noted that Byram's intercultural competency model originated in 'foreign' (sometimes called 'modern') language teaching, particularly of French and German, in Great Britain (Byram, 1997, 2014). This observation is important because it serves as a cautionary signal that perhaps the ICC model should not be applied holus-bolus to language education that differs in character and context from whence it originated. It is salient also that by 2014, Byram's 1997 ICC model had moved beyond language education to be conceived as an all of education approach for citizenship learning: to combat 'discrimination, stereotyping and all forms of racism' (Barrett, Byram, Lázár, Mompoint-Gaillard & Philippou, 2014, p. 7). As explained in *Developing Intercultural Competence through Education*:

> Intercultural competence is a combination of attitudes, knowledge, understanding and skills applied through (inter)action which enables one, either singly or together with others, to:
>
> - Understand and respect people who are perceived to have different cultural affiliations from oneself
> - Respond appropriately, effectively and respectfully when interacting and communicating with such people
> - Establish positive and constructive relationships with such people
> - Understand oneself and one's own multiple cultural affiliations through encounters with cultural 'difference'. (Barrett et al., 2014, pp. 16–17)

The Council of Europe's design of language policy for post-Second World War Europe was undoubtedly the most ambitious in terms of geographical spread, country coverage, diversity of languages and ethnicities, promulgation and publications the world had seen. It may not be surprising then that other countries,

even those from quite different socio-historical and political contexts, went on to consider and adopt aspects of the policy (Byram & Parmenter, 2012; Valax, 2011) For example, Valax (2011) cites the Chief Inspector of Education for Modern Languages in France and the French National Representative to the Language Policy Division of the Council of Europe (CoE), Francis Goullier, at a CoE intergovernmental language policy forum in 2007 in Strasbourg, noting the presence of country delegations from non-European countries Canada, China, the US and Japan, as well as representatives from Australia. Some questioned whether there was much that was European about the CEFR given its wide international appeal. With such demand, the CEFR was translated into 30 languages (Valax, 2011).

Perhaps the logic seemed therefore irrefutable that with an incoming language learning strand in New Zealand's new national curriculum to be launched in 2007, ideas about language education flowing from the Council of Europe might be picked up by policy makers in New Zealand. In their report 'on intercultural language teaching and its implications for effective practice' (Newton, Yates, Shearn & Nowitzki, 2010, p. 1) in New Zealand, Newton and colleagues undertook a review into the integration of intercultural communicative competency in language policies internationally. One section was entitled 'A global trend' with the final comment in the section providing a rationale for intercultural language teaching in Aotearoa:

> There appears, therefore, to be broad consensus on the role of languages education in fostering cross-cultural understanding. New Zealand is clearly on firm ground in developing an approach to language education which reflects this consensus. (Newton et al., 2010, p. 15)

The report, commissioned by the New Zealand Ministry of Education, provided a rationale for a decision to incorporate ICC that had been made several years prior (see Koefoed, 2012), at least as early 2006 when Professor Byram visited Aotearoa for keynote addresses (Durham University, n.d.) and discussions with curriculum writers.

EUROPEAN LANGUAGE POLICY ARRIVES IN AOTEAROA

Byram and Parmenter's (2012) book documents how aspects of the Council of Europe's work were borrowed into many country contexts. The book is called, *The Common European Framework of Reference: The Globalisation of Language Education Policy*. In a contributing chapter, Glenda Koefoed (2012), a

former manager of language education contracts for the New Zealand Ministry of Education, including those for language teacher in-service professional development, details some of the history of the policy borrowing into Aotearoa. She notes that despite efforts to produce a national-languages policy and concomitantly, a more coherent approach to languages education, the 'turbulent' policy and institutional upheaval in Aotearoa in the 1990s and early 2000s, not least in the education arena, mitigated against this:

> policy developments in languages in this country gain traction through a combination of the legacy of history, external policy, legal, academic and economic influences, changing population demographics, internal stakeholder pressure and overall government policy directions. (Koefoed, 2012, p. 233)

Instead of working from Aotearoa's own linguistic and historical context, however, New Zealand officials actively engaged with the work of the Council of Europe in the 1990s and 2000s, with the goal of incorporating those language policy developments into the writing of the new Learning Languages strand of the curriculum (Koefoed, 2012; Valax, 2011).

Unlike the language policy documents emanating from the Council of Europe (e.g. 2001) and Byram's own academic work (e.g. 2014) where languages in education were generally referred to as modern or foreign languages, Koefoed (2012) refers to the languages in the new Learning Languages area as 'additional languages', noting 'Languages … supported (in the curriculum) include European, Asian, Pasifika and official languages (Te reo Māori and New Zealand Sign Language)' (p. 235). The unmarked 'normal' language that the subject languages in Learning Languages (including te reo Māori) are 'additional' to is English. Nowhere does the key difference seem to be highlighted, that Aotearoa's languages include Indigenous languages and that this might impact on the way policy borrowing from global 'centres' such as the United Kingdom and Europe might or should proceed. Alongside this, there appears to be no recognition, either, that Aotearoa's history of colonisation could have some bearing on intercultural relations and therefore intercultural competency education requirements in Aotearoa. Part of the reason for these oversights may be the relentless focus in Aotearoa on learning languages to speak 'overseas', rather than to be a well-educated and fully participative citizen in multilingual Aotearoa. In this sense, educators see our languages curriculum as being just like that of any other country. The *Joint Statement of the Academies* (2020) is a recent example of a global statement on languages education that purports to speak for all English-dominant countries but does not give more than titular attention to Indigenous languages.

Byram's 2014 paper is a retrospective consideration of the development of his first ICC model of 1988, as well as the more well-known 1997 model of intercultural competency for foreign language education. The article includes commentary from members of his online international 'cultnet' group describing their experience and knowledge of ICC in language education in their countries. Byram (2014) observes that 'The strongest statements come from New Zealand and Argentina' (p. 6). In the former, 'cultural studies is now recognised as a core part of the Learning Languages area of the *New Zealand Curriculum* 2007. Culture and Language are now two equally weighted strands of Knowledge awareness that support students' ability to communicate (Conway & Richards)' (Byram, 2014, p. 6).

This new curriculum learning area, Learning Languages (Ministry of Education, 2007a), unbundled the instructed learning of languages, perhaps more accurately described as subject languages (Larsen-Freeman & Freeman, 2008), from the medium of instruction languages (in this case English, but also in New Zealand, te reo Māori). The new learning area required that subject languages other than English, but including te reo Māori, be available to students from years seven and upwards, although the learning of subject languages was not made compulsory. While a range of primary and intermediate (upper primary to year eight) schools had offered languages prior to this, it had been on a voluntary basis, generally unfunded by the government, and dependent on the availability of language teachers and the somewhat diverse views of individual schools and their communities.

As noted above, from the beginning, the new learning area had incorporated language education trends emanating from Europe, most obviously that of intercultural competency. One of the key documents for teachers is a visually dense wall chart (Koefoed, 2012). The chart, available as a PDF on the Ministry of Education's website, is known as the 'Generic framework for teaching and learning languages in English medium schools' (Ministry of Education, 2007b). The document is multimodal in that information is presented through diagrams, text and images. It aims to communicate key messages about the new learning area to teachers, and presumably, teacher educators. The hard copy poster format for the Learning Languages framework is salient because no other learning area in the 2007 curriculum has been produced in the form of a wallchart. Perhaps the thinking behind the new format was that because this was a new curriculum area and since a new way of language teaching was being proposed (incorporating intercultural competency), it was important to produce it in a fashion that would allow easy access and reference for teachers. The decision to do this may also have been due to the enthusiasm of the curriculum writers to widely disseminate the message that intercultural learning was now an integral part of language learning in Aotearoa (Koefoed, 2012).

Many parts of the chart refer to culture, culture learning and intercultural competency (Ministry of Education, 2007b). None of the text, however, specifically informs the reader that the integration of intercultural competency is a new move in languages education in Aotearoa, and a new requirement for teachers of languages. The Learning Languages curriculum statement (Ministry of Education, 2007a) and the generic framework (Ministry of Education, 2007b) are intertextually linked to Byram's work in several places, both as attributed and unattributed text. For example, in the generic framework the following excerpt appears in the second section under the heading 'Why Study a Language' towards the top, left-hand side of the poster, an important position when reading in English:

> Interaction in a new language, whether face to face or technologically facilitated, introduces … [the students] to new ways of thinking about, questioning, and interpreting the world and their place in it. Through such interaction, students acquire knowledge, skills, and attitudes that equip them for living in a world of diverse peoples, languages, and cultures. As they move between, and respond to, different languages and different cultural practices, they are challenged to consider their own identities and assumptions. (Ministry of Education, 2007b)

This text recirculates the 'knowledge skills and attitudes' of Byram's 1997 model. It also incorporates the important reflexive component where students are asked to question their own cultural positioning in order to respond empathetically and knowledgeably to others.

A shift in New Zealand language teaching to so-called 'intercultural communicative language teaching' or iCLT as Newton et al. (2010) coined the approach was what was hoped for and expected (Koefoed, 2012). However, guidelines for the implementation of iCLT were not included on the generic framework wallchart alongside what came to be known as the Ellis principles (Ellis, 2005 cited in Ministry of Education, 2007b) and so did not have equal visibility for teachers who needed further explication of the new focus on language and culture integrated teaching. The Learning Languages wallchart (Ministry of Education, 2007b) includes ten principles for designing effective language programmes based on a 2005 literature review written in preparation for the new learning area (Ellis, 2005). The principles focus exclusively on pedagogy for language acquisition with no mention of culture or intercultural learning.

The wallchart is named 'the *generic* [my emphasis] framework for teaching and learning languages in English-medium schools' (Ministry of Education, 2007b). It was explained that individual language guidelines would offer necessary advice

for teachers for each language. However, the generic framework itself provides no specificity related to the different languages available through the curriculum. In effect, languages are conceived as interchangeable learning packages even though these languages are very different from one another in terms of their power, number of speakers, function, historicities and their place in any putative hierarchy of languages in Aotearoa (de Bres, 2015). Demuro and Gurney (2018) describe this as 'positioning them [languages] as neutral objects of study rather than historically and culturally situated phenomena through which social practices are interpreted and, reflexively, are constructed and shaped' (p. 287).

In a wall chart designed to educate New Zealand language teachers about the new learning area more or less at a glance and with a strong emphasis on the introduction of intercultural communicative competency, no particular profile is given to the Māori language or the Treaty of Waitangi. Te reo Māori appears only briefly on the wallchart as the whakatauki or proverb for the Learning Languages strand at the top of the wall chart. The whakatauki is 'He taonga ngā reo katoa', which can be translated as 'All languages are to be treasured' (Ministry of Education, 2007b). The chart could just about belong to any English-dominant country.

There has never been a New Zealand language policy document explicating why some languages are offered in the curriculum and others are not. Koefoed (2012) explains that languages have appeared in the New Zealand curriculum through a combination of what has been available historically, political pressure for trade languages and domestic lobbying for community languages. As observed above, this lack of clarity in policy making adds to the problem that subject languages in Aotearoa are popularly imagined as something that is of use 'over there', in far off foreign countries. They retain the fixity of the label used in European and British academic literature and policy, of 'foreign or modern languages' even though the suite of offerings in Aotearoa includes Indigenous languages and languages that are used in New Zealand's diasporic communities (often referred to as community or heritage languages).

This European and British construction of languages as being foreign and/or modern also plays into the organisation of the learning of subject languages. The New Zealand language-specific guidelines are written for people learning from scratch, starting with beginner level and moving through eight levels of increasing proficiency to advanced (Ministry of Education, 2007b). These levels roughly map onto the CEFR levels of language proficiency, and are generally targeted at monolingual English-speaking New Zealand students, rather than diasporic and Indigenous students who may already have good proficiency in a language. It is also rarely considered that New Zealand students may have the goal of expanding their multilingual repertoires to communicate more meaningfully with diasporic

communities in Aotearoa (rather than for travel for business, education or tourism overseas).

INTERPRETING ICC FOR NEW ZEALAND TEACHERS

In 2010 the report on iCLT commissioned by the New Zealand Ministry of Education to provide guidance to teachers on how to teach iCLT was released (Newton et al., 2010). The report was seen as a necessary accompaniment to Ellis's principles for language learning and teaching which were included on the 2007 Framework chart (Ministry of Education, 2007b). It should be noted that 2010 was the year that the goals for the new learning area were already supposed to have been reached: that all New Zealand students in years seven and eight would have access to learning a language additional to their language of instruction.

The Newton et al. (2010) report went further than the Learning Languages curriculum statement (Ministry of Education, 2007a) and generic framework (Ministry of Education, 2007b) to tentatively suggest that ICC theories could be more relevant for the New Zealand context. For example, the first chapter of the report discusses the Treaty of Waitangi in relation to iCLT:

> In as much as intercultural language learning explores the relationship between the environment, peoples and cultures, in Aotearoa New Zealand it necessarily has its foundations in the Treaty of Waitangi signed in 1840 between Māori and the British Crown. (Newton et al., 2010, p. 7)

The authors go on to suggest that the Ministry of Education's new policy move behoves that

> careful consideration must be given to the implications of intercultural communicative language teaching (iCLT)[1] for indigenous peoples in New Zealand. (Newton et al., 2010, p. 7)

It is not clear why the implications of iCLT would be for Indigenous peoples in Aotearoa, rather than for non-Indigenous peoples who may need to take indigeneity more self-consciously into their intercultural frame of reference. In addition, the authors do not take the next step and explain how and when 'consideration'

---

1   See the note on terms in the introduction for an explanation of the distinction between 'intercultural language learning' and 'intercultural communicative language teaching' or iCLT.

might be given. Nevertheless, the report suggests that there is more to be done in refashioning ICC for the New Zealand education system, particularly to address the entrenched sense of entitlement and privilege in the predominantly English-speaking, monolingual Pākeha community in New Zealand:

> Thirty years ago, Hohepa (1978) presented the intercultural challenge for Māori:
>
>   [I]t is true that Māori people have had to adapt to Western civilisation in terms of technology, education, housing, clothing and the like. The striving for the continuation of Māoritanga does not mean the automatic rejection of all which is not Māori. … A bicultural person cannot merely switch languages if he (sic) is bilingual but is also able to handle different cultures in exactly the same way. … The conclusion one can reach is of a possible ideal New Zealander who has his (sic) feet firmly rooted in one cultural tradition but has an informed knowledge of and empathy with others. That there are already many people of this kind in New Zealand is worth noting. But that most of them are Māori or other Polynesians is regrettable. (Newton et al., 2010)

This quote from Bill Hohepa is a gently formulated yet somewhat damning indictment of Pākeha culture and race relations in Aotearoa and stands as an intercultural challenge for non-Māori. Newton et al. (2010) present some New Zealand literature on multicultural approaches to education, as well as bilingual and immersion education in respect of te reo Māori and Pacific languages, noting that 'only a small proportion of this literature specifically addresses the topic of our review, namely intercultural language learning' (p. 9).

Chapter two of section two is entitled 'International trends in the practice of intercultural language learning' (p. 10). From this point the report does not return to the question of how New Zealand's version of iCLT would take into account the colonised history of the country and the inequality between languages and peoples. The justification for ICC in the New Zealand curriculum, notwithstanding the earlier section, is broad international consensus. Given that all the literature Newton et al. (2010) refer to in the 'International trends' chapter is about language education and the implementation of intercultural competency, one might have expected that some other countries would mention indigeneity and Indigenous languages as part of the range of issues to be considered, particularly perhaps the United States of America and Australia. This is not the case. In fact, the languages the literature refers to are most often identified as 'modern' and 'foreign' languages. Sometimes these two lexical items are discursively chained as though they are synonyms. For example:

The Council of Europe's Framework of Reference has been described by Australian researchers as 'immensely successful and influential' (Ingram & O'Neill, 2001, p. 12) for *foreign language* [my emphasis] education policy worldwide. Gohard-Radenkovic et al. (2004), drawing on the European experience of language teaching, claim that:

> [T]he teaching/learning of *modern languages* [my emphasis] seems to us to be the discipline par excellence for intensifying the openness to other cultures and the contact with otherness in the development of positive cultural representations associated with xenophile attitudes. (Newton et al., 2010, p. 11)

Significantly, some jurisdictions have several curriculum documents addressing different categories of languages. For example, Australia now has a separate language framework for Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2015) which was produced in 2015. However, the international frameworks cited by Newton et al. (2010) refer to 'modern' and 'foreign' languages. The practice in Aotearoa of bundling te reo Māori as well as the Indigenous Pacific languages into the same subject languages framework is never remarked upon in policy documents (Ministry of Education, 2007a, 2007b). Thus, the labels of 'modern' and 'foreign' languages are often applied to all New Zealand's subject languages, which is inaccurate and inappropriate.

The six iCLT principles arrived at by Newton et al. (2010), while very helpful to New Zealand language teachers for integrating culture and reflexivity into language education, do not touch on New Zealand's context and history. There is no signpost there for how teachers might begin to consider the historicity of languages and the impact that may have on current linguistic ecologies, and how all this might affect intercultural communicative competency.

POINTING A WAY FORWARD FOR ICLT, PARTICULARLY IN POSTCOLONIAL CONTEXTS?

In order to address issues of linguistic power and history, particularly in respect to Indigenous languages in language education, it may be worth turning to a recent paper by Demuro and Gurney (2018). They make the point that languages are currently served up to students and teachers in curricula as though they are the same kinds of learning 'bundles', as though they require the same kinds of approaches to learning and then deployment of the language and culture, once acquired. However, languages and culture do different things in different contexts and over time. Demuro and Gurney (2018) say that discursive constructions of language:

'have placed parameters on the ways in which language is taught and assessed, and function counterproductively to the goal of comprehending … complexities, trajectories and potentiality (p. 287)'. They therefore 'advocate for a critical analysis of both language and culture – concepts intrinsically linked – and consider how dominant ideological positions are constitutive of hegemonic discourses and material inequalities' (Demuro & Gurney, 2018, p. 287).

As Alistair Pennycook (1994, 1998) was able to do some years earlier and comprehensively for English, Demuro and Gurney (2018) demonstrate their argument through a deconstruction of the history and politics of Spanish. They establish how contingent and situated the power of language is and that languages are not neutral objects of study:

> Spanish is a global language used in various configurations, and across domains, by millions of individuals around the world. Through conquest and colonisation, it has become the official language of numerous nations and territories. It has achieved its status by razing local languages and monoglossically inhabiting high status domains of language use, including government, law, media and education, while simultaneously being positioned as a strategic resource uniting native speakers and determining shared cultural practices. Significantly, however, ownership of Spanish is not equally distributed amongst users of the language. (Demuro & Gurney, 2018, p. 289)

Demuro and Gurney (2018) are referring to foreign language education, but here we can also advocate this kind of tracing back and explication of power relationships for Indigenous languages like te reo Māori, so that students can understand why things are as they currently are in Aotearoa. Alongside, students can be encouraged to chart the development of national, regional and local, (whatever seems more relevant) linguistic ecologies so that they begin to understand the power relationships between speakers of differing linguistic and cultural repertoires, as well as apprehending that things could be different. Like the people who poured their lives and aroha (love) into the regeneration of te reo Māori in Aotearoa, students could learn that their efforts might also make a difference in reshaping language/s in favour of something more equitable, empowering and engaging for all citizens.

Through a reading of critical scholars like Demuro and Gurney (2018, 2019) as well as Nakata (2007), we can begin to appreciate that language and culture education needs to be able to work with power and history in order to increase the chance of students becoming powerful themselves in terms of their own agency in intercultural interaction. It may also lead them to a more activist-oriented

standpoint, one that extends and expects compassionate and politically and historically aware intercultural interaction. As Demuro and Gurney (2018) observe,

> In the … language classroom, the omission of critical accounts of language, culture and power – and of their intersections in educational settings – has the potential to reify existing social, cultural and linguistic inequalities. Language cannot be divorced from society and culture because the prevailing conceptions of language promoted within and across sociocultural contexts are axiomatically tied to historically situated and politically driven social processes. (p. 289)

Martin Nakata (2007), a Torres Strait Islander Indigenous scholar in Australia, also emphasises the importance of historical analysis in accounts of language. He adds that an understanding of the histories of the users/speakers of the language and an appreciation of their 'standpoint' is something that has too often been missing in linguistic studies. He writes, 'If the history of a language and its users is not factored into … theory as a primary standpoint, then any knowledge generated about that language is flawed' (Nakata, 2007, p. 37). Without this historical understanding, it is arguably impossible to analyse power dynamics between speakers and languages. In critiquing structural linguistics and its implication in entrenched conceptions of the linguistic superiority of European languages and, by association, their speakers, Nakata, via Volosinov, suggests 'that in its most basic position, modern-day linguistics assumes some 'special kind of discontinuity between the history of language and the system of language (i.e., language in its ahistorical, synchronic dimension)' (Volosinov, 1973, p. 54, as cited in Nakata, 2007, p. 39). Nakata (2007) states that

> the early linguists needed to incorporate a political path to the speech event being described, and a presence that situates it fundamentally in an economy of negotiating social futures. To achieve this requires no less than a full consideration of the people and their connection to the land and seas, their histories, and their political position. (pp. 38–39)

He believes that the continuing neglect of accounting for actual language speakers and 'the history of a language … remains a fundamental limitation of linguistic practice to this day' (Nakata, 2007, p. 39).

In 2014, Byram explained that politics had been left out of his intercultural competence model because it was not appropriate in a European context. There is no mention of history in the model either. Following Nakata (2007) and Demuro and Gurney (2018) then, there is a question as to how well Byram's (1997) ICC model

can address intercultural competence in language education, especially where the learning context includes Indigenous languages.

In their report, Newton et al. (2010) make the point that context must be factored in when languages education is being designed and taught: 'language does not function independently from the context in which it is used' (Liddicoat et al., 2003, p. 8, as cited in Newton et al., 2010, p. 18). The question of what constitutes context is subjective. The context can be deeply or superficially drawn and taken into account.

The suggestion is that the context for languages education needs to be deeply and specifically drawn for each and every educational setting, taking into account the history/ies of languages being taught, alongside their political and social entanglements, and a consideration of what that means for contemporary linguistic, (inter) cultural practices and citizenship.

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, Byram's (1997) model of intercultural competency as explicated through the Council of Europe language and culture policy (see e.g., Council of Europe, 2001) has been examined in the context of its reception into Aotearoa. The model was integrated into the new Learning Languages strand of the curriculum in 2007 (Ministry of Education, 2007a). There are many reasons why the model has not taken hold in New Zealand language education (Harvey, 2018), but one arguably is its inability to account for the specific linguistic, cultural, historico-political context of the country. Language education policy, emanating from the global centres of the United States and Europe, in its relentless focus on foreign and modern languages, is discursively constructed as something that is ahistorical and apolitical, and important to learn for being a 'global citizen'. However, languages education is just as, and perhaps more important, for becoming a good national and local citizen, especially in countries characterised by colonisation and its deleterious impacts on Indigenous languages, multilingualism and superdiversity. New Zealand students need to expand their multilingual repertoires and develop intercultural competency to aid them in becoming compassionate, responsible and historically aware citizens in Aotearoa. If this is achieved, they will also be 'good' global citizens.

It is therefore incumbent on policy writers to deeply consider the national and local context within which language policy is to be situated and activated. Byram's (1997) theory does not account for Indigenous languages at all, and especially vis a vis English and other global, historically colonising languages such as Spanish, German and French. Liddicoat et al. (2003) have suggested that the local context

does indeed need to be taken into account as language policy travels across the globe. It may be that language policy should be quite thoroughly renovated for its uptake in countries and contexts geographically, linguistically, historically and culturally far from its origin in Europe.

In addition, for New Zealand language learners to become interculturally competent, they and their teachers may need to engage in some critical questioning of what they are doing and why. Some starter metadiscursive questions could include: Why are we learning this language and not another at this time in Aotearoa? How does this language fit into the language ecology of our country and globally? Who are its speakers and what is their history? What (political, social, economic) work does this language do locally and globally? How does this language interact and impact on endangered languages e.g., Indigenous languages, and what is our responsibility towards them? What is our linguacultural standpoint in relation to this language and its speakers? As students are supported to research and formulate answers to these questions, their discursive constructions and lived enactments of citizenship will be critically remade.

REFERENCES

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2015). *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Framework – L1 Pathway – Scope and Sequence.* Retrieved from https://docs.acara.edu.au/resources/Framework_-_Scope_and_Sequence.pdf

Arendt, H., & Canovan, M. (1998). *The human condition* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Barrett, M., Byram, M., Lázár, I., Mompoint-Gaillard, P., & Philippou, S. (2014). *Developing intercultural competence through education*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.

Biermann, S., & Townsend-Cross, M. (2008). Indigenous pedagogy as a force for change. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, *37*(S1), 146–154. https://doi.org/10.1375/s132601110000048x

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M. (2014). Twenty-five years on – From cultural studies to intercultural citizenship. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *27*(3), 209–225. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2014.974329

Byram, M., & Parmenter, L. (Eds.). (2012). *The common European framework of reference: The globalisation of language education policy*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2005). *Reclaiming the local in language policy and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/1680459f97

de Bres, J. (2015). The hierarchy of minority languages in New Zealand. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *36*(7), 677–693. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1009465

Demuro, E., & Gurney, L. (2018). Mapping language, culture, ideology: Rethinking language in foreign language instruction. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *18*(3), 287–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2018.1444621

Durham University. (n.d.). *Prof MS Byram – Durham University*. Retrieved from https://www.dur.ac.uk/research/directory/staff/?id=613

Ellis, R. (2005). *Instructed second language acquisition: A literature review*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/schooling/5163

Gohard-Radenkovic, A., Lussier, D., Penz, H., & Zarate, G. (2004). Reference fields and methodologies. In G. Zarate, A. Gohard-Radenkovic, D. Lussier, & H. Penz (Eds.), *Cultural mediation and the teaching and learning of languages* (pp. 27–58). Kapfenberg, Austria: Council of Europe Publishing.

Gurney, L., & Demuro, E. (2019). Tracing new ground, from language to languaging, and from languaging to assemblages: Rethinking languaging through the multilingual and ontological turns. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *19*(3), 305–324. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2019.1689982

Harvey, S. (2018). Intercultural competency: Policy and practice in Aotearoa New Zealand. *The New Zealand Language Teacher*, *44*(2018), 4–17.

Hohepa, P. (1978). Māori and Pakeha: The one-people myth. In M. King (Ed.), *Tihe Mauri Ora, Aspects of Māoritanga*. Auckland, New Zealand: Methuen.

Holmes, P. (2014). Intercultural dialogue: Challenges to theory, practice and research. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, *14*(1), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/14708477.2013.866120

Houghton, S. A. (2012). *Intercultural dialogue in practice: Managing value judgment through foreign language education*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ingram, D., & O'Neill, S. (2001). The enigma of cross-cultural attitudes in language teaching – Part 1. *Babel*, *36*(2), 12–38.

Joint Statement by the Academies. (2020). *The importance of languages in global context: An international call to action*. Retrieved from https://university-council-modern-languages.org/2020/12/01/international-joint-statement-on-the-importance-of-languages-in-a-global-context/

Koefoed, G. (2012). Policy perspectives from New Zealand. In M. Byram & L. Parmenter (Eds.), *The common European framework of reference: The globalisation of language education policy* (pp. 233–247). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kramsch, C. (1989). New directions in the teaching of language and culture. *National Foreign Language Centre (NFLC) Occasional Papers*, 16.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Freeman, D. (2008). Language moves: The place of 'foreign' languages in classroom teaching and learning. *Review of Research in Education*, *32*(1), 147–186. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732x07309426

Liddicoat, A. J., Papademetre, L., Scarino, A., & Kohler, M. (2003). *Report on intercultural language learning*. Canberra, Australia: Department of Education, Science and Training.

Luke, A. (1998). Getting over method: Literacy teaching as work in 'New Times'. *Language Arts, 75*(4), 305–313. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41962065

Ministry of Education. (2007a). *The New Zealand curriculum for English medium teaching and learning in years 1–13*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media Limited.

Ministry of Education. (2007b). *The generic framework for teaching and learning languages in English-medium schools.* Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media Limited. Retrieved from http://learning-languages.tki.org.nz/Learning-Languages-in-the-NZ-Curriculum

Nakata, M. (2007). *Disciplining the savages, savaging the disciplines*. Canberra, Australia: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Newton, J., Yates, E., Shearn, S., & Nowitzki, W. (2010). Intercultural communicative language teaching: Implications for effective teaching and learning: A literature review and an evidence-based framework for effective teaching. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jonathan_Newton2/publication/282694720_Intercultural_communicative_language_teaching_implications_for_effective_teaching_and_learning/links/5618ab1a08ae044edbad263d/Intercultural-communicative-language-teaching-implications-for-effective-teaching-and-learning.pdf

Northey, H. (1988). *Auckland Girls' Grammar School: The first hundred years 1888–1988*. Auckland, New Zealand: Auckland Grammar School Old Girls' Association.

Olsen, T. A. (2017). Privilege, decentring and the challenge of being (non-) indigenous in the study of indigenous issues. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, *47*(2), 206–215. https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2017.16

Pennycook, A. (1994). The cultural politics of English as an international language. London: Longman.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. London: Routledge.

Porto, M. (2019). Affordances, complexities, and challenges of intercultural citizenship for foreign language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, *52*(1), 141–164. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12375

Porto, M. (2020). Negotiating a diverse orientation to critical pedagogies: An interview with Suresh Canagarajah. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, *16*(1), 81–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480x.2020.1788564

Royal Society of New Zealand. (2013). *Languages in Aotearoa, New Zealand*. Wellington, New Zealand: Royal Society of New Zealand. Retrieved from https://www.royalsociety.org.nz/assets/Uploads/Languages-in-Aotearoa-New-Zealand.pdf

Rubenfeld, S., Clément, R., Lussier, D., Lebrun, M., & Auger, R. (2006). Second language learning and cultural representations: Beyond competence and identity. *Language Learning*, *56*(4), 609–631. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2006.00390.x

Statistics New Zealand. (2020). *2018 Census totals by topic – national highlights (updated)*. Retrieved from https://www.stats.govt.nz/information-releases/2018-census-totals-by-topic-national-highlights-updated

Te Puni Kōkiri. (2016). Māori Language Act 1987: repealed, on 30 April 2016, by section 48 of Te Ture mō Te Reo Māori 2016/the Māori Language Act 2016 (2016 No 17). New Zealand Government. Retrieved from https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1987/0176/latest/whole.html

Te Tiriti o Waitangi: The Treaty of Waitangi. (1840, February 6). Retrieved from http://www.treatyofwaitangi.maori.nz/

Valax, P. (2011). The common European framework of reference for languages: A critical analysis of its impact on a sample of teachers and curricula within and beyond Europe [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/10289/5546

Volosinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language* (L. Mateljka & I. Titunik, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wilson, S. (2017). *A malu i fale le gagana, e malu fo'i I fafo. The use and value of the Samoan language in Samoan families in New Zealand* [Doctoral dissertation]. Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from https://openrepository.aut.ac.nz/handle/10292/10742