Creating Translingual Teaching Resources Based on Translanguaging Grammar Rules and Pedagogical Practices

CORINNE A. SEALS [a]

VINCENT OLSEN-REEDER [b]

RUSSELL PINE [c]

MADELINE ASH [d]

CEREACE WALLACE [e]

Victoria University of Wellington New Zealand corinne.seals@vuw.ac.nz	Victoria University of Wellington New Zealand vini.olsen-reeder@vuw.ac.nz	Victoria University of Wellington New Zealand russell.pine@vuw.ac.nz	Victoria University of Wellington New Zealand madsash22@gmail.com	Victoria University of Wellington New Zealand cereace.wallace@gmail.com

Abstract

This article describes the process of understanding how translanguaging is naturally used in multilingual teaching environments and then applying this analysis to the creation of translanguaging grammar rules and ultimately pedagogical materials. Focusing primarily on our work with a Māori puna reo in Aotearoa New Zealand, but also drawing upon our work with a Samoan a'oga amata, we explain in this article how we created translingual children's books and other teaching materials that are able to embody translingual practices and core cultural values. After discussing the materials and their development, this article ends with an initial analysis of the materials' effectiveness as well as a discussion of the importance of translingual pedagogical materials that goes beyond traditional discussions of codeswitching in the classroom.

Keywords: culturally responsive research, pedagogical translanguaging, teaching resources, acceptability judgments, New Zealand

Introduction

Translanguaging is a wide-ranging concept, lens, and pedagogy. This article examines how translanguaging naturally takes place in a multilingual environment. Additionally, it explains how a translanguaging grammar was operationalized by the authors to create translingual children's books and materials for teachers. These materials embody translingual practices and respective community worldviews (e.g. tikanga Māori).

As a starting point, we consider pedagogical translanguaging as encompassing:

> the ways in which [multi]lingual students and teachers engage in *complex and fluid discursive practices* that include, at times, the *home language practices* of students in order to 'make sense' of teaching and learning, to communicate and appropriate subject knowledge, and to develop academic language practices (García, 2014, p. 112, emphasis added).

Translanguaging as practice and pedagogy has value at all levels of multilingual education, particularly for minority students (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017; Nguyen, 2019). Still, as a relatively new pedagogy, translanguaging resources are scarce. With New Zealand's superdiverse population of over 160 languages (Royal Society of New Zealand, 2013), we were keenly aware of the benefits that translanguaging could bring to education. As such, our research teams with the Wellington Translanguaging Project (WTP) and Translanguaging Aotearoa (discussed later in this article) began producing translingual resources in 2018 for two minority language communities in New Zealand – Samoan and Māori. Furthermore, because translanguaging can help support the minority language speaking students most marginalized by mainstream education, it is crucial that resources are aimed at and designed in collaboration with these communities. This is discussed further, later in this article.

In this article, we present innovative grammatical rules that we developed for creating translingual pedagogical resources. These rules were developed for te reo Māori and Samoan early childhood contexts in New Zealand. However, due to space constraints, this article primarily focuses on the Māori portion of the project for this article, with the understanding that the Samoan portion of the project followed the same general methodology. Additionally, this article discusses the resources that we created, based on these rules. The rules and resources are based upon empirical research and are being tested through empirical research, to merge scientific theory and pedagogical practice. Furthermore, we discuss the benefits of using ethnographic data and real in-class discourse as the basis for designing translanguaging resources and pedagogical grammar rules. For example, these resources reflect discourse that occurs between students and teachers in real learning environments. They therefore provide a baseline of structural support upon which teachers can draw to develop students' translanguaging skills. Additionally, students must see themselves represented in language learning resources, through language, culture, and visual aspects, for them to be effective (Menard-Warwick, 2009; Seals & Kreeft Peyton, 2016). Thus, by collaborating with communities to create resources focused on their real-life experiences and values, translingual education can provide additional support for students from these communities.

In the content below, we first provide key historical information about New Zealand's Indigenous language, te reo Māori, to contextualize arguments about translanguaging in New Zealand, and we follow this with some contextual background about Samoan since we also work in the Samoan language space. Since te reo Māori's revival occurs within a highly politicized context, there is often assumed to be a tension between translingual education and immersion education. For many educators, learners and policy makers, te reo Māori immersion spaces are rare spaces for *full* use of te reo Māori. The politicized history of te reo Māori language loss and revitalization results in valid concerns that

allowing English use, through translanguaging, undermines language revitalization. These concerns and associated ideologies about language revitalization result in a perceived tension between immersion education and translingual education. However, we also argue in this article that this tension, while understandable, is unhelpful, and that both forms of education can be employed collaboratively. Thereafter, we turn to the work of Translanguaging Aotearoa and resources created which aim to cater to learners within this sociolinguistic context.

Overview of te reo Māori

Te reo Māori (the Māori language) is New Zealand's Indigenous language. A younger language within the Austronesian language family, it most closely relates to Cook Islands Māori, Tuamotuan and Tahitian (Otsuka, 2005). Though te reo Māori is not completely mutually intelligible with these languages, they share grammatical and syntactic elements. Te reo Māori is the language of the Māori people, which is a conglomeration of many tribes and sub-tribes living in New Zealand. The name 'Māori' was adopted in the nineteenth century, post-British colonization (Wilson, 2005).

Since colonization, the relationship between Māori and Pākehā (European settlers) has been tumultuous. New Zealand was annexed by Britain prematurely and illegally after the Treaty of Waitangi was signed on February 6, 1840. Settlers arriving en masse introduced disease, land theft, significant wars and a Westminster government which largely excluded Māori (Orange, 2005). The resulting population and ideological shift in Aotearoa (New Zealand) caused a language shift from Māori to English (Ruckstuhl, 2018). In response, efforts to reverse this shift arose (Benton, 1991; Spolsky, 2003).

Language revitalization in New Zealand began in the mid-twentieth century (Spolsky, 2003). In education, the Te Kōhanga Reo (language nests) movement is crucial (see Irwin, 1990 for a detailed history of the movement). Te Kōhanga Reo is a family-based learning environment, where adults are expected to participate in language acquisition and in the nest's decision-making and operations (Royal-Tangaere, 2012). Te Kōhanga Reo were intended to be elder-led, thus ensuring language acquisition occurred intergenerationally (Royal-Tangaere, 2012). Sadly, legislative changes in 1993 forced many elders from their language nests. Though Te Kōhanga Reo still exist as a movement, considerable legislative and legal disruption since 1993 directed attention and resources away from Kōhanga Reo's original goals: to intergenerationally transmit te reo Māori simply and effectively (Waitangi Tribunal, 2013).

Furthermore, long-standing top-down pressure on te reo Māori led to legal action against the Crown in 1984, with the submission of the Te Reo Māori Claim to the Waitangi Tribunal (Waitangi Tribunal, 1986). This tribunal is a platform for Māori to air grievances relating to Crown action since the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 (Waitangi Tribunal, 2017). The Tribunal determined, in 1986, that the Crown had failed to carry out Treaty obligations and that it must take immediate action to rectify that failure. Resultingly, in 1987, the Māori Language Act 1987 declared te reo Māori an official language of Aotearoa. This Act provided a significant platform for language activities, and the succeeding Māori Language Act 2016 represents similar values.

The health of te reo Māori today

Making assertions about the health of te reo Māori is difficult, an observation at length elsewhere (cf. Olsen-Reeder, 2018). Significant amounts of literature adopt deficit ideologies such that the overwhelming concerns over language death potentially skew the reality of Māori language health.

However, earlier premonitions of language death did not eventuate. In the 1970s it was lamented that te reo Māori was one generation away from having no native speakers (cf. May, 2018). This did not eventuate, and a small population of native speakers are being born (Olsen-Reeder, 2017). In contrast, just 2.6% of Māori speakers use the language as their primary means of communication at home (Māori Language Advisory Group, 2016). If the home is as important as language experts believe, arguably te reo Māori is not yet absolutely safe. Not yet safe, but not facing certain death either (Olsen-Reeder, 2018). Higgins and Rewi (2014) already note the language has been revitalized from the brink of death, and the task remaining is to increase the normalization and use of the language.

Puna Reo Early Childhood Centres

To say Aotearoa's education system has not been kind to the Māori language understates the mistreatment of students (Simon & Smith, 2001). Schools were first established by Christian missionaries, with te reo Māori as the school's first language (Barrington, 2008). Then, the Government assumed control of schools via the Native Schools Act 1867. Through the Act, Māori language instruction was de-incentivized and later removed, while English-medium instruction was incentivized through higher funding. These actions stemmed from popular ideologies of language subtraction and replacement in the era – then Education Director T. B. Strong once stated, "the actual abandonment of the native tongue inflicts no loss upon the Māori," (Simon & Smith, 2001: 167). Similar ignorance persists today, with Harlow (2005: 145) noting, "New Zealand is doggedly monolingual both in practice and in attitude."

However, the same education system is now a bastion for language transmission and revival. A key establishment is Puna Kōhungahunga Early Childhood Centres (also called puna reo) (Pohio et al., 2014). These centers differ from Kōhanga Reo. While both are governed by different charters under the Education Act 1989, Puna Kōhungahunga follow the national charter for *all* early childhood centers and employ a curriculum called *Te Whāriki* (Ministry of Education, 2017a). In contrast, Te Kōhanga Reo follow their own tūtohinga (charter), which aligns to their curriculum, *Te Whāriki a Te Kōhanga Reo* (Ministry of Education, 2017b). Kōhanga Reo are thus not adequately described as early childhood centers under the Act. Puna reo also carry a legal classification of a 'playgroup' under the Act, of which there are many different kinds. Kōhanga are not designated as such, but are defined uniquely, *as* kōhanga. Further, Kōhanga Reo must be immersion language spaces, while puna reo need not. Lastly, puna reo are managed, like all early childhood centers, under the Education Act, whereas kōhanga reo are managed by a separate entity, the Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust. Still, both contexts share a unified objective: to provide families and children with Māori language education. The Wellington Translanguaging Project (WTP) has so far worked in puna reo, trialling translingual resources with communities, without challenging immersion language contexts, like those of kōhanga reo.

The politics of language revitalization and translanguaging

As alluded to earlier, there is a perceived tension between revitalization efforts, (particularly immersion) and translanguaging. Despite little academic literature positing that language revitalization and translanguaging practices conflict, through this project, the authors have observed that many people hold this belief.[i] Upon beginning to disseminate this work to academic and educational communities in Aotearoa, practitioners of immersion language teaching have felt that any notion drawing away from immersion education is problematic. Hence, this is worth further exploring here.

Māori language educators in Aotearoa are working in sociolinguistically political spaces, not merely linguistic ones. Understandably, educators thus consider the ability (or responsibility) to control the language choice of learning domains to be fundamentally political and educational. Colonization

dictated English language choices to Māori for several generations, so reversing language shift is generally believed to require similar political controls of English. Given that speaker numbers are low, and that many speakers are isolated, opportunities to speak Māori are also often limited to the classroom. This amplifies the political necessity to limit English in the classroom. Therefore, giving less time to Māori and allowing more English use, is an exercise many educators find understandably difficult, as they try to reconcile te reo Māori's linguistic and political needs with classroom pedagogy.

A counter perspective, however, is that all speakers of te reo Māori in Aotearoa are in fact bilingual in Māori and English (cf. Olsen-Reeder, 2017). It makes sense then, to focus on pedagogical practices that enable multilinguals to use their full linguistic repertoire in the classroom. It also makes sense that limiting a multilingual to a certain part of their repertoire (as an immersion class may do) could potentially inhibit communication in a classroom. Since all te reo Māori speakers are bilingual, the wider sociolinguistic experience of all involved in the lesson is a multilingual one. Limiting students to part of their repertoire potentially produces awkward communicative speech acts that are unlikely to be repeated outside of the classroom, thus limiting the likelihood that language gained in classrooms is used outside of it. It is this latter perspective from which we begin our inquiry into translanguaging in New Zealand.

The Samoan situation

Samoan is also an Austronesian language, but it is closest in form to Tokelauan[ii]. Samoan is widely spoken in New Zealand, with over 86,000 speakers reported in the 2013 New Zealand Census results (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). These speaker numbers make Samoan the most spoken Pasifika (Pacific Island) language in Aotearoa New Zealand. As such, Aotearoa also provides more Samoan language programs in school than for any other Pasifika language (cf. Seals, 2017b for a full overview of Pasifika language programs in New Zealand). Despite the presence of programs in sheer numbers, however, the number of actual contact hours is relatively small, with the majority of schools only offering Samoan as a separate subject, for less than three contact hours per week (Seals, 2017b). Unsurprisingly given this context, the number of Samoan speakers is rapidly decreasing compared with Samoan population growth in New Zealand (Bedford & Didham, 2015). Therefore, Samoan speakers are still not getting the language support that they need for language maintenance and to stave off rapid intergenerational language shift (for a more complete overview of the Samoan situation in New Zealand, see Seals, 2017b and Seals & Olsen-Reeder, 2017).

For children in their early years, some Samoan communities in Aotearoa are able to offer early childhood education services through licensed schools called a'oga amata. A'oga amata are largely bilingual in Samoan and English, though some also incorporate te reo Māori and/or additional home languages that their students speak. Additionally, most of the founders and current teachers at a'oga amata are themselves from Samoa and native speakers of Samoan, and most a'oga amata have a strong connection to the church (Togiaso, 2017). A'oga amata in Aotearoa were originally inspired by the success of Kōhanga Reo, seeking a way to support Pasifika language maintenance as well through a language nest program (Mara, Foliaki & Coxon, 1994). Overall, a'oga amata have seen widespread success in language maintenance efforts, though these do not usually carry over to primary school due to the general lack of sociolinguistically supportive environments at the primary school level (cf. Tagoilelagi-LeotaGlynn McNaughton, MacDonald, & Farry, 2005). However, due to the sociolinguistic success of a'oga amata, families from a myriad of backgrounds choose to enrol their children (for example, the a'oga amata we worked with had students with home languages of Samoan, Māori, Tongan, Spanish, Hindi, Mandarin, Arabic, and more). Given the above information, it should be clear that Samoan situation is different from that of te reo Māori. However, both are equally important communities to support through the sociolinguistic advances that pedagogical

translanguaging has to offer.

Method of Data Collection

The data for the current article come from our microethnographic (cf. Garcez, 2008) work with a Māori early childhood center (puna reo), and we also draw upon our work with a Samoan a'oga amata. Microethnography is a research approach focused on understanding the wider ecology of participants through analysis of smaller interactions (Garcez, 2008). Microethnographies also focus on a detailed analysis of a smaller set of data collected within a more constrained timeframe compared to that found within a full ethnography. Further details about this microethnography and on-the-ground research are presented as background for our resulting translingual materials creation.

The microethnographic study detailed in this article forms part of a larger project investigating translanguaging in New Zealand education – the Wellington Translanguaging Project. The Wellington Translanguaging Project has researched te reo Māori and Samoan language educational spaces – the WTP contexts. Through the WTP, we applied our on-the-ground findings to create teaching materials, and this public-facing initiative is called Translanguaging Aotearoa (www.translanguaging.nz). For the current article, we focus primarily on the portion of the project that comes from the Māori puna reo space due to space constraints, but it should be noted that the methodology for on-the-ground research and application remains the same for all of the WTP (cf. Seals, forthcoming for a presentation of findings from the a'oga amata part of the project). Though, some illustrative examples later in this article of pedagogical grammatical rules and translingual resource creation necessarily come from the a'oga amata part of the project, from which they arose.

Tikanga

As previously mentioned, the methodology employed across the WTP contexts is the same. At times, the centers required different cultural considerations, but this did not change the overall methodology, which was to work with each community ethically and responsibly as researchers while following a microethnographic approach. In the case of the Māori center, for example, tikanga Māori was crucial for our research. Here, we discuss tikanga Māori as a central tenet of the methodology, as it aligns with the data we later present.

Broadly, *tikanga Māori* can be considered as a range of governing principles that are based on Māori world views and that influence Māori behaviour (Mead, 2003). It is important, particularly when research involves Indigenous populations, that the research process considers Indigenous customary practices and aligns with the values of the particular population (Broughton, Lawrence & Jamieson, 2016).

Many tikanga principles were essentially embedded throughout this research, such as whanaungatanga (belonging, inclusiveness, connectedness), manaakitanga (helping and supporting each other), kotahitanga (working as one, together), rangatiratanga (self-governance, being in control), mōhiotanga (sharing information, understanding), tuakana-teina (expert/novice relationships, helping each other), and kaitiakitanga (guardianship, nurturing, reciprocity). Furthermore, tikanga principles were key to ensuring the research and resources were relevant, meaningful and appropriate for the teachers, children and parents at the center.

Whanaungatanga and manaakitanga are fundamental within Māori culture; they highlight the value of connections that people build together to promote a culture of inclusiveness and support (Bishop, 1996). To ensure our research aligned with these principles, it was important to answer questions,

explain the intended research approaches and request consent kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) (Port, Arnold, Kerr, Glavish and Winship, 2008). Face to face communication not only aligns with tikanga customs, but it also helps facilitate relationship building and trust (Port et al. 2008). In addition, involving communities in each step of the research project helps maintain the integrity of the research process (Hudson, Beaton, Milne et al., 2016). Within the context of this research process, we collaborated with the teachers throughout to ensure the resources would be valuable to the educational center. Additionally, ethical research within these communities requires acknowledgment by researchers that once a community invites the researcher in, they are required to continue a lasting relationship.

This study with the puna reo required a collaborative relationship, an understanding of tikanga and Māori world views, to carefully consider how to integrate tikanga into the study (Henare et al., 2019). The understanding and partnership established throughout the research process allowed the data to be translated into resources that abide by tikanga and support the learning and acquisition of tikanga and te reo Māori.

Empirical data collection

Based on principles of community responsive frameworks (Cashman, 2018; Heller, 2012), we conducted all work alongside the community and for their benefit. This included pre-data collection community connections, like going to the centers to meet with the teachers, discussing our ideas face-to-face, and asking for and incorporating feedback. It also included discussing various levels of the project, such as where was best to place cameras for recording, when were good times to record, how involved they would like the research team to be day-to-day, and what results they would like from the project. These conversations continued throughout the data collection and afterwards, placing our relationship with the community at the forefront.

While in the puna reo, we recorded (audio and video) for three hours each session. Sessions took place twice per week for eight weeks. Each time we recorded, we used three audio recorders and three video recorders, placed in different locations throughout the center to record different events and levels of detail (Schilling, 2013; Seals, 2018, forthcoming). In total, over 200 hours of data were recorded at each center involved in the project. Two of the research team members were responsible for the recording and were participant observers, assisting the teachers with their day-to-day classroom management, as agreed upon with the community. This approach aligned well with the community's practice of inviting parents and other community members into the space to assist with the classroom activities. One of the team members who collected data in this center identifies as Māori, is fluent in te reo Māori and English, and used both in this space. The other team member who led data collection in this space identifies as Pākehā (European New Zealander), has basic proficiency in te reo Māori, is fluent in English, and used both languages in this space.

Following data collection, all data were coded emergently in NVivo 10 and NVivo 11 through an approach that embraces the tenets of the Grounded Theory Approach (Charmaz, 2014). This theory aims to explore data in a systematic way, with categories emerging from the data, and themes emerging from a recursive, comparative analysis (Ylona et al. 2019). Based on the emergent trends in the data, representative selections were chosen by the research team, transcribed, and translated. These representative selections were then further discussed in team meetings, alongside the totality of emergent trends from the data. Researchers then transcribed these selections, which were then translated and subjected to Interactional Sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982, 2005). This type of discourse analysis draws upon the researchers' full contextual knowledge to interpret the discursive events under analysis. This was crucial for our project, having taken a community-based

microethnographic approach. Utilising our full contextual knowledge of the space was necessary to accurately interpret the discursive events.

Empirical Findings

An example of our on-the-ground data analysis and findings is presented below. In the following excerpt, the original text can be found in the left-hand column, while the translation can be found in the right-hand column. The bolded text is text originally spoken in te reo Māori, while the unbolded text was originally spoken in English.

Excerpt 1 in Māori and English: Translanguaging in the puna reo.

	Original	Translation
Teacher 1	**Kei hea o whero?** That's pink. **E noho** we will do your colour next. **Re---** have you got any **whero?**	**Where is your red?** That's pink. **Sit down** we will do your colour next. **Re---** have you got any **red?**
Child 1	**Āe!**	**Yes!**
Teacher 1	What's next in the **Uenuku? Kei te pai?**	What's next in the **rainbow? Are you okay?**
Child 2	**Āe…Karaka?**	**Yes…Orange?**
Teacher 1	Close… It is the name of the **marae**	Close… It is the name of the **meeting house**
Teacher 2	**Āe** I have seen it.	**Yes** I have seen it.
Child 3	I think it's **māwhero**	I things it's **pink.**
Teacher 1	I hope it's **māwhero**	I hope it's **pink**
Child 2	Is it **puru?**	Is it **blue?**

As shown in Excerpt 1, translanguaging is a normal occurrence for both teachers and students in the center. It is part of the everyday discourse of teaching, and students are socialized into its acceptability and normalcy, thus avoiding the development of a stigma around translanguaging in this educational space. Additionally, as discussed in Seals, Pine, Ash, Olsen-Reeder, & Wallace (2019), translanguaging in the center assists in facilitating access to tikanga Māori for all students, providing additional transcultural enrichment. By normalising translanguaging and incorporating cultural values, knowledge of te reo Māori is given status and encouraged amongst all children, while also building upon their full linguistic repertoire (cf. Seals et al., 2019 for more on the use and benefits of translanguaging in this space).

Application of findings to materials

Based on the empirical findings of translanguaging in practice, we began drafting pedagogical materials in the form of children's books (these are discussed in the next section). These materials were drafted according to a set of pedagogical translanguaging grammar "rules" that were developed based on our empirical analyses. These rules were constructed by the first author and are based on observed discursive practice, including syntax in use by speakers in the communities. These were constructed to enable us to create materials that support simultaneous development and active use across all present languages. The rules we created for a translanguaging grammar/syntactic model, based on our research thus far and applied to our materials creation, are detailed below:

1. The materials need to build vocabulary across languages – where a phrase or idea occurs in one language, it must also occur somewhere else in the other language.
2. There must be repetition of ideas intersententially but also fluidity intrasententially.
3. Three types of translanguaging should be used, based on our own findings of student uptake in the classroom (Seals et al., 2019) and on recent neurolinguistics research (Treffers-Daller et al., 2018):
   1) *translanguaging for self-repetition* (repeating oneself but using a different language each time)
   2) *continuous segmental translanguaging* (moving between languages intrasententially)
   3) *cross-speaker interactional translanguaging* (a second speaker building upon a first speaker's utterance but doing so in a different language from the first speaker).

After creating the initial draft materials, it was absolutely essential for us to test their validity through speaker acceptability judgments. Speaker acceptability judgments elicit the impressionistic ideas that speakers of a language have about what is 'right' or 'not right', which actually correspond to underlying syntactic rules of a given linguistic variety (Dabrowska, 2010; de Villiers & de Villiers, 1972). To elicit speaker acceptability judgments for our translingual resources, we had members of our larger research team who are fluent speakers of each language and fluent bilingual speakers (both simultaneous bilinguals and sequential bilinguals (cf. de Houwer, 1995), review every sentence created through the application of the above rules. When something was flagged as "sounding strange" or "not quite right", we discussed it in depth, dismantling the sentence's grammar to locate what about it stood out to the speakers. We then made adjustments to the sentence's grammar/syntax until it presented as smooth to the speakers once more, noting the individual grammar points that triggered the revision. We repeated this review several times for each of the teaching resources we created, including eliciting speaker acceptability judgments from the involved teaching communities during a final revision round.

The speaker acceptability judgments were absolutely necessary to smooth out the translingual grammar of our resources so that they worked for each community. For instance, in the Samoan/English example below, we found that the structure of the second half of the sentence goes against speaker acceptability judgments to insert a noun phrase, even though a traditional codeswitching analysis would suggest that this would be fine because it does not violate the free morpheme constraint (Poplack, 1980, 1981). The top sentence was originally constructed based on the rules, and the bottom sentence is the revised version following the elicitation of speaker acceptability judgments.

Example 1 in Māori and English:

> *The **tamaiti** put on their jackets and walk to **le faletusi**.
> The children put on their jackets, **ua alu le solo i le faletusi**.

Additionally, the speaker acceptability judgments showed us that it is sometimes more acceptable for a verb and noun to be translanguaged *together* instead of translanguaging between them, as shown in Example 2 (Samoan/English) below.

Example 2 in Samoan and English:

> ***Faiaoga Rosa ma Pele** are outside supervising the **tamaiti** while they play.
> **O faiaoga o Rosa ma Pele** are outside **vaai tamaiti aoga** while they play.

The fact that speaker acceptability judgments led to the need for a verb and noun to be translanguaged

together, rather than dividing them, is fascinating, because this is different from what traditional codeswitching analyses suggest as acceptable syntactic practice (e.g. Gumperz, 1982; Poplack, 1980, 1981).

Finally, it is also necessary to test speaker acceptability judgments across different languages and communities, as shown in the te reo Māori/English example below. Here the entire structure of the sentence had to be changed to make space grammatically for both languages, including a change in vocabulary. This instance also shows that a translanguaged noun phrase can include the content noun in one language and the definite article in another, even though that was not acceptable in the English and Samoan examples above. Thus, translanguaging is bound by rules of specific languages but also produces its own grammatical rules.

Example 3 in Māori and English:

> ***Whaea Matariki** repeats all the **kupu rawe** the **tamariki** said.
> **Whaea Matariki** repeats all the **korero autaia** from the **tamariki**.

As these examples demonstrate, it is necessary to base translingual resource creation both on the rules we uncovered through empirical research, as well as feedback from speaker acceptability judgments.

Applying the Rules

While the article focuses primarily on the puna reo portion of the WTP, this section draws also upon the a'oga amata section of the project to better illustrate the materials we created and their use in education. To create translingual resources for the communities with which we were working, we applied the above rules for a translanguaging grammar. Figure 1 and 2, below, are examples of the types of materials we created. Figure 1 is a page from our te reo Māori/English translingual book *Good Morning, Tamariki Mā* (2019), and Figure 2 is a page from our Samoan/English translingual book *O Le Olaga A'oga* (2018).

Figure 1 *Page from Good Morning, Tamariki Mā (2019)*

Figure 2 *Page from O Le Olaga A'oga (2018)*

In both translingual children's books we created, we began by first establishing the cultural values that were the main premise of each book, based on our empirical research and discussions with community members. For the 2018 book, we chose to create a story based on the Samoan concept of va. This concept is very complex, requiring multiple levels of understanding, but at its heart is the idea of relationships – between people, and between people and the environment around them (cf. Airini, Anae, Mila-Schaaf, Coxon, Mara, & Sanga, 2010). Respecting this relationship and caring for it is central to va. Therefore, the 2018 story uses translanguaging to build upon students' linguistics repertoires while also fostering students' awareness of mutual respect and va.

For the 2019 book, we chose to create a story focused on tikanga, especially the principles of whanaungatanga (belonging, connectedness), manaakitanga (helping and supporting each other), and kaitiakitanga (guardianship and reciprocity) (cf. Mead, 2003). Like the 2018 book, we used the 2019 book to bridge languages, as well as to bridge cultures and highlight Māori cultural values across languages. The 2019 story therefore focuses on telling a story of supporting each other and caring for the school environment.

Once the stories were developed, we created a script that drew upon the discourse from the empirical research at each location. The script followed the rules that we created for a translanguaging grammar, i.e., (1) wherever a phrase or idea occurs in one language, it also occurs somewhere else in the other language; (2) ideas repeat intersententially, but there is also fluidity intrasententially; (3) all three key types of translanguaging are used in the text (translanguaging for self-repetition, continuous segmental translanguaging, and cross-speaker interactional translanguaging). Then, after the first complete text draft was created, we followed the essential step of trialling it with speakers of the languages. This importantly included both native speakers and heritage learners so that we could account for any variance of acceptability judgments. Based on the feedback from speakers (including members of each community with whom we researched), we adjusted the text. We repeated this process several times with each book until everyone felt that the grammar and overall story was acceptable.

Materials in Use

Currently, the materials are still being distributed to communities, and we now have initial empirical reports of what happens when these translingual materials are used in the classroom. As described by Amosa Burgess & Fiti (2019), their school used our recommended process of reading the text all the way through to the children, and then asking questions in Samoan and in English, encouraging children to answer in whatever way is most linguistically comfortable for them.

Amosa Burgess & Fiti (2019) report that through using translanguaged materials and the recommended teaching method, participation was spread more evenly across children than normal, and children's responses to the story were not compromised by translanguaging in the story. In fact, there were more children willing to try and provide verbal answers. This included children who do not often use Samoan at school; they were incorporating Samoan more into their verbal participation through translanguaging. Additionally, children who speak Samoan as a first or heritage language responded positively to the use of Samoan in the text by actively incorporating Samoan when responding to both English and Samoan questions. The authors note that this allowed children who normally use English to be exposed to Samoan language from other children as well, not just the teacher.

Also important to note is that the children for whom Samoan is a first or heritage language utilized Samoan *more* actively while among their peers for whom English was a preferred language. This is particularly important, as the Samoan speaking children would previously utilise more English when amongst their peers for whom English was preferred, therein accommodating to their English-speaking peers' preference (de la Piedra & Romo, 2003; Giles & Coupland, 1991; Myers-Scotton, 1983; Seals, 2017a). However, when engaging with the translingual materials, the Samoan children seemed to be engaging more in the practice of translingual interaction. This result holds promise for supporting minority and Indigenous languages in school, as discussed in conversations of sustainable translanguaging (Cenoz & Gorter, 2017). Thus, early indications show that use of translingual materials in school are encouraging children to utilise minority languages more, by reducing peer pressure to use the majority language and by encouraging children to try answering questions, no matter what linguistic form this takes.

Concluding Discussion

Translanguaging has been posited as a lens for understanding multilingual practices and has been explored in that context (Canagarajah, 2011). It has however also taken on an important position as pedagogical strategy. For a pedagogy to be workable both in the classroom and in transferring to the home context, it requires investment from the students, parents and teachers (Norton, 1995). It also requires resources. Although bilingual materials exist (everything from dual-language to codeswitched resources), resources for a *translanguaging* pedagogy are less common. Further, demonstrated in our discussion of the application of findings to materials, bilingual materials are not necessarily the same as translingual ones. They fundamentally support different approaches to teaching and to applied linguistics, and in fact, as our findings demonstrate, look different in many ways (Cavazos, 2017). Translingual resources take onboard community practices through speaker acceptability judgments and an ethnographic approach, which can result in different resources syntactically. It is therefore imperative that educators have access to specifically translingual resources for translanguaging to be a viable pedagogy. These resources must therefore be created.

Additionally, it is important that these resources are based on real, ethnographic data, because it helps children become invested. Research indicates that children are more likely to have investment when they see themselves reflected in resources (Martens, Andersen, & Rinnert, 2018; Seals & Kreeft Peyton, 2016). Research using our ethnographically based translingual resources supports this (Amosa Burgess & Fiti, 2019). Through this investment, children are therefore better able to learn translanguaging as a skill. Moreover, the language use is more natural because it is based on empirically observed discursive data. Since resources mirror actual language use, it is hypothesized this may facilitate children's acquisition of natural translanguaging skills because they can connect the resources with their experiences (an area also for future research). Further, ethnographically based resources can help convey sociocultural competency which is essential to translanguaging. This is key in communities who are minoritized or othered, and those who are experiencing language loss, as they may also be

experiencing a sense of cultural loss.

Further, translanguaging theory supports the idea of translanguaging as a socially competent skill (Al-Bataineh & Gallagher, 2018). It requires a level of transcultural competency. Ethnographically based translingual resources can help develop this competency by imparting crucial cultural values. This was the case with *Good Morning, Tamariki Mā* (2019) and with *O Le Olaga A'oga* (2018) which helped teach tikanga values and va, respectively, while also connecting with a mainstream New Zealand understanding of respect for oneself and others. Without an ethnographic approach, creating these resources would have lacked an understanding of the key cultural values these communities wanted their children to learn. An ethnographic approach is therefore essential in designing translingual resources that are fit for purpose.

The rules for a translanguaging grammar that we have proposed are highly significant. This is the first time such rules have been proposed, and they can help other researchers and educators more easily build resources that are appropriate for a translanguaging setting. Moreover, these rules result in positive educational outcomes (see discussion of the use of these texts above) and interestingly differ from codeswitching understandings. This helps to answer the recurrent question of the difference between translanguaging and codeswitching and to show the value of translanguaging rules. The rules proposed in our work also help assuage parent and educator concerns about translanguaging by demonstrating translanguaging's scientific basis, and thus allow for strengthening of the home/school language use connection.

The pedagogical grammar rules we have outlined above provide a very important resource to academics and educators: replicability. As work in the WTP has shown, these grammar rules and the process used to create resources can be used across multiple contexts. Puna reo have particular cultural and political contexts, as do a'oga amata. Nonetheless, the pedagogical grammar rules, tested using speaker acceptability judgments, are transferable and work in different settings. As mentioned, there is a paucity of translingual resources, and translingual resources differ from bilingual ones. Thus, the ability for other educators and researchers to use these rules and make their own resources for their own communities is significant.

Further, for academics, the grammar rules are different from those in codeswitching. This is significant because translanguaging is sometimes criticized in academic spheres as simply being 'codeswitching by another name'. Translanguaging scholars refute this assertion, arguing that translanguaging has a different theoretical basis (García & Wei, 2014; Seals & Olsen-Reeder, 2019). These rules demonstrate that a translanguaging lens also leads to different choices in designing resources, as discussed through Examples 1 and 2. This helps legitimate and explain the difference between a codeswitching approach and a translanguaging approach on a practical, not simply theoretical, basis. Translingual grammar rules go beyond linguistic rules such as the free morpheme constraint to include other factors such as speaker acceptability judgments, making sure they are adaptable across and within communities.

Lastly, the monolingual bias (the assumption that monolingualism is normal and perhaps even more beneficial) is an ideology which translanguaging rebuffs (Makalela, 2016). Language attitudes like the monolingual bias are very closely held, and difficult to overcome, particularly when they concern children and their wellbeing. As a result, pedagogical translanguaging faces a challenge in convincing parents and educators (and, in different educational contexts, students) that translanguaging is normal and can be beneficial. Resources based on an empirically supported translanguaging grammar may assist in educating parents and educators about the scientific basis of translanguaging and can also show them how translanguaging mirrors their own language use and is patterned and replicable. Demonstrating the legitimacy of translanguaging through translanguaging grammar rules can therefore

help both educators and parents accept translanguaging. As discussed above, engaging parents in their children's learning can help strengthen links between school and home. If parents and educators are invested in translanguaging, the school and home link may be better maintained to support children's translingual skills. Initial testing (cf. Amosa Burgess & Fiti, 2019) demonstrates exposure to translingual resources results in children who did not previously use Samoan at home beginning to translanguage, and parents taking steps to support their children's translanguaging.

Creating resources for translingual learning is crucial. Ethnographically based resources and resources that use translanguaging grammar rules can enhance and encourage translanguaging skills and sociocultural competency in learners. Such resources can empower learners in their cultural and linguistic repertoire and therefore have far-reaching advantages for language maintenance and revival, as well as learner wellbeing. These opportunities can especially help communities who need it most, including those at risk of language loss and those who are political minorities. Translingual resource creation is thus of the utmost importance, and we offer the pedagogical grammar rules that we have presented in this article in an effort to help facilitate this process.

References

Airini, M.A., Anae, M., & Mila-Schaaf, K., with Coxon, E., Sanga, K., & Mara, D. (2010). *Teu le va- relationships across research and policy in Pasifika education: A collective approach to knowledge generation & policy development for action towards Pasifika education success: Report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.

Al-Bataineh, A., & Gallagher, K. (2018). Attitudes towards translanguaging: How future teachers perceive the meshing of Arabic and English in children's storybooks. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1-15.

Amosa Burgess, F., & Fiti, S. (2019). Using both Samoan and English to shape understandings, reasoning and appreciation during a book experience in an A'oga Amata: An example of translanguaging. In C. Seals, & V. Olsen-Reeder, *Embracing Multilingualism Across Educational Contexts* (pp. 23-38). Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Arthaud, P. (2006). Designing and Using Digital Learning Resources for Second Language Acquisition: What Skills Do Teachers Need? *ALSIC: Apprentissage Des Langues Et Systemes D'Information Et De Communication*, 181-197.

Barrington, J., 2008. *Separate but Equal? Māori Schools and the Crown 1867- 1969*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Bedford, R., & Didham, R. (2015, May). *National ethnic projections.* Presentation at the Languages and Super Diversity in Aotearoa New Zealand Workshop, Wellington.

Broughton, J., Lawrence, H., & Jamieson, L. (2016). Tikanga Māori (Māori Customary Practices) in Oral Health Research. *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 101-109.

Canagarajah, S. (2011). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 1-28.

Cashman, H. (2018). *Queer, Latinx, and Bilingual: Narrative resources in the negotiation of identities.* London: Routledge.

Cavazos, A. (2017). Translingual oral and written practices: Rhetorical resources in multilingual writers' discourses. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 385-401.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Minority languages and sustainable translanguaging: threat or opportunity? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 901-912.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2017). Translanguaging as a Pedagogical Tool in Multilingual Education. In J. Cenoz, D. Gorter, & S. May, *Language Awareness and Multilingualism* (pp. 309-321). Springer.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing Grounded Theory.* London: SAGE Publications.

Chun Tie, Y., Birks, M., & Francis, K., (2019). Grounded theory research: A design framework for novice researchers. *SAGE Open Medicine*, 7, 2050312118822927. https://doi.org/10.1177/2050312118822927

Dabrowska, E. (2010). Naïve v. expert intuitions: An empirical study of acceptability judgments. *The Linguistic Review*, 1-23.

de Houwer, A. (1995). Bilingual Language Acquisition. In P. Fletcher, & B. MacWhinney, *Handbook of Child Language* (pp. 219-250). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

de la Piedra, M., & Romo, H. D. (2003). Collaborative literacy in a Mexican immigrant household: The role of sibling mediators in the socialization of pre-school learners. In R. Bayley, & S. R. Schecter, *Language Socialization in Bilingual and Multilingual Societies* (pp. 44-61). Buffalo: Multilingual Matters.

de Villiers, P., & de Villiers, J. (1972). Early judgments of semantic and syntactic ability by children. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 299-310.

Fishman, J., 1991. *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Garcez, P. (2008). Microethnography in the classroom. In N. Hornberger, *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 257-271). Boston: Springer.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, Bilingualism and Education.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Giles, H., & Coupland, N. (1991). *Language: Contexts and Consequences*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. (2005). Interethnic Communication. In S. Kiesling, & C. Paulston, *Intercultural Discourse and Communication: The Essential Readings* (pp. 33-44). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Harlow, R., 2005. Covert Attitudes to Māori. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*. 172: 137-147.

Heller, M. (2001). Critique and sociolinguistic analysis of discourse. *Critique of Anthropology*, 117-141.

Henare, K. L., Parker, K. E., Wihongi, H., Blenkiron, C., Jansen, R., Reid, P., & Print, C. G. (2019). Mapping a route to Indigenous engagement in cancer genomic research. *The Lancet Oncology, 20* (6), 327-335.

Higgins, R., & Rewi, P, 2014. ZePA – Right-shifting: Reorientation towards normalisation. In R. Higgins, P. Rewi, & V. Olsen-Reeder (eds), *The Value of the Māori Language: Te Hua o te Reo Māori* (pp. 7–32). Wellington: Huia.

Hudson M., Beaton A., Milne M., Port W., Russell K.J., Smith B., Toki V., Wilcox P., Uerata L. (2016). *Te Mata Ira: guidelines for genomic research with Māori.* Hamilton, Te Mata Hautū Taketake-Māori & Indigenous Governance Centre.

Irwin, K., 1990. The Politics of Te Kōhanga Reo, in S. Middleton (eds), *New Zealand Education Policy Today*. Wellington: Allen & Unwin.

Makalela, L. (2016). Ubuntu translanguaging: An alternative framework for complex multilingual encounters. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, 187-196.

Māori Language Advisory Group (2015). *Pūrongo ki te minita whanaketanga Māori: Te Whare o te Reo Mauriora*. Retrieved 4 July 2019, from: https://www. tpk.govt.nz/docs/Maori%20Language%20Advisory%20Group%20Final%20Report%20 English%20Version.pdf

Mara, D. L., Foliaki, L., & Coxon, E. (1994). Pacific Islands Education, In E. Coxon, K. Jenkins, L. Massey, & J. Marshall, (eds.), *The Politics of learning and teaching in Aotearoa-New Zealand*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Martin-Jones, M., & Gardner, S. (2012). Introduction: Multilingualism, discourse and ethnography. In M. Martin-Jones, & S. Gardner, *Multilingualism, Discourse and Ethnography* (pp. 1-15).

London: Routledge.

May, S., 2018. Surveying Language Rights: interdisciplinary perspectives, *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand*, 48:2-3, 164-176. DOI: 10.1080/03036758.2017.1421565

Mead, H. (2003). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.

Menard-Warwick, J. (2009). *Gendered Identities and Immigrant Language Learning*. Tonawanda: Multilingual Matters.

Ministry of Education, (2019). *Establishing a certificated puna kōhungahunga (Māori language playgroup)*. Retrieved 4 July 2019, from: https://www.education.govt.nz/early-childhood/running-a-service/starting-a-service/establishing-a-puna-kohungahunga/w-hat-is-a-puna-kohungahunga/

Ministry of Education, (2017a). *Te Whāriki: He whāriki mātauranga mō ngā mokopuna o Aotearoa - Early childhood curriculum*. Wellington: Ministry of Education

Ministry of Education, (2017b). *Te Whāriki a te Kōhanga Reo*. Wellington: Ministry of Education.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1983). The negotiation of identities in conversation A theory of markedness and code choice. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 115-136.

Ngaha, A. B. (2005). Language and identity in the Māori community. In J. Holmes, M. Maclagan, P. Kerswill, & M. Paviour-Smith (Eds.), *Researching language use and language users* (pp. 29-48). Wellington: NZLS.

Norton, B. (1995). Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9-31.

Nguyen, T. (2019). Translanguaging as trans-identity: The case of ethnic minority students in Vietnam. *Lingua*, 39-52.

Olsen-Reeder, V, (2018). Deathly narratives: Theorising "reo-rientation" for language revitalisation discourses. *MAI Journal*, 7(2): 203-204. DOI: 10.20507/MAIJournal.2018.7.2.7

Olsen-Reeder, V, (2017). *Kia Tomokia te Kākahu o te Reo Māori: He whakamahere i ngā kōwhiri reo a te reo rua Māori*. PhD thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.

Orange, C. (2005). *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Bridget Williams.

Otsuka, Y., (2005). *History of Polynesian Languages*. Retrieved 4 July 2019, from: http://www2.hawaii.edu/~yotsuka/course/PN_history.pdf

Pohio, L., Sansom, A., & Liley, K., (2014). My Past is My Present is My Future: A bicultural approach to early years education in Aotearoa, New Zealand. In L. Kroll & D. Meier (eds), *Educational Change in International Early Childhood Contexts: Crossing Borders of Reflection*. New York: Routledge, (pp. 103-122).

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en enspañol: toward a typology of codeswitching. *Linguistics*, 581-618.

Poplack, S. (1981). Syntactic structure and social function of codeswitching. In R. Durán, *Latino Language and Communicative Behavior* (pp. 169-184). Norwood: Ablex.

Royal Society of New Zealand. (2013). *Languages in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Retrieved from http://royalsociety.org.nz/media/Languages-in-Aotearoa-New-Zealand.pdf

Royal-Tangaere, A., (2012). *Te Hokinga ki te Ūkaipō: A socio-cultural construction of Māori language development: Kōhanga Reo and home*. PhD Thesis, Auckland University, Auckland.

Ruckstuhl, K., (2018). Public policy and indigenous language rights: Aotearoa New Zealand's Māori Language Act 2016. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 19(3): 316-329. DOI: 10.1080/14664208.2017.1391496

Seals, C. A. (2017a). Dynamic Family Language Policy: Heritage Language Socialization and Strategic Accommodation in the Home. In J. Macalister, & S. Mirvahedi, *Family Language Policies in a Multilingual World: Opportunities, Challenges, and Consequences* (pp. 175-194). London: Routledge.

Seals, C. A. (2017b). Pasifika heritage languages in New Zealand. In O. Kagan, M. Carreira, & C. Chik, eds. *Handbook of Heritage Language Education: From Innovation to Program Building* (pp. 298-312). London: Routledge.

Seals, C. A. (2018). Positive and negative identity practices in heritage language education. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 329-348.

Seals, C.A. (forthcoming). Classroom Translanguaging through the Linguistic Landscape. In D. Malinowski, H. Maxim, & S. Dubreil, *Language Teaching in the Linguistic Landscape: Mobilizing Pedagogy in the Public Space.* Springer.

Seals, C. A., & Kreeft Peyton, J. (2016). Heritage language education: Valuing the languages, literacies, and cultural experiences of immigrant youth. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. Early View: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14664208.2016.1168690

Seals, C. A., & Olsen-Reeder, V. I. (2017). Te reo Māori, Samoan, and Ukrainian in New Zealand. In C. A. Seals & S. Shah, eds. *Heritage Language Policies around the World* (pp. 221-236).

Seals, C.A., & Olsen-Reeder, V.I. (2019). *Embracing Multilingualism across Educational Contexts*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Seals, C.A., Pine, R., Ash, M., Olsen-Reeder, V.I., & Wallace, C. (2019). The use of translanguaging to bridge sociocultural knowledge in a puna reo. In C.A. Seals, & V.I. Olsen-Reeder, *Embracing Multilingualism across Educational Contexts* (pp. 39-68). Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Schilling, N. (2013). *Sociolinguistic Fieldwork.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simon, J. & Smith, L.T., 2001. *A Civilising Mission? Perceptions and Representations of the New Zealand Native Schools System*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Spolsky, B., (2003). Reassessing Māori Regeneration. *Language in Society*, 32(4): 553-578.

Statistics New Zealand. (2013). *2013 Census totals by topic.* Retrieved May 20, 2014, from http://www.stats.govt.nz/~/media/Statistics/Census/2013%20Census/data-tables/totals-by-topic/totals-by-topic-tables.xls

Tagoilelagi- LeotaGlynn, F., McNaughton, S., MacDonald, S., & Farry, S. (2005). Bilingual and biliteracy development over the transition to school. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 8*(5), 455–479.

Togiaso, J. (2017). *Narratives of Samoan Women who Established A'oga Amata in Christchurch New Zealand*. Unpublished MA thesis: University of Canterbury.

Treffers-Daller, J., Hofweber, J., & Marinis, T. (2018). Codeswitching, translanguaging and cognitive control. *ECSPM Symposium.* Darmstadt.

Waitangi Tribunal, (2017). *Past, present & future of the Waitangi Tribunal*. Retreved 4 July 2019, from: https://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/about-waitangi-tribunal/past-present-future-of-waitangi-tribunal/

Waitangi Tribunal, (2013). *Matua Rautia: The Report on the Kōhanga Reo Claim*. Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal.

Waitangi Tribunal, (1986). *Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Te Reo Māori Claim*. Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal.

Wilson, J., (2005). *History - Māori arrival and settlement*. Retrieved 4 July 2019, from: http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/history/page-1

Wiśniewska, H. (2017). Learner Autonomy: The Role of Educational Materials in Fostering Self-Evaluation. In M. Pawlak, A. Mystkowska-Wiertelak, & J. Bielak, *Autonomy in Second Language Learning: Managing the Resources.* Springer.

Relevant acts

Education Act 1989.
Māori Language Act 1987.
Māori Language Act 2016.
Native Schools Act 1867.

Author biodata

Corinne A. Seals is a senior lecturer of applied linguistics in the School of Linguistics and Applied Language Studies at Victoria University of Wellington in Aotearoa New Zealand. She established the Wellington Translanguaging Project and its associated resource branch Translanguaging Aotearoa in 2017 and continues to direct both. Corinne's recent books include Embracing Multilingualism Across Educational Contexts (2019, with Vincent Olsen-Reeder), Choosing a Mother Tongue: The Politics of Language and Identity in Ukraine (2019), and Heritage Language Policies Around the World (2017, with Sheena Shah).

Vincent Olsen-Reeder (Ngā Pōtiki a Tamapahore) is a second language learner of te reo Māori, having started his learning at Victoria University of Wellington in 2008. Since then, Māori language revitalisation have become his passion and main subject of research. Vincent's doctoral research investigated the effectiveness of bilingualism as a theoretical approach to revitalisation. It is the University's first thesis to be written and defended in te reo Māori. Additionally to research, Vincent contributes to the resourcing space. He is a published historical fiction and fiction author, poet, song-writer and also translates.

Russell Pine is a registered educational psychologist in New Zealand who supports children and whānau with behaviour, learning and mental health challenges. He is also completing his PhD at Victoria University of Wellington in digital mental health for young people and enjoys both working with people in the community and conducting research. Russell has been involved with the Wellington Translanguaging Project for over three years and has thoroughly enjoyed being involved in the multiple phases of research such as collecting data and helping to create translanguaging resources.

Madeline Ash is a Student Researcher at Victoria University of Wellington, having recently completed a Bachelor of Arts in Linguistics and Modern Language Studies. She is soon due to complete her LLB(Hons). Her research interests include Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, Forensic Linguistics, Hate Crime Law, and Gender and Women's Studies.

Cereace (Cece) Wallace (Ngāti Ruanui, Ngā Rauru, Ngāti Tuwharetoa, Ngāti Kahungunu) is the Administrator for Āwhina, the Māori student support team at Te Herenga Waka – Victoria University of Wellington, and holds an Honour's degree from this institution. As well as an academic, Cece is an award-wining Waka Ama paddler, and is actively raising a new generation of Māori speakers.

---

[i] This is explored more fully in Seals and Olsen-Reeder (forthcoming). Translanguaging in Conjunction with Language Revitalisation. *System*.
[ii] Information on language families confirmed in the Ethnologue online repository.