

Pedagogy and Relationality: Weaving the Approaches

Ana Heti Veikune, Jacinta Oldehaver, Seu'ula Johansson-Fua and Rebecca Jesson

Abstract

Many educationists from the Pacific and elsewhere have drawn attention to the need for comparative educationists and those active in shaping international development discourse to abandon universalist assumptions of knowledge, teaching and learning. They recognize the depth and diversity of epistemological understandings upheld by indigenous education communities and their pedagogical implications. They call for the development of pedagogical models that move beyond the teaching practices upheld in the global north, and that demonstrate an understanding of how teachers' beliefs, values and practices are shaped and informed by the cultural contexts in which schools exist. A particular concern increasingly expressed is the persistence with which pedagogical reforms promoted by the global education agenda of recent decades assume a pedagogical binary between 'teacher-centered' and 'student-centered', and the extent to which so-called developing countries are urged to abandon the former in favour of the latter in order to improve student learning outcomes.

In this chapter we highlight the ways in which researcher-practitioners involved in literacy improvement interventions in Pacific Islands countries moved beyond the notion of such a binary. Explored are the processes of co-designing pedagogical approaches aimed at improved literacy teaching and learning and the extent to which these required close attention to a range of cultural and contextual considerations.

Keywords

teaching – learning – knowledge – epistemology – indigenous – *talanoa* – dialogic – culture

1 Introduction

This chapter's attention to pedagogy is central to the themes of 'relationality' and 'learning' and to the key line of argumentation that epistemologies indigenous to the intervention contexts should have a crucial role in the transformational teaching and learning processes being sought (see Chapters 1 and 3). The strengths-based approach underpinning the interventions includes the understanding that pedagogical improvement means building from existing beliefs and practices about teaching and learning. The epistemological understandings upheld by school systems, leaders and teachers, and the expectation that the pedagogies these understandings imply will enable them to meet their country's educational goals and objectives, are recognized as deeply embedded.

The research-practice team engaged in the interventions, therefore, understood pedagogy as more than teaching technique; rather pedagogy was accepted as a moral and purposeful activity based on important values and ethics shaped and informed by the socio-cultural context in which schools exist. Also understood was that because 'culture' is what gives meaning to school life (Alexander, 2001) so it must be central to education research-practice. Of particular resonance to the intervention team's exploration of a contextually and culturally relevant pedagogical approach was Alexander's explanation of pedagogy as, "the crucial point at which culture, history, policy and ideas about education come together as observable action and felt experience in the classroom" (*ibid.*, p. 7). Of further interest is the call for more research on learning itself, on what actually happens in classrooms, in order to develop a pedagogical model that takes into account that schools and teachers practices are informed by deeply embedded socio-cultural environments as well as institutional norms and structural conditions (Tabulawa, 2003).

Another matter of debate informing the research-practice team's attention to the pedagogical knowledge and skills required to improve literacy teaching and learning, was that of the often-assumed binary between 'teacher-centered' and 'student-centered' classroom approaches. Despite a significant research literature demonstrating this as oversimplifying the complexities of teaching and learning environments (e.g., Barrett, 2007; Schweisfurth, 2011), of concern is the uncritical endorsement by many international development agencies and actors that 'developing' countries should abandon the former in favor of the latter. Of particular interest to us was the work of Guthrie (2011), an Oceanic educationist whose research is specifically informed by his work in Pacific schools and classrooms. According to Guthrie, teacher-centeredness should not be seen as an intermediary step to student-centeredness; rather it is

central to many developing countries' school systems because of its compatibility with both traditional and contemporary cultural practices. Therefore, he maintains, teacher directed learning should not be considered a problem readily fixed through external assistance, "but a deep-rooted cultural behaviour capable of playing an important role" in the further education development of those systems (ibid., p. xxviii).

Guthrie's highlighting of the need for research into processes of working with existing pedagogies in order to discover the contextual implications for improving them, rather than trying to replace them, leads us to McPhail's notion of 'mixed pedagogies' (McPhail, 2013). He emphasizes the need for those driving pedagogical reform to acknowledge that pedagogy is more than a simple binary, or an unproblematic progression from teacher-centered to student-centered classroom practices. His mixed pedagogy approach is based on the selection of certain elements of both teacher-centered and student-centered approaches. Rather than try to replace one approach with another, he proposes that the mix of elements from each approach is improved by building on what already exists within a particular context (McPhail, 2013, p. 122).

Thus, for our research-practice team, working with school leaders and teachers to develop the pedagogical knowledge and skills for improved literacy teaching and learning required attention to a range of contextual and cultural considerations. Moreover, it required 'mixed pedagogies'. Using a metaphor of weaving (Veikune & Spratt, 2016), culturally informed dialogue through *talanoa* (Vaioleti, 2016) and the notion of dialogic pedagogy (Alexander, 2006), empirical investigations into processes of teaching interactions and student learning became the basis of an exploration into the development of contextually based pedagogies.

2 The Pedagogies of *lālanga*: An Example from Tonga

The *Lālanga* (mat-weaving) metaphor was developed to help explain and describe the activities in the program and to explore the process that many Pacific children employ to learn many things. Weaving is the intricate maneuvering (skilled and otherwise) of plant fibres/textiles so that a mat is achieved, and in the Pacific, it is mostly the interlacing of *fe'unu* (strips/strands) of pandanus, in a straight line running the width of the mat. The weavers select the strongest strands to begin the *fatu*, the first row/run of the mat. Only skilled weavers start the mat because that first run determines the straight line of the mat and ensures the right tension is sustained so that the mat does not unravel. The second row is called the *hala fakama'ufatu*, translated as 'the run

that binds/makes stronger'. It is supposed to hold the first row in place and further ensures the mat will be a strong one. Novice weavers watch the weaving and might be allowed to weave small portions while the skilled weaver looks on and monitors. As the mat advances, and the weavers get more confident, they begin to add new strands and make innovations, they begin to make sense of new or acquired knowledge, so that the acquisition of new knowledge becomes almost seamless and, therefore, less stressful for the learner-weaver.

The *Lālanga* metaphor is discussed here for two purposes; one is that the *Lālanga* metaphor symbolizes the work that was done during the interventions from a relational perspective. Two, is that the *Lālanga* process itself, is analyzed to illustrate a particular pedagogical approach situated within a particular socio-cultural context.

3 *Lālanga* as a 'Mixed Pedagogy'

The strengths-based approach taken by this program was based on the understanding that to improve pedagogy was to build from existing beliefs and practices about teaching and learning. And while the classroom-based research offered detailed descriptions of observable teaching practices and student learning, Alexander's call for attention to culture, encouraged the team to also look to the socio-cultural context that embeds the classroom practices. The *Lālanga* process itself illustrates to some degree Tongan beliefs about ways of knowing (epistemology) and how we learn and teach others (pedagogy) about the art of weaving. The *Lālanga* as an act illustrates a pedagogy that is more than the technique of teaching weaving; the *Lālanga* is also a pedagogy that is built on moral and purposeful activities based on the important values and ethics of Tongan society. In this sense, *Lālanga*—as a relational act and as a pedagogy—honors Tongan relationships and communal obligations.

The *Lālanga* also has strong synergy with the Tonga Curriculum Framework (TCF) (2011) which, based on research undertaken by Taufe'ulungaki, Johansson-Fua, Manu and Takapautolo (2007), articulates how Tongan students *ako* (learn) best: through *fakafanongo* (listening), *siofi* (observation), *akoako ngāue* (practice) and *ngāue'i/tā* (performance). In teaching, the teacher (*faiako*) firstly demonstrates (*fakatātā*), followed by practice with the students (*kaungā ala*), then students will be monitored and evaluated (*fakatonutonu*) after which they will perform (*ngāue'i/tā*). The emerging pedagogy identified by Taufe'ulungaki et al. (2007), which now guides teachers' delivery of Tonga's official curriculum, closely aligns with the *Lālanga* as a 'mixed pedagogy' insofar as it speaks not only to the student's learning but also the teacher's approach. There is

attention to both teacher-centeredness and student-centeredness. Moreover, central to writings by Tongan academics (Johansson-Fua et al., 2008; Thaman, 1988) on what education means and entails, is the deep and creative engagement with the words associated with education: *ako* (learn) *poto* (skill) *'ilo* (knowledge) in all its forms, meanings, connotations, and nuances.

Fusitu'a and Coxon (1998) refer to the concept of *poto* as the ideal of an educated person as both a thinker and one who could apply knowledge in practical ways. In Helu-Thaman's (1997) words, such a person is one "who knew what to do and did it well... who used *'ilo*, knowledge, in ways deemed to be beneficial to the collective good of the family, wider community, or the nation" (p. 122). Further explained was that although the traditional notion of *poto* changed under 'western' influence, with less emphasis on the practical application of abstract knowledge, the work of Tongan educationists was leading to a re-evaluation of the notion of *poto* with reference to the educational model upheld by King George Tupou I (see Chapter 2), who recognized no necessary contradiction between Tongan and 'western' educational forms and practices. The adoption of one did not mean the exclusion of the other; one was not a substitution for the other or superior to it.

The Literacy and Leadership Initiative (LALI) gave us the opportunity to explore the multi-faceted process of *ako* (learning), especially enabling school principals and teachers to engage with their school data (classroom observations, student achievement). The Talanga Laukonga process (see Chapter 3) provided parents the opportunity to *talanoa* about their home literacy experiences and learn about the activities which could enrich their child's classroom experience. The overall LALI process allowed principals and teachers to collaboratively *ako* (learn), so that they would *'ilo* (know) more about their schools and their students and, in the process, use that *'ilo* (knowledge) and *poto* (cleverness) to make well-informed plans about literacy. The weaving exercise was an enriching experience, made rich because of the engagement of weavers at all levels of the educational experience, and the use of context-specific resources and knowledge to build into the learning of the new without abandoning the old.

4 The Observable Acts

In maintaining that pedagogy in general requires teachers to make decisions on a wide and flexible array of skills and knowledge situated within relationships, beliefs and theories, we are drawing on a further statement of Robin Alexander (2009) that,

Pedagogy is the observable act of teaching together with its attendant discourse of educational theories, values, evidence and justifications. It is what one needs to know, and the skills one needs to command, in order to make and justify the many different kinds of decisions of which teaching is constituted. (p. 5)

Teachers work on theories of what students know and need to know; based on deep understandings of the focus and content of the learning they collect or build a bank of resources to support the learning, and consider how students are progressing in their learning, and adjust or adapt accordingly. Ultimately, flexible enactment of pedagogies will require expertise and knowledge in being able to weave such extensive repertoires into daily opportunities to learn in order to achieve the outcomes that are desired for the students. Pedagogy, therefore can be considered as decision making; as the weaving of repertoires based on theories and knowledge within the specific context. Effective pedagogy is the selection and combination of the repertoires in ways that best support learning.

From the outset of both the interventions central to this book, it was apparent that some approaches to literacy pedagogy were more visible than others in the classes that we observed. Our approach therefore was to acknowledge existing foundations of strength. Based on teachers' and leaders' contributions and feedback the research-practice team was able to discern what was valued and what was known already. From these starting points, we were able to discuss collectively which directions could build from these existing strengths. Our talk sought to understand new applications of these resources to respond to the patterns of student strength and need. The approach was one of weaving the pedagogic mat from the threads of teachers' and students' strengths. As such, the approach was intended to harness the cultural, social and cognitive diversity across countries, schools, leaders, students and teachers.

The research-practice team used a classroom observation tool to record observable acts. This tool was co-designed by members of the research-practice team from the three countries concerned. Our deliberate efforts to weave the combined knowledge from across the Pacific Ocean through talk began with providing space and time to design and critique the classroom observation tool that would help us understand literacy teaching and learning practice in classrooms.

When learning to read and write, students need to orchestrate a number of key challenges. They need knowledge of letters and sounds. They need knowledge of words, and how to say them and spell them. But reading (or writing)

goes beyond the encoding of sound to text. Students also need vocabulary knowledge, they need to comprehend what they read, they need to know whether or not they have comprehended, and they need to deepen their understanding or consideration of something through considering what if anything this new information adds to their existing knowledge base. In writing, they need to have good ideas to write about, knowledge of language and text structure to express those ideas clearly and of how to choose and combine language in ways that best expresses the intended message.

In the early phases of the LALI program, classroom observation data revealed that teachers in the classroom tended to focus on literacy areas that were discrete skills or items of knowledge. Such discrete skills included areas such as single letter and single word items, either read or written. Fundamentally, knowing letter sounds and being able to identify letters and words is important in learning to read and teachers demonstrated facility with developing these skills. From this firm basis, we were able to extend the content focus to higher order cognitive processes, such as reading longer, more varied texts, and engaging in *talanoa* to further think critically about and thus comprehend what was read.

The tool also provided a snapshot of the approach taken in lessons. There are many ways that teachers might choose to present a lesson or engage students in learning, and a number of key approaches were observed.

- A straightforward way to present new information was the direct teacher-led approach of telling students the information (*fakatātā*). This approach is well suited when the knowledge is formally described and new to learners. On our observation tool, we described this as ‘lecturing’ or ‘telling’.
- An approach similar in form to lecturing, but having a different purpose, was modelling. In this approach, a teacher might ‘show’ students how to go about achieving a task. An example of modelling was when teachers ‘think aloud’ about the thoughts and problem solving processes that they were using as they tackled a challenging task (for example, a teacher might say “I’m going to look for the key words in this passage to get a good idea of what it is mainly about”).
- Practice (*kaungā ala*) is an important part of literacy learning. A key approach that supported practice is repetition and recitation. This approach was well suited to learning something to the point of overlearning – when automaticity and speed of recall was required.
- Sometimes teachers supported students while they were engaged in a task. This approach relied on the teacher giving assistance to students who are having difficulty, redirecting students who have gone off track, or ascertaining how well students have understood (*fakatonutonu*). The approach often

- takes the form of 'roving', moving around a class, checking in with students, pausing briefly to confirm, redirect, praise, offer a key piece of information, and informally monitoring the students' success. This approach is suited to tasks that are mostly within the students' reach and may just need a small amount of input from the teacher.
- Questioning was also apparent in the observable acts. In this approach a teacher asked a question to groups of students, who answered, and received confirmation, redirection or another question. Teachers used questioning sequences often to check that students had learned or remembered key information.
 - A final approach observed was discussion. These were exchanges that went beyond short answers, to extended turn taking, following the contextually and culturally rich process of *talanoa*, which is elaborated below.

5 Weaving a New Pedagogy

Classroom talk might be considered to be the site where culture gives meaning to school life. As a pedagogy, talk instantiates an epistemological stance, the relationships between speakers and a theory of learning. Here, we draw on 'talk' as a pedagogy familiar to the research-practitioner team from diverse perspectives. In this section we briefly describe a dialogic approach to teaching (Alexander, 2006) alongside the contextually familiar cultural practice, of *talanoa* (Violeti, 2006, 2013, 2016).

There are many definitions of dialogic pedagogy from various international authors in this field (e.g., Mercer & Dawes, 2010; Michaels, O'Connor, & Resnick, 2010; Reznitskaya & Wilkinson, 2015). Alexander's (2006) substantial contribution identified five principles of productive talk in classrooms. For him dialogic teaching is;

- *collective*: teachers and children address learning tasks together, whether as a group or as a class rather than in isolation;
- *reciprocal*: teachers and children listen to each other, share ideas and consider alternate viewpoints
- *supportive*: children articulate their ideas freely, without fear of embarrassment over 'wrong' answers; and they help each other to reach common understandings
- *cumulative*: teachers and children build their own and each other's ideas and chain them into coherent lines of thinking and enquiry;
- *purposeful*: teachers plan and facilitate dialogic teaching with particular educational goals in view (p. 38).

These principles of a dialogic approach resonate with the pan-Polynesian concept of *talanoa*. From a research perspective, ‘*talanoa*’ is both method (technique or process) and methodology (philosophical guide) (‘Otunuku, 2011; Johansson-Fua, 2014). In Tongan culture, according to Vaoleti (2016), “*Talanoa* is a process that is an important part of social identity and a Pacific way of viewing and negotiating the world” (p. 4). Moreover, it is values-based (Manu’atu, 2000; Fa’avae, Jones, & Manu’atu, 2016; Johansson-Fua, 2014) which encompasses Alexander’s wider definition of what pedagogy entails. Like Alexander’s notion of dialogic pedagogy, it is both “functional and relational; it is an instruction of what to do and how that is to be done” (Vaoleti, 2016, p. 2).

The dialogic principles: reciprocal, supportive and collective have a synergy with the values-based practices of *talanoa*. The values-base is elucidated by Johansson-Fua (2014) who promotes four key principles of *faka’apa’apa* (respect), *loto fakatōkilalo* (humility), *fe’ofa’aki*, (love, compassion) and *feve-itoka’i’aki* (caring and generosity). Also, for students to be skilled in the act of *talanoa*, they need to be skilled in *fanongo* (listening). As pointed out by Taufe’ulungaki et al. (2007), the process of learning begins with *fanongo* (listening) and *siofi* (observation) both of them practices underpinned by values such as humility and respect.

Alexander’s (2006) final principle, ‘cumulative’ implies the need to build deliberately and explicitly on the contributions of others. This cumulative principle references collective meaning making, through conversations built on relationality. *Talanoa* operationalizes this due to the way in which it opens up culturally appropriate discourse opportunities in which “...Pacific peoples undertake to create meanings about themselves within the world in which they live and their relationships to that world and each other” (Vaoleti, 2016. p. 1).

The principles that make dialogic pedagogy effective for promoting cumulative and collective thinking are instantiated in the use of *talanoa*: within professional learning meetings and as an approach in classrooms, as talk becomes both *what to do* and *how it is done*.

Conversation beyond ‘question and answer’ to more in-depth exploring of ideas, opinions and perspectives is a powerful approach when thinking deeply is required. Such conversations require that students share their thinking, possibly justifying their response or considering alternative ideas. Internationally, classroom conversations of the sort that Alexander described, which might be considered a specialized form of *talanoa*, where students engage in turn taking and building on each other’s ideas, are rare. However, when they were observed, they were powerfully supportive of critical thinking and depth of learning, signifying *talanoa malie*, dialogue that makes sense and is interesting (Taufe’ulungaki et al., 2007).

We used our observations of classrooms to understand the patterns of approaches that teachers chose in their lessons. In the early phases of the program, most common were teachers showing students how to perform tasks or using pedagogical approaches that entailed repetition. There were also question and answer sequences that sought information, for example the title and the author of the story. We asked whether a predominance of an approach might mean that teachers need support in knowing how to enact a more challenging approach. Such a situation provided the opportunity for offering a greater variety of threads for use in the mat: for widening the repertoire of approaches. In other situations, an approach chosen might not be the most appropriate way of teaching the target skill. In such a situation, weaving offered the opportunity to consider which thread might best be suited to the particular place in the mat. In this situation, teachers might be supported to match the choice of an approach to the focus of the teaching: choosing a suitable approach for their intended lesson or choosing multiple approaches within a lesson.

6 The Many Different Kinds of Decisions of Which Teaching Is Constituted

Consistent with our commitment to the notions of collaboration and partnership, our approach included the sharing of analyses and findings from the observations with all of our teachers and leaders. These *workshops* which were renamed '*sensemaking*' were a catalyst, we believed, for examining classroom focus and approaches, and sought to move towards patterns of *talanoa*, in content and form. Our ongoing process of collecting and then sharing back data about observable acts provoked the discussion based on what was observed, and therefore interpreted as occurring in context. Coupled with the collection of teacher and leader voice, the research-practice team was able to carefully categorize the strengths identified in these data before we began to weave together subsequent professional learning sessions, wherein teachers engaged in conversations, making decisions about focus and approaches for students with different literacy strengths and needs. This process supported our own stance of a formative approach, which modelled building from a position of strength, and made visible the processes required to use the strengths of the learners as resources for weaving new instructional designs.

Teachers engaged in discussions about the data showing the collective patterns of observable acts. We asked teachers and leaders, "what can we change to improve children's literacy?" Responses illustrated that there were already

solutions *within* that would support teachers to make decisions about their focus and approach to literacy. The task for the research-practice team was then to provide professional development content that would widen teachers' repertoire of approaches, and help them align those approaches most closely to their wider literacy focus.

7 Teachers Theories and Ideas as a Basis for Decisions

As discussed, pedagogy incorporates theories and beliefs about teaching and learning. Teachers and leaders reported that they valued thinking as important for students. Enacted, a shift towards approaches that valued thinking would also increase opportunities for students to engage in the literacy learning desired for them. One teacher explained her beliefs, "Teacher must try to ask questions at a higher level to encourage children to a higher level of thinking". Another simply stated that it was time to, "Do something about copying!" Many more suggested the need for a reduction of low level, constrained skills, "Less copying, more writing activities for them to *think*." Teachers suggested the need to increase discussion-based pedagogy, the need for teachers to be active in developing their own questioning strategies and proposed a focus on becoming better prepared in the planning stages' "I need to be prepared, to plan activities before the children come (the day before). Lessen copying time. Encourage student composition, with support from the teacher". The talk among teachers focused on the ways that they might enact those theories. The focus on composition, for example, also required teachers to think about innovative ways in which in-class support would benefit the achievement of these valued goals.

The observable form of the pedagogic *talanoa* was a cycle of data collection, feedback, sense making, planning and idea sharing. Over time the research-practice team observed increasing changes in the approaches and focus observed. Observable acts changed in focus, from reading single letter/words, towards reading texts, and then talking and thinking together about the text messages. Matching the shift in focus was a change in the approaches used by these teachers. Notable was an increase in discussion-based pedagogy and a marked decrease in showing and repetition. These changes signaled that students would be more likely to engage in higher order thinking and learning opportunities as a result.

Increasingly, teachers became critical of approaches that did not serve their theories. Teachers shared illustrations of change, reflecting on how they might increase student engagement beyond rote and recitation. Teachers' responses

showed openness to self-evaluation; for example, one teacher recorded, "My main weaknesses in teaching reading is in the asking of questions. I ask the same questions all the time. I mostly just use the stories on the charts so might have encouraged less thinking". Some teachers' reflections were modest about what they felt was making the difference, but explored the breadth of approaches and tasks required to improved outcomes, "Some students have improved and have moved from one group to another. All I did was involve children more in class activities, take more time to lead the slow groups and deal with kids that have problems individually and do more spelling and vocabulary works. Making varieties of activities helped too!" A further comment supported teachers' decision making and planning, "To further develop reading and making meaning, teacher first has to know what he/she will do".

Observations at the conclusion of the intervention programs revealed that teachers provided a greater range of opportunities to read text and engaged students in activities that required comprehension of texts. Furthermore, students were actively engaged for a higher proportion of time in class and students participated in much more *talanoa* during reading, in collaboration with each other. Students' assessments suggested that students were increasing proficient at being able to read and retell texts that they had read.

In the case study interventions, the power of sharing in *talanoa* with other like-minded teachers seemed catalytic for changes in teachers' practice, based on collaboration and sharing, problem solving and creating innovative ways to address the needs of learners. The formative approach to practice sought to promote opportunities for student learning that would engage them beyond the literal and into the critical elements that underpin skilled literacy. Importantly, our approach to pedagogy was not to ascribe binaries or focus on implementing known routines. Instead, teachers' beliefs and theories arose from decisions about observable acts in classrooms. But, as teachers expressed, the results of their influence extend beyond the classroom into life itself, leading to a different definition of what 'student centered' might mean in terms of a contextually defined pedagogy; a definition which privileges the purposes, before the forms of the pedagogy, "to be student-centered by helping them survive anywhere, reduce copying, stop spoon-feeding them all the time".

8 Concluding Comments

We have described here an approach to an 'education for development' intervention that seeks to abandon universalist assumptions of knowledge, teaching and learning. We have used the metaphor of weaving and the processes of

talanoa to considering a pedagogical model that moves beyond imposing the teaching practices upheld in countries from the North. Instead we consider how the dual processes of weaving and *talanoa* makes visible teachers' beliefs, values and practices which are shaped and informed by the cultural contexts in which schools exist. To this end, we argue that effective pedagogy in literacy can be considered an act of weaving a strong mat from existing contextualized resources.

References

- Alexander, R. J. (2001). *Culture and pedagogy: International comparisons in primary education*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Alexander, R. J. (2006). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk*. Cambridge: Dialogos.
- Barrett, A. M. (2007). Beyond the polarization of pedagogy: Models of classroom practice in Tanzanian primary schools. *Comparative Education*, 43(2), 273–294.
- Fa'avae, D., Jones, A., & Manu'atu, L. (2016). Talanoa'i 'A e Talanoa—Talking about Talanoa: Some dilemmas of a novice researcher. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 12(2), 138–150.
- Fusitu'a, L., & Coxon, E. (1998). Ko e'ulungaanga faka-tonga mo e ako lelei: Tongan culture and academic achievement. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 33(1), 23–38.
- Guthrie, G. (2011). *The progressive education fallacy in developing countries*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Helu-Thaman, K. (1997). Re-claiming a place: Towards a Pacific concept for education for cultural development. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 106(2), 119–30.
- Helu-Thaman, K. (1999). Different eyes: Schooling and indigenous education in Tonga. In F. Leach & A. Little (Eds.), *Education, culture and economics: Dilemmas for development* (pp. 69–80). London: Falmer Press.
- Johansson Fua, S. (2014). Kakala research framework: A garland in celebration of a decade of rethinking education. In M. 'Otunuku, U. Nabobo-Baba, & S. Johansson Fua (Eds.), *Of waves, winds and wonderful things, A decade of rethinking Pacific education*. Suva: USP Press.
- Manu'atu, L. (2000). Katoanga Faiva: A pedagogical site for Tongan students, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 32(1), 73–80.
- McPhail, G. J. (2013). Mixed pedagogic modalities: The potential for increased student engagement and success. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 48(1), 113–126.
- Mercer, N., & Dawes, L. (2010). Making the most of talk: Dialogue in the classroom. *English Drama Media*, 16, 19–25.

- O'Connor, C., & Michaels, S. (2007). When is dialogue 'dialogic'? *Human Development*, 50(5), 275–285.
- Otunuku, M. A. (2011). How can talanoa be used effectively as an indigenous research methodology with Tongan people? *Pacific-Asian Education*, 23(2), 43–52.
- Reznitskaya, A., & Wilkinson, I. (2015). Professional development in dialogic teaching: Helping teachers promote argument literacy in their classrooms. In D. Scott & E. Hargreaves (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of learning* (pp. 219–232). Great Britain: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Schweisfurth, M. (2011). Learner-centred education in developing country contexts: From solution to problem? *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31(5), 425–432.
- Tabulawa, R. (2003). International aid agencies, learner-centred pedagogy and political democratisation: A critique. *Comparative Education*, 39(1), 7–26.
- Taufe'ulungaki, A. M., Johansson Fua, S., Manu, S., & Takapautolo, T. (2007). *Sustainable livelihood and education in the Pacific: Tonga Pilot study*. Suva, Fiji: Institute of Education, University of the South Pacific.
- Thaman, K. H. (1988). *Ako and Faiako: Educational concepts, cultural values, and teacher role perceptions* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). The University of the South Pacific, Suva, Fiji.
- Tonga Ministry of Education. (2011). *Tonga curriculum framework*. Nuku'alofa: Government of Tonga.
- Vaioleti, T. (2016). Talanoa: A Tongan research methodology and method. In M. A. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational philosophy and theory* (pp. 1–9). Singapore: Springer.