



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

The language environment of primary school aged children in Tonga

A case study of 4 children.

A thesis
submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree
of
Masters in Education
at
The University of Waikato
by
Talaifina Monalisa Puniani



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

2017

ABSTRACT

The Ministry of Education and Training in Tonga's direction for its language policy has recently changed and at present, all the local schools are expected to implement effectively the new language policy that was in place in the early 2000's. Under the UNESCO and the World Bank's influence, the new language policy articulates the teaching of children from an early age in their local vernacular to establish literacy in the first language before the introduction of English at Class 3 of the primary school level.

This study was conducted in light of this new policy, to explore from a primary school in Tonga the language environments that children experience to identify whether or not the language input they receive is sufficient for balanced bilingualism to be supported. The study also was a way to explore children's understanding of their language environment and choices. It was a way to help out parents and teachers understand the kind of language environment that fosters balanced bilinguals.

The scope of this study, being a Master's thesis, allowed me to use a case study for this research. Four participants from a primary school in Tonga was used for collection of the data. The research took on a qualitative approach with data being generated using two main methods: field observations (both in the classroom and at home) and a focus group interview. The data generated from these methods captured what was observed in the participant's natural environment setting (i.e. the classroom and at home) which included what language is used, who said it and to whom, the activities that were done during the use of language (i.e. what the participants did). The data also provided the childrens' own views of their language choices without the influence of adults to think for them.

It was apparent from the research that although the language policy in place was affirmative of students being bilinguals, there was a huge gap that student participants were experiencing with their language input especially with the use of English and with being given the opportunities to use language to ensure that they have learnt and mastered the input they have received. Both the observations and the focus group identified the dominance of the teacher in the classroom and the very few chances of

input for students especially on their L2 and especially the opportunity to practice and use both the Tongan and the English language.

The research therefore has indicated the fact that while teachers are indeed following part of the prescription of the language policy in Tonga in terms of exposing and establishing a firm foundation on the children at an early age to Tongan, they are not following it with respect to providing English input. The research hence suggests some implications not just for teachers but for the education system to address because there is a crucial need for all parties involved (administration, teachers, parents and students) to work collaboratively to identify and to address and improve the quantity and the quality of language input students receive.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to express my heartfelt and sincere thanks to the following people who have made it possible for me to make it to the end of my journey as a student at Waikato University.

First and foremost, I would like to thank the ONE and only true God that exists in this earth for his grace and unending love and kindness and his guidance during this journey. Without him, I would not have had the courage to complete this paper.

To my parents, Mosese Fainga and 'Ilaise Puniani. I have nothing but love for you both and gratitude that you are both still well to support me during this journey. Time spent away from you two was utter pain but thank God for the support you have given me to keep going. Thank you also to all my brothers and sisters and their families: Brother Sione, Tema and Fainga Si'i (Otago), Sister Salote, Jonathan, Genevieve and Fonokimoana (Singapore), Sister Mohulamu, 'Eneasi, Tevita, 'Iunisi and Telefoni (Otago), Sister Kulia, Laukau, Sean, Sione, Tevita, Matamoana, 'Ilaise Jr and Misinale (Hamilton), Brother 'Okaleni, Vili Si'i, Sonya, Natalya, Gulio, Vaioleti, Dylan (Manurewa), Sister Feangai Folau, Star, Kesa, Kato and 'Etu (Mangere). Aunty Kaluseti Sevele and your family. Second mother: Po'alo'i Vaima'ali Tavake (Puke), Brother Toutai Tavake, Brother Toetu'u, Lini, Po'alo'i, Keleise and Lisa (Puke); and Brother: Va'emolo and his family (United States of America). Thank you all for 2 and a half years of support here in New Zealand while me and my son struggled to complete my studies. I do not know how to thank you all enough but pray that God will bless you all abundantly for your love and support.

To my supervisor, Associate Professor Margaret Franken. I do not have enough words to express how grateful I am for your untiring efforts in supporting me with your professional guidance during the course of this study. I have learnt from you and have grown in my passion and love for language simply because I have learnt from the best. Thank you from the bottom of my heart and to your daughter as well for the help and love shown during this study. May God, bless you abundantly with hope that you will continue to support me should I need advice regarding issues with language in my country.

To the staff of the scholarship office for NZAID Programme at Waikato International office: Deone Taylor, Thomas McDonald, Rachael Elliot, Catriona Chyde, and Huy Vu. Your support has immensely helped me and made things easy for me while I was at Waikato. I really appreciate all the help and the encouragement that you have given me during the course of my study.

To the Chief Education Officer of the Ministry of Education and Training (Tonga), Mr. Claude Tupou, Lucy Moala Mafi and all the staff of the head office; Principal and the staff of the participating school and staff from the scholarship office in Tonga. Thank you for supporting me and for all assistance granted to allow me to do this study in the site of the research.

To the four student participants of this study and their families. This study would not have been completed without your contribution, your passion, your time, and your willingness to help me as a fellow member of our society. I am hopeful that your contribution through this study will help support language development in Tonga's Ministry of Education in the near future.

To all my relatives and friends who have taken the time to wish me well and to pray for me during this course of study, I am truly blessed and grateful for all your support.

Finally, to my family. My 9-year-old son, Paea-I-Aotearoa Puniani. I thank God, every day for blessing me with you. 2 and a half years of your being by my side has made this journey bearable. Thank you, son, for enduring all the hardships for your Mum's sake and for always being the rock that help me see what we can achieve in the future. The love of my life, Tomasi Vaea. Thank you for forever praying and giving our family to the Lord and for enduring the times spent away from us so that we will complete this journey together. To our unborn baby. Although it's a few more weeks before we get to greet you, you have been patient with me during this journey. Thank you for bearing with Mum.

From the very bottom of my heart, I dedicate this thesis to my parents, my brothers and sisters and my little family.

Fakafeta'i ki he 'Eiki ma'u ai pe pea ke 'o 'ona ai pe 'a e kololia mo e Langilangi.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background to the Tongan Language Context.....	1
1.2 Culture and Language in Tonga.....	2
1.3 The new national language policy in Tonga.....	4
1.4 The present study	6
1.5 Overview of the thesis	8
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 The context of language policies in the Pacific.....	9
2.3 Early language policies in Tonga	12
2.4 Current educational reform and national language policy in Tonga	14
2.4.1 Tonga’s current language policy	15
2.5 Bilingualism	17
2.5.1 Subtractive bilingualism	18
2.5.2 Additive Bilingualism.....	20
2.5.3 Balanced Bilingualism	21
2.5.4 Language input.....	23
2.5.4.1 Quantity of input.....	24
2.5.4.2 Quality of input	25
2.5.4.3 Code Switching.....	26
2.6 Conclusion.....	28
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY	30
3.1. Introduction	30
3.2 Research Design	30
3.3 Methods and procedures involved	31
3.3.1 Research site	31
3.3.1. 1 Overview of the school	31
3.3.1.2 Overview of participants and the nature of their environments	32
3.3.2 Gaining informed Consent from participants	35

3.3.3	Assuring participants of the right of withdrawal	36
3.3.4	Assuring participants of confidentiality and anonymity	37
3.4	Data collection method.....	37
3.4.1	Observation data: Classroom observation and Home observation.....	37
3.4.2	: Focus group semi-structured interview.....	38
3.5	Data Collection Procedures.....	39
3.6	Methods of data analysis	39
3.7	Conclusion.....	41
CHAPTER 4:	THE FINDINGS	42
4.1	Introduction	42
4.2	Field Observations	42
4.2.1	Classroom Observations	42
4.2.2	Home Observations	48
4.3	The Focus Group Interview.....	52
4.3.1	Language exposure in interactions with others.....	52
4.3.2	Language exposure in the media.....	54
4.3.3	Language preference	55
4.4.	Conclusion.....	57
CHAPTER 5:	DISCUSSION.....	59
5.1	Introduction	59
5.2	Discussion of analysis.....	59
5.2.1	Quantity of input.....	59
5.2.2	Quality of input	61
5.2.3	Opportunities for children to use language - specifically English.....	63
5.3	Language Policy.....	64
5.4	Recommendations	68
5.4.1	For teachers	68
5.4.2	For parents.....	69
5.5	Conclusion.....	70
CHAPTER 6	CONCLUSION.....	71
6.1	Introduction	71
6.2	Summary of what the study found	71
6.3	Limitations to the research	71
6.3.1.	Formal procedures.....	71
6.3.2.	School Routines.....	72
6.3.3	Researcher vs expectation of parents.....	73

6.3.4	Confidentiality during research.....	73
6.4	Implications for future research	74
6.5	Implications for future practice	75
6.6	Conclusion.....	76
	REFERENCES	78
	APPENDICES	86
Appendix A:	Observation schedule	86
Appendix B:	Semi-structured Interview questions for focus group (English).....	87
Appendix C:	Letter to the Ministry of Education and Training, Tonga.	89
Appendix D:	Invitation letter and consent form for the Principal	90
Appendix E:	Invitation letter and consent form for teachers (English)	93
Appendix F:	Invitation letter and consent form for parents or caregivers (English).....	99
Appendix G:	Invitation letter and consent form for student participants (English)	105
Appendix H:	Table for analysis of data from the classroom observations	109
Appendix I:	Table for analysis of data from home	114
Appendix J:	Transcript for Focus Group	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Percentages for guidance of language of instructions in Tongan classrooms.	16
Table 2:	Weekly time allocation for use of English and Tongan as Language of instructions.	16
Table 3:	Frequency of language used in different activities at school	43
Table 4:	Overall Percentages of language use at school	45
Table 5:	Categories of activities carried out at school (curriculum related or not)	45
Table 6:	Frequency of language activities used at home	50
Table 7:	Overall Percentages of language use at home	50

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Tongan Language Context

In Tonga, the official languages used are Tongan and English. Education in Tonga since the establishment of schools in 1841, identified the use of both these official languages in the classroom (Lal & Fortune, 2000). From then, children began their formal education at the Primary level in Tongan schools where Tongan language was used as the main medium of instruction and where English was taught bilingually from Class 1. When children reached secondary school levels, a shift was made and English became the main language of instruction and Tongan was taught as a compulsory subject until Form 5. With the exception of Tongan studies, all subjects taught at the secondary level used English apart from schools who advocated the use of bilingualism to ensure that their students were understanding the contents of the subjects taught in their schools in the attempt to get these students to pass competitive exams sat at the end of each academic year.

However, in the Sixth Commonwealth Conference in Jamaica in 1974, an analysis of Tonga's education noted that there was a problem with the education system. This was to do with exposing students to contexts that are not their own making learning hard for them. The report from the Commonwealth Conference highlighted that the values and ideals and examples given by schools over the years have derived from the context of a western education and have often been very different from traditional Tongan ideals and values thereby creating conflicts that have accumulated between the ideas learnt at school and those imparted to the children at home (Taufe'ulungaki, 1979). Taufe'ulungaki (1979) clearly describes this when she states that the "content of the previous curricula were directive, centrally-imposed and borrowed from outside" (p. 27). She refers to how not only children were learning the context of different countries but the language used for transmitting these knowledges too were foreign (referring to the elevation of English as the medium of instruction in Pacific schools). These had been the result of colonial times, although Tonga was not colonised, but where the Pacific people had developed a 'colonial mind-set', trying to use ideas of globalised countries to solve indigenous and cultural problems in the Pacific.

Today, one of the crucial challenges Pacific formal education faces, is “how to prepare people to live in an increasingly globalised world and at the same time, develop systems of education that will ensure the survival and continuity of their (Pacific) cultures” (Thaman, 2013, 99). This has led to Pacific educationalists standing up with the initiative to take ownership of their education and reclaim Pacific knowledge and values for Pacific people and their communities by initiating conferences such as Re-thinking Pacific Education (2001, 2003 & 2005), and PRIDE (Pacific Regional Initiative for the Delivery of basic Education Project) to discuss the processes and the vehicles by which these values and knowledge are transmitted.

The effectiveness of these initiatives taken by Pacific educationalists is evident in many of the Pacific islands gradually coming to terms with finding the answers to very crucial questions that Taufe’ulungaki proposed in the first Re-thinking Pacific Education Conference in 2001 which simply asks regarding education: “Whose values? Whose knowledge? Whose cognitive and philosophical theories are they based on? Whose research paradigms, methodologies, techniques, and processes are used in knowledge production and transmission? Whose agenda are we following?” (2002, p. 19). Eisner (2008) asks the exact same ideas regarding curriculums used in education. He asks: What really matters? What are our priorities? (p. 18). As is evident today, many Pacific countries are in the process or are currently implementing what they refer to as ‘contextualised’ curriculum that fits each of their own particular formal school setting including Tonga.

1.2 Culture and Language in Tonga

Before schools were introduced to Pacific Island communities in the early part of the 19th century, (indigenous) education was the joint responsibility of extended family members and the community. Learning was mainly non-formal and informal, underpinned by shared values derived from culture, aimed at cultural survival and continuity. The content of learning was sourced from life itself and drawn from a knowledge system and epistemology that had existed for thousands of years. This holistic nature of life looks at the centrality of good relationships; the connectivity of the past, present and the future; of people, land, sea and sky, and spirituality that bid them together (Taufe’ulungaki, 2011). Cultural values underpinned the processes of teaching and learning and “through observation, imitation and practical activities, the

accumulated knowledge, skills and values of the culture were transmitted to the next generation, using the vernacular language, by appropriate persons, usually elders, to future generations” (Thaman, 2013, p. 100).

The most recent school curriculum of Tonga highlights that education should seek to strengthen and develop the moral and cultural values that underpin Tongan society and sums up these values in the four golden pillars of the Tongan culture which includes dimensions such as “*tauhivaha’a* (caring), *mamahi’ime’a* (commitment), *faka’apa’apa* (respect) and *lototo* (humility) (Government of Tonga, 2014, p. 3). Language, is thus seen as the vehicle through which these values are transmitted, safeguarded, developed, and promoted so that it can continue to serve its people both today and in the future (Taufe’ulungaki, 2012). However, we are faced today with the thorny issue of language loss and language shift, where metropolitan languages have assumed the roles and functions of our vernacular languages.

Otsuka (2007) clearly explains this as the result of globalisation which has pushed small island nations like Tonga to a stage where it is compelled to conform to Western development model associated with English as a socioeconomically privileged language resulting in a speech community voluntarily giving up its indigenous language (s) for another. In Tonga, for instance, young parents today demand their children to have a place in schools in Tonga that use English only as the medium of instruction instead of the local schools that uses local vernacular. In addition to this, the honorific status of language in Tonga (King, Nobles and Commoners) are gradually losing its strength as many young speakers today are incompetent in using honorific language for the King and his house as well as nobles simply because they prefer to use English language. Otsuka (2007) describes that more and more parents are seen to push their children to learn English because of the need for proficiency in English seeing that English is the international language that could enable attainment of better avenues for both careers and further studies for their children. This, however, has forced Tonga to become subject to assimilation, whether forced or voluntary.

Similarly, Taumoefolau (2004) highlights the same problem for not just Tonga but other Pacific islands as well. She believes that people are taking language for granted leading to the decline in use or the erosion of the language from these countries. Significantly, Taumoefolau argues that losing language means losing identity, not just

for a Tongan but for any of the other islands in the Pacific. Thus, it is important that Pasifika adapt methodologies to attain some advantage and to pave ways to make allowance for people to make their choices with regards to language usage.

Many researchers who have studied language in Tonga have found that Tongans much prefer forms of personalised communication which are often taken through the use of 'talanoa' (talking) approach or the 'faikava' (kava ceremony) setting to influence the behaviours of others and provide forums for transfer of ideas and accessing of creative information (Taufe'ulungaki, 2012; Helu, 1999; Thaman, 1998; Fonua, 2004).

It is considered very important that Tongans should know more about their society in all its manifestations. The Tonga Educational Framework 2004 – 2019 was then set up as a way to address this need and its guidelines have mandated the introduction of a new subject: Tongan Society and Culture as a separate subject from the Tongan Language to ensure that students will use it to learn about their society and to help with their language input as well. This change was brought in together with the new national language policy as part of the methodologies to help students to keep their identity but through the use of this language policy, the input of language is seen to also aid them in their understanding of the curriculum materials that they are learning from.

1.3 The new national language policy in Tonga

Tonga's Ministry of Education, in 2008, launched its new National Language Policy for Tongan Schools. The official document began its implementation in schools in 2012. This new language policy mandates that the Tongan language, being the only national and official language people use, be used for its social, business, religious, parliamentary, and national operations and functions in Tonga. This official document was a result of research not only on a global and regional level, but it included civil servants, business owners, youth, principals, teachers and students from different schools, parents, teacher trainees and language experts, consultants, and curriculum writers who all had an opportunity to partake in deciding the national official language to be used in Tongan schools. In the background context of the document, several significant knowledges came out [see translation below]:

- 3.1 Tongan language is the official language used for communication on all levels in the society. The government use it for all its national operations. It is what is being used to teach Tongan students together with English in schools.
- 3.2 Tongan language is used in the Primary level as the main medium of instruction from Class 1 – 6 and it's also a subject in Primary schools.
- 3.3 Results from research identified that Tongan language should be the official language for teaching children in order to build a strong foundation for their education. Knowledge, skills, ideas, values and beliefs of Tongans and their culture can be easily taught to children when the teacher and students understand each other through their mode of communication which includes language skills such as reading and writing. Understanding their first language will help children when acquiring a second language such as English, or a third language such as Japanese or Samoan because of the strong foundation built with the first language.
- 3.4 Research found that attitudes towards Tongan language was poor since most people regard English, the international language, as the gateway to career opportunities, further studies (both local and abroad), and it is the language of discourse in much business in Tonga. However, this may be true on an international level. Locally, the government, businesses and private sectors use Tongan language in their operations.
- 3.5 English is crucial for those seeking to continue education overseas. Opportunities, however, lurk in Tonga as well when there is an increasing opportunity for jobs for second language and third language users, such as Japanese, French and Chinese. There is also increasing number of migrants from China and other foreigners to Tonga who become Tongan citizens and who provide opportunities for them to be trained in the language they use at home.
- 3.6 Most importantly, language gives retention of Tongan culture and is considerably important to national identity.

(National Language Policy for Tongan Schools, 2008, pp. 8 – 9)

These clauses became the main focus of the Tonga Education Policy Framework 2004-2019, which is currently implemented, and in which, has resulted in a change to

the language policy which anticipates that “effective education builds on the child’s early learning in the mother tongue” and the significance of how “literacy in the first language is needed before the introduction of reading and writing in the second language can take place” (p. 37). The policy states that “[t]he main language of instruction in Government primary schools will be Tongan Language up to the end of Year 3 (Class 3), while a bilingual approach (both Tongan and English) will be used to support instruction in Years 4 to 6 (Classes 4 – 6). English will be the main language of instruction from Year 7 (Form 1) onwards (p. 38).

The new language policy resulted in a curriculum review which was to contextualise the curriculum to cater for the new language policy and to equip young people to be innovative and to identify, create, initiate and successfully manage sustainable livelihoods, which is at the essence of safeguarding Tonga’s most important treasure – its culture (Government of Tonga, 2014).

1.4 The present study

This study is considered to be a small case study but a qualitative one that seeks to explore and identify whether or not the language input of students in a primary school in Tonga from their language environments is sufficient for them to be supported as balanced bilinguals. It also looked at understanding children’s choices of their language and giving them opportunities to find out their own understanding of their language choices.

There were a number of reasons for undertaking this study which I wish to elaborate on. At first, my most recent job before undertaking this study was as a curriculum writer in the Curriculum Development Unit of Tonga. When I started this work in 2011, this was the first time new and reviewed curriculum materials were distributed to schools in Tonga (Class 1 – Class 8) in an effort to address the new paradigm the Ministry of Tonga has reached as a result of the UNESCO and World Bank’s support of Pacific initiatives to establish literacy first in the first language before the addition of a second language in many of the Pacific countries, including Tonga. The Tonga Ministry of Education Policy Framework (2004-2019) had prescribed a new national language policy in Tonga mandates the use of Tongan from Class 1 to Class 3 and then introduce English at Class 4 up to the end of their formal schooling ad Form 7. My experience of this, as a curriculum officer at the time, led me to recognise the struggle

that teachers had on the issue of introducing English late (in Class 3). Although I was recruited to work for the secondary division, the job allowed me to help out with the primary school level's curriculum as well. The struggles of teachers, during workshops and trainings were voiced out, and I had therefore been really interested to learn more of the new language policy and to find out its implications on the education system of Tonga since it is part of my job to review and write curriculum materials to address the language needs of students as well as activities for teachers to help with these input.

In addition to this, the curiosity I had explained above led me to wanting to identify how much exposure students have to both English and Tongan. The syllabus for each subject taught in schools and the language policy specifically identifies how much English and how much Tongan are supposedly needed for each level of the curriculum (which will be given details later on in the thesis). However, I wanted to identify which language (English or Tongan) was used in the reality of the actions in the classroom, how much was used and whether this fitted closely with the guide of the language policy, by whom was it used and whether teachers and students used both interchangeably at some point (code switching). By looking at this, I was hoping to see whether the language input that students are receiving are helping them understand what we, as curriculum writers, are giving them to do in their classrooms. Although I was interested to see what teachers' responses were to the new policy, I was more focused on understanding the policy itself on how learning vernacular first will aid the learning of students' L2. Hence, teachers were considered to be observed but only to see the type of input they bring into the policy and how it aided the learning of the students in terms of understanding their subjects.

With this understanding in mind, I therefore wanted to just concentrate on the exposure of children to language input (English and Tongan) and in identifying the amount of exposure the children have to each language because I believed that this will bring to light whether this exposure was enough for students to be identified as balanced bilinguals. I had anticipated also that what was to be found in the study would lead to an understanding of whether the exposure to language input was enough but also whether it will help me understand children and their language preferences and how they understand their language environment.

The study was therefore undertaken with selected participants only as a case study because I believed that a case study will allow me lots of time to observe and record closely what individuals are doing while they are exposed to language and give me more insight into their learning of L1 and L2. The four participants were selected from just one primary school but in different levels (Class 3 – Class 6) then in order to compare the amount of exposure to the language policy's guided prescription in order to see the amount of exposure students have to with language.

1.5 Overview of the thesis

There are six main chapters in this thesis. Chapter one provides an introduction to the country of study: Tonga; with a brief context of what the research will unfold. In chapter two, a review of literature on the topic of study provides details to what experts have found and what this could mean regarding the study. Chapter three describes the procedures and methods used in the research, including details of how the research is analysed. Chapter four will present the findings or the results that were found from the studies providing details of the categories of the findings and what participants have said or have been observed to have done during the research. Chapter five analyses the findings by explaining the findings with regards to what literature have said. It gives an interpretation of why things are that way and also considers the impacts the findings have on the participants. Chapter six provides the setbacks the research has encountered including some implications that are considered to be important for future studies and practices in the classroom.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will be looking specifically at what the literatures say about two concepts: language policies in the Pacific and Tonga; and bilingualism and language input. I will firstly describe the context of language policies in the Pacific especially with regard to the use of the vernacular language, I will explain the early language policy of Tonga and how it has progressed over several decades, and then explain the current language policies and what is in place for all schools in Tonga now. Secondly, I will review literature supporting bilingual education which will include literature about models of bilingualism (subtractive, additive and balanced bilingualism), language input and code switching.

2.2 The context of language policies in the Pacific

When discussing any language policy, Tekiteki (1990) argues that in multilingual, multi-ethnic and multicultural societies, it is useful to remember that the question of which language to use at what level of educational system is quite a controversial issue because the “choice of a language for education is seldom based on purely educational reasons”, rather “education and its mediums, language, are usually regarded as mere vehicles to be exploited and deployed in the wider interests of political, social and economic policies” (p. 57). In the Pacific where bilingualism and multilingualism is common, the issue of using vernacular languages to improve classroom communication and interaction and consequently, the quality of learning and teaching, is contentious given that much of the language choice of the past was controlled by expatriate Europeans whose language dominated the classroom and was conventionally, like in Tonga, accepted as the official language of communication (Tekiteki, 1990, p. 57).

Language, according to Taumoefolau (2004) is a container which holds sets of values and beliefs that gives Tongans or any other Pacific Islands people a sense of who they are as a people of particular island groups. Losing language means losing identity. Because language encompasses such a variety of crucial functions including what was identified by Taumoefolau above, language then, is “the means through which an

individual is acculturated and socialised into membership of a particular group” (Taufe’ulungaki, 2000, p. 1).

In the Pacific, there is much discussion of the vernacular language i.e. the first language (L1) and its relation to English. Vernacular language is defined by Mugler and Lynch as the “language of a community, which is rarely used outside the community” and “lingua franca” as the “language of one community, which is used by speakers of other vernaculars, to communicate across language boundaries” (1996, p. 9). Vernacular is also used sometimes interchangeably with mother tongue which is defined as the “language which a person acquires in early years and which normally becomes his or her natural instrument of thought and communication, [that is, it is a] language that a child is most comfortable with and which he or she speaks at home (Dutcher & Tucker, 1994, p. 40).

Taufe’ulungaki (2000) suggests that “the use vernacular languages or mother tongue as the preferred medium of instruction in schools has become to be more or less universally accepted ever since the UNESCO Meeting of Specialists (1951) supported this with an official statement to the effect that the best medium, psychologically, sociologically, and educationally for teaching a child is his mother tongue” (p. 1). Later reports from studies carried out by Cummins (1981, 1984, 1992, 2000), Bamgbose (1976), Locher (1988), Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukoma (1976.1977) and Ramirez (1991, 1992), among others, strongly advocate the use of the mother tongue as the medium of education for the whole of primary education and at the least, in the early years of primary education, and to teach it both as a subject in its own right and as the foundation for successful second language acquisition (Taufe’ulungaki, 2000, p.1).

Many of the Polynesian countries of the Pacific, such as Samoa and Tonga, where there is relative language homogeneity and where there is one dominant vernacular language spoken by almost the entire population, the mother tongue is accorded high status. This dominant language is recognised as the national language and an official language that co-joins with English as the medium of instruction for all or part of the primary education, and that can either be used separately as a taught subject. It is believed that they can be used alongside each other as teachers code-switch between them in order to clarify new or complex ideas or concepts (Lo Bianco, 1984; Thaman, 1996; Fasi, 1999).

However, in other Pacific countries where there is not one or two but hundreds of vernacular languages e.g. Papua New Guinea with an estimated 800 indigenous languages, Fiji with 15 mother tongues, Solomon with more than 60 indigenous languages or Vanuatu with more than 100 indigenous languages) the issue of what language to use in schools is thus considered highly complex (Siegel, 1997). The decisions, therefore, of what language to use, with whom, and for what purpose and what level of the education system are often based on reasons other than educational (Taufe'ulungaki, 2000; Tekiteki, 1990). Thus, for most of these schools, English has become an official language which operates as a lingua franca. For many of the schools in the Pacific then, the choice and determination of an appropriate language to serve as a medium of instruction in formal schooling is problematic and it is argued that it is one of the most crucial language planning decisions that a country can make.

To assist with developing appropriate language policies to address this problem and to improve the quality of teaching and learning and the equal opportunities for education and educational achievement, the World Bank commissioned a draft paper in 1994 as part of a development strategy on language in education entitled "The Use of the First and Second Language in Education". It found in its review of literature that the mother tongue is confirmed as the best medium for teaching a child, particularly in the early years of education and that "development of the mother tongue is critical for cognitive development and as a basis for learning the second language" (Dutcher & Tucker, 1994, p. viii).

Pacific nations have adopted a variety of language policies which vary from country to country with more recognition of the use of mother tongue as a medium of education such as is used in Tonga. There are compelling arguments for the use of first language (L1) at schools to avert language shift and cultural loss and to assist in the process of maintaining and promoting cultural identity, particularly for cultures which are in danger of being lost (Otsuka, 2007). Siegel (1997) argues that education provided in a foreign language results in many children leaving school functionally illiterate. He argues then that education systems need to be supported and a viable relationship be created with the community in order to develop a curriculum fit for their students with the ultimate aim of attaining sustainable living in the future as a result of their education. The World Bank's report also concludes that unless parents and communities actively engage in

the education process by giving recognition and respect to the cultures and languages of their communities, students will continue to underachieve in schools.

2.3 Early language policies in Tonga

The first language policy to be formulated in Tonga was in 1921 when the Privy Council ruled that English should be the medium of instruction at Tonga College (one of the government schools established in 1882). This policy, however, came to be interpreted as applicable to all existing schools regardless of managing authorities. Tekiteki (1990) explains that the policy was not legally enforceable but since most of the existing schools at the time were run by expatriate Europeans, English was readily accepted as the medium of instruction. There was no official policy passed regarding the use of Tongan language even though Tongan was conventionally accepted as the official language of communication.

The late 1970s saw legislation re-establishing that Tongan was the official language of government. However, cabinet meetings continued to be conducted and recorded in English and proficiency in Tongan language was not mandatory for entry into the Civil Service. Teaching of the Tongan language at both primary and secondary school was still considered a waste of valuable school time which could be more profitably spent in the teaching of English or other academic subjects examinable at School Certificate and University Entrance.

The early 1980s, however, marked a change in the language era of Tonga whereby the Ministry of Education, with financial aid from Australia, addressed the important issue of bilingual education in Tonga in a conference attended by senior officials from the Ministry of Education and other educational authorities in Tonga as well as other prominent educators and linguists from the University of the South Pacific and Macquarie University in Australia. Some of the issues raised included Tonga's aims in bilingual education, how Tongan was being taught in schools, whether Tongan was highly regarded in the community, whether Tongan students were achieving a high level in their own language before they entered school and whether Tongan was the weaker or stronger language in the school system. The conference concluded that English was the stronger language for many students, and that most of the students were experiencing "subtractive bilingualism (where students are functioning adequately in neither language); and a less cognitively able school population

handicapped by being unable to interact meaningfully with their environment in either language” (Tekiteki, 1990, p. 58).

In the 1990s, concerns about achievement in schools were linked to language. Withers (1991), for instance, found in the Pacific Islands Literacy Levels Study: a study conducted with primary pupils, that overall, 71.0 percent of the selected sample were considered to have achieved literacy in two language (vernacular and English/French), and that, there were high percentages of pupils in some countries who had not achieved basic literacy in their own vernacular languages. This caused speculation about the quality of learning in school and the language policies adopted by Pacific islands. Mugler and Lynch (1996) believe that for many Pacific Islands children the language of school is “just one more language to learn” (p. 5).

With many of the Pacific leaders searching for solutions to the continuing high failure rates of Pacific Island students, not only in mainstream classrooms in developed countries like New Zealand and America, but in Pacific schools as well, the push for more attention to vernacular languages led to the World Bank’s commissioning of the report discussed above.

In the early 2000s, many of the Pacific Islands, including Tonga, gave more attention to the argument that a “[w]ell-planned and theoretically sound mother tongue-based education works” (Malone & Paraide, 2011, p. 718). This, in accordance with other studies by Cummins (2000) and Baker (2000) supports the idea that in order for students to achieve more in their education, and to understand curriculum matters, they need to be brought up in an education system where L1 was basically the main language of instruction. By instilling L1 in children from a young age, it paves the way for an easier transfer of ideas from L1 to L2. Today, in education systems, Malone and Paraide argue that the issue is “how best to implement the kind of programs that support minority children as they build a bridge between their home community and the wider society in order to contribute actively to both” (p. 718). For instance, in the Tonga Ministry of Education, such a program would be how the language policy mandates that basic literacy will be established before the introduction of English. Depending on the country and the expectations of what kind of citizens the government wish for its students to become, the language chosen to be used in school

programs should reflect a chance to help children build a bridge in both their community and the wider society in order to be active citizens of both.

Hence, the formulation of a strong inclusive language and education policy for Tonga in the early 2000s that set the stage for a major innovation in primary education with respect to language. Based on reviews done by Pacific island educationalists and the perspective that views language and culture diversity as a resource rather than a problem (1994), as described in the section above, the primary education system and curriculum were revised to allow for mother tongue instruction in the learners' early years to keep up with the principles set forth by UNESCO's Education for All goals (Curriculum Development Unit, MEWAC, 2011).

2.4 Current educational reform and national language policy in Tonga

In 2004, the Tongan Ministry of Education established a mother tongue-based bilingual education policy in which Tongan is taught as a subject and used for instruction in the first three years of formal education. This became established as the Tonga Education Policy Framework (2004-2019). The Tongan Ministry of Education's mission in this policy was "to provide and sustain lifelong relevant and quality education for the development of Tonga, and her people" (p. 15) and in order to do this, the government was "committed to improved access and equity in education, improved quality, better student achievement, and a more efficient and sustainable educational system" (p. 19).

The introduction of the new language policy was a result of the assessment of policy direction by means of which the government wants to improve the quality of education for all students in Tonga. This language policy aligns closely with UNESCO and UNICEF perspectives on multilingualism which state that:

Languages are indeed essential to the identity of groups and individuals and their peaceful coexistence. They constitute a strategic factor of progress towards sustainable development and a harmonious relationship between the global and the local context. They are of utmost importance in achieving the six millennium goals of Educational for All and the Millennium Developmental Goals on which the United Nations agreed in 2000 (Matsuura, 2008, p. 1).

2.4.1 Tonga's current language policy

The current Tongan language policy includes desired outcomes as follows: “students at all levels developing proficiency in the Tongan language, students will understand and speak English by the end of Class 6 and will be competent in oral and written English by the end of secondary schooling; all Tongans will be literate in both Tongan and English and students will also have opportunities to learn other languages including French, Japanese and Mandarin; Education policy issues include determining appropriate bilingual teaching methodologies, the appropriate point at which the language of instruction in schools should switch from Tongan to English, and appropriate diagnosis and support of language learning difficulties” (Tonga Ministry of Education, 2004, p. 36).

Because basic literacy and numeracy skills are essential to success in education and are the right of all children, two key principles therefore underpin Tonga's policy on languages and literacy: (1) Effective education builds on the child's early learning in the mother tongue; and (2) Literacy in the first language is needed before the introduction of reading and writing in the second language can take place. The adoption of these principles is intended to ensure the enhancement of the Tongan language and the Tongan culture. Thus, the Ministry of Education of Tonga maintains that good levels of literacy in students' first language improves their learning of all subjects taught later in a second language. The key to achieving student competence in literacy is therefore the “development of high standards of literacy and effective literacy teaching methodologies by teachers, both in Tongan and in English” (Tonga Ministry of Education, 2004, p. 37).

The existing language policy on languages, literacy, and bilingualism in Tonga currently means that all Government primary schools should follow bilingual teaching methodologies that recognise Tongan as the first language of the majority of students. Basic literacy is needed to be established in Tongan before any of the students are introduced to English. The main language of instruction in Government primary schools therefore will be Tongan up to the end of Year 3 except for language as a subject (English), while a bilingual approach (both Tongan and English) will be applied to support instruction from Years 4 – 6. The following two tables (Table 1 and Table 2 show the distinction between the use of English and Tongan as languages in the

classroom. Table 1 shows the way the two language of instruction are spread across the levels of the primary school years up to when they finish from high school, as explained above; and Table 2 shows specifically the time allocation for use in language subjects such as Tongan and English.

Table 1 shows the percentages of the language that are expected for teachers to use for either Tongan or English as the Language of Instruction (LOI) in the classroom from Early Childhood Education through to Form 7 (Year 13).

Table 1: Percentages for guidance of language of instructions in Tongan classrooms.

Class	Tongan (LOI)	English (LOI)
Early Childhood	100%	0%
Class 1-3	100%	0%
Class 4	80%	20%
Class 5	70%	30%
Class 6	60%	40%
Form 1-7	50%	50%

Table 2 shows the allocation of time when English and Tongan are expected to be used in the classroom on a weekly basis. Tongan subject(s) refer(s) to every other subject (Mathematics, Tongan Language, Tongan Society and Culture, Movement and Fitness, Science, Creative Technology) that are taught in the curriculum which are expected to be taught in the Tongan language as the language of instruction, and English subject refers to English as a second language subject taught in the class.

Table 2: Weekly time allocation for use of English and Tongan as Language of instructions.

Class	Tongan subject (s)	English subject
Early Childhood	Taught across all subjects.	0 minutes
Class 1-2	880 minutes per week 750 direct lessons. The rest incidental within other subjects.	0 minutes
Class 3	820 minutes per week. 750 direct lessons 70 minutes' incidental in other subjects.	60 minutes per week – verbal only

Class	Tongan subject (s)	English subject
Class 4	450 minutes per week	330 minutes per week
Class 5	400 minutes per week	380 minutes per week
Class 6	390 minutes per week	390 minutes per week
Form 1	240 minutes per week	240 minutes per week
Form 2	240 minutes per week	240 minutes per week

As seen in the tables above, there is a slight difference in the use of English in Class 3. For Tongan subjects, the language of instruction is strictly Tongan (see Table 2) while for English subjects, the introduction of English as a language is done in Class 3 (see Table 2) with emphasis on using verbal or oral English only. This is different from Table 1, which specifically states that the Language of Instruction (LOI) for Classes 1 – 3 is 100% Tongan and 0% English. Thus, it is evident from these tables that there is an incremental change as the class level is higher and more time is given to the use of English as a language of instruction but that it is not more than 50% from Form 2 (Year 8) onwards. The use of bilingualism at this stage is crucial because of national examinations for the end of Class 6, Form 5, Form 6 and Form 7.

2.5 Bilingualism

Bilingualism is a complex cognitive and linguistic phenomenon, which may vary widely among individuals depending on the context of the languages they use or how competent they are in using them. Whitehead (2010) defines bilingualism as the “varying degrees of fluency and/or literacy in two languages” (p. 42) which Baker (1988) identified as to either happen simultaneously while children are young as a result of family bilingualism or sequentially or consecutively as a result of what they encounter in life such as moving to a new country and so forth. Each bilingual family will have its own particular circumstances which will determine who speaks which language to whom, and when. “Some children growing up in such a family from birth will use two languages actively while others will limit themselves to one” (Kasuya, 1998, p. 327).

Many bilingual people have different skills in their two languages and can use them for different purposes and at different times. Bilingual speakers may be fully proficient in both languages used (active bilinguals), or understand both language but choose to speak mainly one (passive bilinguals) (Kasuya, 1998; De Houwer, 1995). However, the amount of input the child receives will have a potential effect on the dominance of one language over the other (Lanza, 1997).

Many writers argue that the degree of bilingualism is often to do with the attitudes of society towards the use of bilingualism. If bilingualism is seen as a positive phenomenon and if both languages are valued and encouraged, it becomes an additive bilingual context. If the society react negatively towards bilingualism and see that one language is consistently regarded as the only one worth knowing and learning, then the ability to use, or even maintain, the other language is inevitably diminished hence a subtractive bilingual context will develop where bilingualism is viewed as a disadvantage and something to be avoided or discouraged. But if people have equal proficiency in both their first language (L1) and their second language (L2), they are regarded as balanced bilinguals.

2.5.1 Subtractive bilingualism

Early research on bilingual education conducted primarily between 1920 and 1960, argued against bilingual education with majority of the studies concluding that bilingualism resulted in cognitive disadvantage.

Macamara (1966); Brake and Perry-Williams (1948); and Carrow (1957), all identified in their studies that bilingual children showed lower verbal intelligence which was a result of a “balance effect” whereby proficiency in a second language necessitated a loss in proficiency in one’s first language. For this reason, these studies proposed in their conclusions that when comparing the levels of linguistic proficiencies in bilinguals and monolinguals, bilingual students never reached the levels of proficiency of monolinguals.

Peal and Lambert (1962), however, argue in their studies that bilingualism is an advantage because the bilingual’s two language systems work together to ensure a “mental flexibility, superiority in concept formation, and a more diversified set of mental abilities, in the sense that the patterns of abilities developed by bilinguals were more

heterogeneous” (p. 20). Their study involved 10-year-old middle class French school children in a school in Canada which aimed at relating bilingualism to intelligence and in which they found that bilinguals performed significantly better than monolinguals on both verbal and nonverbal intelligence tests. They explained that this shows how bilinguals are seen to have a language asset, are more agile at concept formation, and have a greater mental flexibility and more diversified set of mental abilities than the monolinguals.

The strong evidence provided in Peal and Lambert’s study provides strong evidence that contradicted earlier negative findings mentioned in the section above on the negative effects of bilingualism. Franken, May and McComish (2008), agree with this study by adding that such research has confirmed bilingualism positively by stating that “students in additive bilingual contexts exhibit clear and consistent advantages over monolingual speakers in the following four areas: cognitive, flexibility, metalinguistic awareness, communication sensitivity and field independence” (p. 19-20).

Cummins’s Separate Underlying Proficiency Model (SUP) (Cummins, 1984) illustrates how one language (preferably the dominant one) can push out the minority language. In Cummin’s (1984) illustration, he used two balloons inside the head, both half filled with vocabulary, grammatical structures, associations and ideas in two different languages. The SUP model thus implies that there isn’t enough room for two full language balloons. As the second increases, the first language balloon is assumed to decrease proportionately. Because both balloons have limited space in which can be used to explain how one language is learned more than the other, the dominant language pushes the minority one out. May, Hill and Tiakiwai (2004) view this push out to have no transfer of skills involved hence this leading to “cognitive overload” for the learner (May, Hill & Tiakiwai, 2004).

In Cummins (1984), he also suggests that the principal reason for the findings of these early negative studies was due to “the minority language children in these studies often fail[ing] to develop a sufficiently high level of proficiency in the school language (L2) to benefit fully from their educational experiences” (p. 333). Cummins (2000), further argues that students with minority language failing in education was mainly due to them being present in a subtractive bilingualism environment “where a second

(majority) language is seen as being in competition with and eventually replacing a first (minority, low status) language” (May, Hill & Tiakiwai, 2004, p. 8). In the subtractive bilingual environment, many bilingual speakers have one language that is stronger than the other. These speakers exhibit varying degrees of control over their respective languages, and often use their languages in different domains and for different purposes. However, May (2001) and Starks, (2004) argue that when one language dominates the other in the wider society, it might result in language shift where the prevailing language will force the other language to be used less and less over time.

In Tonga, for instance, the new language policy clearly prescribes the use of Tongan as the language of instruction. It has been identified in earlier discussions that majority of the Tongan official functions use the Tongan language in their daily operations. If more parents are demanding their children to enter schools that use English as their language of instruction because English is seen to be the international language, Tonga is indeed heading towards a language shift where they will be forcing their children to use English more than they use their own vernacular (Otsuka, 2007).

2.5.2 Additive Bilingualism

Cummins (1980a) argues that early negative beliefs were based on the wrong understandings and methodologies used for the research. Cummins (1984), in his hypothesis that bilingualism enhances the growth of students, states that “a child’s second language competence is partly dependent on the level of competence already achieved in the first language. The more developed the first language, the easier it will be to develop the second language. When the first language is at a low stage of evolution, the more difficult the achievement of bilingualism will be” (p. 169). In fact, Cummins (1984) developed a model that depicted the workings of the mind in relation to bilingual acquisition much more accurately called the Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) which later became known as the Iceberg Model or the ‘iceberg analogy’. This model is presented in the form of two icebergs which are separated above the surface (representing two different languages). Underneath the surface, however, these two surfaces became fused (suggesting that the two languages function together). With the two icebergs floating freely at the top, it suggests that the languages involved are not competing for space but rather, the skills that are taught in one language can hence be transferred easily to the other language reflecting the

fusion that's occurring underneath the surface. In other words, language switching and cooperative sharing show there is substantial interaction between languages. Simply put, both languages operate through a single operating system and both languages can contribute to each other, be accessible to each other and be used interchangeably (Cummins, 1984, Baker & Prys Jones, 1998). The child does not have to be retaught in the second language. "When language skills are well enough developed to understand ideas and knowledge in the second language, what is learned in the first transfers easily" (Cummins, 1984, p. 74). Baker (2000) suggests, however, with this theory that "the child's school language must be sufficiently developed to process the cognitive challenges of the classroom" (p. 75). He argues that "speaking, listening, reading or writing in the first or second language helps develop the whole cognitive system. However, if children must operate in an insufficiently developed second language, the system will not function at its best. The quality and quantity of what is learned from complex curriculum materials and produced in written and oral form may be relatively weak and impoverished" (p. 75).

2.5.3 Balanced Bilingualism

Balanced bilingualism is used to describe those who have similar or equal proficiency in both their first language (L1) and their second language (L2). Genesee, Hamers, Lambert, Mononen, Seitz and Starck (1978) in their study identify balanced bilinguals to be: (1) one who learned his two languages simultaneously (e.g., from infancy on) and with interlocutors who used the two languages equally often and interchangeably and (2) one who had distinctive acquisition settings for each language, distinctive as to time of acquisition or sociocultural context, and so forth. These are later described by writers as proximal language input and distal language input (Hart and Risley, 1995; Hoff, 2005; Armon-Lotem, 2014; Grunter and Paradis, 2014 and Pierce and Genesee, 2014). Baker (2000), however argues that balanced bilingualism is a myth because "[r]arely will anyone be equally competent in speaking, reading and writing both languages across all different situations and domains, nor does language stay constant over time" (p. 5). He goes on to argue that balanced bilingual children may have some cognitive advantages over monolinguals but most children who are balanced bilinguals use their two languages (1) for distinct purposes and functions (according to the context it is used) and (2) that the majority of bilinguals have one

language that dominates which may change with age, education, work and area of residence (p. 6). For instance, Ka'ili (1998), reminisces on her childhood upbringing in the United States of America by her Tongan parents. She wrote: "Our parents made a decision before we were born that the Tongan language would be the language of our home. It did not matter that English was the language of the "educated" for when we were inside the fortress of our home or our cultural capsule, English could not penetrate it". English, in this instance, was only used at school in the context of the school while at their home Tongan was the main language of input because the parents' purpose was for their children to still maintain their identity through their use of language. Thus, Baker (2000) concludes that the term balanced bilingualism tends to refer to a privileged group with the choice and opportunity to use two languages and the educational chances for both languages to blossom (p. 6). Significantly with Baker's discussion above, he raised an important issue that helps the understanding of balanced bilinguals. He asked: "What proficiency is necessary in both languages to obtain thinking advantages?"

In attempting to answer this phenomenon, Cummins (2000) Thresholds theory will be influential in addressing this issue. In his theory, Cummins illustrates the Threshold theory using a house with three floors. Up the sides of the house are two language ladders, indicating that a bilingual child will usually move upward, not remain stationary on the floor. On the bottom floor are those whose competence in their languages are insufficiently developed. When there is a low level of competence in both languages, there may be negative cognitive effects. A child who is unable to cope in the classroom in either language may suffer when processing curriculum information. The second floor or middle level, consists of those with age-appropriate competence in one language but not both. Children can operate in the classroom in one of their languages, but not in both and at this level. This is where the cognition of a bilingual student can be differentiated from a monolingual one. At the top floor are those children who can be described as 'balanced bilingual' who have age-group competence in two or more languages and can cope with curriculum materials in either language. At this level, Cummins describes that the cognitive advantages of bilinguals over monolinguals often appear.

Prior to this Threshold Theory, however, Cummins (1977) suggests in one of his studies that "the level of competence a bilingual child achieves in his two languages

may be an important intervening variable in explaining the effects of his bilingual learning experiences and cognition” (p. 5). For instance, Genesee et al., (1978) suggest that those who develop their bilingualism early have confidence in their language usage and are more inclined to “process the deeper meaning of linguistic information, especially those aspects of meaning that cut across language demarcations, than are those who become bilingual at some later developmental period” (p.3).

However, Cummins (1977) believes that “[t]hose aspects of bilingualism which might accelerate cognitive growth seem unlikely to come into effect until the child has attained a certain minimum or threshold level of competence in his second language (p. 10) as has been illustrated above. That is, there needs to be a balance in the learner’s first and second language before cognitive growth is reached. He further explains this by saying that if a child in an immersion program attains only a very low level of competence in his second language, his interaction through that language with an increasingly symbolic environment is unlikely to optimally promote his cognitive and academic progress. Not only will he fail to comprehend much of the content of schooling but he is also likely to experience difficulty in expressing his developing intelligence and operating on the environment through his L1. One probable consequence of this is a decrease in intellectual academic curiosity” (p. 10-11). Thus, this further provides the notion that language has to be balanced, at which point code switching becomes a useful strategy that teachers choose to use as will be discussed later in this chapter.

2.5.4 Language input

Children acquire language through processes of social interactions. An aspect of input which is related to a child’s language choice and language learning is the quality of input or the type of input that he/she receives in each language (Snow and Ferguson, 1977). Lo Bianco (1990) argues that “[l]anguage acquisition occurs best when the student has to work out what is being said in the target language by building and testing hypotheses about meaning based on the context in which the utterance is produced” (p. 46). In order for the acquisition to occur and for pupils to comprehend input, three things need to occur: (1) student needs to be exposed to input just beyond his/her level of competence (Krashen 1982); parents need to simulate the natural

conditions for language acquisition in a meaningful and interesting way (Strakova, 2012); and teachers need to modify their utterances in the target language to produce input which will help the students to understand the message being communicated (Wong and Fillmore, 1985). Language acquisition process works successfully, according to Strakova (2012), but this can only be achieved when stimulated at the right time and where children are able to understand or guess what is happening from the context or from the interaction with adults. In the classroom for instance, Strakova suggests teachers to move away from rote learning (learning what they hear and repeat) and understand the importance of frequent exposure of students to numerous language samples and activities that will lead them to immediate acquisition. Thus, Strakova (2012) identified that if we want to benefit from children's disposition to acquire language, we need to carefully consider the quality of input we offer children.

2.5.4.1 Quantity of input

When it comes to language input, “[e]xposure levels clearly matter” (Pearson & Amaral, 2014, p. 104). Many researchers on the study of language input have commonly focused on the amount of exposure (i.e. how much input) children receive in each language they are acquiring (L1 and L2) and its impact on the acquisition of specific linguistic structures or grammatical constraints or on general language abilities (Piece & Genesee, 2014; Gruter, Hurtado, Marchman & Fernald, 2014; De Hower, 2014; Hoff, 2005). Gruter, Hurtado, Marchman and Fernald, (2014), for instance, discuss how the nature of a child's linguistic experience is a key component in language acquisition and growth, regardless of the number of languages a child learns. In their report, they provide evidence from studies with Spanish-English bilingual children in California that reflect what was found by Pearson, Fernandez, Lewedeg, and Oller (1997), which is, that the children produced more words in the language they heard most often. That is, those children who heard more Spanish words in interactions with their caregivers also knew more Spanish words and displayed greater efficiency in Spanish words during real-time language comprehension. Those who heard more English words in interaction with their caregivers were relatively more successful at learning English words (p. 26-28). They conclude in their findings that there were measurement issues regarding input quantity in the exposure of language to children because of the varying degrees of engagement

among caregivers and this variation have important implications on the number of Spanish or English words the children would learn. The richer the language environment was, the more exposure and learning the child engages in and hence would be reflected in how they use language every day. A similar study by Hoff et al. (2012) in a study of Spanish-English BFLA toddlers showed that children whose proportion of English input was higher, they used or said more English words than children with a lower proportion of English input; the same was true for Spanish.

Oller (2010) also presented a transcript from his study and experience with his daughter to whom he and his wife spoke German to since her birth while they talk in English amongst themselves as parents. They employed a Spanish-speaking governess who worked part time with their daughter. In their findings, Oller's daughter produced the fewest words in the language she mainly overheard (English) and German was the most frequently used language for her.

De Hower (2014) concluded in her study that there is great input variability in learning language and its effects are more easily noticed. She argues that beyond the expected differences between households in quantity of talk in a first language, the extent to which a child hears a second language differs from child to child.

2.5.4.2 Quality of input

Pearson and Amaral (2014) emphasise an important notion when considering the quality of input by arguing that three things constitute the quality of the input: (1) who the children's language models and interlocutors are; (2) in what circumstances the learner hears the languages spoken, whether in the home or school, through printed materials or electronic media etc., and, (3) the age of onset (AoO).

In their study, Pearson and Amaral argue that the quantity of input (exposure) plays a vital role in the quality of the input. According to their findings, limited exposure to one or both of the languages to be learned "constrains the quality of the eventual stable state of the language that is learned" (p. 104). That is, if there is very limited input, it provides a restricted base for experience from which to build mental representations of the various linguistic units (Hoff & Naigles, 2002) thus leading to distinct differences in the target language and the form of the language that the child masters. For instance, although a native speaker may have spoken their language since birth, if the

language is not sustained and if the use of it is not consistent, the child will not be able to have learnt and mastered the full system including grammatical features such as syntax and so forth in relation to that language (Montrul, 2008). Who the child hears the language from has an important effect on their language learning. It affects not just the opportunity, but also the motivation of the child to use the language. For instance, if the child wants to imitate certain people in their use of language, the chances of that child learning the same language from these people are better (Hakuta & D'Andrea, 1992). The communities also need to consider the source of language for their children. Pearson and Amaral, (2014) propose that “[I]anguage minority communities must work to ensure that their children have ample opportunity and genuine motivation for learning the traditional language, typically in conjunction with another language as bilingualism is more viable than monolinguals” (p. 101).

One crucial factor to consider also in the quality of input is where the language is spoken. Hoff (2006) suggests that if a language is learned in a school setting, the register may be more formal or more complex, and there may be more access to print materials than in the home where the range of topics of conversation may be more limited. On the other hand, the home provides more avenues and potentials for input than at school since it is more informal and has different age group with whom to converse. This brings to mind the age of onset (AoO) for when children are exposed to language learning. According to Pearson and Amaral (2014) early exposure is generally considered better for learners. This is backed up by Rothweiler's study of word order acquisition in German (2006) where he found that children who began learning the L2 before or close to age 3 reflected a similar trend as native monolingual and bilingual speaker whereas those who learned L2 at around 6 behaved more like the adult L2 learners. However, Jia and Fuse (2007) found that AoO effects in language learning can also result from the environment they are in (language of the home, books, and TV, number of native-speakers, friends, etc.) (p. 108).

2.5.4.3 Code Switching

Code switching is a common phenomenon in many bilingual classrooms (Chitera, 2009; Kamwangamalu, 2010). When people know two or more languages, they commonly switch between languages according to the context or language domain, the person they are speaking with, the topic, and other factors depending on the

formality of the situation. This is referred to by many researchers as code switching. Early writers like Macnamara (1967b) and Macnamara, Krauthammer, and Bolgar (1968), provide evidence in their studies to suggest that code switching occurs when bilinguals employ two linguistic systems which are psychologically distinct to express a single set of meanings or intentions. This is evident in how children who grow up in a bilingual environment from an early age do not necessarily learn to speak the two languages they are hearing, and may speak only one, even with a parent who speaks another language to them (De Houwer, 2014; Lyon, 1996; Siren, 1991, Yamamoto, 2001).

Baker and Prys Jones (2006) and Holmes (2001) further clarify this by adding that code switching can be used for wider sociolinguistic reasons such as to indicate solidarity with another speaker, for humour, to signal a change of attitude or relationship, or to include or exclude someone from the conversation. Thus, code switching is seen to give bilingual speakers a heightened awareness of language appropriateness, and a greater communicative sensitivity which is evident in children as young as two years old (Baker and Prys Jones, 1988). This is particularly true for cases of Pacific people whose first language (L1) is the vernacular language or mother tongue and are using English at school (L2) and who have to code switch in order to communicate with members according to the setting and context they are in. Wong and Fillmore (2000) and Portes and Hao (1998) note in their findings that it can be quite a detrimental experience to children and their families if children do not learn to speak a home language that is often the only language in which the parents can adequately communicate. This experience makes parents' role more difficult and may have a negative impact on the closeness and intimacy between parents and children.

Code switching in the classroom implies the use of two or more languages in the classroom by the teacher and the students to comprehend tasks. This approach involves considerable translation of material already expressed in the other language which both teachers and students can use. Ferguson (2003) suggests that codeswitching in the classroom "seems to arise naturally, perhaps inevitably, as a pragmatic response to the difficulties of teaching content in a language medium over which pupils have imperfect control ... [and where] much switching takes place below the level of consciousness. Teachers are often simply not aware of when they switch languages, or indeed if they switch at all" (p. 46).

August (2010) identifies code switching in the use of languages among bilinguals and multilinguals as a common phenomenon. In her views, August believes that if the teacher notices that a child does not have proficiency in English, it is then their duty to ensure that they speak in the child's language in order to make them understand the concept being taught. She argues that the switch between the two languages used can be beneficial because it allows more freedom for the child to choose which language he/she feels comfortable using and relaying his messages across to others. However, again, she argues that teachers are more in control of the children's language and they will decide for a particular language to be used in the classroom. This notion from August suggests that code switching should be automatic but because of teacher control, the amount of exposure students are exposed to depends on the language that is chosen to be used in the classes.

Lo Bianco (1990) suggests that an alternative may be to "alter the balance between English to the vernacular in the bilingual classroom and use the vernacular more regularly as a language of instruction in some of the more technical domains of the curriculum while the students continue to develop their English language skills. Transfer to English only in instruction in some subject areas could then occur more easily" (p. 45). A similar view is provided by Cummins and Swain (1986) who maintain that concepts are best learned in the language with which the student is most familiar. Once these new concepts are learned, these can be easily transferred from one language to another. The student needs only to acquire the new label in the target language (often L1) and once it registers into their brains, the transfer can be made from L1 to L2 and comprehension therefore becomes more balanced.

2.6 Conclusion

The above literature review provides an overall scope of language policies in the Pacific, in general, and how it has impacted the decision and the changes to the language policy for the Ministry of Education in Tonga. It also provides a historical context of the progress of language policy in Tonga and the language policy in place today and how it has impacted the way the curriculum is shaped to cater for the needs of the new language policy. Because the emphasis of the curriculum and language policy is on bilingualism, the literature in this chapter has articulated further on what bilingualism is, the models of bilingualism and the different kinds of bilingualism that

are relevant to this study. This include subtractive bilingualism, additive bilingualism and a look at language input to include the quantity, quality and the use of code switching in the classroom. The literature has offered clear-cut descriptions that highlight the importance of balanced bilingualism in Tonga.

The following chapter will discuss the methodology and procedures used to answer the study questions for this research.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the methods that were employed to investigate the research questions raised in this study. It will explain the research design used, provide information about the methods and procedures used, the data collection methods, the data collecting procedures used, and the methods of data analysis

3.2 Research Design

The aim of this study was to work closely with children in the primary school to find out their exposure to language input in both English and Tongan. Krauss (2005) describes that “many qualitative researchers believe that the best way to understand any phenomenon is to view it in its context (p. 759). For this reason, this research was then carefully designed to use a case study as a qualitative approach to view the exposure of four participants from one school and from different levels to language input (whether it was from English or Tongan or both) and to see in its context what this would mean for them as balanced bilinguals and whether this was enough to support their learning.

As the nature of this study is qualitative, Dezin and Lincoln (2003) suggests that qualitative research “studies things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them” (p. 5). Thus, it was the expectation of this study that through observing participants in their natural settings and through an interview with participants without the presence and the influence of adults, the data would help make sense and provide interpretation of the awareness of participants on their language use, how much exposure they have to the English or Tongan language (or both) through language input and how this can help provide an answer to whether this was enough to support them as bilinguals. The Tongan classrooms and Tongan homes were then selected as the natural setting for this research with the idea of closely looking at the language input both in these two settings and using different methods to collect data.

Using a case study was crucial then because a case study focuses “on one instance (or a few instances) of a particular phenomenon with a view to providing an in-depth

account of events, relationships, experiences or processes occurring in that particular instance” (Denscombe, 1998, p. 32). Hence, these in-depth accounts listed above could help provide the researcher with a better position to make an evaluation on the language input that participants experienced and whether the exposure these participants have to Tongan and English (or both) was sufficient for balanced bilingualism to be supported. Additional to this was whether participants were aware of their language choices and what those choices were which could reflect their points of view, thoughts and feelings, their choices, and the reasons for these.

3.3 Methods and procedures involved

3.3.1 Research site

This section provides an overview of the school context, students’ backgrounds and their families. To preserve anonymity, a very general overview of the participants is given here, the school is referred to as X.

3. 3.1. 1 Overview of the school

The school X, is located a short distance from Nuku’alofa, the capital of Tonga, on the main island of Tongatapu. This school is one of first established primary schools and is operated by the government. There are a total number of 117 students and 6 teachers. The majority of the students in this school belong to the village in the same area as the school, and only a few students live on nearby villages. But all are within close range to be able to walk to the school. A small number of the students are children of teachers. The 6 teachers in this school comprised of one male teacher and 5 female teachers.

There are 6 different classes altogether, Class (Year) 1 – Class (Year) 6, and each of these classes are assigned a different teacher. These teachers are stationed in one class from the beginning of the academic year till the end except for those in Year 5 and 6 who take turns doing lessons to help students’ preparation for the Secondary School Entrance Examination at the end of the year.

In accordance to the Ministry of Education’s language policy, the medium of instruction is prescribed in the following way. Class 1 and 2 should be totally taught in Tongan with introduction of English from Class 4 onwards. See table 1 in Chapter 2.

There are 7 learning areas (subjects) that are taught throughout the year in primary schools which includes Tongan language, English language, Mathematics, Science, Tongan Society and Culture, Creative Technology, and Movement and Fitness. Except for English being prescribed to begin at Class 3, all other learning areas begin from Class 1 through to Class 6. These subjects are taught using the Tongan language as the medium of instructions in Class 1, 2 and 3 and the introduction of English in Class 4 upwards.

However, it is crucial to note here that English, although it is prescribed to have 0% of taught time in the table above, the specifications in the English Syllabus is different from the overall language policy stated above and is shown in the Table 2 in Chapter 2.

English is prescribed to begin at Class 3 with 60 minutes per week but through verbal only. Because of its nature to be just verbal, the overall language policy shown in the table above is summed up to have 0% of English since there are no other tasks to be used but just a 20 minutes' session of talking in English every day for 3 days.

3.3.1.2 Overview of participants and the nature of their environments

The study aimed to have 4 primary school children as case study participants (one student from each level from Class 3 – Class 6). Because the language policy prescribes English to begin at Class 3, the study therefore was designed to focus on students from when they first started their exposure to English in the classroom at Class 3 to when students were getting ready to enter High School at Class 6. It was thought that one child at each level would account to some extent for the differences in how the languages were prescribed to be used. It also seemed a good idea to have a spread of ages so that there would be a range of children involved in the focus group.

The study also indirectly involved teachers and caregivers who are seen to be those that interact with the student participants and who are the dominant sources of language input. This indirect involvement of these adults was merely done through observations of the researcher who was recording and making field notes on what language these adults used with the student participants. Other children were also sources of input and their contributions were observed and recorded in the same way as those of these adults.

After receiving consents from the parents, four participants were selected. There were 69 forms that went out to parents and 42 parents fully consented to have their children participate in the research. 18 parents did not give their consent and some returned the forms without signing them and 9 forms were returned with signatures from parents but the forms were partially filled. Because it was explained clearly at the beginning that the selection was going to be based on whoever consented first, the first student from each of the levels (Classes 3, 4, 5 and 6) who handed in their fully signed consented forms were considered as the participants to the research. The four participants that were selected are described below:

3.3.1.2.1 Participant 1: (FS)

FS lives right next to the school where he goes to. He is the eldest son of two children and his parents had divorced so he lives with his grandmother, two aunties, one uncle, one cousin and his younger brother in one house which is in adjacent to another house where another uncle lives with his wife and two children. FS's mother at the time of the research was currently overseas working and often contacts to check on him and his family.

At home, FS's house does have access to different media in the form of TV, radio, cell phones and games. The grandmother owns a canteen at one of the church halls across the road from the school and the family would manoeuvre around between their two houses and the canteen from time to time if they are not going to town or school.

FS is the eldest grandson of the house and he is deemed to be the pet of the family where he gets what he wants and is often considered to be the talkative out of all the grandchildren.

3.3.1.2.2 Participant 2: (NS)

NS also lives really close to the school. He is the eldest son of five siblings, one of whom is adopted out by one of his aunties leaving 4 of them with the parents. Like many of the Tongan families, NS also lives with his extended family. They live in a large house with his parents, an uncle and his family (a wife and a son) and their grandmother as well who is in her early 70's.

At his home, NS and his family do not have that much access to any media. The only access he has is through his grandmother's small transistor radio which is always tuned in to the AM station and his uncle and parent's cell phones which they sometimes use for listening to the radio.

NS is not the eldest grandson because his uncles have older kids than him, but at his home he is the eldest of all the children that lives there and he is always considered to be the responsible one to look out for his kin and to do some of the chores around the house to help.

3.3.1.2.3 Participant 3: (SC)

SC lives a bit farther from the school than the first two participants. He walks about 8-10 minutes every day from his home to school. At home, there are 3 different houses there. The main house is where his grandparents live, his aunty with his family (5 kids) and his uncle with his family (5 kids) and 2 cousins. The second house is SC's home where he lives with his parents, his elder brother and his sister and his family (1 child). His eldest brother lives in Australia but often comes to visit them. The third house is a DVD shop owned by his uncle who lives in the big house and his uncle sleeps in the shop just for security reasons. SC is the youngest of 4 children and he is the baby of the family. His home is pretty much updated with the latest technologies in the kingdom where they have TV, radio, game and phones as well. Him and his other cousins normally after school gather at the small DVD house at the front of their home to either watch movies or play games or just watch other while they play.

3.3.1. 2.4 Participant 4 (TT)

TT lives about 5 minutes away from the school. He lives with his immediate family but when the research was taking place the family that remained at home with him was his mother and his two elder brothers. His father has just left for Hawaii and his two elder sisters are both living in the boarding school where they go to. TT is the youngest of the family. At home, the mother does not allow them to roam around the next door neighbours so they pretty much stay at home most of the time. They do have a TV at home and the mother owns a cell phone as well but they do not use the TV often and they only watch it sometimes but only during the weekend. The boys are routine every day by their mother to do small chores like picking up rubbish or fetching errands from

the shop but most of the time they are just directed to remain at home and not go roaming around aimlessly amongst their neighbours. The sisters return home for the weekend only and go back to boarding on Sundays. The father too like the sisters travel often in and out of the country to work and send money back home for the family.

3.3.1.3 Access to Participants

To recruit participants for this study, approval from Prime Minister's Office and the Ministry of Education to conduct the research in Tonga had to be sought first. However, because of my position as a scholarship awardee under the Ministry of Education, I was exempted from seeking approval from the Cabinet hence a direct communication with the Ministry of Education's Chief Education Officer was needed in order to approach the school. When approval was given, and approval from the Faculty of Education of Waikato Ethics Committee was granted, I travelled to Tonga on the first week of July 2016 to collect my data.

Upon arrival, I approached the Head office again to finalise the approval for the school and then the Principal of the Primary school to seek approval. I met with all the teachers of 4 levels (Classes 3, 4, 5 & 6) to discuss possibilities of getting participants from their classes (i.e. one child from each level). Information letters and consent forms for the Principal and these teachers were signed and invitation letters and consent forms were distributed to the student participants. When parents responded, participants were selected on the basis of who consented first.

Four student participants were selected and consent forms and invitation letters (Appendix X) were discussed and carefully read over with both parents and student participants and signed. Once all the letters were signed and returned, I proceeded to being a researcher and began collecting my data using the data collection methods to be discussed later.

3.3.2 Gaining informed Consent from participants

Wilkinson (2001) states that "if you want to do research on people, you should ask their permission first. If they say 'no' then you cannot legitimately do research on them" (p. 16). Gaining consent is not just about getting participants to say 'yes' or 'no'. Researchers need to carry out informed consent. According to Tolich (2001), informed consent means that "[s]ubjects ... must be fully informed of the nature of the research,

how it could affect them and what participating in the study involves” (p. 5). Once participants are fully informed, they have the ultimate freedom to agree to participate (Lenza, 2004) and it must be done so without intention of coercion (University of Waikato, 2008) because “coercion ... undermine the moral validity of consent” hence the voluntary nature of fully informed participants (Tolich, 2001, p. 16). Thus, Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000) states that it is important that the participants are informed about the purpose of the investigation because it respects their rights as respondents.

As a researcher, this was the challenging part of the research because it entails a possibility that the task might prove to be harder than anticipated. The task required careful handling of information to participants and because young children were involved, caution was to be taken so as to ensure that at a young age, they understood what they were in for with regards to the research. As such, a clear explanation both written and orally was provided to ensure that important aspects of the research such as the objectives, methods, procedures, benefits and possible risks or harm were communicated to all participants involved.

When all the participants had understood what was required of them, consent forms were then signed and research begun. Crucially, the details in the consent forms were gone over with participants as well so that they knew and understood the nature of the study, the procedures involved as well as what they are consenting to. Significant was the fact their identity would be kept confidential and they remained anonymous in the study.

3.3.3 Assuring participants of the right of withdrawal

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) stated that “[a] subject has the right to refuse to take part, or to withdraw” from a research once it has begun (p. 51). This is further supported by McKernon (2011) who believes that “respondents should be treated with respect at all time” and that the “rights of respondents is paramount” (p. 162). Participation therefore, must have the option to disclose, withhold and even withdraw ‘voluntarily’ to prevent difficult situations from becoming coercive and abusive (McKernon, 2011, p. 162) hence the participants were allowed to make a ‘choice’ without being penalized (Tuckman & Harper, 2012, p. 12).

This was a really important ethical issue that was considered because the rights of the participants were to be fully respected. It was important for me as a researcher to ensure that this was understood by all participants and that their withdrawal was not in any way taken to be offensive.

3.3.4 Assuring participants of confidentiality and anonymity

Menter, Elliot, Hulme, Lewin and Lowen (2011) described that a researcher has “the responsibility to protect the identities and interests of the participants by maintaining complete anonymity and as an assurance of confidentiality throughout the study” (p. 38). Anonymity deals with the guarantee that readers of the research may not be able to identify participants. Confidentiality, on the other hand, is within the “control of the researcher” who is “the repository of the information” and who has “control over the distribution and transmission of that information” (O’Brien, 2001, p. 30). Ethically, participants can only be identified in public with their consent (University of Waikato, 2008). In some researches, some participants are known to the researcher but their identities are not shared in the report. Thus, care was given to this issue to ensure that participants (both students and teachers) understood that any information that was extracted and recorded from them would be done so with confidentiality and anonymity.

3.4 Data collection method

Two types of data were generated from this study: observation data and interview data.

3.4.1 Observation data: Classroom observation and Home observation

The first method used was observations which was done in two different settings: the classroom and at home. This observation of participants was conducted using a pre-prepared observation schedule. See Appendix A. The schedule was designed to record language exposure every 10 minutes in blocks of time during the day from 9-11 am and again from 1-3 pm in the classroom and from 4pm – 5pm at home. In total, each participant was observed using the same schedule for 5 school days.

At intervals, I recorded which language (Tongan or English or both) was being used and what the child was doing while hearing, reading, speaking or writing either of the languages at school. At home, the same schedule was used to record the language that was used with members of the family or community.

The function of this observation schedule was to record the amount of exposure the student participant experienced with each language (Tongan and English) and was providing this was this language input (ranging from teachers, parents, peers or the researcher). It also served to record what activity the participants were doing during the time of exposure. This information is crucial in providing a basis from which to evaluate whether this amount of exposure is sufficient for students to be supported to be balanced bilinguals.

There was a fourth column used in the observation schedule and this particular space was designed for additional comments where I could make other comments or record observations.

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) identify the importance of observation when they say it can “focus on events as they happen in a classroom” (p. 396). Hence, this observation proved to be so because it was being focused on the amount of exposure of children to language (be it Tongan or English) while it happened in the classroom.

3.4.2: Focus group semi-structured interview

The second method of collecting data was a focus group semi-structured interview using all the four participants (See Appendix B).

Menter, Elliot, Hulme, Lewin and Lowen (2011) argue that in focus groups, “participants are allowed to express themselves in their own words and this can provide insights on their understanding of topics and the level of feeling associated with them” (p. 149). The focus group allowed me to get an understanding of how the students viewed their language environment and which language they preferred to use.

The focus group was designed to be in a semi-structured format because such a format allows opportunity for other questions to emerge from the dialogic process between the interviewer and the interviewee (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) believe that group interviewing can be useful with

children as it “encourages interaction among the group rather than simply a response to an adult’s questions” (p. 347) and that it is “less intimidating for them than individual interviews” (p. 374).

The focus group interview was carried out in Tongan, the language that students said they wanted to be used. After the focus group, I summarised the key points that they covered and checked with participants whether that was what they wanted to say. The interview was then transcribed and translated by the researcher.

3.5 Data Collection Procedures

The classroom observations were conducted during normal class time and done in blocks of time from 9-11am in the morning and again at 1-3pm in the afternoon. Each of the 4 participants were observed for the period of 5 days in their classrooms during these blocks of time and observations were recorded every 10 minutes for the period of one minute.

The student participants were closely observed to record what they heard and read, what they spoke and wrote, and what activity they did while they listened, read, spoke and wrote. The teacher was also observed indirectly at the same time as the student participant to record the language that was being used with the participant. The lessons continued with their normal routine and my presence was not to be seen as distracting.

This focus group was conducted in one of the classrooms in the school so that children would feel comfortable in their own natural setting. This focus group ran for about 40 minutes with a teacher being present and whose role was not to say very much but “ensures the group actively discuss the range of topics of relevance to the study” (Menter, Elliot, Hulme, Lewin & Lowden, 2011, p. 149).

The data collected qualitatively from both the observation and the focus group interview combined to “allow the researcher to develop an overall picture of the subject under investigation” (Hittleman & Simona, 2006, p. 70).

3.6 Methods of data analysis

Like all analysis done for research papers, there is an interpretative selection process with a degree of subjectivity as the researcher examines and highlights themes of

interest to the study. This analysis, therefore, needed to be as systematic and as transparent as possible to allow scrutiny from others, which provides a 'trail of evidence' (Kruger & Casey, 2000). Trail of evidence is crucial in this case and as Rabiee states: "The first step in establishing a trail of evidence is a clear procedure of data analysis, so that the process is clearly documented and understood. This step would allow another researcher to verify the findings; it safeguards against selective perception and increases the rigour of the study (2004, p. 657).

Focus groups and observations do tend to generate a large volume of information. Rabiee (as cited in Menter, Elliot, Hulme, Lewin & Lowden, 2011) comments that the way in which you deal with the data will depend partly on the nature of the study and partly on the purpose of the interview or focus group that was conducted. The observation data that were collected were through observation schedules done to identify the language that students were exposed to in the Tongan classroom and home environment and who was using the language at that particular instance in the recording of the observations (the teacher, the child, or the caregivers/parents).

The data that were collected from these observations were sorted into categories and group the activities per what the child did or said in the classroom or at home. When these activities were sorted, the number of times these activities were done and in which language was used were recorded (Tongan, English, or both).

When these were done, the data was put into a frequency table to show the activities the participants were engaged in and the language that was used whether it was Tongan, English or both. These frequency tables were then used to explain what was found during the time of the research and how much of each language (English and Tongan) or how much of both was used in both the school and the home environment. These will be detailed in the following chapter.

The focus group data was on the other hand, used to find out the language preferences of children (English or Tongan) and to make notes on students' awareness of their language choices.

For the transcript of the focus group, the list below showed the process by which the data was analysed:

1. I numbered each line of the transcript

2. printed transcripts and put some code at the back to identify each participant
3. used coloured highlighter pens to identify key text and quotes with the colours of the pens indicating thematic areas
4. cut out the text associated with the main analytical themes and arranged under the existing and/or developing main thematic areas.

When this process was completed, the data was then used to identify the language preferences of the participants and their views on their use of language (English, Tongan, or both) and the data also provided some linkages to the observations by providing information to which language was more dominance in use. These findings will also be discussed in the next chapter.

3.7 Conclusion

This chapter has highlighted the designs, the methods, and the procedures that were used to gather information for this research including reasons for why they were selected to be used. The next chapter will discuss the findings that this research has been able to collect to show the result of the designs, the methods and procedures described in this chapter.

CHAPTER 4: THE FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter a detailed outline of the findings from the classroom observations and the focus group are described. There were four participants involved and each of these participants including their physical environment and the relationship they had with their surroundings (home and school) has been described in the previous chapter. I found emerging categories from the data which helped to address the focus of this research which was to look at the amount of exposure of children to different languages particularly English and Tongan in order to determine whether this exposure is sufficient to support them as balanced bilinguals in Tongan and English.

4.2 Field Observations

The first method that was utilised to attain data was through observations which were aimed at recording the language that was used by, at, and with the selected children in both their school day and their time at home. These observations were done in blocks of time. The findings are presented into two parts: the first explains the classroom observations and the second explains the home observations. Both sets of observations include some general observations of how language was used to, by or with the child participants as well as specific observations taken at points in time over 5 days: in school from 9 am to 11 am in the morning and again from 1pm to 3pm in the afternoon; and at home from 4 pm to 5 pm. I used time sampling in that observations were recorded every 10 minutes for a block of 1 minute during the observation period.

4.2.1 Classroom Observations

As mentioned above, the four student participants were each observed in their classrooms for the period of 5 days each and in blocks of time from 9-11am and 1-3pm. The order of who was to be observed was done randomly and was as follows: Week 1 – FS (Class 4), Week 2 – CS (Class 5), Week 3 – NS (Class 6), and Week 4 – TT (Class 3).

During the 5-day period that each participant was observed, both the student participant and the teachers involved were observed, however the students were the

focus. The four student participants were all observed to record what language they used in the classroom and what language was being used with them and by whom (e.g. the teacher, or another student). Although the teachers of the four participants were observed, this was done indirectly and only in order to record what language he/she was using with the participant at the time of the observation. The data that was collected during these classroom observations, at the end, resulted in the researcher being able to make notes about what language the student participants and the teacher and the class used and what activities were going on inside the classrooms as well as outside during their breaks at the time of the observations. In this way, I could look at language choice in relation to the nature of activities students were engaged in.

These data were then sorted, and coded or classified before they were drawn together. The categories relate to types of activities that were occurring in the context the student was in at the time of the observation.

The following table summarises these activities and gives the frequencies for times that specific languages were used by, to and with each of the participants inside and outside the classroom. (See Appendix H for full details of the data). It should be noted that there were 27 different activities which were identified. The activities are presented in ranked order depending on their overall frequency. These are also broken down into language used.

Table 3: Frequency of language used in different activities at school

	Activities ranked in order of frequency The child is . . .	Frequencies of observed activities	Frequencies of activities using Tongan	Frequencies of activities using English	Frequencies of activities using Tongan/English
1	playing with others in the field	72	72	0	0
2	doing silent reading or writing	48	44	0	4
3	interacting in a group/with the rest of the class/teacher	45	29	0	16
4	talking to other children	30	29	0	1
5	going through their work with the teacher	29	25	0	4

6	participating in a programme outside the regular classroom programme (e.g. being visited by the dental clinic visit, cleaning, visiting the fire brigade)	28	28	0	0
7	being involved in whole class reading	28	16	2	10
8	reciting something with or after the religious instructor (whole class/group/individual)	19	15	0	4
9	engaging in a whole class discussion with the teacher	16	11	0	5
10	being involved in whole class spelling	15	5	0	10
11	doing an activity associated with the curriculum (e.g. moving face clock around, counting with counters, placing numbers to the values table) for the teacher	14	12	0	2
12	being talked to by the teacher	11	8	0	3
13	listening to a radio program	11	8	0	3
14	singing a hymn	10	10	0	0
15	reading own work out loud	9	6	2	1
16	teacher is demonstrating to the child	8	8	0	0
17	working on soroban/abacus	7	7	0	0
18	repeating after the teacher (whole class/group/individual)	7	4	0	3
19	reporting or responding to the teacher	6	6	0	0
20	demonstrating to the teacher/class	6	6	0	0

21	praying	6	6	0	0
22	running errands for teacher	4	4	0	0
23	listening to a story read by the teacher	4	4	0	0
24	answering questions by either verbal or through written activity	3	3	0	0
25	listening to another student's answer	1	1	0	0
26	marking another student's book	1	1	0	0
27	doing a spelling test	1	0	0	1
TOTAL		439	368	4	67

Table 4: Overall Percentages of language use at school

Language Used	English	Tongan	English/Tongan
Percentage of usage in the classroom	0.91%	83.83%	15.26%

There were some interesting trends in terms of the participants' and the teachers' use of language both inside and outside the classroom. Out of the 439 number of observations carried out, only 0.91% (4) of those observations were found to feature the use of English only. These occurred when students were reading as a class and when the participants were reading out loud from their work or charts. 15.26% (67) of the observations were found to use both English and Tongan language, and the rest of 83.83% (364) observations were all in Tongan (See Table 4 above). Tongan was thus the dominant language that was used in and out of the classroom for all the participants.

Table 5: Categories of activities carried out at school (curriculum related or not)

Categories of activities	Non-curriculum related	Students working on their own activities	Students and teachers participating in class activities
Percentage of activities	27.5%	21.5%	51%

From Table 5 above, it was found that 27.5% of the activities were non-curriculum ones during which the participants were playing, running errands, singing and praying and just listening to others. These activities had very little to do with the actual content of the curriculum but it is where all the students, including the student participants, were exposed to language through the activities listed above. 21.5% of these observations showed the students working on their own doing activities like silent reading, talking to other children, talking to the teacher, working on soroban/abacus or marking another student's book. Although these activities were done by students themselves, the use of language during the time of these activities showed how they experienced language input while doing their own work. The remaining 51% were all activities involving both the participants and their teachers in the classrooms. These ranged from the different language modes of reading, writing, listening and speaking and involving activities like whole class reading, whole class spelling, listening to radio programs, and answering questions through verbal discussions and written answers. These were the time that most of the input was done in the classroom.

As can be seen from the above table, the use of English was very limited and only in a number of cases were both languages (English and Tongan) used in the classroom.

There were some general observations that I made about language use in the classroom which discussed in the next section.

4.2.1.1 General observations from the classroom

4.2.1.1.1 Reading methods

The observations that were recorded showed that in all four of the classrooms where student participants were observed, it was noted how *whole class reading, whole class spelling, and repeating after the teacher* were common activities. Each of the teachers used a big chart to write the passage or text that was being used on it and then sat beside the reading and pointed out the words using a long stick. The students read or pointed to words or repeated them after the teacher. This was used whenever the teacher and students were reading regardless of what language (English or Tongan) was in the reading.

It was noted during the observation that the students' language input during this time of reading were through the repetition of these readings which were used over and

over again for about 3 – 5 days in the week. By the end of the week, most of the students had learnt the passages by heart. In all of the classrooms from Class 3 to Class 6, all the teachers used these charts in both Tongan and English language for their reading times. There were no big books or small readers used.

Repeating after the teacher was used a lot by all the teachers of the observed classes (Class 3 – 6). This was especially during spelling times, whole class reading and while the class were reciting times tables, reciting spelling or randomly spelling words the teachers pulled out from readings was also common.

Another observation that was recorded regarding the reading strategy that was also common among the four participants and their classes was the use of round robin reading with students reading a sentence each aloud in turn. This was used during whole class reading whereby the teacher pointed to a sentence and nominated one of the students to read each sentence. The students also spent a lot of their reading time, whether it was in Tongan or in English, giving the teacher a choral response from the whole class or group.

Across the entire observation, participants were given some opportunities to speak on occasions or read out things by themselves. However, this was in the context of answering the teacher's questions but they were not given many opportunities to generate their own language responses.

4.2.1.1.2 Whole school programme outside of regular class programme

During the week, the school had a time when there was a whole school programme. Tuesday afternoon, for instance, was the visit from the Dental Health with the Ministry of Health to demonstrate how to brush teeth. It was noted in my observations that the language used for these whole school programs was Tongan. This may have been because all the students starting from Class 1 who have no exposure to the English language yet at school were included.

Not only this but every Friday morning (9-10am), a representative from each church in the village would be present at the school to run their own religious instruction programme for 1 hour. All these representatives from the churches used Tongan in their services except for some of the songs which were sung in English. These whole school programmes showed the dominance of the Tongan language.

4.2.1.1.3 Classroom set up and resources

In the classrooms of all the four different class levels that were used for the research (Classes 3-6) the way the classrooms were laid out was observed to be similar to each other. The walls were divided into big subject sections (English, Science, Maths, Tongan, Tongan Society and Culture, Creative Technology, Movement and Fitness) and charts with activities selected and written by the teachers were used for those sections. The only non-teacher produced charts were seen in class 3. There were also organisational charts that scheduled the daily class programme

It was also observed that there were hardly any English readers in Class 5, Class 6 and Class 3. There were a few charts used for decorating the classroom that were written in English but there was no library corner for English or English readers visible. There was a corner in each of the classrooms for text books but they were all curriculum books which consisted of pupils' books/ activity work books. There were some Tongan readers but not that many. Class 4's classroom was where the school library was located but as observed, there was no library sessions during the time that I was present. Hardly any of the students borrowed from the library and books were observed to be left without being used. It was also noted that there was a huge box with big books in the office which the teachers and students were not making use of.

There was a lack of students' work displayed on the walls. Students' tasks were either written up on the board, written in a chart and stuck up on the board, put in placement cards or activity cards for students to use during the class, photocopied and given out for students, or pages were already given from a text book for them to do. Students' works and activities were all in their books and nothing visible was displayed for parents or visitors to see in order to give them some measurement or indication on how much input has helped students to be able to carry out activities in the curriculum.

4.2.2 Home Observations

As well as the classroom observation, the participants were also observed at their homes for an hour every day for the period of 5 days in order to record the language that each of the participants used with their families and what their families used with them. Like the classroom observations above, the data for these home visits were also collected, and sorted to show the frequencies of the language used by the participants

and their families at home. The following table summarises these activities and give the frequencies for times that specific languages were used by, to and with each participant at their home (See Appendix I for full detail of the data). There were 13 different activities identified and they are presented in ranked order in the table depending on their overall frequency. These are also broken down into language used.

Table 6: Frequency of language activities used at home

	Activities ranked in order of frequency	Frequencies of observed activities	Frequencies of activities using Tongan	Frequencies of activities using English	Frequencies of activities using Tongan/English
	The child is . . .				
1	doing chores at home that were given by adults	25	25	0	0
2	doing homework (at home/someone else's house)	21	16	0	5
3	playing with other children	20	20	0	0
4	reading	14	12	0	2
5	talking to friend/friend talking to him	13	12	0	1
6	eating	8	8	0	0
7	using media for games	6	5	0	1
8	talking to a member of the family	5	5	0	0
9	being scolded at by an adult	2	2	0	0
10	Taking sibling home	2	2	0	0
11	talking to/ asking for help from teacher	2	2	0	0
12	doing chores in the classroom	1	1	0	0
13	walking from one home to another	1	1	0	0
TOTAL		120	111	0	9

Table 7: Overall Percentages of language use at home

Language Used	English	Tongan	English/Tongan
Percentage of language usage at home	0%	92.5%	7.5%

The observations at home were only done for an hour in comparison to the four hours of observations at school. Because of this, the total frequency of activities is of course smaller.

The observations at home were only done for an hour in comparison to the four hours of observations at school. Because of this, the total frequency of activities is of course smaller.

Table 6 above shows 13 different common categories of activities in the data of language usage at home. Within these 13 different categories, it was revealed that 0% or none of the homes used English only in their language usage. What was found was that 92.5% of the language used in the participants' homes was Tongan (111 of the total 120 observations) and the other 7.5% (9 out of 120 observations) revealed the use of both English and Tongan in the student participants' homes as shown in Table 7 above. Thus, as with the observations in the classrooms, Tongan dominated language use. It is interesting, however, to note that none of these participants used English only in any of their conversations at home although there was a small amount of code switching between English and Tongan used at home. Codeswitching occurred with activities that were related to school such as doing homework and reading, or they were related to the media such as the participants playing games or talking to a friend about either school homework or some form of media.

4.2.2.1 General observations from the participants' homes

4.2.2.1.1 Freedom of the participants

The participants and others in the home observations were asked to follow through with their daily routines without any disturbances from myself as a researcher.

Two of the participants (CS & NS) followed these wishes. These two were similar in the fact that after school, the participants would go back to their homes, change from their uniforms, eat, and then carry out whatever chores that their parents/caregivers or their older siblings had for them. When these chores are done, these participants were pretty much free to roam and do what they would normally do. This was a benefit for me as a researcher because these two participants increased the diversity of the activities I observed. However, this was not the case with the other two participants (FS & TT). Even after explaining to these participants' parents and caregivers at the very beginning of the research my wish to have their normal routine followed, these two participants' caregivers and parents kept their 2 students (FS & TT) at home with me instead of being let go to visit other households or do things they normally would do each day. One of these 2 parents (TT) even insisted on preparing food and a cup of tea for me because it is rude in the culture to have visitors over without offering them something. This limited what I could observe.

4.2.2.1.2 Domination of Tongan at home

Across the four participants' homes, an interesting observation was how none of these households used English only with the participants. **Tables D** and **E** above clearly shows that English was seldom used and only when code switched with the Tongan during the times when the participants and an adult were doing homework or when the participants were given access to the media. It was observed that it was only in FS's home that some of the adults spoke some English to him whereas the other three participants, (TT, NS & CS), all had the adults in their homes speaking to them in Tongan all the time.

4.2.2.1.3 Little access to the media

It is also surprising how all the four student participants had very little access to the media. When I went to the participants' homes, one of the things I asked after the first day's observation was whether the participant had access to some form of media at home. Two of these participants (FS and CS) seemed to have access to some media (radio, games, DVDs) while 2 of them (NS and TT) seem to have little or no access to any media at all. For instance, NS had access to a radio sometimes which was only when some of the adults in his household were at home and were listening to the radio

through their phones or transistor radio. He had no access to any TV at all or games. TT had access to TV sometimes and nothing else.

This was surprising because many children in Tonga were very up to date with the latest movies and as observed at the school, students would sit around talking about a movie that they had watched or something funny that had come up in the media. However, the fact that these participants had minimal access to the media in their homes meant that they had little exposure to English from this source.

4.3 The Focus Group Interview

The focus group was an opportunity for me to obtain the views of the participants without an adult assuming their preferences and their views about Tongan and English. Although one of their teachers was in the room with me to oversee what was going on during the focus group interview, the focus group interview only involved me and the participants conversing. The interview was later transcribed by me but right after the focus group interview, I orally summarised what the participants had said and checked with them whether this summary covered what they intended to say or whether they wanted to change some of the things they had said.

4.3.1 Language exposure in interactions with others

The focus group children were asked, “What is the language that you hear here at home that is being used by people in your home?” The responses pointed to the fact that Tongan was predominantly the language that was used at home and in their surrounding environments (i.e. at school and when with friends).

FS: Our home use Tongan

NS: We talk in Tongan all the time

We use Tongan only at home

No one speaks English I hardly hear anyone using English

CS: Yes, we talk in Tongan

Oh, we're like FS speaking in Tongan

We talk in Tongan at home

Everyone at home speaks in Tongan to me

TT: We talk in Tongan at home

During the home observations, the participants were aware that Tongan was dominant. As noted from the observations done, even though all the participants had some sort of exposure to the English language, the use of English directly with them was very limited or there was none at all. FS, as mentioned above, had English spoken to him by adults through his English homework. CS, TT and NS, however, did not have any of the adults in their homes using English with them hence all interactions done at home were all in Tongan. NS, however, heard some English through the radio and through some from his mother's phone conversations, CS had no one in his home using English with him except the media (games and television) and TT occasionally heard English but only in weekends when they watch television. Thus, when asked, What language do their mums and dads and people around them at home use with them? The participants responded:

NS: No one speaks English at home ... only Mrs. NS sometimes speak in English over the phone

CS: We speak Tongan at home

TT: M and D speaks in Tongan to us

We never hear them [parents] talking in English to us

Of all the participants, only FS seemed to have some family members at home who spoke to him in English.

FS: Only L speaks in English to me ... Oh and S [aunties] ... the rest they speak in Tongan – and sometimes my mum when we talk on the phone.

When asked the question, “How about at school? What language do you hear that is being used at school?”, all the participants agreed that at school, the language they heard was both English and Tongan. However, they reported very limited usage of English:

FS: Reading and Science and English

NS: We read and listen to radio programmes

CS: And just during English lessons

TT: Doing phonics and repeating after Teacher X

ALL: Charts and books

NS, CS and TT: We mostly use charts and pupil's books

The participants agreed that at all the other times at school, they used Tongan language with the teacher. During the observation, these were seen during the whole day when classes were on. Most of the conversations in the classrooms whether it was between the teacher and the students or whether it was amongst the students, were done in Tongan. Activities were explained in Tongan, and even some of the instructions for English activities were first read in English and then explained in Tongan before the students were given time to work on these activities. It was only during English lessons especially during reading that English was heard for some time during the day.

Interestingly, when all the participants were asked to identify the language(s) that they were exposed to at home and their surrounding environments, all four participants varied in their answers. With the exception of the Tongan and the English language as the main language, FS and CS were also exposed to other languages like Chinese, Korean, and Philippines through DVDs and movies they watched, with CS also having exposure to the Samoan language. NS and TT on the other hand, showed very minimal exposure to other languages with NS only having exposed to English and Tongan and TT having very limited exposure to English and Korean. Thus, this brings me to the role of the media in exposing the different languages discussed above to these participants.

4.3.2 Language exposure in the media

The variability in the exposure had the media as its main source in the form of radio and movies which are to be detailed below. However, it was noted that this exposure does not mean that the participants were active users of the languages they were exposed to.

4.3.2.1 Movies

In Tonga, there are many forms of entertainment that people use. Watching movies on DVDs is one of the most popular forms of entertainment. Many people who do not have lots of chores to complete at home or are just relaxing often get themselves DVD movies. The movies that are released are not just English movies but include movies from India, Mexico, China, Korea, the Philippines, and Samoa.

These movies in the homes are part of the exposure that participants have to different languages as can be seen from the following utterances.

FS: Yeah! Like SL [grandmother]. She watches Philippine movies, Korean and Chinese but mostly English and Philippine movies

TT: Yeah, I often see Mrs X (neighbour) and them watching Philippine and Korean movies).

CS: I often go to T and K's DVD shop and watch games and all the different movies there, Philippines, Koreans, Chinese, Samoan and sometimes they give us movies to watch at home with T [mother] and A [sister].

4.3.2.2 Radio (transistor or using mobile phones)

Another form of entertainment is through the radio, either on a transistor or through a mobile phone or a stereo. All the participants commented that the languages that featured most prominently on this form of media in the home were mainly English and Tongan. Two of these participants, who had no access or limited access to a television and have the radio as an entertainment source at home said that both languages were being used by the radio but they only had access to it sometimes.

NS: Only Tongan and English ... we listen to the radio only on P and A and mum's phones or Grandma L's radio.

TT: Just the radio and TV we often hear the use of English from but most of the time it's off during the week and only the weekend we use it to watch wrestling.

NS also explained that at school radio programmes were additional sources of English (as well as the teacher).

4.3.3 Language preference

In this section, I will describe the responses made by the participants on their views of the language they use and which language (Tongan or English) they prefer using both at home and at school.

With regards to using language at home, participants in the focus group were asked: "What language do you prefer to use at home?" All of their responses indicated a preference for the Tongan language at home.

FS: I like Tongan better

NS: I like Tongan better

CS: I like Tongan

TT: I like the Tongan

When these four participants were asked to provide reasons why they preferred Tongan language at home rather than English, they gave the following responses:

FS: Because it's the one I understand and sometimes when L and L [aunties] talk in English I don't really understand them

NS: Because we all talk in Tongan at home and I am too shy to talk in English because my English is not good

CS: I like it because I understand what they [people at home] say and because that's the language I understand well and can use

TT: I like the Tongan because mum told us to talk in Tongan so we can understand each other

In trying to probe their views about the different languages, the children were asked, "How do you feel when people at home or visitors to your home speak in English to you?" Their responses again, give the indication of how much they prefer Tongan to be used at home.

FS: Annoyed because I don't know some of the things L and L [aunties] tell me

NS: Shy, because my English is not good

TT: Funny because maybe I won't be able to understand it

With regards to their views and preferences of language use at school, the children were asked the question, "Do you like using Tongan or English language at school?" Two of the participants (FS and CS) preferred English while the other two participants (NS and TT) preferred Tongan.

When asked to explain the reason(s) why they prefer the language listed in their preferences above, they responded in the following way:

FS: To understand how to speak in English... and to understand the readings

NS: Because if someone talks to me in English I wouldn't really understand

CS: To understand the movies and those things ... and when someone talks to you in English you'd be able to talk back

TT: We hardly talk in English We only do phonics and repeat after Mr. T [teacher]

Although two of the participants explained that they would prefer to use English at school, when asked if they use English during play time with other students when they had the opportunity to use it with the teacher, they responded that they only used Tongan when communicating with students and teachers at school. This is particularly interesting because one would think that these two participants would prefer to use English whenever possible. However, all of the four participants agreed that Tongan was thus the main language used in the classroom and outside the classroom apart from the limited times that they used English.

4.4. Conclusion

These research findings have been presented to investigate the questions of this thesis, which are:

1. How much Tongan and how much English are children exposed to over a selected period of time from teachers and caregivers?
2. What language do they choose to use themselves in interactions with others over a selected period of time?

In order to answer these questions, two main methods were used: observations (both at home and in the classroom) were used to collect data on how much Tongan and English or both languages children are exposed to over a selected period of time from both teachers and caregivers; and a focus group interview was also used to find out the participants' views of the language they use with others and their preferences over which language they think is best for them.

The data from the observations (both at home and in the classroom) revealed that all of the selected participants were exposed to Tongan a much more than English. In the classroom, 83.83% of the time Tongan was used which was also reflected at home with 92.5% use of Tongan. The observations revealed that in both environments code switching occurred although the percentage at school (15.26%) was a little higher than that at home (7.5%) and English exposure in both these environments was very small.

With regards to the preferences of the participants, half of the participants preferred Tongan and the other half preferred English. However, in the general use of the language, all the participants agreed that Tongan was the main language they

preferred to use because it is the language that they are used to and understand and it is the language that they are able to communicate with others. The next chapter will discuss these findings and to explore whether or not the language input they receive is sufficient for balanced bilinguals to be supported.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will present an analysis and provide discussions of the findings of the data collected for this research presented in the last chapter which aimed to explore and document the amount of exposure of four participants to English and Tongan in particular in order to determine whether this exposure is sufficient to support them to become balanced bilinguals.

The findings from the observations (classroom and home observations) as well as the focus group interview with these participants will now be discussed in order to provide explanations of the nature of the results in light of the literature presented in previous chapter (Chapter 2) as well as implications of these findings with respect to balanced bilingualism.

Three major areas are focussed on in this chapter: (1) discussion of analysis in terms of the quantity of input, the quality of input and the opportunities children have for learning language; (2) how the discussion of analysis (quantity, quality and opportunities for input) work with or against the Tongan national language policy; and (3) recommendations for future development in language input for both teachers and parents

5.2 Discussion of analysis

5.2.1 Quantity of input

The Tongan language was used as the L1 for all the classes that were observed in this research (Class 3 – Class 6) while English was used as the L2. Interestingly, this study found from the evidence presented in the previous chapter that the majority of the input that the four selected participants experienced input from during the research was through the use of L1 or the local vernacular. Although this finding may be used to declare that it corresponds well with the language policy of Tonga which pinpoints the expectations of the policy and as evidence to reports (Cummins, 1981, 1984, 1992, 2000; Baker, 2000; Ramirez, 1991, 1992) that students' learning at the early age should be done in their local vernacular before the introduction of English which the literature points out to be "the foundation for successful language acquisition"

(Taufe'ulungaki, 2000, p. 1), it can be argued that there was very little input for both English and Tongan during the study.

The literature points out to the fact that the amount of input the child receives will have a potential effect on the dominance of one language over the other (Lanza, 1997). This was practically the case in this research where the participants agreed that at all the other times at school, apart from when they were studying English as a subject or listening to radio programmes or reading in English, the Tongan language (L1) was basically the language they were exposed to. In the previous chapter, this was evident from the observations which specifically found that most of the conversations in the classrooms whether it was between the teacher and the students or whether it was amongst the students, were done in Tongan. Activities were explained in Tongan, instructions for English activities were first read in English and then explained in Tongan were a few of the examples from the observations in the classrooms. At home, all of these four participants, as was evident in the focus group interview, agreed that the main language they heard and used or were exposed to at home was their L1. This evidence alone can be used to come to the conclusion that this huge amount of exposure to the Tongan language may have been the reason why these participants preferred or chose to use Tongan as their dominant language. As stated also in the literature, Pearson et al. (1997) and Hoff et al. (2012) agree with Lanza (1997) by giving their example that children produced more words in the language they heard most. That is, the more they hear a language, the more words they pick up. In terms of this research, the more participants hear Tongan in their interactions, they will know more Tongan words than any other language they may have been exposed to.

If this result of the dominance of the Tongan language was compared to work of early educationalists such as Lee (1996) perhaps the outcome would be close to the conclusions of their findings that bilingual students will not be able to achieve well like monolinguals. However, Cummins (1984) argues that views like these can only be because children often “fail to develop a sufficiently high level of proficiency in the school language (L2) to benefit fully from their educational experiences” (p. 333). In this research for instance, the input of English was surprisingly very minimal at school (0.91%) and at home (0%) as well. Even with the evidence that there was code switching between the Tongan and English (15.26% at school and 7.5% at home), this evidence showed that there was simply insufficient level of input to give the

participants high level of proficiency in their L2 in order for them to show this in the frequencies of activities done both at school and at home that they have enough exposure to both languages. One key element that needs to be taken into account with regards to looking at the quantity of input at this stage is to do with what Pearson and Amaral (2014) advocate that “exposure levels clearly matters” (p. 10).

Cummins (1977) emphasises that for students to accelerate cognitive growth, they have to attain a certain minimum threshold level of competence in his second language in order to do this. His Threshold Theory (2000) identifies students as ‘balanced bilinguals’ who have competence in two or more languages and can cope with curriculum materials in either language. The findings from this study reveal that there is insufficient level of English (L2) input in the classroom in comparison to how much Tongan input (L1) was recorded. Somehow the level of exposure is explained by a few writers to occur because of the variation in how the child hears and uses a language which may vary from child to child. (De Hower, 2014; Pearson, Fernandez, Lewdeg, and Oller, 1997; Oller, 2010).

As Cummins (2000) states bilinguals needing to be competent in L1 before L2 can be acquired. It is therefore important for teachers in the classroom to allow more time for L2 in order for the students to learn more than the 0.919% of English currently used or the 15.40 % of using both English and Tongan language in order to ensure that the student is indeed achieving better results.

5.2.2 Quality of input

It is important to consider who models language to children (interlocutors); the circumstances where the learners hear language (home, media or school); and the age of onset. In the present study, the findings identified a few different but significant interlocutors: the teachers and peers at school; and parents/caregivers and sometimes friends at home.

In the classroom, the teacher seemed to dominate the input that children participants were exposed to. This can be seen in how a lot of the teaching is controlled or dominated by the teacher. The teachers’ monologues dominated the classroom, and the children spent most of their time listening, repeating after the teachers or answering them in choruses. In all the modes of learning in the classroom (reading,

writing, speaking and listening), Baker argues that if children operate in an insufficiently developed second language, the system will not function at its best and hence both the quantity and the quality of what is learnt from curriculum materials may be weak and needs a lot of attention. Hoff and Naigles (2002) also agree to this by adding that if there is limited input, it gives only a restricted base for experience from which to build mental representations of the various linguistic units thus leading to differences in the target language and the form of the language. That is, one can learn to speak the language fluently but not master the technicalities or the grammatical and syntactical features that goes together with it (Montrul, 2008). In addition to this Chesterfield (as cited in Cummins, 2000) also adds that insufficient input and activities such as repeating after the teacher and answering in choruses do not expand the language input of children themselves.

At home, parents/caregivers were also observed to use primarily Tongan.

Pearson and Amaral (2014) argue in this case that limited exposure to one of both of the languages to be learned constrains the quality of the eventual stable state of the language that is to be learned. Hence, English as a second language (L2) become very restricted and limited in its use and what the child understands of English is very little in terms of mental representations hence, their being able to learn sufficient L2 is not achieved.

Language input from peers or friends was also found in the findings discussed in previous chapters. Tables 3 and 4 show in the frequencies of language activities used in both school and home that there were quite a few occasions when friends were part of the activities of the participants (whether it was through playing, talking, being involved in a whole class activity or visiting friend's house) and therefore these peers may be seen as part of the interlocutors although the level of input may be the same throughout. Such learning as the above example given by Montrul (2008) may be applied to peers which will have a detrimental effect on language learners especially if this individual will be imitated by other language learners and especially since the quality of input also relies on who the child hears language from.

Significantly in attaining the quality of input, when and where the language input is heard and spoken needs to be considered. In the findings of this research, the school environment and the home environment were the two places that were used to

observe the language input and the time has been emphasised a lot in earlier discussion. According to the literature by Hoff (2006), there is definitely going to be a difference in the settings of where the language is heard. For instance, school setting will be more formal whereas the home language will provide more avenues and potentials for input than at school. Both the observations recorded from the school and the home in this research had thus shown that the balance of the use of Tongan and English in these two environments was not achieved which was reflected in many of the activities being either too controlled by the teacher or did not involve much input of the English language.

Finally, in this section, the language of onset (AoO) for when children are exposed to language learning needs to be considered. Literature from Pearson and Amaral (2014) highlights that early exposure is generally considered better for learners. Cummins (1980a), emphasises this by how he thinks that “a child’s second language competence is partly dependent on the level of competence already achieved in the first language. The more developed the first language, the easier it will be to develop the second language. When the first language is at a low stage of evolution, the more difficult the achievement of bilingualism will be” (p. 169). This, and other writers’ reports (Baker, 2000; 2011; Taufe’ulungaki, 2000; Thaman, 1996) have influenced the language policy of many of the Pacific Islands including Tonga to change the policy and follow this world-wide phenomenon put forward by these writers to have the vernacular language/community language/ mother tongue become the foundations of the children’s language input (L1) before any other language is introduced (L2).

5.2.3 Opportunities for children to use language - specifically English

From the previous chapter, the observations from the classroom as well as observations from the home which were categorised and put in Table 3 and Table 6 of the previous chapter (see Chapter 4) clearly provided evidence that there were very few opportunities for students to use a particular language (specifically English) in both these settings (school and home). Table 4 and Table 7 in the Findings clearly revealed the overall percentages used for each of the language and when they were code switched. The evidence found that there seem to be a huge discrepancy in the usage of the two language. (i.e. Tongan (92.5% at home and 83.83% at school); English (0%

at home and 0.91% at school); English/Tongan (7.5% at home and 15.26% at school)). The Tongan language takes the biggest percentages of the language input while the English sits at a very low level of input which was none at home and close to nothing at school. (Given the fact that student participants were learning two languages, the expectation at the beginning of the research was that there would be a lot of code switching in order for the input of language to be balanced. However, as indicated by the findings, this was not the case. The frequency of language used in different activities showed that the only times for students to code switch and use both languages was through reading, interacting in a group with others, talking to other students, going through work with the teacher, reciting or repeating after teacher, whole class discussion or spelling, curriculum related activity, talked to by the teacher, and listening to radio programmes at school; and doing homework, reading, talking to a friend, and using the media at home. (That is, 67 out of 439 observations at school or 15.26% of language input at school; and 9 out of 120 observations at home or 7.5% of language input at home).

Although these figures shown in the calculation above revealed that there is a deficiency in the input of English as a language, Baker (2000) argues that this is likely to happen because balanced bilingualism hardly ever happens and although it has its advantages, bilinguals who have balanced input use their two languages for distinct purposes and functions (according to the context it is used) and that the majority of bilinguals have one language that dominates which may change with age, education, work and area of residence.

5.3 Language Policy

As discussed in the Literature Review Chapter, the literature on the language policy of Tonga taken from the Tonga Education Policy Framework (2004-2019) emphasised the purpose of the policy to support strategies to improve the education system of Tonga through improved access, equality and attaining better and improved quality education for students (Government of Tonga, 2004). With the two principles of building on children's early learning in the mother tongue; and literacy in L1 before introducing L2 being in place, literature on additive bilingualism (Peal & Lambert 1962; Franken et al, 2008; Cummins, 2000) again emphasised the importance of building

competence in the first language in order for an easier transition and development in the second language to occur.

Specifically, the Ministry of Education identifies as one of its desired outcomes that “students at all levels will understand and speak English by the end of Class 6, and will be competent in oral and written English by the end of secondary schooling” (Government of Tonga, 2004, p. 36). This, indeed, reveals that bilingualism is considered to be one of the priorities that the government has in order to attain the level of achievements that it is wishing for its citizens to be able to help them live sustainable lives.

From the observations done in this research, one of the findings that was explained in the last chapter (Findings) identified that teachers do not follow the organisational charts that are present in the classroom nor the time allocation that was prescribed in the Tongan language syllabus to guide teachers with their time allocation and with how much English and Tongan language to use in the classroom.

In Chapter 2, Table 1 and 2 clearly show the allocation of time that the Ministry of Education of Tonga has aligned for the language policy of Tonga to be used as a guide for teachers to use. This discussion will look closely at the four levels of classes that were used for the observations and participants of this research (Classes 3 – 6) which is worth explaining at this point in the research.

In Class 3, the language policy states that the language of instruction will be purely Tongan (i.e. 100% Tongan and 0% English). This means that all subjects taught at Class 3 are meant to be taught in L1. However, as can be seen in Table B of this time allocation, the English syllabus is a bit different whereby introduction of the English language will be done at this level but only 60 minutes per week with instructions to have these lessons carried out verbally only. In the findings of this research, this 60 minutes per week was equivalent to 3 radio programmes which consisted of 20 minutes each. From the observations in the classroom, this was not the case. The teacher for class 3 used English more than the 60 minutes prescribed in the syllabus. Each morning before anything else, the teacher seats the students and they would be learning blends both in Tongan and English for about half an hour every morning before the lessons begin for the day. This gives the students in Class 3 more exposure

to English than is prescribed although this does not have an immediate on the students as was observed during the research.

For Class 4, the prescribed time allocation given was 80% Tongan and 20% English (See Table 1 and Table 2). As observed in the research, there were hardly any use of English except for when the students were reading as a whole class, repeating after the teacher or doing activities together in groups or having class discussions. The lessons were basically all done in the Tongan vernacular and the teacher dominates the talking. Similar to Class 3, Class 4 also had times when they spent too much time on Tongan as a subject or Maths where the whole morning will be spent on one subject instead of the 30 – 40 minutes that was given for each of these subjects. Hence, Class 4 also showed dominance of the Tongan language in the classroom.

Class 5 was prescribed 70% Tongan and 30% English. Class 5, according to the observations that was recorded was the only class that had instances when the teacher was able to use English only for some of its students (See Appendix H for full details). However, a lot of the lessons were again like those in Class 3 and Class 4 where the language input was all done in Tongan. There was code switching in the class where a lot of repeating, chorus answering from students and a lot of whole class reading was done but as in the observations recorded, the whole class reading was done in round robin readings that Chesterfield (as cited in Cummins, 2000) argues that it did not help expand the language input of children themselves.

Class 6 had a similar case as well as the other classes. The prescription guides teachers that there should be a 60% Tongan language input in class 6 and 40% English input. However, from the observations, the majority of the class was done in Tongan and it did not reflect a 40% English input. Most of the students like NS who was in Class 6 did not also reflect in the activities how the percentage of input that was expected to have been used in Class 6 worked because at class 6, NS did not have that much exposure to English at all, both at school and at home.

In general, the time allocations given in Tables 1 and 2 of the Literature Review, expects that the higher the level of the class is, the more percentage is being given to the English usage of language in the classroom as has just be clarified above. However, from the data collected and explained in Chapter 4 (Findings), the data clearly showed from the classroom observations identified that 83.83% of the activities

done at school were all done in the Tongan Language, 15.26% of both English and Tongan and 0.91% of the classes were done in English alone. The overall figures show that the targeted amount of input the students get on a daily basis does not meet the requirements of the supposedly guiding table for how much Tongan and English language the students are supposed to have been exposed to at each level in the classroom.

The home observation showed a similar trend to the observations in the classroom which identified that 92.5% of the language used at home were all in Tongan and the other 7.5% was the use of both English and Tongan language. It was a surprising fact that the data showed that none of the homes of the four participants used or practiced using English only in their language use at home.

One thing that should be noted here that Hoff (2005) argues is that “the source of variation in children’s rates or courses of language development” depend on the “variation in the degree to which children’s environments provide the support” (p. 56). Hence, if the findings show (like above) that there is indeed a high level of support for the use of the Tongan language in the classroom, it will be expected that the outcome that will be reflected from students will show the same degree as well where Tongan language will indeed show to be more of the language that students chose to use.

Similarly, if parents choose to use Tongan at home, the children will thereby be Tongan speakers and users instead of them learning languages that they are not familiar with. As such, the social contexts the child live in, whether it consists of proximal or distal surrounding becomes the primary “engines of development” (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, as cited in Hoff, 2005, p. 56) for the children’s learning and whatever the quality and diversity of the input the children receive from their environment, it is what is considered to be relevant for their development (Armon-Lotem et al., 2014). So, if Tongan is the language used in the context of the home, we should expect the children to develop more Tongan in the home too.

Finally, in this section, it is worth mentioning that what teachers are doing at this point is working against the policy. Although the expectations of the syllabus and the national policy is met, it is only to some extent. I say this because it is evident from the findings that Tongan is indeed used in accordance to the national policy, the way teachers work in the classroom does not fulfil the second half of the policy where there

should be enough exposure to English (L2) as well in order for bilingualism to be balanced and for the child to be able to function well with learning curriculum materials. Hence, this is reflected in the work of August (2010) who found that teachers in PNG were working against the policy by saying that they use English in their work but the findings from research pointed that teachers were indeed using Tok Pisin more than they did English. This does mean that there should be something that needs to be done in order for a better result in terms of the overall effect this have on the children's learning which will be done in the next section of this chapter.

5.4 Recommendations

As is argued from the previous section, one thing that needs to be done is to give out recommendations on how could we, as researchers and educationalists increase the quality of language input to help students become balanced bilinguals? It is important to encourage teachers to improve the quality of their teaching and also what parents can do should play a vital role in the development of their children. This section will look at recommendations for both the teachers and parents.

5.4.1 For teachers

As seen in the findings, the teachers used too much control in their teaching. For instance, whole class reading, whole class spelling, repeating after the teacher, choral responses to the teacher and the teacher therefore is seen to have total domination in the classroom. Reading as a whole class using the same materials over and over again (in both languages), asking closed questions or simple ones that does not trigger thinking, repeating after the teacher, and choral responses which are all seen to be a major part of the teaching strategies identified in the findings indicates that most of the responses of the children from these activities is formulaic. The students have become familiar with these everyday activities that they know how to response to them by providing the right responses or answers without fully grasping or understanding the gist of the activities. In instances like these, the activities indicate that the learning focus more on what the teacher wants rather than the children thinking for themselves. As such, children will withdraw their opinions and will just follow instructions instead of becoming active learners which does not help the expansion of their language input (Anthony, 2008). Teachers need to add new ways of introducing literacy activities to

students which will encourage them respond and to speak and use language, especially English, to show that they have comprehended the task hence have enough exposure in them to understand and use the language well. Teachers should therefore refrain from concentrating on questioning children for choral response because it prevents children from participating in shaping of their knowledge and allow more interaction in class where the students use language (both Tongan and English) interchangeably to show that their exposure to language has helped them understand curriculum materials and use their world from the home to merge with their language skills at school.

One of the strategies that was common and was discussed earlier on was the use of round robin reading and choral responses. Even the observation that some of the readings was used throughout a lapse of 3 – 5 days was also considered as a common strategy amongst the teachers Chesterfield (as cited in Cummins, 2000, p. 20) clearly argues against this by pointing out that repetition thus lowers the awareness of language and limited communication.

It is therefore important in this section to discuss how students can be encouraged to talk more and to use English more. They need more opportunities to try out the language in the classroom especially English in order to help them understand curriculum materials. As such, it is important to consider Strakova's (2012) suggestion that frequent exposure to much language input will lead to acquisition. Children needs lots of language activities to help them be exposed to the language that is targeted for them to learn.

5.4.2 For parents

Tongan students use Tongan as their L1 at home but are required by the school curriculum to learn English when they get into Class 3 of their formal education., Literature such as Lyon (1996) and Yamamoto (2001) argues that children who grow up in a bilingual environment do not necessary learn both the languages they are exposed to because it depends on the children's choice of language and what they have been exposed or taught most to use. Like the example that Oller (2010) gave earlier in this paper about his daughter learning German, hearing them talk in English and having a Spanish governess but ended up using English instead of German and Spanish, this clearly shows that what language the children are exposed to does not

mean that children will be speaking those particular languages. It depends on the child's choice of language and which language input they understand most and have had the chance to practice and use. The four participants used in this research, for instance, had different exposure to the language both at home and at school. At home, out of the four, FS was seen to be the only one with a little exposure from family members at home to English, CS had his little exposure to English from the media, NS often from the radio or his mother, and TT rarely was exposed to English at home. The exposure that was the result of the research clearly reflects that less exposure to English for these participants both at school and at home means that they too would have more L1 development than L2. Hence, it is important to note that there needs to be more exposure to L2 in their case if they are to become balanced in their bilingualism.

Pearson and Amaral, (2014) argue that the communities need to consider the source of language for their children and proposes that “[l]anguage minority communities must work to ensure that their children have ample opportunity and genuine motivation for learning the traditional language, typically in conjunction with another language as bilingualism is more viable than monolingualism” (p. 101). Hence, if this was the case, parents should then give way to including more of the L2 into their daily conversations as a way to give children not just the motivation but the opportunities as well for them to become balanced bilinguals.

5.5 Conclusion

The discussion chapter has clearly highlighted that that both the quantity and the quality of language input in the primary education of Tonga needs further attention to especially the use of English in the classroom. The next chapter will provide the conclusions to this research which will include the significance of this study for future research.

CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

This chapter will summarise the research. It will first provide a summary of what the study found, then it will highlight some of the limitations that I had encountered while carrying out the research. It will then provide implications for future research, and implications for future practices before ending by drawing conclusions of the research.

6.2 Summary of what the study found

The research has gathered important information and data that reveals the dire need for more language input in the classroom, especially English, and how there needs to be more input from both teachers and parents/caregivers to help and support students' language input in order for their cognitive development to be further enhanced and in order for them to be able to understand their world and their surroundings. In a lot of instances in the research, the adults seem to dominate the world of the students when students need opportunities to be exposed to and practice language.

6.3 Limitations to the research

There were several challenges that I, as the researcher, experienced while conducting this research. These will be discussed in the following section with hope that future researchers working in Tonga might be guided by my experiences.

6.3.1. Formal procedures

Before the research took place, I had to ensure that the time I spent in the field was sufficient for my field research and that was to do with the formal procedure of getting permission to go into the field. I was informed that it would take up to 2 weeks for my permission to be granted. Documents such as my ethics approval, information and consent letters for all participants, had been sent off to officers in the Ministry of Education in Tonga to ensure that I had sufficient time and had followed the proper procedure of getting permission.

When I arrived in Tonga, I made it my first priority to get into the head office and check on the progress of my permission form. However, I found that my application had not

been forwarded for approval. This in fact was not done until the morning I planned to start my research. This was after I returned again to the Ministry. Researchers who need to begin planning their research and getting permission for it, should be aware that this is sometimes difficult from a distance, and that face to face contact can be much more effective to ensure this is timely.

6.3.2. School Routines

One of the things that I have learned while working in the Curriculum Development Unit in Tonga is that much of the routine was controlled by either the teacher or the weather in Tonga.

Teachers follow a certain routine when teaching in the classroom and these routines are specifically highlighted in their activity books or teachers' planners. Some teachers even have their daily routine for the week written out in big charts and put them on the wall of their classrooms so that they ensure that this is followed throughout the week in order to cover the different areas of the learning subjects that are being prescribed for them to teach. However, teachers do not always follow these prescribed schedules. I observed that this occurred during my research. This meant that when teachers are not following the schedules, there are opportunities for them not to be aware that their use of language are not balanced whereby they could be using more Tongan than English in their teaching as evident from Tables 3 and 4 and from Appendices H and I

With respect to the weather, there were several days when it rained heavily. On those days, only about 20% of the students turned up to school and a few of them were sent off home to go and change out of wet clothes. Many parents during rainy days will keep their children at home, and schools also sometimes notify parents that they will be closed. This is because of flooding in the school making classrooms unfit for teaching and learning. The other reason had to do with the perception that children might get sick from getting wet in the rain. This means that during rainy days, I, as a researcher was not able to carry out my observations during the allocated time and the days when there was rain had to be replaced by other days during my schedule in order to be able to complete the number of days and hours that I was expected to observe and carry out my research at the site. This meant also that the rainy day's schedules that have occurred a few times during the research could have affected my

study if it prolonged for a long period of time which would not allow me to complete my study given that I was only in the site for a limited period of time.

6.3.3 Researcher vs expectation of parents

At the beginning of the research before data collection period, both parents and student participants had some time where the researcher carefully explained about what the research would involve especially where the participants were going to be observed at school and at home and be interviewed after the observation was done. Generally, there was never an issue with me as the researcher because parents saw these visits as beneficial for them and their families and, because I was someone from their town, any chance of helping with educational issues was welcomed by parents.

However, although I highlighted that I wished to observe the child in his/her normal environment without them having to change the routine of their daily lives, this was not the case in most of the homes where I conducted the observations. Most parents or caregivers strictly kept their children in my vicinity so that they could ensure that they were behaving well while I was doing the research. On several occasions, I asked a few of the caregivers whose children normally go out to neighbours after school to let them continue to do this. But, because parents wanted to make a good impression on me, and show courtesy to me, their child needed to remain at home and did as they were told. This restricted the range of activities that I could observe.

6.3.4 Confidentiality during research

In a small country like Tonga where the size of the island is small and the population of the chosen village was also small, anonymity and confidentiality cannot be assured. Before the research was conducted, I was very careful to ensure that the protocols for ensuring anonymity were put into place whereby the principal, parents and students were informed that their names or the name of the school would not be used, and pseudonyms would be assigned to participants so their identity will be concealed to everyone except for myself and my supervisor. I also asked participants not to talk about the research to others.

However, very soon people in the village knew that I was conducting my research and knew who this was with. Some students were also interrogated by some parents too just to find out what the researcher was doing in the school and in specific people's

homes. This experience taught me that ethical principles of anonymity and confidentiality are not as straightforward as made out in ethics applications when doing research in small communities.

6.4 Implications for future research

This study was conducted in one primary school in Tonga close to the heart of Nuku'alofa, the capital. The chosen school was specifically selected to be used for a case study using four participants and their natural settings (home and school) to find out how much exposure they have to language (both English and Tongan), what their language preferences are. This was in order to see whether the amount of exposure they had was enough to support them as balanced bilinguals. The findings from this research have pointed specifically to the conclusion that there is very little input especially in English. However, these findings were based on using two methods only: observations (classroom and home) and focus group interview. Hence, the research indicates that there are indeed gaps that needs to be addressed when conducting research like this in the future.

The following are suggestions of what future research of this nature could consider:

1. Because this study was a case study only, using four participants, the scope of the study did not allow for other avenues related to the topic to be explored. For instance, researchers could explore teachers' views of the language policy such as that done by August (2010). In August's study, she discusses both views and teacher practice and found that teachers were working against the language policy in Papua New Guinew by their extensive use of Tok Pisin, teacher centred input, choral esponses as output and their limited commitment to and support for bridging language development. Such coverage could have been considered. However, this study was limited in its scope because it specifically looked at what was seen (observed) and thought of (focus group), and that it only focused on students rather than considering other aspects that could have provided further details on other's views and experiences to help language input.
2. Because of the scope of the research being intended for a Master's qualification, the number of participants and the study only concentrated on the

children and their exposure to language and in only one school in Tonga. The data, in my view, although is sufficient to conclude that the amount of exposure the students in this particular school was not sufficient, it does not represent different schools in different areas. For instance, a school in a remote village or a village from one of the islands in other parts of Tonga would likely result in different patterns of language exposure. It is therefore, crucial for those who will carry out similar studies in the future to replicate the study but consider other schools in other parts of the country to get a better idea of what is occurring in schools in Tonga.

6.5 Implications for future practice

From the research, the study also indicates that there are much needed implications for future practices especially for teachers in primary schools.

The following are suggestions of what future practices on language input could consider:

1. The findings concluded that there is very little language input occurring in class which could be for many different reasons. Future studies could take into account these points: the training teachers need for them to be able to carry out and provide more input into the students' language learning; training on what language can do; what sort of activities or resources are needed for them to provide students with more or better bilingual lessons; and how best to assess and measure whether students are indeed learning both languages well in order to ensure they have a better understanding of curriculum materials at school and use the language effectively in their communities to be active citizens.
2. The study also showed that there is a huge gap in students' exposure to language especially in English. Future studies should consider also including in the research an implementation of some trial materials that could demonstrate to both teachers and students the kind of exposure that students need to have for both language in order for students' development in language to occur.

3. In order to provide effective ways of supporting students in Tonga to become balanced bilinguals, implications are drawn from the study. The Ministry of Education in Tonga should act upon its mission of providing and sustaining lifelong relevant and quality education for the development of Tonga and her people by being the main vehicle for supporting its language policy.

It is anticipated that with the implications suggested above for future practice, the findings from such a study in the future will provide the Ministry of Education of Tonga with more necessary information to ensure that students in primary schools in Tonga are provided with the best support to aid them in their transition from their L1 to their L2 and to help them become balanced bilinguals who function well in all facets of the society. August (2010) has provided some really significant information that can be used across Pacific Islands with a few minor changes to make it applicable to the context of the given country. Some of her suggestions for future practice includes: encouraging students to use both languages in learning in order to develop proficiency in both L1 and L2; teachers allowing children to use language much more in spoken form, integrating literacy tasks in L1 and translating them to English; and supporting children to produce language in a meaningful way especially with more effective use of teacher-student interaction and teacher feedback. These are important aspects of teaching language input that education systems in any given country needs to consider so as to ensure that the language input that students are experiencing, helps them much more than we realise.

6.6 Conclusion

Overall, because the language policy that is now in place being a new addition to Tonga's Ministry of Education and as this research is one of the few research studies that have been carried out looking at language policy in Tonga, this research has unveiled the importance of supporting students as balanced bilinguals in the classrooms and at home.

Finally, I wish to emphasise the importance of this research with its findings in the role it can contribute to Tonga's Ministry of Education's development of the details of how to improve its language policy. Hence, because Tonga is reliant on donors and aid to improve some of its policies and resources in terms of education, this study is

somehow seen to be valuable in providing necessary findings that could aid the development of initiatives to provide support for children's bilingual learning in Tonga.

REFERENCES

- Anthony, A. R. B. (2008). Output strategies for English-language learners: Theory to practice. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(6), 472-482.
- Armon-Lotem, S., Joffe, S., Abutbul-Oz, H., Altman, C. & Walters, J. (2014). Language exposure, ethnolinguistic identity and attitudes in the acquisition of Hebrew as a second language among bilingual preschool children from Russian-and English-speaking backgrounds. In T. Gruter, & J. Paradis (Eds.), *Input and Experience in Bilingual Development*. (pp. 77 – 98). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- August, M. (2010). *Supporting English language learning by bridging from childrens' first languages in Papua New Guinea: An analysis of Grade 3 teachers' conceptions and practices* (Master's thesis). University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand.
- Baker, C. (1988). *Key issues in bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, C. (2000). *The care and education of young bilinguals*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Baker, C., & Prys Jones, S. (1998). *Encyclopaedia of bilingualism and bilingual education*. Clevedon. Multilingual Matters.
- Bamgbose, A. (ed). (1976). *Mother tongue education: The West African experience*. London, Hodder and Stoughton.
- Chitera, N. (2009). 'Code switching in a in a College Mathematics Classroom', *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 6(4), 426-442.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education (5th ed.)*. London, England: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Cummins, J. (1977). Delaying native language reading instruction in immersion programs: A cautionary note. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 34, 46-49.
- Cummins, J. (1980a). The entry and exit fallacy in bilingual education. *NABE Journal*, 4(3), 25-60.

- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-50). Los Angeles, CA: California State Department of Education.
- Cummins, J. (1984). Bilingualism and cognitive functioning. In S. Shapson & V. Oyley (Eds.), *Bilingual and multicultural education: Canadian perspectives* (pp. 55 - 70). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1984). Language Proficiency, Bilingualism, and Academic Achievement in a Second Language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23, (3).
- Cummins, J. (1992). Bilingual Education and English Immersion: The Ramirez Report in Theoretical Perspective. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16, 1 & 2
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingualism children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. & Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism and education: Aspects of theory, research and practice*. London: Longman.
- De Houwer, A. (1995). Bilingual language acquisition. In Fletcher, P. & Macwhimney, B., (Eds.), *The handbook of child language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- De Hower, A. (2014). The absolute frequency of maternal input to bilingual and monolingual children: A first comparison. In T. Gruter, & J. Paradis (Eds.), *Input and Experience in Bilingual Development*. (pp. 37 – 58). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Denscombe, M. (1998). *The good research guide for small-scale social research projects*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Denzin, N. K.; Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). *Strategies of qualitative inquiry (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DiCicco-Bloom, B., & Crabtree, B. F. (2006). The qualitative research interview. *Medical Education*, 40(4), 314-321. <http://dx.doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x>
- Dutcher, N. & Tucker, G. R. (1994). *The use of first and second languages in education: A review of international experience. Draft for Review*. Population

and Human Resources Division, East Asia and the Pacific Regional Office:
The World Bank.

- Fasi, U. L. (1999). *Bilingualism and learning Mathematics in English as a second language in Tonga. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation)*. University of Reading, UK.
- Franken, M., May, S., & McComish, J. (2008). *Pasifika languages research and guidelines project: Literature review*. Retrieved from http://leap.tki.org.nz/research_links
- Ferguson, G. (2003). Classroom code-switching in post-colonial contexts. In Makoni, S., & Meinhof, U. H. (Eds.), *African and applied linguistics. AILA Review volume 16*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Genesee, F., Hamers, J., Lambert, W. E., Mononen, L., Seitz, M., & Starck, R. (1978). Language Processing in Bilinguals. *Brain and languages*, 5, 1-12.
- Gruter, T., Hurtado, N., Marchman, A. & Fernald, A. (2014). Language exposure and online processing efficiency in bilingual development: Relative versus absolute measure. In T. Gruter, & J. Paradis (Eds.), *Input and Experience in Bilingual Development*. (pp. 15 – 36). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hakuta, K., & D'Andrea, D. (1992). Some properties of bilingual maintenance and loss in Mexican background high school students. *Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 72-99.
- Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young American children*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Hittleman, D. R., & Simona, A, J. (2006). *Interpreting educational research. An introduction for consumers of research (4th ed.)*. New Jersey, NJ: Upper Saddle River.
- Hoff, E. (2006). How social contexts support and shape language development. *Developmental Review*, 26, 55-88. [http:// doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2005.11.002](http://doi:10.1016/j.dr.2005.11.002)
- Hoff, E., & Naigles, L. (2002). How children use input to acquire a lexicon. *Child Development*, 73,418-433. <http://doi:10.1111/467-8624.00415>

- Hoff, E., Core, C., Place, S., Rumiche, R., Senior, M., & Parra, M. (2012). Dual language exposure and early bilingual development. *Journal of Child Language*, 39, 1-27. <http://doi:10.1017/S0305000910000759>
- Jia, G., & Fuse, A. (2007). Acquisition of English grammatical morphology by native Mandarin-speaking children and adolescents: Age-related differences. *Journal of speech, language and hearing research*, 50, 1280-1299. [http://doi10.1044/1092-4388\(2007/090\)](http://doi10.1044/1092-4388(2007/090)).
- Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2010). Multilingualism and Codeswitching in Education. In Hornberger, N. H., & McKay, S. (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Kasuya, H. (1998). Determinants of Language Choice in Bilingual Children: The Role of Input. *The international journal of bilingualism*, 2(3), 327-346.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Lanza, E. (1997). *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: A sociolinguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lenza, M. (2004). Controversies surrounding Laud Humphreys' tearoom trade: an unsettling example of politics and power in methodological critiques. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 24(3/4/5), 20–31.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1984). *UNESCO in the Pacific*. Report of a consultancy conducted for the Australian national commission for UNESCO. University of the South Pacific: Vanuatu.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1990). Language in bilingual classrooms: Samoa as an example. In *Vernacular Languages in South Pacific Education*. Report on a workshop held at the Pacific Languages Unit of the University of the South Pacific, Port Vila, Vanuatu, 24-28 October, 1988, pp. 45 – 48.
- Locher, U. (1988). *Educational reform in Haiti – results, problems and conditions for success*. Paper presented at VII International Conference of the Caribbean Studies Association, Guadeloupe, May, 1988.

- Lyon, J. (1996). *Becoming bilingual: Language acquisition in a bilingual community*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- McKernon, S. (2001). Designing an ethics code for qualitative market research. In Tolich Martin (Ed.). *Research Ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education New Zealand Limited.
- Malone, S., & Paraide, P. (2011). *Mother tongue-based bilingual education in Papua New Guinea*. Business Media: Springer. <http://doi:10.1007/s11159-011-9256-2>
- May, S. (2001). *Language and minority rights: Ethnicity, nationalism and the politics of language*. London: Longman.
- May, S., Hill, R., & Tiakiwai, S. (2004). *Bilingualism /immersion education: indicators of good practice: Final report to the Ministry of Education*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.
- Menter, I., Elliot, D., Hulme, M., Lewin, J., & Lowden, K. (2011). *A Guide to Practitioner Research in Education*. London, England: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Ministry of Education and Training. (2014). *English Language Syllabus for Secondary Education in Tongan Schools: Class 9 – Class 10*. Nuku'alofa: CDU.
- Ministry of Education and Training. (2008). *Tonga national language policy*. Nuku'alofa: CDU.
- Montrul, S. (2008). *Incomplete acquisition in bilingualism: Re-examining the age factor*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mugler, F. & Lynch, J. (1996). (Eds.). *Pacific Language in Education*. Institute of Pacific Studies, Suva; Department of Literature and Language, Suva; Pacific Language Unit, Vanuatu, The University of the South Pacific.
- Oller, K. D. (2010). All-day recordings to investigate vocabulary development: A case study of a trilingual toddler. *Communication disorders quarterly*, 31, 213-222. <http://doi:10.1177/1525740109358628>
- Otsuka, Y. (2007). Making a case for Tongan as an endangered language. *Contemporary Pacific: A Journal of Island Affairs*, 19(2) 446-473.

- Paradis, J. & Gruter, T. (2014). *Introduction to input and experience in bilingual development*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Peal, E., & Lambert, W. E. (1962). The relationship of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs*, 76(27), 1-23.
- Pierce, L. & Genesee, F. (2014). Language input and language learning: An interactional perspective. In T. Gruter, & J. Paradis (Eds.), *Input and Experience in Bilingual Development*. (pp. 59 – 70). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Pearson, B. Z., & Amaral, L. (2014). Interactions between input factors in bilingual language acquisition: Considerations for minority language maintenance. In Gruter, T. & Paradis, J. (Eds.), *Input and experience in bilingual development*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pearson, B. Z., Fernandez, S. C., Lewedeg, B., & Oller, D. K. (1997). The relation of input factors to lexical learning by bilingual infants. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 18-41-58. <http://doi:10.1017/S0142716400009863>
- Portes, A., & Hao, L. (1998). E pluribus unum: Bilingualism and loss of language in the second generation. *Sociology of Education*, 71, (October), 269-294.
- Rabiee, F. (2004). Proceedings of the nutrition society, 63, 655-660. <http://doi:10.1079/PNS2004399>
- Ramirez, D., Yuen, S. D. & Ramey, D. R. (1991). *Executive summary of the final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children*. (Contract No. 300-87-0156). Washington: US Department of Education.
- Ramirez, D. (1992). Executive summary. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16, (1 & 2), 1-62.
- Rothweiler, M. (2006). The acquisition of V2 and subordinate clauses in early successive acquisition of German. In Lleo, C. (Ed), *Interfaces in multilingualism: Acquisition, representation and processing*, (pp. 93-115). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Siegel, J. (1997). Formal and Non-formal vernacular education: The education reform in PNG, *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 18(3), 20-22.
- Siren, U. (1991). *Minority language transmission in early childhood, parental intention and language use*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stockholm University, Institute of International Education.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Toukomaa, T. (1976). *Teaching migrant children's mother tongue and learning the language of the host country in the context of the sociocultural situation of the migrant family*. Helsinki: The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Toukomaa, T. (1977). *The intensive teaching of the mother tongue to migrant children of pre-school age and children in the lower level of comprehension school*. Helsinki: The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.
- Strakova, Z. (2012) *Second language acquisition and the role of input in the classroom*. Retrieved from http://www.pulib.sk/elpub2/FHPV/Kesselova1/pdf_doc/16b.pdf
- Taufe'ulungaki, A. (2000). *Pacific cultures in the teacher education curriculum. Module Two, Vernacular languages and classroom interactions in the Pacific*. University of the South Pacific: UNESCO.
- Taumoefolau, M. (2004). A place to stand. In Baba, T (2002)., *Research Pacific and indigenous peoples: issues and perspectives*. Centre for Pacific Studies; Pacific Islands Postgraduate Symposium: University of Auckland.
- Tekiteki, S. (1990). *Language planning and education in a bilingual society*. Report on a workshop held at the Pacific Language Unit of The University of the South Pacific, Port Vila, Vanuatu on October 24-28. 1988: The Australian National Commission for UNESCO, UNESCO Paris and the Pacific Languages Unit.

- Thaman, K. H. (1996). The Tongan Studies Programme. In Mugler, F. & Lynch, J. (eds.), *Pacific language in education*. Suva, Fiji: The Institute of Pacific Studies.
- The University of Waikato. (2008). *Ethical Conduct in Human Research and Related Activities Regulations*. Retrieved from <http://calendar.waikato.ac.nz/assessment/ethicalConduct.html>
- Tolich, M. (Ed). (2001). *Research Ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand: Concepts, Practice, Critique*. Auckland, New Zealand: Longman
- Tonga Ministry of Education. (2004). *Tonga Education Policy Framework (2004-2019)*. Curriculum Development Unit: Nuku'alofa.
- Tuckman, B. W., & Harper, B. E. (2012). *Conducting educational research* (6th ed.). Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Wilkinson, T. M. (2001). The core ideas of ethics research. In Tolich Martin (Ed.). *Research Ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education New Zealand Limited.
- Withers, G. (1991). *Pacific islands literacy levels: a criterion-referenced study*. Apia, Western Samoa: UNESCO.
- Whitehead, M. (2010). *Language and literacy in the early years 0 – 7* (4th ed.). Los Angeles/London/New Delhi/Singapore/Washington DC: SAGE.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (1980). *Language and learning through bilingual instruction*. Berkely: University of California.
- Wong Fillmore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In Gass, S. M. & Madden, C. (Eds.). *Input in second language education*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Wong Fillmore, L. & Snow, C. E. (2000). *What elementary teachers need to know about language*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Yamamoto, M. (2001). *Language use in interlingual families: A Japanese-English sociolinguistic study*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Observation schedule

Name of child:

Place of observation:

Date:

Time	What language is the child hearing or reading?			What language is the child speaking or writing?			What is the child doing?	Additional comments
	T	E	T/E	T	E	T/E		
.00								
.10								
.20								
.30								
.40								
.50								

Notes:

Appendix B: Semi-structured Interview questions for focus group (English)

When I was with you in your home and in your classroom, people used different languages around you. They used Tongan and English.

1. Do you notice what language people are using?
2. Which language do you like people using with you?
3. Let's look at some people. What language do you like them to use when they talk to you?
E.g. I like Mum speaking in English to me.
4. How does it make you feel when _____ uses Tongan with you?
5. How does it make you feel when _____ uses English with you?

When I was with you in your home and in your classroom, you used different languages with people around you. You used Tongan and English.

1. Do you notice what language you use?
2. Which language do you like using with people?
3. Let's look at some people. What language do you like to use when you talk to them?
E.g. I like using Tongan with my friends.
4. How does it make you feel when you use Tongan with _____?
5. How does it make you feel when you use English with _____?

Semi-structured interview questions for focus group (Tongan)

Ngaahi fehu'i tataki 'o e faka'eke'eke mo e fanau 'oku fakatotolo'i.

'I he taimi ne u 'i ho 'api ai mo 'i ho loki ako, ne ngaue'aki 'e he kakai kehekehe e lea kehekehe 'i ho 'ataakai. Na'a nau ngaue'aki e lea faka-Pilitania pea moe lea faka-Tonga.

1. Na'a ke fakatokanga'i koe ha e lea ne ngaue'aki 'e he kakai?
2. Ko e fe lea 'oku ke sai'ia hono ngaue'aki atu 'e he kakai ke nau lea atu 'aki kia koe?
3. Ta ki'i sio ange ki he kakai ko eni. Koe ha e lea 'oku ke sai'ia ke nau lea atu 'aki kia koe? Hange ko eni: 'Oku ou sai'ia au ke lea faka-Pilitania mai a Mami kia au.
4. 'Oku anga fefe ho'o ongo'i he taimi 'oku ngaue'aki ai 'e _____ 'a e lea faka-Tonga 'i ho'omo talanoa?
5. 'Oku anga fefe ho'o ongo'i he taimi 'oku ngaue'aki ai 'e _____ 'a e lea faka-Pilitania 'i ho'omo talanoa?

Koe taimi koe nau 'i loki ako ai mo 'i ho 'api ai mo koe, na'a ke ngaue'aki e lea kehekehe mo e kakai keheke 'i ho 'ataakai. Na'a ke ngaue'aki e lea faka-Tonga mo e lea faka-Pilitania.

1. Na'a ke fakatokanga'i e lea na'a ke ngaue'aki?
2. Ko fe 'a e lea 'oku ke sai'ia ke ngaue'aki ki he kakai?
3. Ta ki'i sio ange ki he kakai. Koe ha e lea 'oku ke sai'ia ke ngaue'aki 'i ho'o talanoa mo e kakai ko eni.
4. 'Oku fefe ho'o ongo'i he taimi 'oku ke ngaue'aki ai e lea faka-Tonga mo _____?
5. 'Oku fefe ho'o ongo'i he taimi 'oku ke ngaue'aki ai e lea faka-Pilitania mo _____?

Appendix C: Letter to the Ministry of Education and Training, Tonga.

3/40 York Street
Hamilton East
Hamilton 3216
New Zealand
Phone: +64 7 8566201
Email: tmpuniani@yahoo.com

May 17, 2016

Director of Education
Ministry of Education and Training
Nuku'alofa
Tonga

Dear Sir,

SUBJECT: PERMISSION TO DO RESEARCH IN TONGA UNDER THE MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

My name is Talaifina Puniani. I am currently a student at the University of Waikato studying a Masters in Education. As part of the requirements for this study, I am required to complete a field research in my home country.

The title of my research is: The language environment of selected primary school children in Tonga: Sufficient for balanced bilingualism?

The research focuses on the language environment of children, both at school and home, and how much Tongan and how much English they are exposed to, and how much Tongan and English they use. This is to evaluate whether or not we are giving them sufficient exposure to Tongan and English for them to be supported as balanced bilinguals. The research will also investigate whether children are aware of their own language use, and if they have preferences for using Tongan or English.

I am writing to seek your approval to allow me to visit and collect data from selected participants in the Government Primary School of Hofoa. With your permission, I am hoping to begin my data collection in July 2016 at the beginning of Term 3.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me by email: tmpuniani@yahoo.com or telephone +676 21256/7758698 while in Tonga or +64 7 8566201 in New Zealand. Or you can contact my supervisor, Associate Professor, Margaret Franken, at the Faculty of Education by email: franken@waikato.ac.nz

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration regarding my request. I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours faithfully

Talaifina M Puniani

Appendix D: Invitation letter and consent form for the Principal

Dear Sir/Madam,

SUBJECT: INVITATION FOR YOUR SCHOOL TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

My name is Talaifina Puniani. I am currently a student at the University of Waikato studying a Masters in Education. As part of the requirements for this study, I am required to complete a research project.

The title of my research is: The language environment of selected primary school children in Tonga: Sufficient for balanced bilingualism?

The new curriculum wants children to grow up to be bilingual. I aim to explore the language environments of children, both at school and at home. I want to see how much Tongan and how much English they are exposed to.

My study will help to evaluate whether or not we are giving them sufficient exposure to Tongan and English for them to be supported as balanced bilinguals.

I also want to talk to children to see if they are aware of their own language use, and if they have preferences for using Tongan or English.

I have been granted permission from the Ministry of Education and Training to carry out this research in Tonga. I therefore am seeking your assistance and approval for your school to participate in this research project.

In total I would like to work with four children, one at each class level (year 3, 4, 5 and 6).

This research will involve:

1. Observations to record which language is being used in the child's environment, and which language the child is using. These will be done for a 5-day period during two blocks of time at school 9–11am, and 1–3 pm.
2. A focus group sharing interview for children to come together in a group and talk with me. This will take about 30 minutes. The time and place will be at your child's school where they feel comfortable, like a classroom. One of the teacher participants will be selected and will be asked to be present at this location during the focus group interview. At the end of the interview I will summarise what we talked about and check with the children if they want to change or add anything.

Teachers will not be observed directly. I will only record what language they use with the students. I will not identify the students, teachers or school in my thesis, or any work that results from it.

My research also seeks to observe students for a short period of time in their homes after school. I will be asking teachers to distribute information letters and consent forms to parents as well.

This study follows the university's research ethics guidelines, and has been approved by the Faculty of Education Research Ethics Committee.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me by email: tmpuniani@yahoo.com or telephone +676 21256/7758698 while in Tonga or +64 7 8566201 in New Zealand.

Or you can contact my supervisor, Associate Professor, Margaret Franken, at the Faculty of Education by email: franken@waikato.ac.nz

If you agree to your school's participation in the study, please read the consent form and sign your approval for participation.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely

Talaifina M Puniani

GIVING CONSENT

Research Project: A study of the language environment of selected primary school children in Tonga: Sufficient for balanced bilingualism?

I _____ of _____, agree that I have read and understood that:

- Participation of my school in the study is voluntary.
- Participants for this study include students and teachers in my school, and the researcher will seek their consent to be part of the study.
- The identity of the students, teachers and school will remain anonymous when the researcher writes up the report for the research.
- The information (data) obtained by the researcher will only be used for the thesis for the Masters of Education, in any articles, or in any presentations she may do in conferences.

I understand that I have a right to:

- Withdraw my school from participating in the research at any time
- I understand who I can contact if I have any questions or concerns

(Please tick the appropriate boxes below)

I consent to:

- Allow my school to participate in the research project through classroom observations
- Have the researcher carry out the focus group sharing interview at my school
- Allow the participants to be audio taped during focus group and have this transcribed

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Appendix E: Invitation letter and consent form for teachers (English)

Dear teacher,

SUBJECT: INVITATION FOR YOU TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

My name is Talaifina Puniani. I am currently a student at the University of Waikato studying a Masters in Education. As part of the requirements for this study, I am required to complete a research project.

The title of my research is: The language environment of selected primary school children in Tonga: Sufficient for balanced bilingualism?

The new curriculum wants children to grow up to be bilingual. I aim to explore the language environments of children, both at school and at home. I want to see how much Tongan and how much English they are exposed to, and how much they use.

My study will help to evaluate whether or not we are giving students sufficient exposure to Tongan and English for them to be supported as balanced bilinguals.

I also want to talk to children to see if they are aware of their own language use, and if they have preferences for using Tongan or English. In total I would like to select four children, one at each class level (year 3, 4, 5 and 6).

I have been granted permission from the Ministry of Education and Training to carry out this research in Tonga. I therefore am seeking your assistance and your consent to participate in this research project.

As part of this project I will be recording what language you use with a selected child in your classroom. Teachers will therefore not be observed directly.

This research for you will involve:

- Observations to record which language is being used in the child's environment, and which language they use. These will be done for a 5-day period during two blocks of time at school 9–11am, and 1–3 pm.

In addition to this observation, I would like to involve students in the following:

- A focus group sharing interview for children to come together in a group and talk with me. This will take about 30 minutes. The time and place will be at your child's school where they feel comfortable, like a classroom. It is required that one teacher should be present during this interview. Thus, a possibility would be that you will be requested to facilitate this focus group interview. At the end of the interview I will summarise what we talked about and check with the children if they want to change or add anything.

I will be seeking consent from students and their parents so that students can be involved in the observation and focus group sharing interview.

My research also seeks to observe students for a short period of time in their homes after school. I will be asking you to distribute information letters and consent forms to parents as well.

Participants for this study will be chosen on the basis of those who consent first.

This study follows the university's research ethics guidelines and has been approved by the Faculty of Education Research Ethics Committee.

I will keep your identity, that of the school, and the students anonymous by using pseudonyms. Please understand that:

- Your participation is voluntary.
- You can withdraw at any point in the research.
- You can say you don't want observation data from a particular day or time included, but you must do this before I start observing again on the next day.

The research will be published in the form of a digital thesis on the university's website under Research Commons at the University of Waikato. All data from the research will be stored for the period of five years then destroyed.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me by email: tmpuniani@yahoo.com or telephone +676 21256/7758698 while in Tonga or +64 7 8566201 in New Zealand.

Or you can contact my supervisor, Associate Professor, Margaret Franken, at the Faculty of Education by email: franken@waikato.ac.nz

If you agree to your participation in the study, please read the consent form and sign your approval for your participation.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely

Talaifina M Puniani

GIVING CONSENT

Research Project: A study of the language environment of selected primary school children in Tonga: Sufficient for balanced bilingualism?

I _____ of _____, agree that I have read and understood that:

- My participation in the study is voluntary.
- The researcher will only be recording which language I use, but I will not be directly observed.
- The identity of the students, teachers and school will remain anonymous when the researcher writes up the report for the research.
- The information (data) obtained by the researcher will only be used for the thesis for the Masters of Education, in any articles, or in any presentations she may do in conferences.
- The researcher may request my assistance in facilitating the focus group shared interview.

I understand that I have a right to:

- Withdraw myself from participating in the research at any time
- I understand who I can contact if I have any questions or concerns

(Please tick the appropriate boxes below)

I consent to:

- Allow my language use to be recorded as observation notes by the researcher
- Facilitate the researcher during the focus group shared interview

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Invitation letter and consent form for teachers (Tongan)

Si'i faiako,

Ko hoku hingoa' ko Talaifina Puniani. 'Oku ou lolotonga ako 'i he 'Univesiti 'o Waikato' ki hoku faka'ilonga ko e Masters in Education. Koe kongā 'o e fiema'u ki he polokalama' ni 'oku kau ki ai hono fakahoko ha fekumi pē fakatotolo.

Koe hingoa 'o 'eku fekumi ko e: The language environment of selected primary school children in Tonga: Sufficient for balanced bilingualism? (Ko e 'ataakai 'o e lea 'oku ngaue'aki 'e he fanau lautohi 'i Tonga: 'oku fe'unga nai eni ke tau pehe ku palanisi 'enau 'ilo e ongo lea?)

Ko e silapa fo'ou' 'oku fiema'u ai e fanau ke nau tupu hake kuo nau poto 'i he lea kehekehe 'e ua. Ko 'eku taumu'a' keu fakatotolo'i e 'ataakai 'o e lea 'oku ngaue'aki 'e he fanau ako' 'i 'api pea mo 'apiako foki. Ko 'eku faka'amu' keu siofi pe koe ha e lahi 'o e lea faka-Tonga mo e lea faka-Pilitania 'oku ngaue'aki ki he fanau', pea mo ia 'oku ngaue'aki 'e he fanau'.

Koe fekumi' ni 'e tokoni ia ki hono vakai'i pe 'oku fe'unga nai 'etau lea 'oku ngaue'aki kia kinautolu (tatau pe 'i he lea faka-Tonga mo e lea faka-Pilitania) ke nau lava ai 'o fakahoko lelei 'enau ako' 'i he ongo lea fakatou'osi ko eni'.

'Oku ou fiema'u foki keu talanoa ki he fanau' pē 'oku nau fakatokanga'i 'a e lea 'oku nau ngaue'aki', pē 'oku 'i ai ha lea 'oku nau manako ki ai 'i he ongo lea' ni fakatou'osi. 'I hono fakakātoa, oku ou fiema'u ke filifili ha fanau 'e toko fā, taha mei he kalasi 3, 4, 5 mo e 6.

Kuo u 'osi ma'u 'a e ngofua mei he Potungae Ako mo Ako Ngaue ke fakahoko 'a e fekumi' ni 'i Tonga ni. Koia ai 'oku ou fai 'a e tohi' ni ke kole 'a ho'o tokoni' pea mo ho'o ngofua' ke kau mai mu'a ki he fekumi' ni.

Koe kongā 'o e fakatotolo' ni 'oku fiema'u ke hiki pē lekooti 'a e lea 'oku ke ngaue'aki mo e taha 'o e fanau kuo fili ki he fakatotolo' ni 'i ho loki ako'. 'I he 'ene pehee', 'e 'ikai ke kaunga hangatonu ki he fekumi' ni.

Ko ko'o kaunga ki he fekumi' ni 'e makatu'unga pē ia 'i hono siofi mo lekooti 'a e lea 'oku ke ngaue'aki mo e tokotaha 'oku ngaue'aki 'i he fekumi' pea moe lea 'oku' ne ngaue'aki'. 'E fakahoko eni 'i he 'aho 'e 5 lolotonga e uike' pea 'e hiki fakakongokonga eni mei he 9 – 11 pongipongi mo e 1 – 3 ho'atā.

Tānaki atu ki heni, 'oku ou faka'amu ke fakakau e fanau 'oku nau kau ki he fekumi' 'i ha ki'i faka'eke'eke makehe. 'E fakafuofua ki he miniti 'e 30 nai ke fakahoko ai e ngaue' ni. Koe taimi mo e feitu'u 'e fakahoko ai e faka'eke'eke' ni koe taha pē 'o e ngaahi lokiako 'o e fanau' ke 'oua te nau ongo'i faingata'a'ia. 'I he hili 'o e faka'eke'eke ko eni', te u fakama'opo'opo 'a e me'a ne mau talanoa ki ai mo vakai'i ki he fanau pe 'oku nau loto ke toe liliu pē tanaki ha me'a ki ai.

Kuo pau pē ke u kole 'a e ngofua 'a e fanau ko eni' pea mea kinautolu mo 'enau mātu'a' koe'uhi' ke nau kau ki he faka'eke'eke ko eni'. Koe fekumi' ni foki 'oku fiema'u ke siofi e fanau ko eni 'i honau ngaahi 'api' foki. Ko ia 'oku ou fiema'u ho'o tokoni' ki hono tufaki e ngaahi tohi fakamatala' mo e foomu kole ngofua' ki he mātu'a 'a e fanau ako' fakafou 'i he fanau'.

Ko kinautolu 'e kau ki he fekumi' ni 'e fili kinautolu fakatatau kiate kinautolu 'e 'uluaki ma'u mai e ngofua mei he mātu'a'.

Koe fekumi' ni 'oku' ne muimui'i ofi e ngaahi tu'utu'uni ki he fakatotolo' 'a ia kuo ma'u e ngofua mei he Komiti Efika 'a e Tafa'aki 'o e Ako (Faculty of Education) 'a e 'apiako ke fakahoko 'a e fekumi' ni.

'E 'ikai ke faka'asi ho hingoa, pē 'o e fānau ako, pē 'o e 'apiako 'i he taimi 'e fai ai hono lipooti e fekumi' ni pea 'e ngaue'aki e ngaahi hingoa fakapulipuli 'i he taimi 'o e lipooti. Kataki 'o fakatokanga'i ange:

- Ko ho'o kau mai 'oku tau'ataina pē.
- 'E malava ke ta'ofi ho'o kau mai 'i ha fa'ahinga taimi pē 'lolotonga 'a e fekumi.
- 'E malava ke fakahā mai 'oku 'ikai ke fiema'u ke ngaue'aki ha fa'ahinga fakamatala mei ha 'aho pe taimi lolotonga e fekumi ka kuo pau ke fakahā mai eni kimu'a pea kamata 'a e hiki pē lekooti 'o e fakamatala 'o e 'aho hono hoko'.

Koe lipooti kakato 'o e fekumi' 'e tuku atu ia 'i he uepisaiti (website) 'a e 'apiako' 'i he feitu'u 'oku ui ko e Research Commons. Ko e ngaahi fakamatala kotoa 'e tanaki mei he fekumi' ni 'e faka'uha ia hili ha ta'u 'e nima mei heni.

Kapau 'oku 'i ai hao toe faka'eke'eke pē me'a te ke tokanga ki ai, kataki 'o fetu'utaki mai ki he 'imeili tmpuniani@yahoo.com pē telefoni 21256/7758698 'i he lolotonga 'eku 'i Tonga ni' pē koe +64 7 8566201 'i he taimi te u foki ai ki Nu'usila. Pē te ke fetu'utaki hangatonu ki he'eku supavaisa, Associate Professor, Margaret Franken ki he va'a 'o e ako' (Faculty of Education) 'i he 'imeili: franken@waikato.ac.nz

Kātaki ka 'oku ke loto ke kau ki he fekumi' ni pea ke lau 'a e tohi fakangofua 'i he peesi hoko' pea ke fakamo'oni hingoa ki ai.

Fakamālo atu 'i ho'o tokoni.

Faka'apa'apa atu

Talaifina M Puniani

FOAKI 'O E NGOFUA KI HE FEKUMI

Ko au _____ 'o e 'apiako _____, 'oku ou tali pea kuo u lau mo mahino'i 'a e ngaahi me'a ni:

- Ko 'eku kau ki he fekumi' ni 'oku tau'atainam pē
- Ko e tokotaha fekumi' te ne hiki pē 'a e lea 'oku ou ngaue'aki', ka e 'ikai ko ha toe me'a ange.
- Ko hoku hingoa', mo e fanau ako', mo e 'apiako' 'e 'ikai 'ilo ki ai ha taha he taimi 'e tohi ai 'a e lipooti 'o e fekumi' ni.
- Ko e ngaahi fakamatala 'e tanaki mei he fekumi' ni 'e ngaue'aki ia ki he fakakakato e polokalama fekumi' ni mo ha ngaahi fanga ki'i me'a fakaako 'e fiema'u 'e he tokotaha fekumi'.

'Oku ou mahino'i:

- 'E malava ke ta'ofi 'a 'eku kau ki he fekumi' ni 'i ha fa'ahinga taimi pē.
- Ko hai teu fetu'utaki ki ai 'o kapau 'e 'i ai ha ngaahi fehu'i pē palopalema 'e hoko.

'Oku ou fakangofua 'a e tokotaha fekumi:

Ke ne hiki 'a e lea 'oku ou ngaue'aki' 'i he'ene ngaahi fakamatala ki he'ene fekumi'.

Ke u tokoni ki ai lolotonga e taimi 'o e fakakulupu makehe mo e fānau.

Fakamo'oni hingoa: _____

'Aho: _____

Appendix F: Invitation letter and consent form for parents or caregivers (English)

Dear parent or caregiver,

SUBJECT: INVITATION FOR YOU AND YOUR CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

My name is Talaifina Puniani. I am currently a student at the University of Waikato studying a Masters in Education. As part of the requirements for this study, I am required to complete a research project.

The title of my research is: The language environment of selected primary school children in Tonga: Sufficient for balanced bilingualism?

The new curriculum wants children to grow up to be bilingual. I aim to explore the language environments of children, both at school and at home. I want to evaluate whether or not we are giving them sufficient exposure to Tongan and English for them to be supported as balanced bilinguals.

In total I would like to work with four children, one at each class level (year 3, 4, 5 and 6). I am seeking your assistance and approval for your son/daughter to participate in this research project. Participants for this study will be chosen on the basis of those who consent first.

I will be recording what language is used with your child at times during the school day and for a period of time after school. I also want to talk to children to see if they are aware of their own language use, and if they have preferences for using Tongan or English.

This research for your child will involve:

3. Observations to record which language is being used in the child's environment. These will be done for a 5-day period during three blocks of time (at school 9–11am, 1–3 pm; at home 4–5pm).
4. A focus group sharing interview for children to come together in a group and talk with me. This will take about 30 minutes. The time and place will be at your child's school where they feel comfortable, like a classroom. There will be a teacher present during this focus group sharing interview to facilitate me during this session. At the end of the interview I will summarise what we talked about and check with the children if they want to change or add anything.

This research for you will involve:

1. Observations to record which language is being used with your child at home, and which language they use. This will be done for a 5-day period from 4pm – 5pm.

This study will follow the university's research ethics guidelines, and has been approved by the Faculty of Education Research Ethics Committee.

I will keep the identity of your son/daughter anonymous by giving them a pseudonym when I write up the research, and what we talk about in the focus group sharing interview will only be used by me in my research.

- Your son's/daughter's participation is voluntary, and so I will also ask them if they want to participate.
- You can withdraw your son's/daughter's participation at any point in the research.
- You can say you don't want their observation data from a particular day or time included, but you must do this before I start observing again on the next day.
- You cannot withdraw data from the focus group interview.
- Your participation is voluntary and I will only be taking notes based on my observation of what language is being used in the child's environment.
- You can withdraw your participation at any point in the research.

The research will be published in the form of a digital thesis on the university's website under Research Commons at the University of Waikato. All data from the research will be stored for the period of five years then destroyed.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me by email: tmpuniani@yahoo.com or telephone +676 21256/7758698 while in Tonga or +64 7 8566201 in New Zealand.

Or you can contact my supervisor, Associate Professor, Margaret Franken, at the Faculty of Education by email: franken@waikato.ac.nz

If you agree to your son's/daughter's participation in the study, please read the consent form and sign your approval for their participation.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration.

Yours sincerely

Talaifina M Puniani

GIVING CONSENT

Research Project: A study of the language environment of selected primary school children in Tonga: Sufficient for balanced bilingualism?

I _____ of _____, agree that I have read and understood that:

- Participation of my child in the study is voluntary.
- My participation is voluntary.
- The researcher will only be recording which language I use, but I will not be directly observed.
- My son/daughter's identity and my identity will remain anonymous.
- The information (data) obtained by the researcher will only be used for the thesis for the Masters of Education, in any articles, or in any presentations she may do in conferences.
- Data cannot be withdrawn from the focus group interview done by the researcher.

I understand that I have a right to:

- Withdraw myself or my child from participating in the research at any time
- I understand who I can contact if I have any questions or concerns

(Please tick the appropriate boxes below)

I consent to:

- Allow my son/daughter to participate in the research project through classroom observations.
- Allow my son/daughter to participate in the research project through home observations.
- Allow my language use to be recorded as observation notes by the researcher.
- Have my son/daughter's interview audio taped during focus group and transcribed.

Signed: _____ Date: _____

Invitation letter and consent form for parents or caregivers (Tongan)

Si'i Mātu'a/Tauhi fanau,

Ko hoku hinga' ko Talaifina Puniani. 'Oku ou lolotonga ako 'i he 'Univesiti 'o Waikato' ki hoku faka'ilonga ko e Masters in Education. Koe konga 'o e fiema'u ki he polokalama' ni 'oku kau ki ai hono fakahoko ha fekumi pē fakatotolo.

Koe hinga 'o 'eku fekumi ko e: The language environment of selected primary school children in Tonga: Sufficient for balanced bilingualism? (Ko e 'ataakai 'o e lea 'oku ngaue'aki 'e he fānau lautohi 'i Tonga: 'oku fe'unga nai eni ke tau pehe ku palanisi 'enau 'ilo e ongo lea?)

Ko e silapa fo'ou' 'oku fiema'u ai e fānau ke nau tupu hake kuo nau poto 'i he lea kehekehe 'e ua. Ko 'eku taumu'a' keu fakatotolo'i e 'ataakai 'o e lea 'oku ngaue'aki 'e he fānau ako' 'i 'api pea mo 'apiako foki. Ko 'eku faka'amu' keu siofi pe koe ha e lahi 'o e lea faka-Tonga mo e lea faka-Pilitania 'oku ngaue'aki ki he fānau', pea mo ia 'oku ngaue'aki 'e he fānau'.

Koe fekumi' ni 'e tokoni ia ki hono vakai'i pe 'oku fe'unga nai 'etau lea 'oku ngaue'aki kia kinautolu' (tatau pe 'i he lea faka-Tonga mo e lea faka-Pilitania) ke nau lava ai 'o fakahoko lelei 'enau ako' 'i he ongo lea fakatou'osi ko eni'.

'I hono fakakātoa 'oku ou faka'amu keu ngaue mo ha fānau e toko fā, taha mei he kalasi 3, 4, 5 mo e 6. 'Oku fai ai 'a e tohi' ni ke kole 'a ho'o tokoni' 'aki ha'o fakangofua mai ho'o tamasi'i/ta'ahine' ke ne kau ki he fekumi' ni. Ko kinautolu 'e kau ki he fekumi' ni 'e fili kinautolu fakatatau kiate kinautolu 'e 'uluaki ma'u mai e ngofua mei he mātu'a'.

Ko e ngaue 'e fakahoko' te u lekooti 'a e lea 'oku ngaue'aki ki ho'o tama 'i he lolotonga e taimi ako' pea mo e tuku 'a e ako' foki 'i 'api. 'Oku ou fiema'u foki keu talanoa ki he fānau' pē 'oku nau fakatokanga'i 'a e lea 'oku nau ngaue'aki, pē 'oku 'i ai ha lea 'oku nau manako ki ai 'i he ongo lea' ni fakatou'osi. '

Ko e fekumi' ni 'e fakakau ho'o tamasi'i/ta'ahine' ki he ngaahi me'a' ni:

- Siofi mo lekooti 'a e lea 'oku ngau'aki 'e ho'o leka 'i hono 'ataakai'. 'E fakahoko eni he 'aho 'e 5 pea 'e lekooti fakakongokonga (9 – 11 pongipongi mo e 1-3 ho'ata 'i 'apiako, pea mo e 4 – 5 'i 'api).
- Faka'eke'eke makehe ki he fānau 'e toko 4 te nau kau ki he fekumi'. 'E fakahoko eni 'i loto 'i he miniti 'e 30 'i he lokiako pe 'i he 'apiako. 'I he hili 'a e faka'eke'eke' ni te u fakama'opo'opo 'a e me'a ne mau talanoa ki ai' pea vakai'i ki he fānau' pe 'iku 'i ai ha me'a 'e toe liliu pe tanaki ki he fakamatala kuo hiki'.

Ko ko'o kaunga ki he fekumi' ni 'e makatu'unga pē ia 'i hono siofi mo lekooti 'a e lea 'oku ke ngaue'aki 'e he tamasi'i/ta'ahine mo koe 'i 'api'. 'E fakahoko eni 'i he 'aho 'e 5 mei he 4 – 5 efiafi.

Koe fekumi' ni 'oku' ne muimui'i ofi e ngaahi tu'utu'uni ki he fakatotolo' 'a ia kuo ma'u e ngofua mei he Komiti Efika 'a e Tafa'aki 'o e Ako (Faculty of Education) 'a e 'apiako' ke fakahoko 'a e fekumi' ni.

‘E ‘ikai ke faka’asi ho hingoa’, pē ko ho’o tamasi’i/ta’ahine’ ‘i he taimi ‘e fai ai hono lipooti e fekumi’ ni pea ‘e ngaue’aki e ngaahi hingoa fakapulipuli ‘i he taimi ‘o e lipooti’. Kātaki ‘o fakatokanga’i ange:

- Ko e kau mai ho’o tamasi’i/ta’ahine ‘oku tau’ataina pē.
- ‘E malava ke ta’ofi ‘a e kau mai ho’o tamasi’i/ta’ahine’ ‘i ha fa’ahinga taimi pē ‘lolotonga ‘a e fekumi’.
- ‘E malava ke fakahā mai ‘oku ‘ikai ke fiema’u ke ngaue’aki ha fa’ahinga fakamatala mei ha ‘aho pe taimi lolotonga e fekumi’ ka kuo pau ke fakahā mai eni kimu’a pea kamata ‘a e hiki pē lekooti ‘o e fakamatala ‘o e ‘aho hono hoko’.
- Ko ho’o kau mai’ ‘oku tau’ataina pē pea koe fakamatala ‘e hiki’ ko e lea pē ‘oku ngaue’aki mo ho’o tamasi’i/ta’ahine’.
- ‘E malava pe ke ta’ofi ho’o kau mai ki he fekumi’ ‘i ha fa’ahinga taimi pē.

Koe lipooti kakato ‘o e fekumi’ ‘e tuku atu ia ‘i he uepisaiti (website) ‘a e ‘apiako’ ‘i he feitu’u ‘oku ui ko e Research Commons. Ko e ngaahi fakamatala kotoa ‘e tanaki mei he fekumi’ ni ‘e faka’uha ia hili ha ta’u ‘e nima mei heni.

Kapau ‘oku ‘i ai hao toe faka’eke’eke pē me’a te ke tokanga ki ai, kataki ‘o fetu’utaki mai ki he ‘imeili tmpuniani@yahoo.com pē telefoni 21256/7758698 ‘i he lolotonga ‘eku ‘i Tonga ni’ pē koe +64 7 8566201 ‘i he taimi te u foki ai ki Nu’usila. Pē te ke fetu’utaki hangatonu ki he’eku supavaisa, Associate Professor, Margaret Franken ki he va’a ‘o e ako (Faculty of Education) ‘i he ‘imeili: franken@waikato.ac.nz

Kataki ka ‘oku ke loto ke kau mai ho’o ta’ahine/tamasi’i’ ki he fekumi’ ni pea ke kātaki ‘o lau ‘a e tohi fakangofua ‘i he peesi hoko’ pea ke fakamo’oni hingoa ki ai.

Fakamālo atu ‘i ho’o tokoni.

Faka’apa’apa atu

Talaifina M Puniani

FOAKI 'O E NGOFUA KI HE FEKUMI

Ko au _____ 'o _____, 'oku ou tali pea kuo u lau mo mahino'i 'a e ngaahi me'a' ni:

- Ko e kau atu 'eku tamasi'i/ta'ahine' ki he fekumi' ni 'oku tau'ataina pē.
- Ko 'eku kau ki he fekumi' ni 'oku tau'ataina pē.
- Ko e tokotaha fekumi' te ne hiki pe 'a e lea 'oku ou ngaue'aki', ka e 'ikai ko ha toe me'a ange.
- Ko hoku hingoa', mo e hingoa 'eku tamasi'i/ta'ahine' 'e 'ikai 'ilo ki ai ha taha he taimi 'e tohi ai 'a e lipooti 'o e fekumi' ni.
- Ko e ngaahi fakamatala 'e tanaki mei he fekumi' ni 'e ngaue'aki ia ki he fakakakato e polokalama fekumi' ni mo ha ngaahi fanga ki'i me'a fakaako 'e fiema'u 'e he tokotaha fekumi'.

'Oku ou mahino'i:

- 'E malava ke ta'ofi 'a 'eku tamasi'i/ta'ahine' pea mo 'eku kau ki he fekumi' ni 'i ha fa'ahinga taimi pē.
- Ko hai teu fetu'utaki ki ai 'o kapau 'e 'i ai ha ngaahi fehu'i pē palopalema 'e hoko.

'Oku ou fakangofua 'a e tokotaha fekumi:

- Ke ne fakakau 'eku tamasi'i/ta'ahine' 'i he fekumi' ni 'aki 'ene siofi mo hiki e lea 'oku ngaue'aki 'i loki ako'.
- Ke ne fakakau 'eku tamasi'i/ta'ahine' 'i he fekumi' ni 'aki 'ene siofi mo hiki e lea 'oku ngaue'aki 'i 'api'.
- Ke ne hiki 'a e lea 'oku ou ngaue'aki' 'i he'ene fekumi.
- Hiki tepi mo hiki tohi tatau e faka'eke'eke 'eku tamasi'i/ta'ahine' 'i he faka'eke'eke fakakulupu 'e fakahoko'.

Fakamo'oni hingoa: _____ 'Aho: _____

Appendix G: Invitation letter and consent form for student participants (English)

I am a student at the University of Waikato in New Zealand. I want to do a project working with some students to find out what language - Tongan or English - people use with you, and what language you use.

I want to choose four students, and am asking you if you want to be in this project.

Each day for a week from Monday to Friday I will be with you making notes on what language people use with you at home and at school, and what language you use. This will be recorded every 10 minutes from 9 to 11 in the morning and again at 1 to 3 in the afternoon in your classroom. I will also be doing the same thing from 4 – 5 in the evening when you are at home.

After I have done this with four students, I would like to ask you some questions about what language you like using and what language you like others using with you. We would do this in a group with all the four students in a classroom at your school. One of your teachers will be present during this talk.

After the conversation together I will check with you that I have everything you want to say. Once this change is made and the information is ready, you cannot withdraw any information from this data.

I will be recording our conversation and writing things you say in my project.

When I write it up, I will use pretend names for you, your family, your teacher and the school.

If you want to know more, please ask me or your classroom teacher.

Talaifina Puniani

CONSENT FORM

Tick the boxes if you say yes.

I am happy for Talaifina Puniani to work with me and make notes about language.

I know this means she will be in my classroom during the day, and in my home in the afternoon for 5 days.

I know that I will answer questions in a group.

I know that I can stop being part of the project at any time.

Name:

Date:

Invitation letter and consent form for student participants (Tongan)

Ko au 'oku ou ako 'i he 'Univesiti 'o Waikato' i Nu'usila. 'Oku ou faka'amu ke fakahoko 'eku fekumi ngaue'aki ha fānau ako ke u vakai'i pe koe ha e lea – faka-Tonga pe faka-Pilitania – 'oku ngaue'aki 'e he kakai mo koe pea pehē mo hono ngaue'aki 'e koe moe kakai koia.

'Oku ou faka'amu ke u fili ha fānau 'e toko fā pea 'oku ou kole atu pē te ke loto pē ke kau 'i he fekumi' ni.

Koe 'aho kotoa pē mei he Monite ki he Falaite te u ngaue mo koe ke u hiki 'a e lea 'oku ngaue'aki 'e he kakai' mo koe 'i loki ako pea mo 'api foki pea pehe ki he lea 'oku ke ngaue'aki mo kinautolu'. Te u hiki fakaminiti e 10 'a e lea 'oku ngaue'aki' mei he 9 – 11 pongipongi mo e 1 – 3 ho'atā 'i loki ako. Te u fai 'a e ngaue tatau 'i he 4 – 5 'i 'api.

Hili 'a hono fakahoko 'o e ngaue tatau ki he fānau 'e toko fā, te u fiema'u leva ke 'eke ha fanga ki'i fehu'i kiate koe fekau'aki moe lea 'oku ke sai'ia hono ngaue'aki' moe lea 'oku ke sai'ia hono ngaue'aki atu 'e he kakai' kia koe. 'E fakahoko eni 'i ha ki'i kulupu 'a ia te mou kau kotoa ki ai e toko fā 'i ha loki ako 'i 'apiako.

Hili 'etau potalanoa fakataha', teu 'eke atu kia koe pē koe me'a na'a' ke talamai' ko e me'a ia na'a ke fiema'u ke u hiki'. Te u hiki 'a 'etau fepotalanoa'aki' pea koe me'a te ke lea'aki' 'e hiki tatau ia 'i ha tohi pea teu ngaue'aki ia ki he'eku fekumi'.

Koe taimi te u fai ai hono fakama'opo'opo 'eku fekumi', te u ngaue'aki e fanga ki'i hingoa fakapuli kia koe, ho famili', ho'o faiako', pea moe 'apiako'.

Kapau pē 'oku fiema'u ke toe 'ilo lahi hake ki he me'a' ni, kataki o fehu'i mai pē kiate au pe ko ho'o faiako'.

Faka'apa'apa atu

Talaifina Puniani

CONSENT FORM (TONGAN)

Faka'ilonga'i e puha kapau 'oku ke tali 'io ki ai.

- 'Oku ou fiefia ke u ngaue fakataha mo Talaifina Puniani pea ke ne hiki fakamatala fekau'aki mo e lea 'oku ou ngaue'aki'.
- 'Oku ou 'ilo'i mo mahino'i 'oku 'uhinga eni te ne 'i hoku loki ako' he lolotonga e 'aho' pea 'i hoku 'api' 'i he efiafi' 'i he 'aho 'e 5.
- 'Oku ou mahino'i te u tali fehu'i 'i ha ki'i kulupu ngaue.
- 'Oku ou mahino'i 'e malava ke u ta'ofi 'eku kau ki he fekumi' ni 'i ha fa'ahinga taimi pē.

Hingoa:

'Aho:

Appendix H: Table for analysis of data from the classroom observations

NB:

S.N – class 6 participant; S.C – Class 5 participant; F.S- class 4 participant; V.T: class 3 participant

D1.1 – Day 1 observation 1 etc.

Activity	Tongan	English	Tongan/English
Child talking to other children	D1.4, V. T D1.5, V. T D2.12, V. T D4.8, V. T D.1.7, S.C D.1.10-12, S.C D.2.15, S.C D.2.18, S.C D.3.3, S.C D1.17-18, S. N D1.21, S. N D3.2, S. N D1.4, S. F D1.7, S. F D1.11, S. F D1.13-16, S. F D2.11, S. Fa'asolo D3.13, S. F D3.22-23, S. F D4.7, S. F D5.7-8, S. F		D2.6, S. N
Whole Class Reading	D2.6, V. T D2.21, V. T D3.13, V. T D4.3-5, V. T D.3.4, S.C D.3.8-10, S.C D1.23, S. N D2.22-23, S. F D3.12, S. F D4.16, S. F D5.7, S. C	D.1.2-3, S.Cook	D3.1, V. T D3.6, V. T D.1.8, S.C D.2.2, S.C D1.5, S. N D2.2, S. N D3.5, S. F D5.16-17, S. F D5.21, S. C
whole class spelling	D1.1, V. T D1.2, V. T D.3.1, S.C D1.2,3, S. F		D2.1, V. T D4.1-2, V. T D.1.1, S.C D.2.2, S.C D2.1, S. N D4.2, S. F

			D5.18, S. N D5.18, S. F D5.20, S. C
Child repeating after the teacher	D.2.4, S.C D4.8, S. N D1.1, S. F D1.9, S. F		D4.1-2, V. T D4.1, S. F
Child being talked to by the teacher	D2.22, V. T D.1.17-18, S.C D2.22-23, S. N D1.3, S. F D1.12, S. F D3.3, S. F		D2.3-4, V. T D2.3, S. N
Child playing with others in the field	D2.16, V. T D3.16-18, V. T D4.11-12, V. T D4.14-15, V. T D.1.13-16, S.C D.2.10-12, S.C D.2.19-21, S.C D.3.11-16, S.C D1.10-15, S. N D2.10-15, S. N D3.13-14, S. N D4.11-15, S. N D2.15, S. F D3.11, S. F D3.13-15, S. F D4.10-12, S. F D4.19-21, S. F D5.10-15, S. N D5.10-15, S. F D5.10-15, S. C		
Child interacting in a group/with the rest of the class/teacher	D2.9, V. T D2.19-20, V. T D2.24, V. T D3.22-23, V. T D4.7, V. T D4.16-18, V. T D.1.19-224, S.C D.2.7-8, S.C D.3.5-6, S.C D2.21, S. N D.3.19-23, S.C D3.7-11, S. N		D2.5, V. T D3.2-5, V. T D3.7-8, V. T D1.4, S. N D1.8, S. N D3.16-17, S. N D3.19-23, S. N
Child reporting to Teacher/talking to teacher	D.2.16-17, S.C D2.16, S. N D4.17, S. N D2.2, S. F D3.10, S. F		

Child is doing silent work (R/W)	D2.10-11, V. T D2.23, V. T D3.19-21,24, V. T D4.9, V. T D4.19-22, V. T D.2.14, S.C D1.16, S. N D2.24, S. N D3.6, S. N D3.24, S. N D4.1-2, S. N D4.16, S. N D4.19-21, 23 S. N D1.8, S. F D2.16-18, S. F D1.23-24, S. F D2.4-6, S. F D3.17-21, S. F D4.17, S. F D5.8-9, S. N D5.9, S. C D5.16, S. C D5.19, S. C		D.1.5-6, S.C D1.6, S. N D2.4, S. N
Child is in a whole school activity (Dental clinic visit, Cleaning, Fire brigade visiting)	D2.13-15, V. T D5.19-24, S. N D5.19-24, S. F D5.8-11, V. T D5.13-18, V. T D5.22-24, S. C		
Child is listening to a radio program	D1.1, V. T D3.3-5, S. N D4.5-6, S. N D3.1-2, S. F		D2.2, V. T D4.3-4, S. N
Child is running errand for teacher	D1.9, S. N D3.15, S. N D1.10, S. F D1.17, S. F		
Child is doing an activity (i.e. moving face clock around, counting with counters, placing numbers to the values table etc) for the teacher	D1.3, V. T D2.7, V. T D.2.9, S.C D.2.23-24, S.C D.3.2, S.C D1.20, S. N D1.22, S. N D4.9-10, S. N D1.19, S. F D4.6, S. F		D1.2-3, S. N
Child is working on his soroban	D1.6-8, V. T D1.13, V. T D4.13, V. T		

	D2.17, V. T D3.11, V. T		
Child is reading out loud from his work	D1.2, V. T D.2.3, S.C D.2.6, S.C D1.24, S. N D4.7, S. N D4.18, S. N	D.1.9, S.C D.2.1, S.C	D3.4, S. F
Child is reciting something the teacher/religious instructor wants them to learn (whole class/group/individual)	D1.9-10, V. T D4.10, V. T D1.19, S. N D3.1, S. N D1.20-221, S. F D2.7-8, S. F D5.5, S. N D5.7, S. N D5.5, S. F D5.5, V. T D5.5, S. C		D3.6-9, S. F
Child is going through their work with the teacher	D1.11, V. T D1.14, V. T D3.12, V. T D4.23-24, V. T D.3.7, S.C D.3.17-18, S.C D.3.24, S.C D2.17, S. N D4.24, S. N D1.18, S. F D2.9-11, S. F D2.19-21, S. F D3.24, S. F D4.8-9, S. F D4.18, S. F D4.23-24, S. F D5.17, S. C		D1.1, S. N D1.7, S. Ni D2.5, S. N D5.17, S. N
Child is demonstrating to the teacher/class	D1.12, V. T D2.18, V. T D2.8-9, S. N D2.19-20, S. N		
Child is listening to another student's answer	D2.8, V. T		
Teacher is demonstrating to the child	D3.9-10, V. T D3.14-14, V. T D.2.13, S.C D.2.22, S.C D2.7, S. N D3.16, S. F		

Child is marking another student's book	D2.18, S. N		
Child is in a whole class discussion with the teacher	D4.22, S. N D1.5-6, S. F D2.1, S. F D2.3, S. F D2.24, S. F D4.13-14, S. F D4.22, S. F D5.8, S. C D5.18, S. C		D3.18, S. N D3.20, S. N D4.3-5, S. F
Child is at his home during the break	D2.13-14, S. F		
Child is singing a hymn	D5.1, S. N D5.4, S. N D5.4, S. F D5.9, S. F D5.1, V. T D5.4, V. T D5.3, S. C D5.6-7, V. T D5.12, V. T		
Child is closing eyes during prayers	D5.2, S. N D5.6, S. N D5.1, S. F D5.6, S. F D5.1, S. C D5.6, S. C		
Child is answering questions	D5.3, S. F D5.2-3, V. T		
Child is listening to a story	D5.3, S. N D5.2, S. F D5.2, S. C D5.4, S. C		
Child is doing a spelling test			D5.16, S. N

Appendix I: Table for analysis of data from home observations

NB:

s.n – class 6 participant; s.c – Class 5 participant; f.s- class 4 participant;
v.t: class 3 participant

D1.1 – Day 1 observation 1 etc.

D5.4-5.5 – Day 5 observation 5 to Day 5 observation 5

Activity	Tongan	English	T/E
talking to a member of the family	D1.1-s.c D3.1-s.c D5.4-5.5 – v.t D2.2-s.f		
playing game (using media)	D1.2 – s.c D5.1-5.2 – s.c D5.5 – s.c D5.1 – s.n		D1.3 – s.c
talking to friend/friend talking to him	D1.4 – d1.6 –s.c D2.3 – 2.4 – s.c D3.3-3.4 – s.c D1.4-1.5 – v.t D4.3 – v.t D5.3 – v.t D1.6 – s.n D4.5-sf		D2.2 – s.c
doing chores at home	D2.1 – s.c D3.2 – s.c D5.3 – s.c D5.4 – s.c D5.6 – s.c D1.1 – v.t D2.1 – v.t D2.6 – v.t D3.1 – 3.4 – v.t D4.1 – v.t D4.6 – v.t D5.1-5.2 – v.t D1.1-1.2 – s.n D3.1-3.2 – s.n D3.4-s.n D4.2-s.n D5.4-s.n D4.1-s.f D4.6-s.f		

	D5.2-s.f		
doing homework (at home/someone else's house)	D2.5 – s.c D3.5- 3.6 – s.c D4.2-4.4 s.c D4.6 – s.c D2.2 – 2.3 – v.t D4.5 – v.t D1.3 – s.n D1.5 – s.n D2.1-s.n D1.1-1.3 – s.f		D2.6 – s.c D2.3-2.6-s.f
playing with other kids	D4.1-s.c D1.2-1.3 – v.t D 2.5 – v.t D1.6 – v.t D5.5-5.6-s.n D3.5-3.6-v.t D4.2 – v.t D4.5 – s.n D4.3-s.n D 4.4 – v.t D2.4 – 2.5 – s.n D3.5 – s.n D3.5-3.6-s.f D5.5-5.6-s.f		
being scolded at by an adult	D4.5 – s.c D5.3-s.f		
eating	D2.5 – v.t D5.6 – v.t D3.3 – s.n D4.1 – s.n D5.2-s.n D2.1-sf d3.4-sf d5.1-s.f		
taking sister home	D1.4 – s.n D2.3 – s.n		
talking to/ asking help from teacher	D2.2 – s.n D2.6 -s.n		
doing chores in the classroom	D3.6 – s.n		
reading	D4.4-s.n D4.6 – s.n D1.4-1.6 – s.f D3.1-3.3-s.f D4.2-4.4-s.f D5.4-s.f		
walking from one home to another	D5.3-s.n		

Appendix J: Transcript for Focus Group

Date: 4th August 2016 Time: 3:45pm

Place: GPS Hofoa – Class 6's classroom

Present: 4 participants, researcher and Miss E

Interview regarding the Tongan Language

Introduction (The researcher used about 5 - 10 minutes to try and get students to understand the purpose of the interview – to find out what language they use at home, by home, with whom and to whom as well as at school. The researcher also was able to identify during this introductory time the language they preferred to be used for the interview which all of the four participants agreed that they would prefer to use Tongan. The Class 6 teacher is present in the classroom as well just to facilitate the researcher with the interview and help if there are moments that things might need clarification for the kids. The time selected for this was after school so that all the other students will be off from the school compound giving the researcher and the participants some quietness for them to concentrate on the task).

R: Koe ha e lea 'oku ke fanongo 'oku ngaue'aki 'I 'api ni?

What language do you hear being used here at home? (e.g. Tongan, English, Chinese). What are all the different language you hear here at home?

What is the language that you hear here at home that is being used by people in your home?

(Children hesitates to answer). (R. gave an example: Like you hear your parents talk to you in Tongan, you hear the radio ... what language do you hear on the radio or tv and so forth (R. then asks them individually).

SF: 'Oooo ko mau 'api 'oku nau lea fakaTonga pe nautolu ka ku fa'a lea fakapalangi mai a L taimi niihi. Ku fa'a fanongo pe letio moe tv lea fakapalangi pea mo e faiako (R:'i 'api pe S) 'oo ko S L ia ku fa'a sio faiva Pino ia (TT comes in and said: 'io ku fa'a sio mo au ka L mo e kalasi koi a nau fa'a sio Pino mo e Kolea). 'io tatau mo SL ku fa'a sio Pino, Kolea mo e Siaina ka e lahilahi pe Pino mo e palangi.

Oh, our home use Tongan but sometimes L (aunty) speaks to me in English. We listen to the radio and watch TV which uses English and the teacher (R: only here at home FS). Oh ... SL also watches movies and they come in Philippines, Koreans and Chinese (VT: yeah, I often see L (neighbour) and them watch Phillipino and Korean movies) ... yeah like S.....she watches Pilipino movies, Korean and Chinese but mostly English and Pino movies

R: *Fefe koe NS?*

How about you NS?

NS: Ku mau lea fakatonga pe mautolu ia i 'api ku 'ikai ha taha ia e lea fakapalangi tataaitaha pe ha ai ha taha ia 'e lea fakapalangi.

We use Tongan only at homeno one speaks English I hardly hear anyone using English

R: *Fefe letio, tv pe me'a pehe?*

How about the radio or tv and such?

NS: 'Oku hala api ia ko e telefoni pe 'a 'A mo P mo na ku fa'a fanongo ai letio moe letio pe 'a L lahi.

We don't have any only 'A, P and N's phones we use for radio and LL's radio

R: *koe lea fakaha 'oku ke fanongo ai ki he letio?*

What language do you hear on the radio?

NS: Fakatonga pe moe fakapalangi.

Only Tongan and English

R: *Fefe koe CS?*

How about you CS?

CS: 'Oo ko mautolu ia mei tatau mo FS ku lea fakaTonga pe ka ku fa'a hau au sio game mo faiva fale a K mo T ku lahi 'u faiva kehekehe ai Pino, Kolea, Siaina, Ha'amoia pea fa'a 'oange moe faiva mau sio ai I 'api mo T mo 'A. Ka ku mau talanoa fakatonga pe mautolu ia i 'api.

Oh, we're like FS speaking in Tongan but I often go to T and K's dvd shop and watch games and all the different movies there, Pinos, Koreans, Chinese, Samoan and sometimes they give us movies to watch at home with T and 'A but we talk in Tongan at home.

R: *TT fefe koe?*

TT how about you?

TT: Mau talanoa fakaTonga pe mautolu ia i 'api.

We talk in Tongan at home.

R: *Fa'a lea fakapalangi atu a F ka moutolu?*

Does F speak in English sometimes to you?

TT: 'Ikai ko e letio pe moe tv ku fa'a fanongo ai lea fakapalangi ka ku lahi ange pe mate 'ana ia he lolotonga uike ku toki fa'a 'ai hake pe ia he 'aho tokenaki ke mau sio fangatua fesi.

No, just the radio and tv we often hear the use of English from but most of the time it's off during the week and only the weekend we use it to watch wrestling.

R: *Sai fefe nai hoomou nofo i 'api 'oku lea fakaTonga kotoa atu pe mou 'api ka moutolu?*

How about when you are at home? Do all of the people at home speak to you in Tongan?

FS Ko L pe fa'a lea fakapalangi mai'oo mo L ...koe kalasi ia koe kun au lea fakaTONGA pe nautolu ia

Only Leti speaks in English to me ... oh and L the rest they speak in Tongan

NS 'Io ku mau lea fakaTonga pe ko N pe fa'a fanongo ki'i lea fakapalangi he taimi ku telefoni ai ka ku mau talanoa fakatongape mautolu ia

Yes, we talk in Tongan only N sometimes speak in English over the phone but we talk in Tongan all the time

CS 'Io mau lea fakatonga pe

Yes, we talk in Tongan

- TT 'lo
Yes
- R 'I 'api, talamai ange koe ha e lea 'oku ngaue'aki atu 'e mum mo dad mo homou 'api kia koe?
At home, tell me what language does your mum and dad and people around your home use with you?
- FS Ko L p emo L fa'a lea fakapalangi mai mo mami he telefoni ko e toenga ia kun au lea fakatonga pe a S si'i ia mo T emo au mo P moe kautama 'a M mo L
Only L and L speaks to me in English and sometimes my mum when we talk on the phone. The rest talks in Tongan, S, T, me, P, M's kids and L's.
- CS Katoa pe mau 'api ku nau lea fakatonga mai pe nautolu ia kia au
Everyone at home speaks in Tongan to me
- NS Fakatonga katoa pe – L, T, N mo e kauleka a'u pe ka 'A mo P
In Tongan, L, T, N and my siblings even 'A and P
- TT ko N ia mo F na lea fakatonga pe naua ia ku 'ikai ke 'i ai ha taimi ia kun a lea fakapalangi mai ai kiamautolu
N (dad) and F (mum) speaks in Tongan to us We never hear them talk in English to us
- R Koe ha e lea ku ke fiefia ke ngaue'aki i 'api? Koe ha hono 'uhinga?
What language do you prefer to use at home? Why?
- FS Sai'ia loua pe au ia ai ka ku sai ange pe lea fakatonga kou mahino'i he ku fa'a lea fakapalangi a L ia mo L taimi ni'ihiki ku 'ikai keu 'ilo 'e au
I like both of them but I like Tongan better because it's the one I understand and sometimes when LS and LS talk in English I don't really understand them
- CS Sai'ia ange pe lea faka-Tonga koia ku mahino lelei kia au hono ngaue'aki
I like Tongan because that's the language I understand well and can use

NS Oku ou sai'ia ange pe he lea fakatonga he ka lea fakapalangi mai ha taha ia 'e 'ikai keu fu'u loko 'ilo ia 'e au he ku mau lea fakatonga katoa pe ia 'api pea kou ma au ia he lea fakapalangi ku 'ikai sai 'eku lea

I like Tongan better because if someone talks to me in English I wouldn't really understand because we all talkin Tongan at home and I am too shy to talk in English because my English is not good.

TT Sai ange pe lea fakatonga ku fekau mautolu 'e F ke mau lea fakatonga p eke mau fetaulaki

I like the Tongan because mum told us to talk in Tongan so we can understand each other.

R Koe ha ho'o ongo'i he taimi ku lea fakatonga atu ai homou 'api kia koe?

How do you feel when people at your home talk to you in Tongan?

FS Fiefia

Happy

CS Sai'ia kou mahino'i 'enau lea mai

I like it because I understand what they say

NS Fiefia 'aupito

Really happy

TT Ongoi pe ku sai'ia he'emaui talanoa katoa

I feel that I like it when we all talk

R Fefe nai e taimi ku talanoa fakapalangi atu ai homou 'api kia koe. Ke ongo'i fefe?

CS Ku 'ikai ha taha ia e lea fakapalangi mai ka au i 'api

No one speaks to me in English at home

TT Tatau pe mo au ku 'ikai ke mau lea fakapalangi mautolu

Same as me we don't use English

R Ka 'oka pau nae ngaue'aki te ke ongo'i fefe?

But if English was used to you how would you feel?

Fakaoli'ia hei'ilo pe teu mahino'i

Funny because maybe I won't be able to understand it

NS Mo au pe ku 'ikai ke mau lea fakatonga I 'api

Just like me we don't use English at home

FS Sai'ia pe ai ka ku fa'a 'ita taimi ni'ihi he lea mai a Leti mo Lau ku 'ikai keu 'ilo 'e au pe koe ha me'a na talamai

I like it but sometimes I get annoyed because I don't know some of the things Lau and Leti tell me

R: Fefe nai a 'apiako. Koe ha e 'u lea 'oku ngaue'aki he ako?

How about at school. What are the languages you hear being used at school?

ALL Fakapalangi mo e fakatonga

English and Tongan

R Koe faiako pe ku lea fakapalangi atu kia koe? ... faiako pe 'a'au?
(Addressing each participant): 'oku fa'a toe talanoa fakapalangi atu ha faiako kehe kia koe?

Is it only the teacher who speaks in English to you? ... your teacher? ... or do other teachers talk to you in English?

ALL: Ko L pe mo 'emau faiako

Only L and our teacher

R: Ko L?

L?

All: 'io

Yes

R Koe laukonga pe talanoa?

Is it just reading? Or do you talk in English?

FS Laukonga mo e saienisi mo e Ingilisi

Reading and science and English

NS Mo e lesoni letio

And the radio programmes

R 'Aia koe toki taimi pe ia ku mou ngaue'aki ai e lea fakapalangi? Taimi laukonga p emo e letio?

So, the only these are the only times you get to use English? Only when reading and radio?

CS Moe taimi kalasi 'Ingilisi pe

And just during English times

R Moe taimi 'Ingilisi pe? Katoa leva e taimi ku mou lea fakatonga pe moutolu moe faiako?

And English time ... so all the other times you use Tongan language with the teacher?

All 'Io

Yes

R Mou sai'ia hono ngaue'aki e lea fakatonga pe lea fakapalangi he ako?

Do you like using Tongan or English language during school?

FS & NS 'Io

Yes

R 'Io ki he ha? Fakatonga pe fakapalangi

Yes, to which one? Tongan or English?

FS Fakapalangi

English

R Fefe koe TT:

How about you TT?

TT Fakatonga

Tongan

R SN?

SN?

NS Fakatonga

Tongan

CS Fakapalangi

English

R Koeha me'a ku sai'ia ai e ongoua koe he ngaue'aki e lea fakapalangi?

Why do the two of you like English more?

FS & CS: Ke mahino'i e lea fakapalangi

To understand how to speak in English

R Pea moe ha?

Why else?

CS Ke lava mahino'l e faiva moe me'a pehe

To understand movies and those things

R Koe taimi koe hange ko 'api oku mou fa'a sio faiva, koe fanongo hiva moe me'a pehe ... 'oku tokoni ki ho'omou lea fakapalangi?

When you are at home watching movies, and listening to music and those things Do they help you with your English?

Participants took their time

FS 'Io 'oku tokoni

Yes, it helps

NS Pau pe ke tokoni

It should help

CS 'Io

Yes

TT Hei'ilo

I don't know

R ha ke hei'ilo ai VT?

Why don't you know VT?

TT Ku tataaitaha pe mau fanongo letio mo sio tv

We hardly listen to the radio or watch TV

R 'Aia ku mou sai'ia leva ai i 'apiako? ... sio ki he ongoua koe kun a sai'ia naua he lea fakapalangi I 'apiako pea ko moua ia mo sai'ia pe moua ia ke lea fakatonga. Ka koe tu'u koe he taimi ni kapau 'e ngaue'aki e lea fakapalangi 'i 'apiako 'o toe lahi ange, te mou sai'ia ai pe 'ikai?

So, you do like it at school? Those two like using English at school and you two like using Tongan. If, for instance, English will be used a bit more at school, would you like it?

ALL 'Io

Yes

R Fakafuofua mai ange pe koe ha e loloa ho'omou ngaue'aki e lea fakapalangi he 'aho 'e taha I lokiako?

Could you give me an estimation of the length of time you use for speaking English in one day in the classroom?

Silence

R 'Oku 'aho kotoa pe ku 'I ai ha'amou fo'I kalasi 'Ingilisi pe ku tipeni pe mei he faiako?

Is it everyday? Or is it only during English class? Or does it depend on the teacher?

FS, CS, NS: 'Aho kotoa pe

Every day

R 'Aho kotoa pe ku 'i ai ho'ou fo'i kalasi 'Ingilisi (all nodded). 'oku fa'a loloa?

So, everyday all of you would have an English lesson? Is it long?

- FS, CS, NS 'Io
Yes
- TT 'ikai
No
- R 'Aia ko e ha ho'omou me'a 'oku fai ai?
What do you do during those classes?
- FS Mau fa'a lahi laukonga pe ki he pulula mo e singikulaa
We often read about plural and singular
- NS Mau fa'a laukonga p emo fanongo letio
We read and listen to radio programmes
- CS Laukonga
Reading
- TT Mau 'ai e ongo koe lea mo fa'a angimui pe ka Toni
We do phonics and repeat after Toni
- R Ko ho'omou laukonga ku tohi saati pe peku 'iai mo e taimi mou ngaue'aki
aim o e fanga ki'i pepa?
Your readings ... are they all from charts? Or do you sometimes use
reading books?
- All Saati mo e pepa
Charts and books
- R Pepa ngaue pe pe ko ha tohi kehe
Pupil books or other books?
- FS Tohi laipeli
Library books
- R Mou fa'a o laipeli?
Do you often use the library?
- FS Mau kalasi pe

Only our class

R Fefe kautama koee

How about the others?

3 'Ikai mau lau saati pe mautolu mo e pepa ngaue fānau

No, we mostly use charts and pupil's books

R 'Aia ko 'apiako ku ke sai'ia he talanoa fakapalangi moe faiako i 'apiako pe koe lea fakatonga

So, in school, you like talking in English with your teacher or do you prefer Tongan?

FS Loua pe ka kou ki'i sai'ia he lea fakapalangi

Both but I like English a bit more

NS Tonga

Tongan

CS Fakapalangi

English

TT Tonga

Tongan

R Koe taimi koe ku ke ngaue'aki ai e lea ... 'oku ke sai'ia k eke lea fakapalangi pe ku ke sai'ia ange pe koe ho'o lea fakatonga?

When you use language, do you like talking in English or in Tongan?

All Fakapalangi

English

R Ka ku mou fa'a lea fakapalangi ki he kauleka he taimi va'inga?

Do you talk in English to other kids during play time?

All 'Ika'i

No

R Sai'ia p eke lea kae'ikai ke ngaue'aki ia he 'apiako?

So, you like to speak it but not use it at school?

All Smile

R Ka koe ha e lea ia ku ngaue'aki m oho ngaahi kaungame'a he ako?

What language do you use with your friends at school?

ALL Fakatonga

Tongan

R He taimi kotoa pe?

All the time?

FS 'Io

Yes

R Tatau pe mo moutolu?

All Nods their heads

R Ka koe ha me'a ke sai'ia ai ke ngaue'ake e lea fakapalangi

Why do you prefer English language then?

FS ke lau e laukonga ke mahino

To understand the readings

R Fefe koe CS?

Howa about you CS?

CS Ke talanoa fakapalangi mai ha taha pea te lava o talanoa fakapalangi ki ai

So, that when someone talks to you in English you'd be able to talk back

R Koe taimi koe ke lea fakapalangi ai i 'apiako ko hai ku ke fa'a lea ki ai?

When you speak in English at school, who do you talk to?

All Faiako pe

Only the teacher

R Ku toe 'iai ha me'a 'e tokanga ki ai ha taha?

Does anyone have anything more to add?

All 'ikai

No

R Kapau pe 'oku 'ikai pea kou fakamalo atu

If there's nothing, then I thank you all

The researcher then thanks each of them individually for their time and explains to them that the transcript of the interview in Tongan would be made ready for them to view again before it becomes data and ready to be used for the researcher's work.

Interview ended: 4: 39 pm