A study of language use in secondary school classrooms in the Solomon Islands: Conceptions, practices and proficiencies.

A thesis submitted
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
of
Master of Education
at
The University of Waikato
by
Lanelle Olandrea Tanangada

THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

2013

ABSTRACT

Multilingualism is a complex phenomenon in the Pacific, particularly in Melanesia, where there is more than one language being spoken by individuals. Therefore it is important for the education systems to consider learners' needs in providing quality education that accommodates students' first language in the English curriculum.

This study set out to explore teachers' and students' beliefs, practices and proficiencies in two selected secondary schools regarding their use of language in English classrooms. Bilingual/multilingual educational research is a recent phenomenon in the South Pacific, including the Solomon Islands. This presents serious considerations for policy makers, educational authorities, teachers and students about the importance of accommodating students' first language (L1) alongside the English-only curriculum.

A qualitative research methodology approach was used, based on the interpretive paradigm, with individual and focus group interviews and classroom observations. Eight teachers and sixteen students from two schools, one rural and one urban, were interviewed on their conceptions of language use and the place of vernacular, Pijin and English in the English curriculum. Classroom observations carried out on two of the teacher participants focused on their language practices in English lessons and on capturing students' code-switching practices.

The findings of this study suggest that there is a mismatch between teachers' beliefs and practices. While all the teachers acknowledged the English-only policy, and the importance of using English as the medium of instruction, their reported practices and observed lessons supported the use of students' L1. The students also highlighted that the use of Pijin and/or vernacular supported their learning of English. This raises important points regarding bi/multilingual educational approaches to

teachers' pedagogical practices in accommodating students' L1 for effective learning purposes.

This study has unveiled teachers' beliefs about language use in secondary school classrooms, reported practices and students' patterns of language use and assumed language proficiencies. It therefore makes a contribution to the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development advocating for the importance of bi/multilingual education and teacher pedagogical practices and approaches to teaching English as a second language without impeding the students' L1.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my dearly loved mother
The late Joyce Eva Sikepitu

My father
Sattaboy Tapo Sikepitu

My beautiful daughter
Sonelle Gwen Tavaena Tanangada

My dearest husband
Jimson Fiau Tanangada

And my brother
Raynold George Sikepitu

For your endless love, consistent support, faithfulness and prayers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 An overview of English medium education in the Solomon Islands

English medium education in the Solomon Islands has been a challenge for students over the years. It is a requirement in the curriculum that students be educated using English as the medium of instruction, however, language acquisition and proficiency still remains a gap in secondary schools. Teachers' pedagogical knowledge has a role to play in students' learning of the subject, especially when English is not the students' first language. This is a problem not only in the Solomon Islands but a common pitfall in many educational settings where English is a foreign language and is expected to be used as the medium of instruction in the classroom (Gleeson, 2010; Hall & Eggington, 2000; Siegel, 1996b; Singh, 2001). Students' ability to read, write and speak academic English is very important. This means that the curriculum must be explained and interpreted in the language that students are more familiar with. Thus, the use of techniques such as code-switching, translation and more recently translanguaging might solve the current issue of students not achieving their full potential in their external examinations. It is all parents' and teachers' desire that students succeed in their studies with the knowledge of English because it is a language of great importance in today's world (Jourdan, 1990; Lotherington, 1996; Siegel, 1996b). Therefore, bridging the gap between the need of students' academic language of learning and English as language of academic instruction is an important focus for schools in the Solomon Islands.

This introductory chapter presents the issues regarding language use in the Solomon Islands, the context of the study, my simple reason for undertaking this study and the significance of this research in the Solomon Islands.

1.2 The issue of English learning in the Solomon Islands

The formal education system in the Solomon Islands requires all primary and secondary schools to use English as the official language of instruction for teaching and learning. This policy is problematic as many students' English proficiency is not high enough to enable them to learn English effectively, be confident in using the language other than learning in the school and pass external examinations. Students come to school with different language backgrounds with the expectation to learn English, a language that is only learned as they begin their early childhood and primary education. It is important to assess how teachers scaffold the content of the curriculum in English when students learn it only in the classroom as a subject. This leaves all teachers with a responsibility to support English language acquisition.

1.3 Background context of the Solomon Islands

The Solomon Islands is a small island country located in the Pacific Ocean, southeast of Papua New Guinea and 1,900 kilometres northeast of Australia. This third largest scattered archipelago in the South Pacific covers a total land area of 28,369 square kilometres, stretching southeast from south of Bougainville island to Santa Cruise. The country is made up of six major islands, namely, Guadalcanal, Malaita, New Georgia, Santa Isabel, Makira and Choiseul with hundreds of smaller islands and atolls, making the archipelago. Across and within these six major islands there is significant language diversity with some 80-90 languages being spoken. With the diversity of languages spoken in these islands and atolls, it is clear that students come to school from different language backgrounds; Pijin, as the common language, thus plays an important part in this study (Honan & Harcombe, 1997).

This country is a multicultural nation with an estimated population of 515,870 in the 2009 census and with an average growth rate of 2.3 percent (Palmer, 2011). From the total population, 93 percent are Melanesians, 4 percent are Polynesians and 1.5 percent are

Micronesians. The remaining 1.5 percentage includes Europeans, Chinese and other Pacific Islanders (McKinnon, Atkinson, Brash, Carillet, Dragicevich, Harewood, Luckham, McLachlan, & Starnes, 2009). About 84 percent of the population live in the rural settings and depend on agriculture for survival and income. Sixteen percent live in urban areas, with an estimated 78,000 living in the capital city of Honiara.

The country is rich in resources, language and culture. It is a multilingual environment, with different speakers of languages and dialects living in the same country. Students come to school with various language backgrounds but one common goal – to learn English. The language of education and its characteristics will be discussed in the next chapter as it is important to understand the background of language and its use and importance in education, which is the focus of this study.

1.4 The present study

This research project was situated in two separate national secondary schools in Honiara, the capital city and Western Province in the Solomon Islands. One was located in an urban area and the other was rural. It is a qualitative study that investigates teachers' and students' English language use in the secondary school classrooms, specifically in English as a curriculum subject. In particular it focuses on how teachers and students do make best use of the language resources they have to access curriculum content. The teachers' and students' conceptions and practices associated with their language use, and specifically their academic English use were explored in this multilingual context.

I have taught English to senior secondary students for the past eight years and have seen a great need for both teachers and students to be competent in English and specifically in the language needed for academic study. This I call academic English. All curriculum subjects are examined in English but students find it difficult to express ideas in English. The reality is that in most secondary schools, students are more

comfortable in expressing their ideas using Pijin, which is the lingua franca of the country (Siegel, 1996b). I have observed that teachers are also challenged when students experience difficulty in using academic English. The students understand better if I discuss concepts in English followed by an explanation in Pijin. This approach has the advantage of providing students with critical information in a language they are more comfortable using. Teachers' lack of knowledge on how to scaffold curriculum learning in English by using the vernacular or first language of the students is minimal in the Solomon Islands. "Translanguaging" and code switching (see Franken & August, 2011; Garcia, 2009a, Willans, 2011) may provide one way of understanding such scaffolding. I am interested in seeing if teachers teaching English as a subject use this approach even though they may not know about it in any theoretical sense. Furthermore, I am interested in looking at how students use language and whether the status of their English language proficiency is sufficient for academic learning.

My experience as an English teacher has challenged my beliefs. Having a preconceived notion that the English-only policy was the best way to support students' learning of the subject; I was an advocate of this language. My bias toward using solely English in the classroom resulted in students having difficulty understanding concepts. However, I naturally resorted to code-switching when I found my students struggled with understanding concepts. This misconception and lack of awareness of my own practice motivated this study on language use in secondary school classrooms, with a particular interest in teachers' and students' conceptions, their language proficiencies and language practices.

A conception is best described as "a dynamic and interdependent trilogy of actions, intentions, and beliefs" (Pratt, 1992, p. 206). One's beliefs, intentions and actions are interwoven to influence how one perceives his/her world and expresses his/her understanding of something. Pratt (1992) adds that we "view the world through the lenses of our conceptions, interpreting and acting in accordance with our understanding of the world" (p. 204). An exploration of teachers' and students' conceptions about

academic English and how languages should be used for curriculum learning provides an insight in how they understand the complexities of language and what they see as important in their learning in the classroom context.

In identifying what teachers and students believe about language use, I explore what they say they do in the classroom, what languages they use to communicate and access curriculum content, the frequency of the languages used and their code-switching practices. I had hoped to justify the place of students' L1 in learning curriculum content in secondary schools.

Finally, my having observed teachers' and students' practices in the classroom adds weight to this study, in that teachers' pedagogical practices with regard to how they best scaffold students' learning in the language can be documented. Students' code-switching practices provide insights into how teachers can exploit this and support it to help students access curriculum content.

1.5 Structure of the thesis

This thesis comprises eight chapters. Chapter One provides information related to the context of the study and my interest in teachers' and students' language use in secondary school classrooms in the Solomon Islands. Chapter Two examines the language background of the Solomon Islands and its place in the education system. Chapter Three discusses current literature on bilingual and multilingual theories and models and their place in Solomon Islands education. Chapter Four considers pedagogical approaches to teaching academic English and the implications for teacher professional development. Chapter Five explains the methodology and methods applied to generate data to answer my research questions. It includes ethical considerations which are paramount in any research, as well as an explanation of the research process itself. The sixth chapter presents the themes that emerged as a result of the

data analysis. Chapter Seven is a discussion of the findings and current literature to interpret and explain their relevance. The final chapter concludes with a view to thinking of the impact for secondary school curriculum education in the Solomon Islands. It also presents the limitations of this study and recommendations for future study in this area.

CHAPTER TWO
LANGUAGE BACKGROUND

2.1 Language characteristics of the Solomon Islands

There are between eighty and ninety indigenous languages being spoken in the Solomon Islands (Moseley, 1991; Singh, 2001; Tyron, 1979; Watson-Gegeo, 1987). Pijin is the lingua franca of the country, while English is the official language for business, government and education. Before the Solomon Islands gained independence from Britain, Solomon Islands Pijin had already become the lingua franca in the urban centres because of its use as a language of trade during the whaling and trading days (Watson-Gegeo, 1987).

2.1.1 Emergence of Pijin in the Solomon Islands
Pidgins and creoles develop in multilingual communities out of a need for communication among people who do not share a common language (Lefebvre, White & Jourdan, 2006; Siegel, 2008). Melanesian Pidgin, an English-based Pidgin is commonly spoken by the people of the Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu. It developed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries between the indigenous people and Europeans, when the Europeans were travelling throughout the Pacific. In Papua New Guinea it is better known as Tok Pisin, as Bislama in Vanuatu, and in the Solomon Islands it is called Pijin (Jourdan, 1991; Lotherington, 1998; Lynch & Mugler, 1999; Mugler & Lynch, 1996; Siegel, 1997; Smith, 2002).

Solomon Islands Pijin was developed as a result of the indigenous people's exposure to the English language as spoken by the whalers and traders in the first half of the nineteenth century between the 1820s and 1850s (Bennett, 1987; Hall, 1959; Tyron, 1979; Watson-Gegeo, 1987). This language further developed during the "blackbirding" days of the 1860s-1960s, when Solomon Islanders were taken on board the ships to Fiji and Queensland to work in the sugar cane plantations as labourers. According to Watson-Gegeo (1987) the majority of plantation workers from

the Solomon Islands who went to Fiji and Queensland struggled to communicate as they all spoke different dialects. This placed a need to learn a common language when communicating with the Europeans. Bennett (1979, 1981), Siegel (1986) and Watson-Gegeo (1987) suggest that the large number of English-based Pidgin speakers given the influence of English-speaking whites in the Solomon Islands, possibly accounts for why the Solomon's Pijin today is English-based rather than Fijian-based.

Some of the population moved from speaking their own indigenous languages in their communities to Pijin, a language that came to be common to all.

2.1.2 Language use by urban and rural children

With 80-90 languages spoken in the Solomon Islands, there is a diverse use of these languages. In the remote areas of the Solomon Islands many young children primarily speak one language – their vernacular. However, due to the increasing trade between each island, intermarriage and inter-island migration in many contexts there is a diverse pattern of language use. Thus, some people become speakers of two or more vernaculars and Pijin. Urbanisation has also influenced language use causing more people who may later become literate in English to speak Pijin, the language that is spoken widely in towns. English is predominantly the language spoken in schools and workplaces.

Most children in rural contexts learn their vernacular as their first language (L1)[1] and learn Pijin through exposure to other students and at school. In contrast, students in the urban areas tend to speak Pijin as their first language, as it is the main language used in the urban centres (Jourdan, 1991). However, some urban children also know their indigenous

---

[1] This study interchangeably refers to "mother tongue", Pijin and or vernacular as the child's L1, where two or more languages are spoken at home.

language because it is spoken in their homes. English (L2)[2] is learned at school by many students and is taught as a subject from year 1 right through to college (Singh, 2001). Children, who come from homes where parents speak to them in English, learn the English language at home. Though English is learned in the classroom as a subject, Pijin remains the language of urban social life and among children who are officially being schooled in English (Jourdan, 1990).

2.1.3 The influence of the church on language use

As in many countries worldwide, Christian missionaries have had a significant influence in language use in the Solomon Islands. Between 1850 and 1915 the missionaries started their influence by providing basic education. The missionaries preferred to use local languages rather than English because the vernaculars were an important vehicle for communicating their evangelical message (Lynch & Mugler, 1999; Mugler & Lynch, 1996; Tyron, 1979; Watson-Gegeo, 1987; Watson-Gegeo & Gegeo, 1991). Those who were educated in these missions had positive attitudes towards vernaculars. As such, there was a feeling up until early in the 20th century that maintaining indigenous languages was important. The church's influence on language use set the foundations for vernacular education in the past, where students were encouraged to learn in their L1. However, as the churches grew and attracted converts from different islands with different dialects, using a common language of instruction became essential. They began to support Pijin and largely continued to do so until the early 1950s. This was to change when the government began playing its major role in educating Solomon Islanders.

However, there were already some churches like the South Seas Evangelical churches that had early influence in the use of English as the language of instruction. Mühlhäusler and Mühlhäusler (2005) suggest that there was evidence that English was regarded as an important language of instruction as early as 1913. By the 1920s there was already pressure

---

[2] In this study L2 refers to English, the language of instruction in the schools. However, in a multilingual context such as the Solomon Islands, English may not be the second language.

from within the mission and the government to re-evaluate the language policy and make the language of instruction solely English.

2.2 Language and education in the Solomon Islands

The 1950s was an important era for changes in language use in the Solomon Islands because at this stage the British government had already started to influence the education system. Most schools had expatriate teachers using materials written in English. This impacted on the language of education and English became the language of government, power and advancement (Alamu, 2010; Keesing, 1990; Mugler & Lynch, 1996). In 1972, a recommendation was made by the British Solomon Islands Protectorate Education Conference that English should be the compulsory medium of instruction from grade three onwards (Jourdan, 1990; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003; Lotherington, 1998). This was subsequently enacted in 1974.

The first Prime Minister of the Solomon Islands, the Rt. Hon. Sir Peter Kenilorea was a strong advocate for "total immersion in English". He believed that total immersion encouraged students to learn more quickly (Kenilorea, 2008, p. 71). From this period students were punished for speaking their vernacular or Pijin. Solomon Islanders had mixed feelings about this shift in language use. However they realised that their vernaculars would not provide them with material advancement compared with having knowledge of English. For many, English was seen as the language of advancement, education and access to the outside world (Siegel, 2006; Tyron, 1979).

2.2.1 Language policy in schools
The recommendations of the 1972 British Solomon Islands Protectorate Education Conference were supported as appropriate by the Solomon Islands Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development (MEHRD). As a result, the 1972 recommendation led to enactment in 1974 when the government of the Solomon Islands took control of the formal

education sector and the language policy in schools. This educational policy focused on the achievement of literacy in English, and did not acknowledge any role for Pijin in education.

English-only medium teaching was the policy from the 1970s until 2007 when a change was signalled for the current review of the primary school curriculum. The recently published National Education Action Plan (2007–2009) states that consideration should be given to acknowledging "ways of strengthening language development, including policy on the use of the vernacular in primary schooling as a medium of instruction, and ways to improve performance in English" (MEHRD, 2007, p. 44). This signals an important change in the approach and perceptions of Education officials towards the use of a vernacular as a medium of instruction. The change is seen as a positive move by the Solomon Islands MEHRD. The most recent National Curriculum Statement, a guiding framework developed by the MEHRD (2011), supports this notion by recognising that initial literacy is best taught in a vernacular language, including Pijin.

Despite the recognition of vernacular education within the latest policy document, students are still ultimately expected to acquire literacy in English (Lotherington, 1996). English is used "throughout the curriculum in textbooks, libraries, computers, the internet, and also by instructors and teachers to transfer knowledge, skills, attitudes and values to learners" (MEHRD, 2008, p. 2). It is also taught as a separate subject in schools and students are expected to learn English as it is perceived to be the technical language of education. However, students do not consider English to be important outside the classroom as it is not an integral part of their daily communication.

Students only start to realise the important role English plays in their learning when they are preparing for national examinations in secondary schools. At this point they realise that English is the gateway to further education and job opportunities (Tyron, 1979). In this instance Jourdan's view from 1990 still has relevance when she says:

> The children know, however, that English plays an important role in other realms of the Solomon Islands' life: in public service and in the world of commerce, for instance. As they grow older, they realize only too well that English is the key to social advancement through secondary schooling or well-paid employment. (Jourdan, 1990, p. 169)

There have been several studies conducted in the Solomon Islands regarding language and its place in the education system (Jourdan, 1990; Lee, 1996; Lotherington, 1996; Siegel, 1996b; Watson-Gegeo, 1987) but none specifically concern students' attitudes towards English language learning and use of other languages in secondary school classroom. English is an international language, the language of trade and economic relations. Therefore, students need to be competent in English to have the chance to make the most of opportunities for advancement and employment (Jourdan, 1990). A major problem faced in most secondary schools is the dropout rate of students who sit for the external examinations. All curricular subjects are examined in English and students are expected to write their answers in English. However, it can be difficult for students to express ideas in English and as a result teachers are challenged when students experience difficulty in using academic English.

According to Lotherington (1998), the Solomon Islands' policy states that English must be solely the language of instruction in the classroom but in reality "teachers often rely on vernacular communication" (p. 70) to enable students to understand the concepts taught. Although this has been seen as distracting attention from English language learning in the Solomon Islands, research has sought to explain its role in supporting curriculum learning (see August, 2010; Franken & August, 2011; Garcia, 2009b; Shameem, 2002; Willans, 2011). Compounding the problem is the fact that teachers who are themselves products of this submersion schooling, lack confidence in English, which adds to the existing issue of students battling to understand academic English and to use it. Therefore, it is important that teachers are cognisant of recent research on how to scaffold students' learning both orally and academically, using students' L1 whether that be a vernacular or Pijin.

A possible way of finding a solution to the problem of English achievement in schools is to develop the teachers' knowledge of effective pedagogies for bilingual learners that allow Pijin to be incorporated as a tool in scaffolding the academic English content. This could lead to the improvement of students' language proficiency and high achievement in their school examinations (Baker, 2000; Cummins, 2000; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

Learning literacy skills in a language already spoken by the students as a means of learning the second language is an important phenomenon which has a lot of attention in the literature (Baker, 2011; Cummins, 1976; MacSwan & Pray, 2005; Siegel, 1996b). In the Solomon Islands context also, this idea has support. Lee's (1996) study of the use of Pijin in education found that "applying the principle [known to unknown] would mean learning literacy skills in a vernacular – or for many in Pijin – before learning to read and write English" (p. 207). When dealing with language issues it is important to consider such views as Lee (1996) suggests. In the recent National Curriculum Statement (MEHRD, 2011), it is hoped that the teaching and learning of English and/or students' L1 in the Solomon Islands will increase language proficiency in general, and communication skills, critical thinking and literacy skills. Specifically this may support students to become skilful and live productive lives in their schools and the wider community.

2.3 Education and language policies in the Pacific

The history of the development of language in education in the Solomon Islands has also been reflected in other Pacific countries. The Pacific is known to be the most linguistically complex region in the world, with one-fifth of the world's languages found there (Mugler & Lynch, 1996). In particular the Melanesian region, (Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, New Caledonia and Fiji) is said to be one of the most multilingual areas of the Pacific, with a high language density (Lotherington, 1998). Two of these Melanesian countries, Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu will

now be discussed in terms of their educational policies because historically their educational policies excluded initial literacy in students' L1 and both countries share the same Melanesian Pidgin (Siegel, 1996b). This may therefore provide a context in which to consider policy and possibilities for the Solomon Islands.

2.3.1 The Papua New Guinea context: Language policy

Papua New Guinea has more than eight hundred spoken languages. The three recognised national languages are: Hiri Motu, Tok Pisin and English. However, Tok Pisin is the country's most common lingua franca (August, 2010; Siegel, 2008; 2010; Smith, 2002). As in the Solomons, the churches had influence in the education system of Papua New Guinea with the belief that teaching students in the vernaculars was the best way to educate the local people (Siegel, 1996b). Teaching and learning was conducted in vernacular in the 1940s, however, after the Second World War, the English language became the language of education and national government. It was seen as the language of prestige with only a minority of Papua New Guineans achieving high educational levels through English (August, 2010; Johnson, 1977a; Kale, 1990).

The first Director of Education, W. C. Groves, promoted an education system using each community's vernacular and culture but the government did not support this idea as there were major shifts in the political opinion towards the "need, not for universal primary education, but for the production of an educated elite capable of running the country's institutions at independence" (Kale, 1990, p. 192). Johnson (1977b) suggested that this position was not educational but had political, economic and logistical reasons. English continued to be the medium of instruction in schools (Kale, 1990; Romaine, 1992; Siegel, 1996a, 1996b; Smith, 2002). The Education Department declared in 1962 that only English should be the language of instruction in schools. However, with 85 percent of the population living in rural areas, there was still a need for vernacular education. Therefore a Tok Ples Pri Skul (TPPS) was implemented for children aged 6-8, for one or two years. This was

purposely done to get children ready for the formal system in the government-run community schools (Siegel, 1996b). It had quite a number of different aims and goals, with the main one being the maintenance of the vernacular.

The success of the TPPS programmes contributed to the release of the "Matane Report" (Litteral, 1999) which stressed the importance of traditional values and vernacular languages including Tok Pisin (Abare & Manukayasi, 1996; Siegel, 1996b; Swan & Lewis, 1990). This report has brought significant changes in educational policy in PNG. One of its recommendations was that the "vernacular language be used as the medium of instruction in the early years of schooling and English be used in the later years" (Matane et al., as cited in Siegel, 1996b, p. 36).

From 1993, language policy in PNG allowed schools at early levels to use their local languages as the medium of instruction for teaching and learning (Waiko, as cited Pickford, 2005). The children's initial language, the local vernacular, was to be taught in the preparatory grade, grade 1 and 2 at the elementary schools (Gould, 2004; Johnson, 1977a; Verhaar, 1989). Papua New Guinea language policy would seem to be a step ahead of the Solomon Islands in the way vernacular education is supported by the Ministry of Education (MoE).

In the section above it has been seen that Papua New Guinea provides a model of possibilities albeit an early-exit transitional one. This is also true of Vanuatu.

2.3.2 Vanuatu context: Language policy

The Republic of Vanuatu, formally known as the New Hebrides, was once colonised by France and Britain. It is the world's most linguistically diverse nation with respect to the number of "actively spoken indigenous languages per head of population" (Crowley, 2006, p. 157). At least 80 local languages are spoken by an average of only about 2500 speakers each (Crowley, 2006). During the mid-1800s the missionaries played a

major role in educating the Ni-Vanuatu (people of Vanuatu), with the main goal of bringing Christian beliefs and values to the people through their vernaculars (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2006; Crowley, 2006). Vernacular literacy was again supported by the church. The missionaries' influence ceased in the late 1950s, and in the 1960s, the British and French laid their foundation for the education system, setting up two school systems. Vernacular literacy as well as use of Bislama was prohibited in the schools (Crowley, 2006; MoE, 2010; Willans, 2011).

After the country gained its independence from the joint Anglo-French colonial control in 1980, the Constitution of the Republic of Vanuatu declared that English, French and Bislama would be the official languages. Bislama was made the national language and English and French became the principal languages of education (Baldauf & Kaplan, 2006; Early, 1999; Lynch, 1996; Thomas, 1990). Thus, the official languages of instruction at all levels were French and English. Ni-Vanuatu students attend English or French medium schools, but the majority of students do not know English or French well in their initial stage of learning. In principle, both students and teachers are expected to use either French or English. However, there are Ni-Vanuatu teachers especially in rural areas that use some Bislama or vernacular with their younger students in their classes (Tyron & Charpentier, 1989).

Recently, the Vanuatu government has adopted an Education Master Plan with the "Vanuatu National Curriculum Statement" stating that "developing literacy in vernacular language leads to stronger intellectual development while the children are also better prepared for life outside school" (MoE, 2010, p. 47). Like the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea, Vanuatu has gone through educational curriculum reform and the "Vanuatu National Curriculum Statement" acknowledges the importance of students' initial learning in their vernacular. Vanuatu has recognised the importance of scaffolding students' learning in L1. According to Crowley (2006), this change of policy is "an educational one, with the argument being that the current policy is imparting initial literacy through an unfamiliar metropolitan

language is educationally damaging to the child (and ultimately, the country)" (p. 186). Crowley (2006) suggests that great care needs to be taken when implementing such policy, especially when preparing the resources to support vernacular education and the training needs of teachers. The current Vanuatu National Syllabuses for the Primary years have accommodated the use of a local language and/or Bislama as the initial language of instruction in the first two years of their education (MoE, 2012). Lotherington (2008) suggests that this "may light the way for the Solomon Islands to improve the status of Pijin, which would help to raise their low literacy levels" (p. 27).

One of the major reasons for discussing Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu is to show similarities in these three countries. They all had missionary influence that encouraged vernacular education. These countries were also colonized by people who imposed English as the language of instruction out of economic and political interest, for power and trade (UNESCO, 1953, 2003). This has resulted in their educational policies promoting English as the medium of instruction in both education and the government even though the majority of citizens of these countries predominantly speak Pidgin and vernacular.

More specifically, Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands encounter similar challenges where students are officially taught in English or French in their initial stage of learning in primary schools. Students face difficulties in their learning especially those who have no contact with those languages prior to entering school (Mangubhai, 2003). Thus, we find that these countries have undergone educational curriculum reform recently acknowledging that initial literacy is best taught in students' L1. The question that remains unanswered in countries where there are multiple languages is which initial vernacular should be used as the medium of instruction. Mangubhai (2003) suggests that the model currently used by Papua New Guinea, seems to be successful and worth learning from. This model encourages education in the first three years of a child's language (L1) later bridging

the gap where English becomes the language of instruction. Such models will be discussed in the subsequent chapter.

CHAPTER THREE
BILINGUALISM

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses theories and models of bilingualism with the understanding that they also encompass multilingualism. They need to be considered in relation to the students in the secondary school classrooms in the Solomon Islands and to the complexities of multilingualism in the Pacific. By considering the multilingual context of the Pacific, its place in the Solomon Islands and what education policy makers have put in place regarding the language of instruction in the schools, one will gain an understanding on the importance of language use in secondary school classrooms. It is through understanding the importance of language use in the classroom, taking into account students' L1 and their learning of L2, that policy makers, teachers and students will gain insight into the importance of bi/multilingual education.

3.2 Theories on bilingualism

Bilingualism is a complex and a very broad phenomenon. Grosjean (2010) proposes a simple definition of bilingualism; bilinguals are "those who use two or more languages (or dialects) in their everyday lives" (p. 4). Early research on bilingualism conducted during the years 1920-1960 with its claim of bilingualism's negative effect on children's development has undermined the potential use of bilingual education. A misconception about how the brain stores languages has affected people's attitudes towards bilingual education (May, Hill & Tiakiwai, 2004). This has stemmed from a belief that the brain dealt with different languages separately. Therefore, it was argued, bilingualism had the potential to cause "cognitive overload" for the child. This view has been described as the Separate Underlying Proficiency Model of Bilingualism (SUP) (Cummins, 1980a). This model poses that the two languages operate separately in the brain without transfer and the brain has a restricted

amount of "room" for languages (Baker, 2006). Hill (2010) suggests that the SUP model "implied a limited capacity for storing language information, and that the growth of one language detrimentally affects the other" (p. 17).

Peal and Lambert's (1962) study provided strong evidence that contradicted earlier studies showing negative effects of bilingualism. Their research in middle class French schools in Canada of bilingual and monolingual ten year olds concluded that bilingualism does not have detrimental effects on a child's development but may constitute a cognitive advantage over monolingualism. Bilingualism develops greater mental flexibility, with the ability to think more abstractly and more independently (Baker, 2001, 2006; 2011; Cenoz, 2003). According to Hill (2010), "Common-sense dictates that what SUP postulates cannot be correct because if there is a limited capacity for language growth in a bilingual mind, then most of the people in the world would be intellectually disabled" (p. 17). Learning a second language does not detrimentally affect other languages, nor does it result in loss of other languages (May et al., 2004). The Common Underlying Proficiency model (CUP) or "the iceberg model" supports this notion.

3.2.1 The Iceberg Model

The Iceberg Model presents as two icebergs that are separated above the surface but connected below. Below the surface, lies the central operating system that fuses the two languages which do not function separately but, rather, operate through the same central processing system (Cummins, 1980a, 1981). The two languages do not compete for space and so the skills that are taught in one language can be easily transferred to the other language. This eliminates the need to duplicate the teaching of skills in each language (Hill, 2010).

This theory claims that a bilingual can successfully separate two or more languages when learning and using languages and not become confused. The CUP model provides a way of understanding how a bilingual child

learns and uses languages in a bilingual educational context. However, this model is not sufficient in itself to account for how learning can best take place. We need to add the Threshold Theory.

3.2.2 The Threshold Theory

The Threshold Theory, first postulated by Toukomaa and Skutnabb-Kangas (as cited in Baker, 2006) and Cummins (1976, 1979), posits that once a child obtains a certain level of competence in his or her L2, there will be positive cognitive consequences. May, et al. (2004) suggest that this theory was created to explain the observation that "academic proficiency transfers across languages" and that "students who have developed literacy in their first language (L1) will tend to make stronger progression in acquiring literacy in their second language (L2)" (p. 40). There are two important reasons for this theory. First, the Threshold Theory seeks to account for the fact that when students are instructed more in their L2 the better their educational outcome. The second reason is that students often fail to cope academically and linguistically when they are submerged in a school environment where their weaker language or the L2 is the language of instruction (Cummins, 2000). Thus, using students' L1 as a medium of instruction aids in their development in the L2 (Baker, 2011; May, et al, 2004). According to Cummins, "there may be a threshold level of linguistic competence which a bilingual child must attain, both in order to avoid cognitive deficits and allow the potentially beneficial aspects of becoming bilingual to influence his [her] cognitive functioning" (1976, p. 2).

The model is described as a house with three floors, each depicting a level of bilingual proficiency and the ladders depicting the growth of each language. Each threshold provides a description of the level of language competence as well as the cognitive and linguistic consequences it holds for a child (Baker, 2006; May et al., 2004). Cummins (2000) argues that a child needs to progress beyond the second floor, and ideally to the third floor, in order to avoid negative consequences of bilingualism. At the first level, a child has low levels of competence in both languages, and this will

have negative cognitive effects. The second level is required for a child to experience the positive benefits of bilingualism, as at this level, there are children who are competent in one of their languages but not in both and it is likely that the second language will still be relatively weak (Baker, 2006, 2011; Hill, 2010; May et al., 2004). The third level depicts a bilingual with two highly developed languages. A bilingual who reaches this level is termed a "balanced bilingual" by Cummins (2000). They are able to cope with curriculum material in either language. Hill (2010) suggests that the "higher the progress of the bilingual child in both languages, the greater the likelihood of academic success" (p. 20).

Importantly, the Threshold Theory explains why students who are deprived of their right to learn English with the support of their L1 continue to fail in school as they are not accommodated in the third floor of this three-storied house. According to this theory, attaining cognitive progress and language proficiency at the third level is most likely to happen in additive bilingual contexts.

3.2.2.1 Implications of the Threshold Theory for the Solomon Islands

As discussed above, there is a need to consider what implications the Threshold theory has for Solomon Islands' children. Students come to school knowing either their vernacular, or Pijin, or both. They have used these orally as there is no literature in these languages. At school they are introduced to English, their second or third language. They are expected to learn solely through this language and complete examinations in it at secondary school level. However, they do not develop high levels of academic English. Meanwhile their vernacular and Pijin is not used to support the English learning. Moreover, these languages remain at a conversational level and English growth struggles.

This might explain why students submersed in an L2 educational environment experience failure in their external examinations (Daudau, 2012). There is no use made of their L1 in the classroom to shape or scaffold students in learning English, and their development in these

languages is not supported. As a benchmark for the Solomon Islands, it is worth learning from what is stipulated in Peal and Lambert's study (1962), that developing high levels of proficiency in both the L1 languages and the additional language provides positive academic outcomes for students.

3.2.3 The Developmental Interdependence hypothesis

Cummins (1979) developed another theory of bilingualism to refine the relationship and parameters associated with the languages. He termed this the Developmental Interdependence hypothesis. The Interdependence hypothesis suggests that a "child's second language competence is partly dependent on the level of competence already achieved in the first language" (Baker, 2006, p.173). This hypothesis explains the concept that developing a child's second language depends on the strength of his/her first language. If the child's first language is at a low stage of evolution, it will be more difficult for the child to achieve bilingualism. Therefore, it is important to develop a child's first language, as this supports the development of his/her second language (Baker, 2001, 2006; Hill, 2010; May, et al., 2004; Vea; 2010).

Cummins (2007a) further suggests that the relationship between first and second language literacy skills leads to effective development of language literacy skills which provide a conceptual foundation for long-term growth in English literacy skills. Therefore, we can see that in a bilingual context, a child needs to develop both languages in order to gain superior learning outcomes.

This hypothesis has significant implications for school programmes, especially in schools that do not accommodate a child's first language, such as English-only classrooms. Students in these contexts will not be able to use their L1 to support their L2 development, which explains why many bilingual students fail in school (May, et al., 2004). Bilingual programmes that allow education of a child in his/her L1 before English language classes arguably enable better outcomes. A minimum of six years instruction in L1 is recommended in order to safeguard bilingual

children against educational failure (Thomas & Collier, 1997). Consequently, recent research has shown that paying attention to a student's L1 is vital, as children who had been in long term bilingual education programmes performed better than those whose parents opted for English-only education (Hill, 2010). Thus, we find that research supports the Interdependence Hypothesis, where two languages mutually support each other for the development of a child's language proficiency.

3.2.4 Basic Interpersonal Communication Skill (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP)

More time is needed for non-English speaking students to acquire academic English proficiency in an environment where English is the medium of instruction. Cummins (1980b, 2000) argues that language proficiency has more than one dimension. There is context embedded communication and cognitively demanding communication. Cummins (2000) explains that it normally takes two years for a child's conversational ability or surface fluency in an L2 to develop. He further suggests that it takes between five and eight years before the more evolved academic skills that are required for a child to cope with classroom language and curriculum content to develop fully. Cummins (2000), Hakuta, Butler and Witt (2000) and Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976) rebut the notion of a single dimension of language proficiency, arguing that despite children developing high conversational skills in English, many still perform poorly in school.

Cummins (1980b, 2000) formalised this distinction by creating the terms: Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). There is a difference in the academically related aspects of competence and conversational language (Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa, 1976). Conversational competence (BICS) relates to the phonological, syntactic and lexical skills that are necessary for everyday interpersonal contexts. It is essential that this language competence takes place in "cognitively undemanding and contextually

supported situations such as a conversation that occurs between individuals" (Hill, 2010, p. 22).

By contrast, CALP is an academically related language competence that occurs in context reduced academic situations. According to Baker (2006) where "higher order of thinking skills (e.g. analysis, synthesis, evaluation) is required by the curriculum, language is disembeded from a meaningful, supportive context" (p. 174). Additionally, these thinking skills are essential for the successful acquisition of literacy skills at school as they involve one's ability to use language as an instrument of thought in problem solving (Cummins, 2000). Apart from mastering the academic language register of the L2, the children will also have to learn new curricular information through that language, thus causing a delay in their acquisition of the academic language proficiency (May et al., 2004).

The distinction between CALP and BICS in bilingual education helps explain why students who are proficient in their conversational language in an L2 often fail to reach their full potential at school. Language education in a minority context should help students acquire high levels of literacy so that they can process information and develop their cognitive skills. This is best acquired through the language with which they are most familiar and then easily transferred to a second or third language. In a study conducted in Central Arizona, MacSwan and Pray (2005) found that students in bilingual education acquire English very quickly and that academic content instruction in the students' native language supported their learning academically when they needed to learn English well. Therefore, considering the Solomon Islands context, it is important for educators and policy makers to consider students' L1 and its importance in the development of learning English.

3.3 Bilingual education

It is important to consider the different models of bilingual education and identify the model that is appropriate in the Solomon Islands context. This

will require an understanding of how students learn in a multilingual context and the challenges faced in such a context.

3.3.1 Philosophical approaches to bilingualism

Language education policies and the programmes that put those policies into practice can be seen as either aiming to add another language to the students' existing language, known as the additive approach or to shift students from bilingualism to monolingualism in the dominant language, termed as subtractive bilingualism (Lambert, 1973).

Additive and subtractive bilingualism were first postulated by Lambert (1973) who defined additive bilingualism as adding a second language without replacing the other language. The additional language usually is of high status. This approach implies the belief that both languages and cultures will provide positive outcomes for the child's overall development. When a child is able to use both languages extensively they are likely to have high proficiency in both languages (Franken, May & McComish, 2008). This is supported by the interdependence principle, which shows that acquiring literacy in one's L1 provides the strongest basis for successfully transferring literacy skills to an L2 such as English (Baker, 2006; May, et al., 2004). Genesee (1999) suggests that developmental bilingual education (late-exit bilingual education) supports the additive approach to educating English language learners. It encourages and "promotes full proficiency in all aspects of the students' first language in addition to full proficiency in all aspects of English language development" (Genesee, 1999, p. 24). This calls for full development in students' first language and English.

A subtractive bilingualism context, on the other hand, is seen as a negative phenomenon especially in a minority context where the learners' L1 is not valued and encouraged. It aims to shift the students from their L1 towards a dominant language, as in an English only classroom. Students in such contexts abandon their native language for the dominant language (Genesee, 1999; Roberts, 1995). A child's L1 is regarded as "interfering"

with learning the L2, such as English, and is actively discouraged. Time and effort spent using the L1 is seen as subtracting from the child's ability to achieve good levels of proficiency in the L2. Because a child's L1 is not encouraged to support the L2, he/she is unlikely to gain high proficiency in both languages. A subtractive approach to bilingualism ignores the key principle of language interdependence and thus is the least successful educational model for bilingual students (Franken, et al, 2008; May, 2008). According to Garcia (2009a), the subtractive model could possibly lead to the death of many indigenous languages around the world in situations where the students' L1s are ignored and being replaced with the L2. This approach moves students towards monolingualism, which is a disadvantage for students who have rich linguistic backgrounds. Lambert (1973) argued that under this subtractive model students experience inferior academic achievement.

3.3.2. Bilingualism programmes

May (2004) and Hill (2010) usefully distinguish between the levels of models and programmes and the purpose of this section is to discuss the submersion programme and merge the two concepts for the transitional programme and model. The Solomon Islands approach has been a subtractive model and a submersion programme at the primary level, where English alone was the expected language of instruction. The policy in general has not accommodated students' L1. Thus has been one of submersion.

3.3.2.1 Submersion programmes

In a submersion programme students are placed in a classroom where their second language is mostly used. This places them in a situation where they have to learn via their L2 to the best of their ability in order to learn the school subjects. Students face constant pressure to think about the form of the language but less time is taken to think about the curriculum content (Baker, 2006). It is suggested that students could give up easily or be labelled academically weak unless they are motivated and/or highly intelligent (Mangubhai, 2003).

Solomon Islands programmes raise a number of issues, one of which is equity for students in rural settings. Students in urban areas have more opportunities to be exposed to English but students in rural settings experience difficulty coping cognitively with the English language when there is no proper scaffolding of their L1 in their early years of learning. Acknowledging the detrimental impacts of the submersion approach on students, the Solomon Islands education system should consider improving the language education of the country in relation to bilingual education.

3.3.2.2 Transitional programmes

A transitional programme, despite the L1 being encouraged in early stages of schooling, only serves as a bridge, helping the students to move from their native language to English (Genesee, 1999; Roberts, 1995). The aim is to introduce basic literacy and numeracy in the students' vernacular language. The students' L1 is used to facilitate the transition of the minority language (L1) speaker to the dominant language (L2). According to Genesee (1999) most of the transitional programmes are "early-exit" programmes, as the L1 is only used for 1-2 years and is then replaced by the L2. This brings negative outcomes as it is a subtractive and weak bilingual model. Thus in the Solomon Islands, the shift is from bilingualism to monolingualism in English language.

As discussed earlier, the transitional programme as a model is subtractive in nature, in that it aims to shift students away from their L1. As an approach, the transitional bilingual education focuses on a minority language. Students are initially taught through their L1 until considered proficient enough in their second language to cope in the English language education (Hill, 2010). On reaching the level of proficiency in their L2, the students are moved to an English-medium class. The transition to English language generally occurs after one to three years in the early exit programmes, or after four to six years in the late-exit programmes. This approach recognises the importance and usefulness of using the students' L1 in bridging to the acquisition of L2. However, it

treats the students' L1 as a bridge towards learning English. It is therefore subtractive.

Students of the early-exit transitional programmes will develop fluency in conversational ability but will not have enough time or opportunity to develop the academic language ability required in the curriculum (Thomas & Collier, 2002). According to Benson (2004) early exit transitional programmes "try to do too much too fast and fail to produce optimal results, giving parents and teachers the mistaken impression that the L1 has caused the confusion" (p. 14). This contention is consistent with Thomas and Collier (2002) and Ramirez's (1992) findings that students in the late-exit programmes experience better outcomes in their academic language proficiency in an L2, and make better academic progress.

The Solomon Islands is reported to encourage vernacular education in what is predominantly English submersion education (Siegel, 1996b). Teachers use either the students' vernacular and/ or Pijin as conversational language but materials are written in the English language which makes it difficult for students' learning. This may explain why students under this transitional model, such as in the Solomon Islands, do poorly in external examinations.

3.3.3 Implications of the approaches in multilingual Melanesia

The term "multilingual education" was adopted in 1999 by UNESCO, referring to the "use of at least three languages, the mother tongue, a regional or national language and an international language in education" (UNESCO, 2003, p. 17). Considering the complexities of the multilingual context in the Pacific it is important to rethink about the bilingual educational models, as bilingual education primarily frames two languages, whereas in many areas particularly Melanesia have a more complex situation, with more than one language. This poses a challenge for education systems to "adapt to these complex realities and provide a quality education which takes into consideration learners' needs, whilst

balancing these at the same time with social, cultural and political demands" (UNESCO, 2003, p. 12)

The relevance and importance in the Pacific region of the transitional approach in relation to the Solomon Islands context needs elaboration. The Solomon Islands is not alone in adopting a basic early-exit transitional model. Other Pacific countries, such as Papua New Guinea (August, 2010), Samoa (Siegel, 1996a) and Vanuatu (Willans, 2011) adopted similar approaches. It is also the case that the situation especially in Melanesia is very complex given the extent of multilingualism. In considering the role of the vernacular (which could be Pijin) in Melanesia, Siegel (2006) has categorised three specific approaches to "bilingualism" in education which will be briefly discussed. The three approaches are instrumental, accommodation and awareness educational programmes, where vernacular varieties are in existence. The instrumental approach uses vernacular as the medium of instruction at the initial stage of students' learning. It is used as a "tool to help children adjust to school and learn basic skills, especially literacy, while at the same time learning the standard" (Siegel, 2006, p. 45). Secondly, the accommodation approach not only applies initial literacy in the students' vernacular but accepts the language in the classroom, which allows freedom of expression in students' home language. Lastly, the awareness approach emphasises English as the medium of instruction with students' vernacular considered as a resource to use for learning English and not an impediment (Siegel, 2006).

With these three approaches, Siegel (2006) is describing the scheme of what currently exists where the awareness and accommodation approaches actually recognise a longer term for vernacular but are still not sufficient for student learning. The instrumental approach, on the other hand, could be associated with the early-exit model which is transitional. It is most relevant in the multilingual context such as the Pacific, where the vernaculars are "markedly different from the standard language used in education" (Siegel, 2006, p. 44). This assists students to acquire the

language, understand its functions and the differences in terms of the structure and its use in the learning environment. But nevertheless it is still represented as an English-only outcome.

If there is understanding about the benefits of late-exit programmes and the approaches discussed by Siegel (2006), improvements can be made in the educational systems of these Pacific nations. The policy makers will not only focus on English-only outcomes but committed to maintaining the language and inherent value of cultural diversity. Research has shown that learners "learn best in their mother tongue as a prelude to and complement of bilingual education approaches" (UNESCO, 2003, p. 7). There are more benefits than harm associated with vernacular education, where students' own language used in long-term educational programmes resulting in outstanding academic achievements (Siegel, 1996b, 2006). Students' self-expression in their own vernacular better facilitates cognitive development. Furthermore, when the students' vernacular is valued in the educational setting, it contributes to low anxiety, high motivation and high self-confidence (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1998) These three important factors are closely related to successful educational programmes. Finally, Siegel (2006) points out that when students' vernacular is not encouraged in the classroom, the students are deprived of potential benefits for academic achievements and language acquisition. Therefore, this leaves a challenge for Pacific Island nations including the Solomon Islands to consider the benefits of vernacular education in a multilingual complex society.

The next chapter will discuss the approaches to teaching academic English in a multilingual contexts and the importance of "flexible bilingual pedagogy" and its place in the learning of English.

CHAPTER FOUR
APPROACHES TO TEACHING ACADEMIC ENGLISH

4.1 Introduction

The pedagogical practices of second language teachers are important to consider in a context where the learning of academic English has been an on-going issue. Numerous authors have identified effective teaching approaches and strategies for effective language and literacy learning in a bilingual context. Thus, teachers could use approaches to support the students' learning of the English language in the context of subject learning. Walqui (2007) argues that "it is possible for second language learners to develop deep disciplinary knowledge and engage in challenging academic activities if teachers know how to support them pedagogically to achieve their potential" (p. 202). Some of the approaches will be discussed as appropriate for effective language and literacy learning in the multilingual context like the Solomon Islands.

4.2 General approaches for integrating language and content

Learning is a collaborative endeavour where skills, content knowledge and the student identities emerge and are shaped through teacher student interaction (Cummins, 1983). According to Walqui (2007) education never occurs in a vacuum but is "deeply embedded in a sociocultural milieu" (p. 202). Thus learning is not only a matter of cognitive development but also of shared social practices. Interaction between the teacher and the students as well as students amongst themselves is the primary process by which learning takes place. It is a joint activity that focuses on matters that are of interest to the students and one that provides opportunities for learning (Walqui, 2007).

This collaborative learning can be further explained by referring to Vygotsky's (1978) Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). It suggests that:

> Successful coordination with a partner, or assisted performance, leads learners to reach beyond what they are able to achieve alone, to participate in new situations and to tackle new tasks, or, in the case of second language learners, to learn new ways of using language. (Gibbons, 2002, p. 8).

Creating contexts for linguistic and academic learning in the ZPD partly occurs in the scaffolding provided by social interaction. Thus, working in the ZPD means that the learner is assisted by others to be able to achieve more than he or she would be able to achieve alone. Scaffolding refers to the detailed circumstances of such work in the ZPD (Walqui, 2007).

4.2.1 Scaffolding

Bruner (1983) defines scaffolding as "a process of 'setting up' the situation to make the child's entry easy and successful and then gradually pulling back and handing the role to the child as he becomes skilled enough to manage it" (p. 60). It is a special kind of assistance that supports learners to progress toward new skills, concepts and levels of understanding. Though it is a temporary assistance by the teacher in helping the learner, it is a positive approach as the learner will be competent to do a similar task alone in future (Gibbons, 2002). It is the teacher's responsibility to initiate the student's new step of learning by building on what the learner is currently able to do alone.

It is important that students are supported to learn the language of schooling, in this case, English. In addition, integrating the content with the language is important. Three instructional scaffolding methods will be further explored based on their relevance to the Solomon Islands secondary education context where students are expected to achieve a high level of proficiency in academic English as well as subject learning.

4.2.1.1 Modelling

Teachers need to provide clear examples to students of what is required of them. For instance, when introducing a new task to the students, it is essential that the students are able to see, read or hear what is expected

of them. Teachers could use previous students' work for demonstration purposes. Modelling the appropriate language use to the students for specific academic functions, for example, describing, comparing, summarising and evaluating, can be effective (Walqui, 2007). This approach assists students in learning both the content and the academic language, particularly if aspects of what is modelled are brought to the students' attention.

4.2.1.2 Activating prior knowledge

Learners come to school with prior knowledge and experiences, and engaging students' prior knowledge and understanding in teaching is a positive approach. Donovan and Bransford (2005) point out that "new understandings are constructed on a foundation of existing understandings and experiences" (p. 4). Prior knowledge is explained as students' skills, beliefs, concepts and experiences that have shaped their identity and cognitive function. It can also refer to their knowledge of language that they bring to school. Cummins (2008) suggests that "the role of prior knowledge is particularly relevant to the issue of teaching for transfer in the education of bilingual students because if students' prior knowledge is encoded in their L1, then their L1 is inevitably implicated in the learning of L2" (p. 67). Teachers are encouraged to use students' prior knowledge to support the learning of the L2, and to draw on students' knowledge of their L1.

4.2.1.3 Developing metacognition

Metacognition is defined as "people's abilities to predict their performances on various tasks and to monitor their current levels of mastery and understanding" (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2004, p. 12). This is simply explained as ways in which students manage their thinking including both thinking about content and language. It includes students consciously applying learned strategies while engaging in activity; being aware and knowledgeable to decide which option is effective for their learning in a particular activity. Further still, students should be able to monitor, evaluate and adjust their performance (whether it be in the

domain of language or content) during any activity and plan for future performance basing on their evaluation of past performance (Walqui, 2007).

4.3 Instructional practices related to language

It is vital that teachers in the Solomon Islands pay attention to the teaching and learning approaches that will enhance students' learning of academic language. If teachers' pedagogy does not scaffold students' learning in Pijin and/or vernacular to English, this may cause difficulties when they are expected to express their thoughts in writing and speaking using academic English. This becomes a disadvantage when students interpret and answer questions in external examinations. Most teachers in the Solomon Islands have this traditional view that English should be the only language of instruction. However, that is not practical when it comes to teachers' pedagogy in the English classrooms.

Williams (as cited in Garcia, 2009a) suggests that translanguaging may provide the solution to the issue of developing the proficiency of the students' languages successfully. It has been successfully implemented in other contexts. Even though this is a big ask for implementation in the Solomon Islands it is important to consider the benefits of such flexible bilingual pedagogy as a suitable approach in the secondary school context. The last section of this literature review will explore the pedagogical practices of using more than one language such as code-switching, translation, metalinguistic comparison and translanguaging.

4.3.1 Code-switching

Code-switching is a common phenomenon widely observed in an L2 medium classroom where multilingual speakers switch back and forth with two or more languages or dialects (Buell, 2004; Cheng & Buttler, 1989; Willans, 2011). It has been discouraged in the education systems because of the fear that it will influence one or both languages leading to language decay (Aitchison, 1991) and "serve to pollute a language, rather than

enhance the communication between bilingual individuals" (Cheng & Buttler, 1989, p. 293). However, Buell (2004) suggests that "code-switching is a key marker of social identities, relations, and context" (p. 100). Martin (1996) noted that teachers switch into students' dominant language to facilitate learning. Willans' (2011) study also demonstrated "teachers alternating between languages in order to enhance understanding or relate topics to experience outside class, thus accommodating students' needs" (p. 24). It is a language practice that could support classroom communication (Setati, Adler, Reed and Bapoo's, 2002) and a useful resource for effective bilingual communication (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2005).

Studies carried out in the Pacific (August, 2010; Tamata, 1996; Willans, 2011) suggest that teachers code-switch in the classroom when they notice students lack proficiency in English. They tend to use the language students are comfortable with to clearly express meaning and support their development in English (August, 2010). Willans' (2011) study also found that teachers' and students' reason for code-switching was "generally to help understanding" (p. 34).

4.3.2 Translation
The use of translation in the bi/multilingual classroom has been argued about and debated (Cook, 2001; Howatt, 1984; Turnbull, 2001). Howatt (1984) discourages the use of translation with the belief that "it could lead to the formation of cross association and hinder the development of the foreign language" (p. 172). Torres-Guzman (2007) claims that teachers should avoid translation even when they see that their students do not understand the L2. She emphasises that teachers should trust the long-term language learning process, because when students know that teachers will translate they will devote less effort to "figuring out what the second language being spoken means" (Torres-Guzman, 2007, p. 53; Turnbull, 2001). In addition, translation can be a tiring exercise for the teachers to explain twice which they may at times do it incorrectly (Torres-Guzman, 2007).

However, recent studies (Cummins, 2007b, 2008) have provided a different view on translation. Translating from L1 to L2 and vice versa "can be a powerful tool to develop language and literacy skills and increase metalinguistic awareness" (Cummins, 2007b, p. 237). But this can be achievable and appropriate if the student has been taught through both languages (Garcia, 2009a). Cook (2001) suggests that students' L1 "can be a useful element in creating authentic L2 users rather than something to be shunned at all costs" (p. 402). Manyak's (2004) study of Spanish dominant students in California also claimed that "encouraging bilingual students to engage in translation in the classroom represents a practical and powerful way to draw on linguistically diverse students' sociocultural resources to facilitate their language and literacy learning" (p. 12). Translation was necessary as it promotes the acquisition of English, biliteracy development and promotes the learners' identity of competence (Manyak, 2004). Cummins (2007b) proposes that:

> Students' L1 is not the enemy in promoting high levels of L2 proficiency; rather, when students' L1 is invoked as a cognitive and linguistic resource through bilingual instructional strategies, it can function as a stepping stone to scaffold more accomplished performance in the L2. (p. 238)

It is important to consider the benefits of translation for which there is room for positive impact to students in such multilingual contexts as the Solomon Islands where there are speakers of more than one language.

4.3.3 Translanguaging

Translanguaging is a pedagogical practice defined as "multiple discursive practices in which bilinguals engage in order to make sense of their bilingual worlds" (Garcia, 2009a, p. 45). This pedagogical practice switches the language mode of bilingual classrooms, for example, the input (reading or listening) is done in one language and the output (writing or speaking) in another language. This concept of translanguaging has received attention from Baker (2006), Creese and Blackledge (2010), Cummins (2008), Garcia (2009a, 2009b) and Wei (2011). It is based on the concept first discussed by Williams (Baker, 2006) who suggested that there are strategies teachers can use to develop both languages in the

classroom successfully while content learning is taking place. This notion counters traditional views of bilingual education that languages should be kept separate in the teaching and learning of languages (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2007b). According to Garcia (2009b) when separating two different languages that are familiar to students in the classroom, it deprives the students of their ability to speak their home language. Thus challenges one of their greatest educational assets.

In a more recent study by Lewis, Jones and Baker (2012), a new concept of translanguaging has emerged arguing that translanguaging is a concept that has different functions from code-switching and translation. It is more concerned with planned use of two languages. The term translanguaging then has become somewhat contested but if we keep to the less prescribed definition as used by Creese and Blackledge (2010), Garcia (2009b) and Wei (2011), translanguaging can offer flexible spaces for language practices. Garcia (2009b) continues to suggest that pedagogical code-switching is an instance of translanguaging. It is a "pedagogical scaffolding technique" that makes "additional language more comprehensible" (Garcia, 2009b, p. 153).

This pedagogical practice should be seen as a natural process and a flexible teaching instructional strategy of a teacher in a bilingual classroom. It should provide a flexible space for language practices that will improve communication among students (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Franken & August, 2011; Garcia, 2009b; Lopez, 2008). The classroom should be an environment where students are encouraged to use the language they understand best and switch from one language to the other to accomplish a task. Yet, careful planning must be involved as it should be a deliberate and systematic strategy where knowledge is transferred from one language to the other, and not just an act of repeating the content in the other language (Hill, 2010).

A classroom that encourages translanguaging provides the students with important educational practices whereby students are able to construct

understanding, make sense of their worlds and the academic materials, involve in a collaborative learning and acquire other ways of language (Garcia, 2009a). It will help students to develop the linguistic security and identity needed for successful learning. Garcia (2009b) further supports translanguaging in a multilingual classroom by suggesting:

> In an increasingly heterogeneous world, where children in school are of all kinds and bring different language practices, the only way to build equitable educational systems is to develop multiple multilingual programs that acknowledge translanguaging as a resource for engaging cognitively and socially, as they also develop standard ways of communicating in dominant languages. (p. 157)

Educating students in a language they do not understand often leads to educational failure, which sets a challenge for teachers to maximise communication using the child's language practice (Garcia, 2009b). Makoni and Mashiri (2007) suggest that we should be describing the use of vernaculars that lead into one another to understand the social realities of their users and not just developing language policies that attempt at hermetically sealing languages, especially students' L1.

4.3.4 Metalinguistic awareness

Metalinguistic comparison is an important strategy in a bilingual classroom that "makes more explicit the connection between languages" and "supporting the transfer of learning from one language to another" (Franken & August, 2011, p. 225). It is not enough to switch in and out of languages, but if there is a more explicit relationship between the two languages then it is much more likely to have the development of both languages. Cummins (2007b) and Siegel (2006) suggest that "by juxtaposing aspects of the language systems, and drawing attention to the similarities and differences between them, teachers can support children's metalinguistic development" (as cited in Franken & August, 2011, p. 225). More strength is added to students' knowledge about their L1 and L2 when teachers not only translate the languages but show their relationship through comparing and contrasting and learn about how both systems

operate. Such practice then leads to the promotion and development of both languages.

Therefore, the idea of translanguaging will only be more effective in students' learning, when the teachers have sound knowledge of how both languages function, their form and what they mean in certain contexts. August (2010) found in her study of Papua New Guinea bridging class that the type of connection that was most consciously used by teachers was at the conceptual level and word level. This though can be complicated when some words in Pijin/vernacular are multifunctional however Siegel (2006) suggests that when students do not notice the differences of the languages then drawing their attention to the similarities and differences of Pijin/vernacular English maybe useful. Cummins (2007b) proposed that "when students' L1 is invoked as a cognitive and linguistic resource through bilingual instructional strategies, it can function as a stepping stone to scaffold more accomplished performance in the L2" (p. 238).

4.3.5 Implications of the instructional practices in the Solomon Islands

The Solomon Islands could consider the positive impacts of the strategic approaches discussed earlier to facilitating a real knowledge of both Pijin and English in a multilingual context. The common approach teachers in the Solomon Islands appear to use in the classroom is code-switching and translation. However, learning from Garcia (2009a, 2009b) and Baker, (2006, 2011) translanguaging goes beyond code-switching as the teacher needs to carefully scaffold students' learning and not necessarily repeating what has been mentioned in English to students' L1, which is normally what teachers in the Solomon Islands context practically do. Translanguaging should be based on providing learning for students using both languages, so that the subject matter is clearly understood in the language students know best.

It would be a positive shift in the education system of the Solomon Islands, should the curriculum division consider the strategies of effective bilingual

education. However, there are steps needed to be taken to reach the goal of accommodating both students' L1 and L2. Despite the mentioning of vernacular education, there is a need for a well organised system with printed materials to support vernacular education. Teachers need to learn the successful pedagogical practices of which translanguaging is one that will support students' learning of academic English. This will support and promote students' language use and lessen the dropout rates in the country.

CHAPTER FIVE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the research approach I selected to investigate my research questions on what teachers and students think about academic English and language use of both teachers and students in secondary school classrooms. Creswell (2009) suggests that a description of research methodology moves from "broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection and analysis" (p. 3). This is how the chapter is structured. The purpose of the research determines the methodology and design of the research (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). Researchers need to recognise the important philosophical issue concerning the relative importance of paradigms, the methods, and research questions (Anderson, 1990; Guthrie, 2010; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Freebody (2003) suggests that educational research aims "to provide a principled basis for 'knowing' to guide policy and practice" (p. 20). Freebody (2003) acknowledges educational research as a tool to "inform, advance or obstruct policy and practice in education" (p. 20); and it is hoped that this research will contribute to the language policy of the Solomon Islands. The following research questions elaborate on how this research study sought to achieve its aim:

1. What are students' and teachers' conceptions regarding academic English and the role of Pijin/vernacular and the curriculum?
2. What are the teachers' language practices in the curriculum area of English?
3. What are the students' patterns of language use in the English curriculum tasks in the classroom?
4. What is the nature of teachers' and students' code-switching and patterns of language use?

5.2 Research paradigms

A paradigm is a "basic set of beliefs that guides action" (Guba, 1990, p. 17; Creswell, 2009; Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). It is a "coherent collection of propositions about the world, their relative importance, and particular ways of finding out and knowing about them" (Freebody, 2003, p. 38). It is a "perspective about research held by a community of researchers that is based on a set of shared assumptions, concepts, values, and practices" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 33). Theories and concepts are seen as important parts of the paradigm.

A paradigm determines the way a researcher considers his/her research topic, and designs the methods for data collection and analysis. The choice of a research paradigm is "shaped by the discipline area of the students, beliefs and past research experiences" (Creswell, 2009, p. 6). Understanding the basic framework of the paradigms will assist researchers to maintain consistency between the approaches used for data collection. According to Lincoln (2010) the paradigm is significant in research as it tells us something important about the researcher's standpoint, and his/her proposed relationship to other research and it provides insight on what the researcher thinks counts as knowledge.

5.2.1 An interpretive paradigm

An interpretive paradigm has a major regard for understanding the subjective world of human experience. It focuses on the action and begins with the individual. Cohen et al. (2000, 2007) suggest that the "social world can be understood only from the standpoint of the individuals who are part of the on-going action being investigated" (p. 19). The interpretive paradigm, unlike the positivist belief in objectivity and predictability, aims to get inside the person and really understand from within. Creswell (2009) suggests that the goal of this research is to "rely as much as possible on the participants' view of the situation being studied" (p. 8). As an approach to qualitative research, interpretivism "holds assumptions that individuals seek understanding of the world in which they live in and work" (Creswell,

2009, p. 8; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003a). From there it establishes the foundation for understanding individuals' interpretation of the world around them (Cohen, et al., 2000, 2007).

Researchers recognise that their own background contributes to shaping their interpretation. They position themselves in the research to acknowledge how their personal, cultural and historical experiences influence their interpretation (Creswell, 2009). The beliefs held by individual researchers will often determine their choosing either a qualitative or quantitative approach to research. It is with such considerations that qualitative approach was considered appropriate.

5.3 Qualitative research

Qualitative research is concerned with understanding the individual's perceptions, beliefs and opinions of the world. It sets out to present a holistic picture that seeks insights, based on verbal narratives and observations rather than statistical analysis (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 2002; Bell, 1999; Creswell, 2005; McMillan, 2012; Morell & Carroll, 2010). Bateson (1972) suggests that all human beings are guided by principles which combine the beliefs about ontology (the nature of reality) epistemology (ways of knowing) and methodology (methods of acquiring knowledge). It is these beliefs that shape how a qualitative researcher views the world and how he/she acts upon it (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003a).

Qualitative data provide rich, detailed knowledge from "descriptive accounts of the unique lived experiences of the participants to enhance understanding of the particular phenomenon" (Mutch, 2005, p. 19). Locke (2004) further suggests that "empirical data derived from any study cannot be treated as simple, irrefutable facts. They represent hidden assumptions – assumptions the critical researcher must dig out and expose" (p. 37). A qualitative researcher needs to look at things "from the eyes of those being studied" (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 75). This justifies the reason for identifying and presenting the conceptions of the participants in this study.

Crotty (1998) further suggests that researchers must seek to understand the context of the participants by visiting that context, gathering useful information and interpreting what they find, which will be shaped in each case by the researcher's own experiences and background. This justifies the reason for including observation in this study.

5.4 The sample

In this section I present the research process used for this study. I briefly explain my section of the site and the participants for the study.

5.4.1 Site selection

I conducted the research in two national secondary schools in the Solomon Islands, one in Honiara (urban) and the other in the Western Province (rural). It was my intention to include one rural and one urban school to provide two different settings. The selection of these schools was based on the fact that I am familiar with both schools and the authority they are administered under.

It is the policy of the Solomon Islands government that any external research completed in the country is granted permission to proceed by the MEHRD. Therefore a letter was initially sent to the Permanent Secretary of the MEHRD to ask for approval to conduct the research project in the country (Appendix 1). A research application form was completed and attached with the request letter (Appendix 2). After the MEHRD had granted permission (Appendix 3), a letter was sent to the Education Authority of the two secondary schools to seek permission for the research to be carried out in their schools (Appendix 4).

After I gained approval from the educational authority and having had some informal discussion with the principals, a letter was sent to these principals to obtain formal permission to conduct research with teachers and students in their schools (Appendix 5). These letters were sent a month prior to the collection of data.

Having gained permission from the principals, I met with the English teachers individually and explained the purpose of this research. When the teachers all agreed to be involved I provided them with an information letter and consent form (Appendices 6 and 7). I met with students for my focus group interview, explained the research process and provided them with the information letter and their consent forms (Appendices 8 and 9). Electronic copies of the letters and consent forms were also provided as both schools had access to the internet.

5.4.2 Participants

Data collection was done in three stages: an individual semi-structured interview with four English teachers from each school, a focus group interview with eight students per school, and classroom observation of one teacher in each school. The teacher participants from the two schools had from five to 30 years of teaching experience, which provided a very wide range of professional experience, and their age difference also contributed a lot to my findings. There was also gender balance. The students in the two schools were between 14 to 18 years of age, ranging from year 8 to year 13. Codes have been used for both the teacher and student participants. Since I collected data from two schools, one, a rural and the other urban, I have designated teachers in the rural as TR1-TR4 and the teachers in the urban, TU1-TU4. I have used similar numbering for the students, except that I had eight student participants in the rural school (SR1-SR8) and eight in the urban school (SU1-SU8). I also did classroom observation on two of the teacher participants who were also part of my semi-structured interview (TU2 and TR3).

5.5 Data collection methods

Methodologies constitute research designs that affect the choice of methods to be used (Anfara & Mertz, 2006; Cohen et al., 2007). In this context a method is a "range of approaches used in educational research to gather data which are to be used as a basis for inference and interpretation, for explanation and prediction" (Cohen, et al., 2007, p. 47).

In this case, semi-structured interview and classroom observation methods were used in answering the research questions designed for this study.

5.5.1 Interviews

The interview is perhaps the most widely used method of data collection in educational research. According to Cohen et al. (2007), this method enables the researcher and participants to "discuss their interpretations of the world in which they live in, and to express how they regard situations from their own point of view" (p. 349). When carefully administered, interviews provide rich sources of data for the researchers (Anderson, 1990). I used semi-structured interview questions as the major data gathering tool for my study (See Appendix 10 and 11). I conducted individual semi-structured interviews with the English teachers and focus group interviews for students.

5.5.1.1 Semi-Structured Interview

Semi-structured interviews provided the opportunity to explore secondary school students' and English teachers' conceptions and attitudes related to academic English and their language use. Semi-structured interviews seemed appropriate for this research in that rich data could be gathered from discussions about language use in secondary schools and how teachers could best scaffold students' learning in a multilingual context like the Solomon Islands. Knowledge was developed from conversations with the different participants through guided interview questions. It was an interchange of views between two or more people on a topic that was of interest to both parties. The semi-structured interview is specific, focused and flexible where questions are carefully planned, controlled and in line with the research question (Wellington, 2000). Furthermore, interviews provide opportunities for the interviewer to follow up on respondents' answers to get more information, and clarification of vague statements. The topic is introduced by the interviewer who guides the discussion by asking specific questions or by probing (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007; McMillan, 2012; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Wisker, 2001). Probing and prompting the participants enabled me to clarify topics or questions and asking them to

elaborate, clarify or qualify their points in the discussion added richness to the data (Bell, 2005; Cohen et al., 2011). Cohen et al. (2007) mention that these are "some of the hallmarks of successful interviewing" (p. 361).

Mears (2009) further suggests that "an effective interview also requires that the researcher enjoy interacting with people and the researcher must effectively relate to people during interview and while attending to the process" (p. 21). This allows greater understanding of issues and trends relevant to the subject and of the natural contexts of the respondents (August, 2010; Cohen et al., 2007; Patton, 2002). Interviews also enable the interviewer to pick up non-verbal cues such as facial expressions and tones of voice which add depth to the research method.

Wisker (2001) further suggests that, "researchers can elicit almost endless responses that would give a good idea of the variety of ideas and feelings that interviewees have as they would enable them to think and talk longer and show their feelings more fully" (p. 141). Employing the tactic of elicitation was useful in this present study, as it creates a positive atmosphere, where I could elicit important information and ideas from my participants. The skilled interviewer builds trust and rapport with the respondent in that information is possible to obtain, which the individual would not reveal using any other data collection method (Gall et al., 2007). It is an "exciting way of doing strong valuable research" (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009, p. 15).

Participants' natural language expresses their perspectives on the matter being discussed and thus "limits the effect of the researcher's preconceptions and bias and beliefs in directing the line of interviewing" (Burns, 2000, p. 441). The face-to-face interview allows for clarification of discussion points (Cohen et al., 2007). Thus, semi-structured interview is a potential tool to yielding richer information and contents compared to other research methods (Bell, 2005).

5.5.1.2 Focus Group Interviews

I considered the focus group interview as appropriate for my context as it is "economical on time" and less threatening especially for the students (Cohen et al., 2007, p. 376). It is also a good tool to gather information from English teachers who are professionals and have had similar experiences in their teaching careers (Bell, 2005; Cohen et al., 2007). The focus group interview is also a valuable tool in gathering and sharing information related to particular themes or issues. This is made possible from the rich interaction of the group that is guided by the interview questions (Cohen et al., 2007). Creswell (2002) suggests that four to six participants in a focus group interview is the ideal number so that they would feel comfortable to share their ideas rather than having a large group. In this study eight students participated in each focus group interview.

A focus group interview is a positive tool for gathering data whereby questions that are difficult for one person to answer can be expanded and clarified by ideas from others in the group. Ideas will flow from more than one person which will help the researcher gain rich information from the interview. Cohen, et al. (2007) suggest that "participants interact with each other rather than with the interviewer, such that the views of the participants can emerge – the participants' rather than the researcher's agenda can predominate" (p. 376). These are the strengths of the focus group interview, and made it especially appropriate for this study, which used focus group interviews in two secondary schools. The aim was to develop a comprehensive view of students' beliefs about and conceptions of academic English and language use in secondary schools. This was valuable for this study as data from the interviews could be compared to students' actual practice in the classroom which was collected from the classroom observation.

While the semi-structured interview is a powerful implement for researchers (Cohen et al., 2000, 2007), and highly recommended because of its adaptability and appropriateness (Bell, 1999; Cohen et al, 2007),

there are also limitations. It can be an expensive exercise which consumes time of both the researcher and participants (Mears, 2009). It is also open to interviewer bias because of its highly subjective technique (Basit, 2010; Bell, 2005). A form of bias would be the participants answering questions with the answer they think the interviewer would like to hear, thus providing the "official view point rather than the personal view" (Memua, 2011, p. 42).

The quality of data derived from interviews may be affected by the kind of questions they asked (Morse & Field, 1996), or interview fatigue. If an interviewer's questioning is too deep, participants may adopt avoidance. Questioning should be made easy, short and simple, and avoid using academic language which would require further clarification to the respondent (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

Tape recorders are used in an interview to capture the voice of the participants. Using such a device could be problematic when its use is not well prepared for. It could hinder good questioning and listening skills when the researcher depend on it and think that he/she will be able to hear the interview again when transcribing (Davidson & Tolich, 1999)

5.5.2 Classroom observation

Two English teachers and the students in their classes were being observed, one from a rural secondary school and the other from an urban secondary school, with a maximum of three lessons each. The reason for observing these two schools was to get a balanced view of how teachers scaffold their students' learning in the classroom, with particular attention to their teaching practice, language usage and dialogue with their students. I observed the students with the purpose to see their language use in the classroom when communicating with the teacher and their peers. I recorded and transcribed the conversations in the lessons taking particular notice in their language patterns.

A simple modified version of August (2010) technique derived from the Communicative Orientation of Language Teacher Observation Scheme by Spada and Fröhlich (1995) was used during the observation as a way of monitoring teachers' and students' language use (see Appendix 12). Spada and Fröhlich (1995) designed this tool as, "an instrument for observing teaching and learning in ESL classrooms" (p.1). I took particular interest in teachers' and students' code-switching patterns in the lessons observed.

August (2010) suggests that "the findings from the observation schedule would be invaluable evidence of whether or not the teacher's practices aligned with their conceptions and beliefs and what they actually said they did in practice, as gathered from the interviews" (p. 48). I intended to use the COLT to capture teachers' and students' language use in the classroom and assimilate that to their conceptions about language use and what they said they did.

There are also limitations to observations. Classroom observations can be costly in time and effort, and can change behaviour of participants during the observation (Cohen, et al., 2007; Creswell, 2009) and there may be distractions which could lead to important things being missed out (Creswell, 2009). The observation method was not paramount in this research, but it supported what had been mentioned in the interviews as I particularly focused on the language use in the classroom.

By establishing a good rapport with the participants, having a well-planned guideline to what needs to be observed and clearly informing participants of what is to take place in the classroom, the researcher can minimise some of these limitations and maximise the purpose of this research method.

5.6 Data collection procedures

The individual semi-structured interviews were conducted with four English teachers at each school (urban and rural). These interviews were conducted at the times scheduled by the teachers themselves in the venues they were comfortable with. The focus groups of eight students per school were conducted in the staff room on a day when they were not engaged with school appointments. I observed three of the English lessons of one selected teacher from each school to record teachers' and students' language use at intervals of 10 minutes using an observation sheet. I also captured their conversation using a tape recorder and transcribing later.

Teachers' and students' conversation during the interviews and the classroom observations were audio taped and transcribed. This was done while in the Solomon Islands as I had to return the raw data to the participants for comments and confirmation on the transcriptions. Coding and analysis began after all the data were confirmed and corrections made.

5.7 Research quality

Quality in educational research requires the researcher to focus on the accuracy of his/her findings. It must be maintained throughout the research process, irrespective of the paradigm being used (Basit, 2010, Cohen, et al., 2007). The quality of the research can be achieved if the data are reliable, valid and trustworthy, and are triangulated.

5.7.1 Triangulation

Triangulation is used in order to gather the best data, in that qualitative researchers will gather rich description of the interested area. Brewer and Hunter (2006) stated that the multi-method approach allows investigators to "attack a research problem with an arsenal of methods that have non-overlapping weaknesses in addition to their complementary strengths" (p. 4). This multi-method approach covers qualitative research techniques

such as interviewing, participant observation and interpretive analysis where different sources of information can be combined to address the same research question (Cohen, et al., 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003a, 2003b; McMillan, 2012). Triangulation is expected to enhance the researcher's ability and effort to assess the accuracy of the findings and thus assure the reader that they are reliable (Bell, 1999; Creswell, 2009; Mertler, 2009). It adds quality when multiple sources of data are used to study a particular phenomenon (King & Horrocks, 2010).

In this study, the semi-structured interviews (individual and focus groups) and observations added quality to my research, because I was able to observe my participants language use in the classroom and observe whether what they had told me in the interviews aligned with their actual practices in the classroom. Triangulation checked for consistency in my findings and gave me as researcher increased confidence (Cohen, et al., 2007, 2011).

5.7.2 Validity and reliability

Validity is a key concept in research. There must be demonstrable cohesion between the conceptual framework's methods, approaches and techniques, so that they really fit in and measure the issues being researched (Gibbs, as cited in Creswell, 2009). Reliability is another essential concept, and involved scrutinising research in terms of its accuracy and making sure that data is free from error, especially in the interpretation of the results. McMillan (2012) suggests that reliability is "a necessary condition for validity. That is, scores cannot be valid unless they are reliable" (p. 143). Stiles (1993) reiterates that reliability refers to trustworthiness of observations or data, while validity refers to the trustworthiness of interpretations or conclusions.

Validity and reliability ensure that the researcher is able to reassure his/her audience about the trustworthiness of the data. The researcher aims at understanding and interpreting the world in terms of those concerned (Burns, 1995; Cohen et al., 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Lincoln and Guba (1985), Mears (2009) and Shenton (2004) further argue that validity and reliability in the qualitative paradigm must draw on its credibility, transferability, dependability and conformability to determine the value of the study, both in the process and findings. Mears (2009) also suggests that "[w]hat is valid in interview research is the degree to which it illuminates what it claims to inform, what credibly captures and portrays the meaning and significance of representative participants' perspectives on set of events and experience" (p. 25).

Credibility of the research findings can be gained through prolonged engagement and persistent observation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This requires the researcher to spend quality time with the participants considering their performance in their lessons. August (2010) suggests that the "persistent observer can identify the characteristics and details that are most relevant to the issue being investigated" (p. 51). However, in this study I could not really sustain prolonged classroom observations because of limited availability of time.

Bell (1999), Creswell (2009) and McMillan (2012) noted the importance of participants rechecking the data and the interpreted meanings as this contributes to both reliability and validity of those evidences. Respondent feedback is also important to prove how well the interpretations fit their lived experience. This allows participants a stronger voice in how they are presented. King and Horrocks (2010) suggest that "it can be a useful element in strengthening the quality of analysis" (p. 163).

The participants were provided with the data to review and gave their feedback. Consideration and thought were exercised regarding any bias that would limit the validity and reliability of this study, and care was taken when asking questions and probing during the interview, as well as in the classroom observations.

5.7.3 Trustworthiness

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) trustworthiness allows the researcher to reassure his/her audiences that the findings are valuable and worth paying attention to. The questions asked and the arguments based on the findings need to be effective. Thus Bell (1999) suggests that "efforts should be made to cross-check findings, and in a more extensive study, to use more than one method of data-collecting" (p. 102). This relates to the credibility of the research which was discussed earlier. Questions that should be asked are: "Are the themes and patterns that emerge from the data credible, accurate, consistent and meaningful?" and "Does the researcher have confidence in the results and conclusions?" (McMillan, 2012). If the answers to these questions are positive then undoubtedly the data and the analysis of the findings can be considered trustworthy.

However, if the research evidence is not trustworthy, findings based on it will be questioned (Eisenhart, 2006). The triangulated data in this research contributes and adds quality to this research, enabling it to gain the trust of those who will find it important in their learning. Quality time spent with my two supervisors added credibility to this research as we reviewed and analysed all the findings.

5.8 Ethical considerations

Ethical issues permeate interview research where knowledge produced depends on the social relationship of interviewer and interviewee (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Because the objects of interviews are human beings extreme care must be taken to avoid harm to the participants (Fontana & Frey, 2005). The interviewer must ensure that the respondent is comfortable, free and safe to discuss privately, and understands that what is said will be recorded for later public use. Respect for the person involves "recognising the personal dignity and autonomy of individuals" and it is exercised through an informed consent process (Buchanan, 2008, p. 397). This "requires a delicate balance between the interviewer's

concern for pursuing interesting knowledge and ethical respect for the integrity of the interview subject" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 16).

Ethics are concerned with right or wrong. The ultimate reason for abiding to research ethics is to ensure that both parties are happy and satisfied during the course of data collection process (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). A qualitative study needs to be able to assure that no harm is done to the participants and that there may be benefits expected from their participation in the study. The ethical principle of "beneficence" is important as the participant deserves respect from the researcher. Beneficence is an "obligation to protect persons form harm by maximizing anticipated benefits and minimising possible risk for research" (Buchanan, 2008, p. 397). The researcher must be aware that the openness and intimacy of such qualitative research may be seductive and can lead participants to disclose information that they may later regret (Kvale, 1996; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). The researcher must ensure that s/he is sensitive and committed to the moral issues and actions. Eisner and Peshkin (1990) suggest that researchers need to be sensitive when identifying ethical issues and prepare to be responsible and committed to act appropriately according to such issues. Informed consent, privacy, anonymity and confidentiality and consideration for socio-cultural sensitivity are crucial elements of research ethics.

5.8.1 Informed consent
It is important that the participants are informed about the purpose of the investigation and what is to take place because this respects the rights of the respondents (Cohen et al., 2011). As a researcher I was able to tailor the explanations so that students and teachers easily understood the interview process and what would be involved. The participants were informed of possible risks and benefits from participating in the research project and they were fully aware that they had the right to withdraw at a time which would be agreed upon (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

A clear explanation was provided of the objectives, procedures, confidentiality, potential benefits and likely risks of this research were given to potential participants. Those who chose to take part then completed the consent form when they fully understood the nature of the research (Appendices 7 and 9). It was made clear that participation was voluntary, that I respected their decisions, and that they would not be disadvantaged in any way. This was tested in my research in the urban school when two of my participants withdrew after hearing the explanation of the procedures because they decided they were not confident to participate. I respected their right to withdraw, and two other students were selected to replace them. All the teacher participants willingly participated in the research including the classroom observations. With informed consent comes confidentiality.

5.8.2 Privacy, anonymity and confidentiality
In the research context, confidentiality means not disclosing data that could identify participant. However, anonymity is quite difficult to maintain, and care must be taken when using names unless it is the desire of the respondent that his/her full name is credited. The protection of respondents' privacy by changing their names and identifying features is important when reporting interviews (Cohen, et al., 2007; Creswell, 2009; Kvale, 1996; McMillan, 2012). Participants must be informed as to who will have access to the data, where the tapes will be stored if interviews are recorded and how transcripts will be anonymised.

All steps were taken to ensure that the data obtained in this research were kept confidential to the participants, the researcher and the supervisors. The participants were assured prior to the interview, that the information provided would be confidential and used only for the purpose of the research. Individual codes were used for the participants to conceal their identities. No school was named. During the research, utmost care was taken to protect the participants from any significant risk. It has been anticipated that during the interviews the participants might at times offer unsolicited negative, evaluative comments about their administrators,

colleagues, students, or other aspects affecting them personally within the school environment. However, such comments were treated as confidential and only those selected for research purposes were reported. Any further information that might endanger a participant's career was concealed.

5.8.3 Socio-cultural sensitivity

The Solomon Islands is a country with diverse cultures and ethnicities and it was essential for me to consider the welfare of those I came in contact with. Great care and sensitivity must be adhered to. I was also aware of the school culture and because I was familiar with church schools, I was very careful when contacting and requesting permission to research in the two schools, while conducting interviews, observing and just simply my personal presentation while in the schools. The most important thing was for me as a teacher to be a role model to my students and a friendly colleague to the other teachers.

5.8.4 Researcher positioning

> Doing participant observation or interviewing one's peers raises ethical problems that are directly related to the nature of the research technique employed. The degree of openness or closure of the nature of the research and its aims is one that directly faces the teacher researcher. (Hitchcock & Hughes, as cited in Cohen, et al., 2007, p. 69)

Another issue that requires reflection is the positioning of the teacher as a researcher, researching people I know in my own organisation. I was conscious that the interviews and classroom observations could influence the response and cause discomfort to the participants. However, I set boundaries and aimed for the desired outcome of obtaining important information pertaining to the study. Cohen, et al. (2007) suggest that involving the "development of a sense of rapport between researchers and their subjects will lead to feelings of trust and confidence" (p. 69). Finally, in any research the researcher will definitely encounter methodological and ethical issues that are "inextricably interwoven" in qualitative or interpretative research (Cohen, et al., 2007, p. 69).

5.9 Data analysis

Qualitative data analysis is making sense of the data, and involves organising, accounting for and explaining (Cohen, et al., 2007), inductive and interpretative (Wellington, 2000), continual reflection and asking analytical questions (Creswell, 2009). Findings from qualitative data are generated from the raw data, coded, analysed and transformed into new knowledge (Burns, 2000; Creswell, 2009). There is more than one strategy for analysing data (Burns, 2000; Cohen et al., 2007; Creswell, 2009) but this study adopted the thematic analysis approach (McMillan, 2012).

The raw data were coded and later I looked for relationships and patterns, interpreted the findings, synthesised the information and drew conclusions from the findings (McMillan, 2012) which is the integral part of thematic analysis (Bell, 2005; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Mutch, 2005). Mutch (2005) further suggests that this approach is suitable for analysing and reporting qualitative interview data. I found thematic analysis particularly helpful when I had huge amounts of transcribed data from both teachers and students. Grouping the codes into similar categories contributed to the emerging themes on teachers' and students' conceptions, practices and their proficiencies in the English language and these brought meaning and value to the research.

5.10 Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the qualitative approach of research methodologies taken in this study to answer the research questions. It was an appropriate approach as it was essential to gather perceptions, beliefs, experiences and expectations of the participants about their language use in secondary schools. Triangulation was important for maintaining the, validity, reliability and credibility of the research. This added quality to the work. Ethical considerations were paramount and as a researcher I ensured that no harm was done to the participants and that both parties involved were satisfied. Because the study was focused on language use in secondary schools, the schools selected were able to provide ample

information in answer to the research questions. The next chapter will present the findings gathered using the methods and approaches discussed in this chapter.

CHAPTER SIX
FINDINGS

6.1 Introduction

The overall aim of this study is to understand how Solomon Islands English teachers and students view language use in secondary school classrooms. This discussion will be divided into three key areas including teachers' and students' beliefs about the place of English in secondary schools, their perceptions of reported practices, and their observed behaviours. This chapter will discuss teachers' data first and then students' data.

6.2 Teachers' knowledge about language policy

It is important to begin this investigation with an understanding of teachers' knowledge of language policy, because this often affects the nature of practices that teachers engage in. While the teachers demonstrated an incomplete view of the current education policy, they all understood that in the current policy, English should be used as the sole language of instruction in Solomon Islands classrooms. This is reflected in two of the teachers' statements.

TU2: I only knew that English was a compulsory subject for the Solomon Islands and it should be taught [through] speaking in English in class.

TR1: In the Solomon Islands, especially our curriculum, English language is compulsory.

Three of the teachers acknowledged the importance of English as an instructional tool for learning. They commented that the policy emphasised the importance of English as the language of the classroom.

TU3: The emphasis was basically on the instruction by teachers; the instructional language is English.

TU1: I think the policy of the Solomon Islands states that teachers must speak in English inside the classroom and students too must speak in English in the classroom. This

occurs when giving explanation or just basically talks [*sic*] with students inside or outside the classroom.

TR2: What I understand about the education policy of Solomon Islands is that English should be the medium of instruction in classroom. Every teacher is encouraged to use English in the classrooms, particularly inside the classroom during their teaching and when they give instructions to their students.

6.2.1 English teachers' personal views of language policy

All of the teachers shared the view that there were issues around implementing the English-only policy. The teachers in both schools identified that teachers do not always follow the language policy that excludes languages other than English.

TR4: Not everybody teaches in English in a school setting. The English teachers are forced to teach in the English language, but not everybody does it.

TR1: But [at] some of these schools not all teachers speak in English in class. I think only teachers teaching English, those are the only ones...maybe or in majority are using English.

Two teachers suggested that student language use was not always "policed".

TU3: The instructional language is English in the classroom. While it is very very difficult to police it outside but inside, inside classroom, English is a must. We must use the language.

TU1: But as you can see, we do not really follow this policy because at times teachers teach using English in the classroom but the students answer to the teachers in Pijin.

TR3 expressed the view that teachers encouraged students to speak English.

TR3: They would encourage students to speak in English, but that is just like a cliché. And in my experience, teachers would encourage students to speak in English but they don't enforce it somehow.

TR3's perception seems to be that teachers should do a better job in controlling the language use of students, by the use of the term "cliché".

TU2's view of teachers of subjects other than English not using English is strongly negative.

> TU2: While I am trying to emphasise English speaking and English teaching in the class, other teachers are not very cooperative. They just keep on teaching using the Pijin which really gets on my nerves sometimes. If we say that English is a compulsory subject then it should be compulsory for all teachers, but this is not the case. Most do not teach in English.

While all of the English teachers expressed similar views in relation to the importance of English as the language of instruction in their subject classrooms, four were of the view that the amount of experience the teachers have may influence their choice of language use at school. TU3 felt that younger teachers were more likely to use Pijin. His comments are also negative.

> TU3: The policy may be there, but teachers are not carrying it out, okay, in the classroom. As I can see over the years, what I see now is it's getting worse now with our young teachers. A lot of teachers now "new" …, are not sticking to that whatever policy may have on the language because they switch back and forth and most times they just explain in Pijin.

It seems that teachers who were educated during the period when English was mandated as the language of instruction, and who were taught by native speakers of English were more concerned about maintaining English as the sole language of the classroom. The next sections will focus on teachers' beliefs about the place of other languages in student learning, and their language practices in the classroom.

6.3 Teachers' views on language use in the classroom

This section discusses the teachers' understandings of academic English, and language use in the secondary school classroom.

6.3.1 Teachers' beliefs about the place of other languages in the classroom

The teachers expressed two views about the importance of Pijin/vernacular languages in education. They either affirmed the strong positive outcome of students using vernacular in the English classroom, or they felt that other languages should only be used in early childhood and primary school level education. At the same time, however, six teachers acknowledged the place of Pijin in the classrooms.

When the teachers were asked about how they viewed their students' language practices TU1 explained that allowing their students to use their vernacular assisted in their use of English.

> TU1: Some students, when they learn in their own vernacular and they translate to English their writing is accurate.

TU2 expressed a similar view. She mentioned noticing students in the rural school writing more effectively than those in some of the urban schools. When asked why this might be, she explained that the students used their vernacular to translate and interpret the English content. She saw this as an enabling process.

> TU2: What I find with vernacular is the students understand it better. From vernacular they are able to interpret in English and their English is written well in comparison to students using Pijin in town.

Furthermore, TU2 felt that there was an advantage for students using their vernacular.

> TU2: So what I see is that from [vernacular] language to English is easier with the connection. The way they think enables them to connect themselves and express themselves in their writing. Although in their speaking it is a bit difficult, especially with the accent and pronunciation. But when they organise their thoughts and put it on paper, [it] is far better than those students who use Pijin and English and put it on paper.

TU2 saw the importance of the vernacular but not Pijin in the learning of the English curriculum.

TU2: I think they should improve the English curriculum by involving other languages in the Solomon Islands for the students to learn. Why not have one in the Solomon Islands, for example the Guadalcanal language because it is the main language [dialect]. We teach it as well as use it. I think it will help the students avoid sentences they make up because of the influence of Pijin.

TU2 had the view Pijin was having a negative impact to the learning of English, but did not state why. This may have been a result of the negative views commonly held about Pijin.

TU4 and TU1 reiterated TU2's view on this subject when talking about language transfer.

TU4: I tend to think that the students who come to school think in a local language but they write in English.

TU1: When the students do this, the meaning of their writing is okay and their essay is similar in meaning but written well in English.

TR2 felt that Pijin/vernacular language should be used because of the benefits of being able to tap into the students' stronger language to support learning in English.

TR2: I think there is a role for other languages in the English curriculum. It helps especially the slow learners to understand what you are saying, then you use other languages to explain it to them, simplify it to them.

One teacher, TU3, offered the view that the use of Pijin/vernacular in education is appropriate, provided that it occurs only in childhood and primary levels.

TU3: While some may argue that you need to switch back to vernacular, I think it is more relevant in the very lower forms, very young students, because they do not have that background, so you need to get back to what they can understand in order to develop their concepts….But as the students develop, and the higher you become especially the secondary, I think there should be the need to emphasise the English language.

The teachers were further questioned about what language the students felt most comfortable using. The majority of teachers felt that Pijin was their preference. TU1 and TU2 stated the following.

TU1: These students are more comfortable to speak Pijin rather than English inside the classroom. I mean to express their views inside the classroom, their answers, and express themselves. They are comfortable with using Pijin.

TU2: If I have them speak in English they are not expressive. But if I allow them to speak in Pijin the expressions come out very clearly. Their creativity is displayed very well.

Four teachers mentioned that students articulated their views well when they used Pijin because it helped them to clearly understand concepts. They emphasized the importance of providing an avenue for the students to do so. One teacher's comment illustrates this clearly.

TU4: It is good to have someone express his or her idea in the language in which he or she is confident.

The teachers' views demonstrate that while they favoured English-only instruction in the classroom, they also accepted the use of other languages. The teachers articulated their beliefs about the place of Pijin/vernacular in the English curriculum and the positive attitudes related to L1 use. It was felt that Pijin was the strongest language of the students in the classroom. Sometimes this was at odds with what they had earlier stated.

6.3.2 Teachers' perceptions about the place of code-switching in secondary schools

Code-switching is a common practice in secondary schools in the Solomon Islands. When asked specifically about their views on code-switching practices in the classroom, all teachers expressed negative views about its effect on students' learning of academic English. This is also somewhat at odds with some of their statements above. Whilst TU2 acknowledged the use of students' L1 in providing explanations, she felt that it also caused confusion.

TU2: I think code-switching is not good because you will confuse the students' thinking at times. I find it brings confusion to

66

the students, especially to those students who concentrate well in class and they find that you switch between languages. That to the students will be confusing.

She suggested that a better way of explaining difficult concepts to students is through translation.

TU2: What I think is you explain the concept well in English and then stop and start again explaining using Pijin. That I see will work well and the example in Pijin will clarify the theory, rather than going back and forth. Bright students will not find a problem but the average will be affected.

She clearly did not see code-switching and translation on the same continuum, but rather as very different instructional strategies.

TR2 and TU4 articulated the view that code-switching would impact negatively on students' use and proficiency in English.

TR2: Students' confidence in speaking English will be affected. They would always want to speak in Pijin. And as time goes on they will forget the English and they go ahead with Pijin and that is not helping them in their academic English, because as I said earlier on, they think in Pijin but they want to say it in English and they find it very difficult.

TU4: If we start code-switching, their English will go down; it will go down the drain.

One teacher felt that Pijin could be used outside the classroom but inside the classroom, English should be prioritised.

TU4: There might be room for code-switching outside the normal school hours but as a rule we should not allow code-switching in the classroom. Even though we know it is happening we should discourage teachers from code-switching.

Three teachers also believed that code-switching led to language interference, where patterns from Pijin were transferred to English. This was observed by TR3 in examinations.

TR3: But I think the problem there is that the students do not know how to switch their thinking back in to English, so they use the same word I used [Pijin] in their answer in the English exam.

The next section probes teachers' views on language use issues further by exploring what they feel are the factors impacting on students' language use.

6.3.3 Teachers' perceptions about factors impacting on students' language use

The teachers from both schools acknowledged that while English is a compulsory subject in secondary schools and is expected to be the language of instruction, there are still barriers that hinder student learning of this subject. It is likely that as English is not the students' L1, they will inevitably experience difficulties operating in that medium. Pijin is widely used in most homes, especially in the urban communities, while in the rural areas; both Pijin and the students' vernaculars are usually used. (See Appendix 12). TR1 emphasised that English is solely the language of the classroom; elsewhere however, other languages dominate.

> TR1: They only speak English during English class and that's all. The rest of the day they speak Pijin or their own languages.

Furthermore, the teachers explained that the students viewed English as being less important because it is not their L1 and is not spoken widely outside the school.

> TU3: Some students think and may have this mentality that it is not really important to learn English. Because when they get out in the real world, out here for example in the offices, in the government for example, you speak to the people behind the desk in Pijin, the lingua franca. You do not speak in English and that is one setback, because they don't see it as a language that is important when you really get to the local setting here, especially Honiara.

> TU2: They use the language as a third language. It is not their first. So having it as a third language they don't see it as important.

The majority of teachers from both schools commented that a lot of students are reluctant to attempt to speak English in the presence of their peers because they fear ridicule. In this respect, a culture appears to have developed in schools.

TU2: They are not confident. They are afraid that their friends might laugh at them.

TU1: They are scared of others in the class who will make fun and laugh at them. The students know how to speak it, but they are shy to speak it because others might laugh at them.

TR3: This is our culture but [I] don't totally believe that [it] can be remedied; that's when somebody wants to talk in English, students laugh [and] they make comments. So laughing and spoiling kids in the class who want to speak in English is a barrier.

The fact that students are adolescents would undoubtedly contribute to this phenomenon.

The teachers' frequent use of Pijin in the classroom is likely to contribute to stigmatising English use. The view that using Pijin in the class weakens students' enthusiasm to use English as the language of instruction was expressed by TR2.

TR2: Teachers ourselves, we lack being role models to the students. Teachers are not speaking in English, so why should we speak in English? That is the kind of mentality students have when teachers lack being a role model for them.

The teachers may not be role models in the classroom because they themselves lack proficiency and confidence in using the language. The effect of students listening to others using incorrect English was identified by TR4.

TR4: By listening to people not using some of the words correctly, or the phrase; expressions not right, but because they listen to it all the time they think it's right, so they will tend to use it in their writing, but it's not right.

The task is not simple. Students have two types of skills that they must learn in order to function in English as school: to learn how to communicate using English and to learn English as an academic subject.

6.3.4 Aspects of academic English

Having knowledge of academic English is important for students in secondary schools. The teachers believed that by mastering the basic skills in English, (reading, writing, listening and speaking), students will also improve their writing. TU2, TU3 and TU4 viewed writing as a process which improved students' level of academic English writing, and that their writing ability improved when teachers supported them to write and highlighted their common errors. Furthermore, by providing students with samples of good academic writing, and emphasising why these were outstanding, students would then be able to try their best to strengthen their own writing.

> TU3: I think because we teach them the skills, we teach them the skills that we expect in writing, so naturally they will have to try and come up with a piece of writing that meets the requirements.

Ensuring that the overall school programme is well structured and that the students' skills are built sequentially throughout the years of their secondary schooling was an important consideration that TU2 suggested.

> TU2: If they have a good background in their primary level with good teachers teaching them well, it influences how well they write throughout the years.

Three teachers (TU2, TR2 & TR4) felt that reading also helped students with their writing, but expressed their disappointment at the students' lack of interest in reading. They felt this may be due to a lack of encouragement at home to read more books. Nurturing a love of reading was a point clearly articulated by these teachers.

> TU2: A student who loves to read when he is small and continues in high school with the habit of writing, it really shows in his writing.

> TR2: Parents take interest in them so they buy them books, so they do a lot of reading at home. They are the ones who can write effectively in English.

> TR4: Not enough reading done. Maybe that's why they are not good in writing.

The teachers acknowledged that performing well in English supports student learning in the other subjects across the curriculum and beyond school in their workplaces. TR1, TR3 and TU3 emphasised this point.

> TR1: I think to improve academically students need to learn English, because English is the basis of learning other subjects in this school. If they do not know how to use English, they will not understand science, maths and other subjects written in English, so academically if they get the idea or basic of English they can understand other subjects.

> TR3: I have sort of formed up a basis already that those who are good in English in their skill in reading and understanding English, they should do well in Social Science, Arts subjects.

> TU3: A person who has a good grasp of academic English language is more prone to succeed in whatever area of studies, whether it is the language or any other field for that matter, because as I see it, there is a high correlation between that and the other fields of study.

Overall, from this section on teachers' beliefs an emerging pattern about the teachers' views seems to be that Pijin is interfering with English learning in schools. The teachers felt that the relationship between the two languages was one of tension and therefore, the two languages could not occupy the same space.

6.4 Teachers' perceptions regarding their practice

This section will present the teachers' self- reports of their language use.

6.4.1 Teachers' reported language use of Pijin and code-switching

Six of the eight teachers expressed the view that they used Pijin to explain concepts to students. While they acknowledged that English should be the medium of instruction, they found that the students became confused when they used English to explain concepts. They reverted to Pijin to make the concepts clearer for students, and did this when they received cues from the students that they did not understand the concepts. TU1 and TR2 explained this.

TU1: As an English teacher I try my best to speak English when I teach in the class, but then if I know, and I can feel it when my students do not understand a concept I want to put across to my students in class I use Pijin.

TR2: I do not give instructions in Pijin unless I see the students are confused. That is when I would switch to the language that they better understand.

Four other teachers used Pijin in a similar manner. While they preferred speaking English, they did not use it all the time because the students did not understand some of the English words and concepts. One of them mentioned using translating and paraphrasing in Pijin.

TR1: When I teach them, I do not always use English in the class because some of the words I use they do not understand, so I have to translate that in Pijin because we do not have dictionaries for the last five years. I have to find ways how I can explain to them that word in Pijin.

TU2 used English most of the time, but acknowledged that she only used Pijin to explain grammar rules.

TU2: They find it very difficult to understand concepts especially with grammar rules. I really have to come down to their level and sometimes I have to explain it in Pijin for them to understand.

TR4 claimed that she used English as much as possible, because she felt that students did not get much instruction in English, but also reported switching to Pijin when students did not understand words or concepts.

TR4: Ok, personally I try to use English as much as possible, every time. However, sometimes I switch, but I tried to make it the language in the class, because I feel that maybe in other classes they do not get their instruction in English, so that is why I tried my best. Only when I feel that they do not understand me that I speak in Pijin. But mostly I speak in English.

In contrast, two of the English teachers were adamant that they neither used Pijin for explaining concepts to students nor in communicating with students in the class. They used other teaching strategies to scaffold the

English language, such as repeating explanations and providing more English activities for students. TU3 emphasised that he strictly used English, because he felt that an important role of an English teacher was to promote the learning of the subject.

> TU3: I do not switch to Pijin and then come back to English, you know code-switching. I think as an English teacher I have to maintain that to my students that this is the language of teaching, and we must live up to the requirements, expectations of the teacher.

TU4 mentioned that he repeated explanations or used other approaches to scaffold English language learning. He also saw the importance of being a role model to his students in using English.

> TU4: I stand in the classroom or sometimes outside the classroom as someone who uses English all the time, so that is like my motto. I say I am the mentor [and] I must inspire them in everything that I do. And I find that when I talk to the students in English they learn and they respond.

More than half of all the teachers acknowledged that code-switching helped them when explaining and connecting difficult concepts to students.

> TR2: I switch from that same concept, or that same word or example I try to give in English. I try to do it in other languages so that other people can really understand it.

> TR4: Ok, normally it's explaining something, maybe a word they don't understand, so you switch to Pijin. That's normally what I do.

Thus, most teachers resorted to using another language, usually Pijin, to assist them in explaining concepts to students and simplifying difficult vocabulary.

6.5 Teachers' observed practices

This last section will report on the language teaching practices of two teachers, TU2 and TR1, who had acknowledged they used both Pijin and English in the classroom. Each teacher was observed in three lessons. TR1 was observed teaching form one and two (Year 7 and 8) classes in

the rural school and TU2 was observed in form four and six (Year 10 and 12) classes in the urban school. The teachers' language practices are discussed in five categories: questioning, explaining, translating, sharing texts aloud and communicating ideas with students. These will now be discussed.

6.5.1 Questioning

Both teachers in the two schools used English and Pijin when questioning their students. In this first example TU2 read the question in English from the text and asked the same question again using Pijin.

Example 1:

TU2: The next question there… Why does the poet use uncivil to describe government employees? *Why na hem usim the word uncivil for civil servants*? It is just asking for what you think.

[The next question there…Why does the poet use uncivil to describe government employees? *Why did he use the word uncivil for civil servants?* It is just asking for what you think].

In another utterance TU2 read the instruction in the text in English but reiterated it in a question form in Pijin; before moving back to English to provide the students with clues as to where to find the answer in the text. He then switched back to Pijin to repeat the question.

Example 2:

TU2: Explain in your own words one of the uncivil thought. *Wat na wanfala lo oketa uncivil thoughts?* Your clue is the fourth and the fifth line. *Wat na samfala uncivilised samting wea ota civil servants or public servants save doim? Iumi save se 'yo uncivilised'* but refer that to government.

[Explain in your own words one of the uncivil thoughts. *What is one of those uncivil thoughts*? Your clue is the fourth and the fifth line. *What are some uncivilised things which the civil servants or public servants used to do? We used to say 'uncivilised'* but refer that to government].

In the example above, it is interesting to note that the teacher uses Pijin for the substantive parts of the utterance focusing on the nature of the task.

In the next example TR1 resorted to questioning in Pijin after a lengthy attempt at prompting his students to answer his question. He asked the same question in English three times, but there was no clearly articulated answer. Below is the extract of how he questioned the students.

Example 3:

TR1: Why does the Lifeline writer suggest that it is a good idea for the girl to postpone her marriage? Why? Because what? Why does the lifeline writer suggest it is a good idea for the girl to postpone her marriage? (pause). Ok Melody, your answer, what do you think? Why? Question is why? (pause) Suggestions, Lifeline gave a suggestion. Why does the Lifeline writer suggest that it is a good idea for the girl to postpone her marriage? (pause) Do you understand the question? *Wat na kuestin hem minim?* (pause) *Kuesten hem olsem, why na laeflaen raeta sujestim dat hem gud aedia fo gele ia fo muvum na wat?*

[*What does the question mean*? (pause) *The question is, why does the lifeline writer suggest that it is a good idea for the girl to move the what*?]

Ss: Marriage

TR1: *Fo muvum na marit blo hem go lo nara taem*. Why?

[*To move her marriage to another time*. Why?].

Ss: *Bikos hem no graduate yet*.

[*Because she has not yet graduated*].

TR1: No not only about graduation. Because what?

S: Because her feelings may change.

TR1: Okay, because her feelings may change. Good!

Interestingly, the students (indicated by Ss) provided a clear choral answer to his question in English. He then provided an elaboration in Pijin of their one word response. When he asked another question, "why?", the students produced a choral response in Pijin. The subsequent interaction reverted to English presumably because the students now appeared to be "on track".

In the following example, TU2 asked questions in English and probed further with leading questions, in Pijin. This was done to prompt the students to give the teacher the answer.

Example 4:

TU2:   In their culture what happens? Who does the food preparation? *Mumi ia nomoa? O evri wan*? Everyone has to work together? What do we learn from their marriage? What do we learn from the relationship of women in this culture? If I continue talking I'll tell you the answer.

[In their culture what happens? Who does the food preparation? *Is it just the mother, or everyone*? Everyone has to work together? What do we learn from their marriage? If I continue talking I'll tell you the answer].

In this next example, it appeared that TR1 used a directive, first in English then in Pijin, to focus the students' attention on how they might answer the question. He then repeated the question, again in English.

Example 5:

TR1:   The malubi³ rice. Look at that, that's the method how *bae iumi preparem. Lukim method lo dea.* How many methods are there?

[The malubi rice. Look at that, that's the method *how we will prepare it. Look at the method*. How many methods are there?].

In example 6 below, TR1 predominantly used Pijin for the questions but worked to elicit a response from students in English which was the target vocabulary item, ingredients.

Example 6:

TR1:   *Ten fala ways bae iu folom fo iu cum up wetem, completem an kukim na wat*?

[*Ten ways you need to follow in order to come up with, complete and cook the what*?].

Ss: Malubi rice

---

³ A recipe of rice with mixed vegetables, tuna and soya sauce.

TR1: Malubi rice (pause) *hao for kukim malubi rice hem na method lo dea. Wat iu nidim fo kukim na malubi rice hem na wat ia…*?

[Malubi rice (pause) *how to cook the malubi rice is the method. What you need to cook the malubi rice is the…*?].

Ss: Ingredients

Following the students' response, TR1 chose Pijin to elaborate on the meaning and significance of the word "ingredients" and summed up using English.

Example 7:

TR1: The ingredients *ota samting wea iu nidim fo mekem na malubi rice. Iu no ken jes se food.* Don't just say food, be specific, malubi rice. Okay let's look at the method there.

[The ingredients *are the things that you need to prepare the malubi rice. Do not just say food*].

The following interaction began in the same way as Example 4 with Pijin being used to ask a leading question.

Example 8:

TR1: What does it mean by "they share the same stream"? *Ota sharim, ota digim nara half go lo dea, nara half ota digim cum disaed*?

[What does it mean by "they share the same stream"? *Did they share? Did they dig half of the stream to one side and the other half to this side*?].

Ss: No

The teacher then began the question sequence by repeating question in English. The students provided the answer in Pijin and then the teacher summed it up in English.

Example 9:

TR1: No. So what does it mean they share the same stream?

S: *Ota washim calico lo same stream but no save tok lo each other.*

[*They wash their clothes in the same stream but they do not talk to each other*].

TR1: Okay, they use it; they wash their clothes in the same stream but they never talk to each other (pause) good.

In the next example below, the teacher's initial questioning was in English; however, in his third utterance he began questioning in English, but further probed using Pijin to confirm their understanding of the term "jaw dropped". This time the students answered in English, and he continued by summing up the question in English.

Example 10:

TR1: What was the expression of Mary?
Ss: Surprised.
TR1: What did the story say?
Ss: Her jaw dropped.
TR1: Her jaw dropped. What does it mean? *Jaw blo hem fall out from maos blo hem*?

[Her jaw dropped. What does it mean? *Did her jaw fall out from her mouth*?].
Ss: No.
TR1: What does it mean?
Ss: Surprised.
TR1: She was what?
Ss: Surprised.
TR1: Yes she was surprised… mouth opened… it dropped because she was surprised of this bridge.

The teacher worked to link the expression "jaw dropped" with its meaning and used primarily English to do this. However, in the middle of the interaction he reverted to Pijin using leading questions as in examples 4, 5 and 9.

In the following example, TU2 set the scene in Pijin, recounting what happened in the story, and then switched to English to ask the students a question. The students gave one word responses and the teacher further questioned in English.

Example 11:

TU2: And then we come to the last chapter. There is a message about the funeral. *This fala man ia hem kam carem kam na wail sound of the night. Hem pronounce lo village wea*

death hem kam. And then he pronounces the name and this particular old man has died. What is his name?

[And then we come to the last chapter. There is a message about the funeral. *This man brought a wailing sound of the night pronouncing to the village where there's death*. And then he pronounces the name and this particular old man has died. What is his name?]

Ss: Ezuedo

T: Ezuedo, he dies and he has status in the village (pause) what is his status?

Ss: Warrior (chorus)

Perhaps she questioned about the character's name in English as it was an easy answer to give, as was the answer about the character's status.

6.5.2 Explaining

The teachers acknowledged during the interview that they code-switched to Pijin when providing explanations to students about concepts the students did not understand. This was observed in three of the lessons taught by the two teachers. TU2 gave out a descriptive writing task for her form four (year 10) students to complete. She set the scene for the students, about a hunting trip and the students had to complete the story describing their experiences falling into a deep hole. The teacher then walked around the class checking on the students, during which some of them repeatedly asked the teacher to explain to them individually. The difficulty the students experienced was how to begin the writing task. Thus, TU2 code-switched in this next example to clarify how she set up the task as the teacher, and what the students needed to do to fulfil the task.

Example 12:

TU2:   Okay remember, some are confused here. Dis *wan hem scene blo iu nomoa ba* (pause) *me setim for iu.* You can start off with your introduction using this scenario *wea me mekem finis. Iu can jes addim moa detail lo hem fo example*, "One day I am in a forest with this group of people travelling looking for pigs, suddenly I trip off myself to a deep dark hole…" and then you continue from what happens. Another way to do it is *scene hem set finis lo dea so me continuem story blo me from hia nomoa* (pause) *iumi clear? Iumi clear?*

[Okay remember some are confused here. *This is just your scene* (pause) *I am setting it for you.* You can start off with your introduction using the scenario *which I have made. You can just add more details to it, for example*, "One day I am in a forest with this group of people travelling looking for pigs; suddenly I trip off myself to a deep dark hole…" and then you continue from what happens. Another way to do it is the scene is already set there *so I will continue my story from there* (pause) *is it clear? Is it clear*?].

Ss: Yes!

She appeared to use Pijin to focus students' attention and understanding of the functions we saw in the previous examples. It may have been that because the story beginning was in English the teacher switched back to English after the lengthy explanation in Pijin.

This next example is similar to example 11, where the teacher had a clear view of what he wanted the students to do. Pijin was used to talk about task requirements and to confirm understanding.

Example 13:

TR1:   You are going to write up a recipe. You think back at home (pause). *Wat kaen food na iu kukim lo home an iu raetem daon wat na ota ingrediens iu usim an iu raetem daon na wat na iu save kukim bekos me save evriwan save kuk.* At least all of us we know how to cook. Think of a traditional recipe lo home *iu save wakem. Iu raetem daon na hao iu preparim na datfala meal ia. Hem clear na ekspleneson blo me?* Inside the recipe you will need the ingredients and the methods. *Iu garem eni kuestin iu putim han blo iu up.*

[*What kinds of food do you cook at home, and you write down the ingredients you use, and write down what you used to cook because I know everyone knows how to cook.* At least all of us, we know how to cook. Think of a traditional recipe at home *which you know how to cook. Write down how you normally prepare that food. Is my explanation clear?* Inside the recipe you will need the ingredients and the methods. *If you have any question put your hands up*].

Below is another example of the teacher clearly explaining what he was expecting of his students and using Pijin to do so and confirming understanding.

Example 14:

TR1: *Taem iumi se malubi rice hem na kaekae ia. Sapos iu se rice make sua iu save wat rice- milk rice or motu rice.* Make sure you differentiate that one. Clear? *Sapos iu se oh recipe blo me potato* (pause) *wat kaen potato* (pause) *motu potato, boiled potato or bonebone potato?* If you don't know some of the things, the methods ask your friends and discuss and write it down.

[*When we say malubi rice, we mean the food. If you put rice, make sure you know what type of rice recipe- milked rice or baked rice.* Make sure you differentiate that one. Clear*? If you say that your recipe is potato* (pause) *what type of cooking style* (pause) *baked potato, boiled potato or roasted potato*? If you do not know some of the things, the methods, ask your friends and discuss and write it down].

In examples 12, 13 and 14, the teachers used Pijin when they wanted to articulate what they expected from the students, in other words the task requirements and to confirm students' understanding. However, they frequently switched back into English when emphasising key words such as "scenario", "scene", "ingredients" and "methods". This seemed to highlight the importance of these words in their lessons.

6.5.3 Translating

In the literature class with the form six students, TU2 directly translated English to Pijin to elicit students' understanding of certain words and phrases in the texts. The students experienced difficulty, so the teacher used Pijin to simplify the meaning.

Example 15:

TU2: "They cannot erase my existence"
In other word (pause) *iu no naf tekem me out from ples me waka ia.*
"I work in very difficult places and I work for hour."

["They cannot erase my existence"
In other words (pause) *you cannot take me out from my work place.*
"I work in very difficult places and I work for hours"].

This next example is similar to Example 15, but in the first utterance the teacher switched to Pijin to translate the expression and returned to English to complete the sentence. The teacher herself acknowledged that the sentence could be confusing, and then translated to Pijin.

Example 16:

TU2: "Their bodies, though weakening from muscular indifferences" (pause)
Now that might be a few words that might be confusing. In other words *ota tired na for doim same samting ia*, making people poor.

["Their bodies though weakening from muscular indifferences" (pause)
Now that might be a few words that might be confusing. In other words, *they are tired of doing the same thing*, making people poor].

Below is an example which is a different strategy from Example 16. The teacher expressed the disadvantages of the working conditions for the working class, and the salary they receive, and then quoted the expression and gave an alternative version in Pijin.

Example 17:

TU2: Working conditions *hem difficult ia. Hem hard, but pay hem hamas? Lelebet nomoa*. So in other words, "you cannot erase me. I am here I work in difficult conditions for many hours".

[Working conditions *is difficult. It is hard, but how much do we get paid for? Just a little bit*. So in other words, "you cannot erase me I am here I work in difficult conditions for many hours".]

TU2 provided a simple definition of the word "indifference" in English, but then switched to Pijin, expressing how a person with power would talk.

Example 18:

TU2: Indifference here simply means they are showing no interest, so when the public is working hard they are up there and they say *"ok iu waka hard fo iumi"*.

[Indifference here simply means they are showing no interest, so when the public is working hard they are up there, and they say "*okay you work hard for us*"].

This is another example translated in Pijin, simply defining the expression "You make my blood boil".

Example 19:

TU2: You make my blood boil. *If iumi say osem hem minim iumi cross.*

[You make my blood boil. *If we say that, it means we are angry*].

6.5.4 Sharing text aloud

In this section, the following are examples of where the teacher was using Pijin in the context of sharing texts aloud. Code-switching was used when the teacher read a descriptive piece of writing and inserted Pijin into the reading text to create a visual image. Here the teacher was reconstructing and embedding in the reading aloud text.

Example 20:

TU2: "I waded into the narrow passage to the main building" Okay you can imagine that he is now wading through from the western end- *coconut ples ota save salem ia hem go insaed smol narrow ples fo go insaed market na ia.*
"I could see a mother with her screaming toddler clinging to her back as she struggles to serve a buyer".
Okay you can just imagine the old lady, *pikinini crawl olobaot lo behain an hem trae fo servim ota pipol wea cum fo buy.*

["I waded into the narrow passage to the main building".
Okay you can imagine that he is now wading through from the western end- *the place where they sell the coconuts; he went through a small narrow path to go into the market area.*
"I could see a mother with her screaming toddler clinging to her back as she struggles to serve a buyer".
Okay you can just imagine the old lady, *the little child crawling everywhere, and she is trying to serve the customers who are there to purchase her goods*].

The vernacular of a small number of students and the teacher herself was used in the next example, in order to make the setting come alive and show humour. I noticed that when the teacher did this, the students laughed, and it captured their interest while listening to the descriptive piece of writing.

Example 21:

TU2: "As I listened, sellers were conversing in strange dialects. Their sharp eyes focused on the different varieties of food laid orderly before them"
"Kachiena hoi! Mae! Ae iu go lo wea ia?" Yeah (pause) different dialects in the market.

["As I listened, sellers were conversing in strange dialects. Their sharp eyes focused on the different varieties of food laid orderly before them"
"Be quick!' Come! Where are you going?" Yeah (pause) different dialects in the market].

In this next example the teacher was using Pijin first to set the scene (as in previous examples) and to reflect on how characters would have spoken the words in the text the students were reading. It was noticed that the students were attentive to the teacher and seemed interested in the lesson as well.

Example 22:

TU2: Just imagine *iu laen up fo go kakae but wat nomoa left lo table ia*?

[Just imagine *you lining up to serve your food, but what is left on the table*?].
Ss: Bones.
TU2: *Potato nomoa* (pause) things you don't want to eat and you start to get angry. "*Ota pipol laen up ia kakae tumas".* That was what happened to Tortoise. He ate and was so full and then he let the birds eat the left overs. And so the birds say *"Iu givim cum baek evri feathers"* and what is left of him? Nothing!

[*Only potato* (pause) things you do not want to eat and you start to get angry. "*Those people who lined up are eating too much".* That was what happened to Tortoise. He ate and was so full, and then he let the birds eat the left overs.

And so the birds said "*Give us back all the feathers"* and what is left of him? Nothing!].

6.5.5 Communicating ideas with students

It was noted that TU2 frequently switched to Pijin when discussing important ideas and issues in the novel "Things Fall Apart" by Chinua Achebe, adding humour and making the scenes come alive in a way students could relate to. In the first example the teacher discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the main character Okonkwo, beginning in English and switching to Pijin and back to English.

Example 23:

TU2:   Okay. Let me put it this way, Okonkwo doesn't realise that at times, or in some ways he misuses his power over his wives. *Hem garem strength, hem garem power, hem garem status and samtaems hem save forget na that hem misusim na family blo hem or hem abusim ota wives blo hem* by the way he speaks, how he beats them up.

[Okay. Let me put it this way; Okonkwo doesn't realise that at times, or in some ways he mis-uses his power over his wives. *He has strength; he has power, he has status, and sometimes he forgets that he mis-uses his family or he abuses his wives* by the way he speaks, and how he beats them up].

In another example, the teacher discussed the theme of retaliation using an example in Pijin.

Example 24:

TU2:   Okay, we can have that theme running through our community, for example, *mami kross lo dadi becos daddy no peim salt lo haus*. In the end mummy hem less for cookie lo evening, hem run away or something. That idea also runs in our community. When someone is abused he can retaliate.

[Okay we can have that theme running through our community, for example, *mum is angry at dad because dad did not buy salt for the house*. In the end, mum did not want to cook and she ran away or something. That idea runs in our community. When someone is abused he can retaliate].

In the last example, the teacher frequently code-switched while discussing and retelling the story, which made the lesson more interesting to the students. It was noticed that the students were very interested in what the teacher was sharing in class.

Example 25:

> TU2: Achebe is putting humour into his writing for *mekem pipol laugh but at the end he tries to point a very educational value lo disfala stori blo tortoise.* On top of that he shows that Okonkwo and Ekwefi *no folom religious kastom hem can som that samfala taem pipol* can go against religious custom when necessary. In a sense *lo here ota lukim that pikinini blo ota maet dae or and oketa lukim* that it was a taboo for them to run after Enzima but the *pikinini blo mefala ia* we want to know if she is alright so they went against the religious taboo. They are telling us that there are some people who do not follow the religious taboos. On the other hand, Achebe portrays a loving side of Okonkwo. He is a loving person but he does not show that publicly (pause) *night nomoa hem save som na that fala loving part blo hem ia,* loving in a sense that he came after Enzinma.
>
> [Achebe is putting humour into his writing *to make people laugh,* but at the end he tries to point a very educational value *to this story about the tortoise*. On top of that he shows that Okonkwo and Ekwefi *did not follow religious custom which can show that sometime people* can go against religious custom when necessary. In a sense, *they saw that their child might die and they saw that* it was a taboo for them to run after Enzinma, *but our child,* we want to know if she is all right so they went against the religious taboo. They are telling us that there are some people who do not follow the religious taboos. On the other hand, Achebe portrays a loving side of Okonkwo. He is a loving person but he does not show that publicly (pause) *only at night he usually shows that loving part of him*, loving in a sense that he came after Enzinma].

Overall, the teachers tended to write on the blackboard in English, read questions in English and use English in the introduction and conclusion of their lessons. However other languages, predominantly Pijin, were used during questioning, explaining, and in reading aloud texts. The Marovo vernacular was used a few times in the urban school.

6.6 Summary

This section presented teachers' data that indicate that while the teachers understood that English should be the sole language of instruction in the secondary schools, as stipulated in the Solomon Islands language policy, most did not adhere to it.

Overall, while the teachers understood the English-only policy, the general views of most of the teachers suggested that Pijin was not an ideal language to include in the English curriculum. Some did perceive Pijin as a barrier to students' learning of academic English. However, they still saw a place for vernacular and Pijin within their day-to-day instruction.

The teachers reported that Pijin was the language students used most comfortably, and that their students' ideas were expressed well when using that medium. The teachers talked about encouraging students to express their ideas using Pijin. The majority of teachers (six teachers) acknowledged that they themselves switched to Pijin when explaining concepts to students. They mentioned that though they tried their best to use English in their lessons, cues from the students indicated that they needed to explain concepts, define difficult vocabulary or provide examples in Pijin.

During the observed lessons, the two English teachers (TU2 and TR1) code-switched when questioning, explaining concepts, translating back into English, sharing texts aloud and communicating important ideas, and for emphasis of important points. Thus, a pattern that emerged from my work with the teachers demonstrated a misalignment between what teachers believed about multilingual use, their self-reports, and what I observed in the classroom. While they held strong views that in learning academic English, both teachers and students should use English as the language of instruction, they did code-switch using Pijin and English. Teachers talked about the importance of using vernacular, but the setting in the two schools was not favourable, as students came from diverse language backgrounds.

6.7 Language background of students

I interviewed sixteen students, including eight year 8-13 students (14- 18 years) from the urban school and eight year 8-12 students (14-18 years) from the rural school. (See Appendix 13 for the students' language backgrounds)

6.7.1 Languages spoken at home

Seven of the sixteen students, the majority of whom were from the rural school, mentioned that the languages they spoke at home were either Pijin or their mother tongue. Their parents either spoke to them in their dialect or they used Pijin.

> SR2: At home we speak in Pjin and our dad speaks to us in Marovo language and mum speaks to us in Roviana language.

> SU5: I was brought up in town and the first language I learnt how to speak was my mother tongue. Then I learnt how to speak in Pijin.

Four students mentioned using English, Pijin and their vernacular at home.

> SU3: At home I speak both English and Pijin, and sometimes mother tongue.

> SR5: The languages we speak at home are English and Pijin. My parents are both teachers and so they encourage us to speak in English. We also speak Roviana language at home as well.

Although English was not predominantly spoken at home by all of the students, SU6, SU2 and SR5 mentioned that their parents encouraged the use of English.

> SU6: What I appreciate from my parents, they encouraged me to… speak in English. They also help teach me to speak in English.

> SU2: We speak Pijin but at times we speak in English, because my father is a lecturer at SICHE and he normally uses English to his students and so he wants us to use English at home.

> SR5: My parents are both teachers and so they encourage us to speak in English.

In addition, three students from the urban school mentioned that Pijin was the only language they used at home. SU1 expressed this view, but added that he desired to embrace his mother tongue.

SU1: At home we speak in Pijin as well but at times I would like to learn my mother tongue.

Pijin was the predominant language spoken in most students' homes, and vernacular was commonly spoken in the homes of the student participants who grew up in the rural setting. English was an additional language spoken only by fewer than half of the students. SR3 was the only student who solely spoke his mother tongue at home.

SR3: The language that we speak is our mother tongue because we stayed in the village, so the medium of communication is just our own language, Gela language.

6.7.2 Learning English

Eleven of the sixteen students mentioned that their learning of English began at primary school between the ages of six and eight. They described the ways they learned English at school.

SR1: I started learning English in primary school when we recited poems in the classroom. But that time I did not really understand English but only memorised it.

SR4: I first learnt English in first grade. I was given reading books by my teacher. The small reading books helped and contributed a lot to my learning of English, and it has an impact on my understanding of English till today.

SU5: When I started primary school I learnt how to speak in English as my teacher encouraged us to learn how to speak in English as he told us it will be important for our future learning.

6.7.3 Students' perceptions of the importance of English

When asked whether they saw the academic English language as an important learning tool, all of the students responded positively. Three saw English as a subject that supported and promoted their learning in the other subjects. This was clearly expressed by SR2, SR3 and SU7.

SR2: I see learning English in class as important, because without English we will not be able to understand the

> questions in maths. Reading and writing in English will help me in my studies.

> SR3: I see academic English as important for us to learn in schools because it will help us in other subjects. English will help us to write things in Social Science and Science. I see it as promoting my learning in the school. It helps me to be able to write in class.

> SU7: When I speak English it will help develop my mind and how to write in English will be easy as all subjects use English.

Two other students discussed the importance of academic English as a global language.

> SR5: I see academic English as important for us students to learn in school because we will not always stay in our own country but we will go abroad, thus it is important for us to learn that subject. English is a language that we need to learn to communicate to people who are not from the same country.

> SU3: We need to have a mind-set that we need to speak more English. It is an international language and we need to think ahead. We will not always stay in one place. We have to learn it.

SU4, SU2 and SR6 had some different views about aspects of academic English.

> SU4: Speaking in English will really help us. Teachers speak in English, and so if we use English it will be easy for us to understand and even write in English.

> SU2: When I speak English it will help me a lot in school especially in my grammar and writing.

> SR6: I see English as important in class, as it helps me to learn English. In terms of reading, I see it helping me in my learning of the subject.

6.8 Students' pattern of language use in the school

6.8.1 Students' reported use of different languages

All the students acknowledged that they used both Pijin and English in the school. Their responses indicated that they code-switched between

English and Pijin, especially when asking questions of the teachers, and occasionally for fun with their classmates and friends.

SU6: In class I use English, we ask questions in English. But when students speak in Pijin I tend to speak in Pijin too. For me it takes constant practice to speak in English.

SU8: When my English teacher asks questions in English we speak in English, but mostly we speak in Pijin.

SU3: In class, my friend and I both speak in English and Pijin as we come from the same primary school, so we are used to speaking in English to each other.

Eight of the students acknowledged that they tended to speak English to their English teacher. However, some students reported other subject teachers were not strict about language use in the classroom therefore, Pijin was also used.

SR1: I only speak to my English teacher when I see her around the school because she encourages and helps me in terms of learning the English subject especially with speaking the language.

SR4: We normally speak in English only in English class. But for other subjects we speak in Pijin when we discuss. It depends on the teacher, for example, when the English teacher comes to class she speaks to us in English and so we tend to speak in English. But when other subject teachers come to class they start off by speaking in Pijin so we naturally speak in Pijin in the class.

SU5: When I speak to my teachers I use English, but especially to my English teachers. With the other teachers I normally speak to them in Pijin. Also teachers in other subjects encourage us to use Pijin and they will tell us this is not the English class so I guess that is one reason why we use Pijin in other subjects.

When asked how often they used Pijin or their vernacular in school, most of the students reported using Pijin and vernacular inside and outside of the classroom. Responses from the students established that vernacular is only used between students who speak the same language, but Pijin is commonly used by all students during class times, or when communicating with their peers. This was expressed by the following students.

> SR2: Pijin is used all the time as it is the normal language we speak. We use it both in and out of the class, every time, everywhere. Now with the other languages, I speak Marovo language to Marovo students.

> SR7: I speak Pijin in the class and outside, but for my mother tongue I hardly speak that in school because I do not have any classmates who speak the same language as me. I speak the language of Santa Cruz.

> SU7: I think I use Pijin or other languages in relation to my school when I discuss school work with my classmates, and also ask questions to teachers in their private homes.

When asked about English language use, ten students mentioned that they used English during class presentations, in their writing, and reading.

> SR2: I use English when I do presentations in class or when we write speeches.

> SR3: I use English in the class in the area of writing.

> SR4: I use English in the class when students take programmes during worship. They are encouraged to use the English language in front of the church. The school wants to uphold that and speaking in front helps me as a student to improve my learning.

6.8.2 Students' reported code-switching practices

All sixteen students reported that English teachers and other subject teachers frequently code-switched in class. Most teachers' code-switching practices occurred when students did not understand concepts, vocabulary and instructions in English. Twelve students mentioned that they appreciated their teachers code-switching practices as it was helpful for them in understanding difficult concepts. They understood better when teachers explained things in the language that they knew best, Pijin.

> SR1: Teachers code-switch a lot of times in class. To me, code-switching is helpful. Sometimes I do not understand the concepts when taught in English, but when teachers repeat it in Pijin the concept was made clear and I understand it well.

> SU4: I find it easy when teachers use English and then when they use some words I do not understand, but if they explain in Pijin I could easily understand.

However, four students expressed their disapproval of code-switching. They viewed teacher' code-switching practices as adding confusion when they are concentrating on the lesson content. This practice, they felt influenced their writing negatively. They said they tended to mix English with Pijin in their writing.

> SU1: When teachers speak in English I will concentrate, but when the teacher switches to Pijin it really makes me confused. It disturbs my mind and puts me off at times in class that I just do not want to listen to the teacher. Why I want the teacher to speak one language like English is that because when I do my study it will be in English so it will help me to quickly learn. When I mix Pijin and English it affects my writing as I will repeat myself in my essay.

> SU7: English is difficult for me and so if a teacher always uses English then I see it will help me in my learning of the language. But if the teacher switches back to Pijin it distracts my mind and concentration.

The students from the rural school described how they themselves used code-switching and translation strategies in their heads to help them interpret tasks and clarify ideas.

> SR1: That is how I study, I read things in English and then think in Pijin and sometimes I think in my mother tongue in order for me to understand before I move to the next concept. Most times I think and especially when I do problem solving in maths. I try to put it back to Pijin and it helps me a lot. Even though the sentence is too difficult, I translate to Pijin. When the teacher explains then I try and think in Pijin before I answer the question.

> SR2: I read things in English and in my brain I try to translate it back to Pijin to understand the concept better.

> SR7: For me, when I read in English I also translate to Pijin and then to my own language. So at times when I sit a test and I do not really understand, I also translate to my own language and I will understand it better.

6.9 Students' code-switching practices in the classroom

Observing the students' patterns of language use was done using an amended version of the COLT Observation Scheme developed by Spada and Fröhlich (1995) (Appendix 12), and data tape recorded during

students' group discussions and presentations. The students were engaged in lessons for listening, reading, writing and speaking. With the spoken aspect of language, students responded to the teachers either in English or Pijin, depending on the questioning of the teacher.

6.9.1 Students' responses to teacher questioning

The students responded to teacher questioning either in English or Pijin. It was observed that when the teachers used Pijin in their lessons, in most instances students responded in Pijin.

TU2: But what happens? *Parot kam sens mesij* (pause) the message is: "Put the hard objects at the bottom so that Tortoise will fall on them". The Tortoise represents men who have the power and potential to be society's rulers. The birds are the rest of the community or women who go under their control. Having that in mind, what is their attitude toward power?

[But what happens? *The parrot came and changed the message* (pause)].

S1: Woman *getem paoa fo kros*

[Women *have the power to be angry*]

TU2: Ok

On another occasion, the teacher questioned in English, but the students responded in Pijin and the teacher responded to students' answers in Pijin but continued understanding in English.

TR1: Give me an example of a word to show you know respect?

S: *No holem heti blo dadi*

[*Do not touch daddy's head*]

TR1: Ok *no holem heti blo dadi*… is that true?

[Okay *do not hold daddy's head*…is that true?].

S: Yes!

The students in the rural school tended to use more Pijin when answering questions, but this may have been a result of the nature of the lesson, where the teacher engaged more with the students in questioning, whereas at the urban school they were involved in less questioning and more individual work on their assigned tasks. The level of classes may have also been a contributing factor influencing both the teacher and

students' choice of language. The junior classes were engaged in more group discussion and teacher student activities, whereas the senior classes were more involved in self-directed tasks.

6.9.2 Other instances of students' observed language use

Two of the three lessons observed in the rural school involved group discussions and presentations. The form two (Year 8) class was divided into twelve groups and the form one (Year 7) class was in eight groups. I was able to capture the students' language use during group discussions and group presentations on three groups from one form one class and one form two class. I coded them as GF1A, GF1B, GF1C and GF2A. Code-switching was a common practice observed in all the groups. In this next section the ways in which code-switching was used by the students will be discussed under the categories of interpreting the questions, explaining ideas, providing examples and translating to English.

6.9.2.1 Interpreting questions

The most frequent use of code-switching occurred when the students read the questions for group discussion in English but whilst discussing and trying to understand it code-switched to Pijin. GF2A discussed questions from the text based on the information from the passage they read and its application for students.

GF2A:

S3:   Why is it difficult to tell your parents about some things, for example boyfriends, girlfriends…do you think your parents understand you, if not why not?

S1:   *Wat na tingting blo iu*?

[*What do you think*?].

S3:   *Samtaem hem hard tumas fo iumi talem ota parens wat hem happen lo iumi...*

[*Sometimes it is difficult for us to tell our parents what happened to us*].

S2:   *Why na hem difficult fo talem ota parens blo iumi about feelings blo iumi*?

[*Why is it difficult for us to tell our parents about our feelings*?].

In the next example, one of the students misunderstood the question but another student corrected her misinterpretation in Pijin.

S3:   *Ok hem se na ia why na samtaem hem difficult fo ota parens blo iumi lettim iumi fo…?*

[*Okay it says why is it that sometimes it is difficult for our parents to allow us to…?*].

S2:   No! Why *na hem difficult for iumi talem ota parens blo iumi dat iumi gat boyfren*?

[No! Why *is it difficult for us to tell our parents that we have a boyfriend*?].

6.9.2.2 Explanation and exemplification

There were two instances where two types of explanations were provided. In the first one, the students were correcting one another's English, and in the second one, during group presentations the student was switching from one language to the other throughout his discussion to explain a concept. S2, in the example below answered the question by engaging in the idea, whereas S3 was looking at the correct grammar and not the idea. She tried her best to correct her friend in writing the sentence when explaining the difference between the words "use" and "speak".

GF1B:

S1:   Do you sometime hurt others…examples…we use bad words to them. Do you sometimes hurt others?
S2:   We speak bad words to them
S3:   *Bae hem no stret lo sentence na* "when we speak"…

[*It will not be correct if we use* when we speak].

S1:   *Ma iumi talem out…iumi no usim…iumi talem out lo maos*.

[*Well we are telling it out…we are not using it…we are speaking bad words*]

S3:   When we use…
S2:   When we use bad words to them.

A similar example was observed in GF1A when one student was confused about the meaning of the word "tease" and used a wrong example to associate with this word but S2 was able to correctly define the word tease in Pijin with a simple explanation.

GF1A:

S1:   When we tease someone…

S3:   *Taem ota samfala kilim bro blo iu bae iu fil hurt lo hem tu ia. Ating hem nomoa tease ia? Or nomoa?*

[*When someone hurt your brother you will feel hurt. Is it the same word as 'tease' or n*ot?].

S2:   *Tease ia osem iu mekful lo hem…spoilem…iu barava spoilem hem*

[*Tease is when you really belittle someone*].

With the group presentations most of the groups introduced their group in Pijin before reading the questions in English. They code-switched between the two languages, explaining in Pijin the points discussed by the group members.

GF 1A:

S: Ok, *mefala grup lo behain ia mefala discussim na kuestins ia-* Do you sometimes hurt others? *Den mefala sei ye*s (pause) *eksampol hem* se (pause). First one, when we tease someone. *Taem iumi teasim samwan osem iumi hurtim oketa na ia. Bae oketa fil sem osem and sekon wan hem sei* when someone steal your property. *Wen samwan steal your properties bae iu kros lo oketa ia. Hem.* And three, during sport times when someone might kick your leg or *osem ia iumi bae kros lo hem ia.* Last one, when someone kill your brothers or sisters*, bae iu kros lo hem. Thank you.*

[Okay *our group discussed the question-* Do you sometimes hurt others? *Then we said yes* (pause). *For example* (pause). First one, when we tease someone. *When we tease someone we are hurting them. They will feel ashamed and second one says* when someone steals your property. *When someone steals your property you will get angry at them.* Thirdly, during sport times, when someone might kick your leg, *we will get angry at him.* Lastly, when someone hit your brother or sister, *you will be mad at them.* Thank you].

GF1C:

S: *Grup blo mefala discuss about na kuestin hem se*, do you have something you wish to thank others for? What is it? *So mefala sei yes. Fas wan blo mefala hem sei na ia* (pause) when somebody build my house. *Taem samfala man kam bildim haus blo mefala bae mefala se tagio lo hem. Sekon one blo mefala* when somebody makes my

garden. *Taem sambody kam mekem garden blo mefala bae mefala sei tagio lo hem*. Okay last one when somebody buy a present for me. *Taem sambody baem presen for mefala bae mefala sei tagio lo hem. Hem nomoa.*

[Our group discussed about the question which says, do you have something you wish to thank others for? What is it? So we said yes. Our first point says (pause) when somebody builds my house. When some people come and build our house, we will thank them. Second point is when somebody makes my garden. When somebody come and makes our garden we will thank him. Okay, last one when somebody buys a present for me. When somebody buys a present for us we will say thank you to him. That's all].

6.9.2.3 Providing Examples

The students used English to provide examples to gain a clear understanding of the points raised in their group discussion. In this next excerpt Pijin was used when providing examples in order to gain a clear understanding of important points in their discussion.

GF1A:

S3: Do you sometimes hurt others? *Samtaem yu hurtim samfala too*?

[Do you sometimes hurt others? *Sometimes you hurt some people too*?].

S2: Yes

S3: Example…*iu tok spoilem hem*.

[For example, *when belittle them*]

S2: *Taem iu play den ota kickim iu or eniwan lo team blo iu iu save kros lo hem tu ia…*

[*When you play and someone kicks you or any of your team mates, you will get upset as well*].

S1: During game times, during sport times when someone hurt you.

6.9.2.4 Translation

After the discussions when students were preparing their presentations they translated what they had discussed from Pijin back into English.

GF2A:

S1: *Samtaem iumi sem of ota parents*

> [*Sometimes we are ashamed of our parents*]
> S2: Because we are ashamed of our parents. *Iumi no like for mekem feelings blo ota hurt and sore*. Why? Because we are trying to…
>
> [Because we are ashamed of our parents. *We do not want to hurt our parents' feelings and make them sad*]
> S3: *Raetem na*
>
> [*Write it*]

S2 provided an example in Pijin, and in the last utterance S3 translated it into English expecting the other students to write the exact sentence and the correct spelling of the word 'kick'.

GF1A:

> S2: *Taem iu play den ota kickim iu o eniwan lo team blo iu, iu save kros lo hem too ia.*
>
> [*When you play and they kick you or anyone in your team, you will be angry at him as well.*]
> S1: During game times. During sport times, when someone hurt you.
> S3: No no no.
> S1: When someone kick your leg
> S3: *Yah*
> [*Yeah*]
> S1: Or your body, you get hurt.
> S3: During sport times when someone might kick your leg...kick...k...i...c..k.

Students' code-switching practices were observed during their group discussions and group presentations. Pijin was used frequently to interpret, explain, provide examples and translate important points to English for their group presentations.

6.10 Summary

Overall, the second section of this chapter on students' perceptions and language behaviours has found that the students favoured the use of more than one language in the classroom and their practices matched that. The students mentioned the importance of learning academic English, as it not only supported their learning in the English subject but also all the subjects

taught in the school. The students understood that if they had a good understanding of grammar and vocabulary of English, it supported them in being able to understand and write concepts in other subject areas. The students also talked about the importance of English globally, as it is the international language, the language of success.

The students reiterated that code-switching was useful for explaining concepts that were difficult to understand. Most of the students appreciated their teachers' code-switching practices when the teachers explained concepts to them in the language they understood best. This form of code-switching was helpful to them rather than the use of English, the language they often found difficult to understand. However, while code-switching was favoured by students, most of them felt that a negative aspect of it was that using vocabulary and grammar of Pijin would interfere with their English writing. Both groups acknowledged this. Four of the students expressed their disapproval of any kind of code-switching. They felt that it caused confusion to their learning in the English language, especially when teachers code-switched every minute. These students felt that they could not retain the underlying meanings being expressed by the teachers every time they switched from one language to the other.

The majority of the students repeatedly mentioned that they tried their best to use English in class. However, they feared making mistakes. They viewed themselves as being inadequate in their use of the English language, but acknowledged that they attempted to respond to their teachers in English during class time. When the teacher used Pijin, however, they tended to respond in that language. This perception was consistent with what I observed in several of the lessons. The students tended to use whichever language was initiated by the teacher.

Another important point raised was that the students said that they usually spoke English to their English teacher, but not to the teachers of other subjects. This was also confirmed by a few of the English teachers. Unfortunately, I was not able to collect data to prove this, but students

unanimously mentioned it. Code-switching was a phenomenon that most students discussed using. The students talked about using Pijin, and said that vernacular was only used when speaking to other students who understood the language. Students also talked about code-switching when discussing difficult concepts, during their private study and when trying to understand a question the teacher posed in class. In these cases they read in English and rephrased in Pijin, or they thought in Pijin before translating back to English.

What the students reported about their language use correlated with the lesson observations. The inconsistencies were with teachers' and students' beliefs about language use, especially in relation to academic English and its importance in their learning. The teachers did not see the significance of using students' L1 in scaffolding their learning of English. However, they seemed to acknowledge Pijin as an important tool in the learning of English. Overall, the findings of both teachers and students revealed that their views about the use of academic English and other forms of language in the classroom differ somewhat from the actual observed practices in the classroom. Furthermore, while there were negative views voiced regarding code-switching, it was confirmed that most of the learning and interactional practices were done in two languages, English and Pijin.

CHAPTER SEVEN
DISCUSSION

7.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings relating to teachers' and students' language use in two secondary schools in the Solomon Islands. The findings were enabled by the methods of data collection: semi-structured interviews, focus groups and classroom observations. A key finding that emerged from the data was that conceptions and practices of teachers did not always align. This misalignment appeared to be influenced by a number of factors, including curriculum and language policy influences, beliefs about the place of particular languages in education, and the status of Pijin compared to English. This chapter will discuss three key findings concerning the teachers along with the findings from interviews and observations of the students.

7.2 Misalignment of teachers' conceptions and practices

This study revealed that the English teachers understood the requirement stipulated in the educational policy that English should be the medium of instruction in classrooms, and they embraced its use in their classrooms. However, their use of English was inconsistent and did not always align with their perceptions. Most teachers reported that they predominantly used Pijin or a vernacular, when there was a need to explain difficult concepts or when defining difficult vocabulary. At other times, English was the sole language of instruction.

However, the classroom observations revealed that they were using a great deal of Pijin than they had revealed in the interviews. They code-switched extensively in their lessons when explaining, elaborating and defining concepts. This shows that the teachers may not have been aware of the extent to which they code-switched. It is a phenomenon that has also been found in other Pacific and Melanesian studies of contexts where

a Pijin or local vernacular is spoken (see for example, August, 2010; Shameem, 2002; Willans, 2011). Franken and August (2011), for example, suggest that this phenomenon reflects the complex contexts in which teachers work. They state that this pattern "allows us to recognise the tensions that exist in teachers' conceptions that may unconsciously and consciously affect their practices" (p. 237). This key finding has implications for teacher training, in that teachers need to be educated in bi/multilingual education and to understand the various models and approaches to language acquisition. Flores (2001) highlights the need for an alignment between teacher perceptions and practices by suggesting that there is a need for effective teacher preparation. Factors influencing teachers' inconsistent views and reasons why they engaged in particular practices will be elaborated on below.

7.3 Explaining teachers' views

All the teachers held positive views towards using English as the language of instruction but often voiced negative views towards Pijin, despite admitting to using this and other languages in the classroom. It would appear that the teachers in this study may have been influenced by their underlying attitudes towards Pijin and the students' vernacular languages. In their eyes, English is the language of status and success. This view is likely to have its foundation in the historical influence of colonial powers on the language of education in the Solomon Islands (Benson, 2004; Kaplan & Baldauf, 2003; Lotherington, 1998). Pennycook (1994, 1998) suggests that current views of language and language teaching mirror earlier understanding that English should be the language of education. Most of the teachers of this study were no doubt guided by the language policy that English should be the medium of instruction in the schools and had limited knowledge of the new language policy which is soon to be implemented in the schools (MEHRD, 2010). The teachers also held negative views on mixing both Pijin and English in the lessons. They preferred keeping the languages separate.

In a scholarly article that explored the effect of code-switching on gifted bilingual children, Hughes, Shaunessy, Brice, Ratliff, and McHatton (2006) suggest that teachers react negatively to code-switching "even when they themselves employ it" (p. 9). This finding aligns with what researchers have found in Papua New Guinea (Franken & August, 2011), Fiji (Tamata, 1996), Tonga (Vea, 2010) and Vanuatu (Willans, 2011). A possible explanation could be that teachers feel the students' languages should be kept separate to maintain purity in language learning. This view has it using two languages at one time, causes language interference (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Cummins, 2005, 2007; Honan, 2003; Jacobson & Faltis, 1990; Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Siegel, 1997; Wei, 2011). Such views link back to second language learning approaches which emphasise a monolingual teaching approach (Cummins, 2008; Howatt, 1984).

An interesting contradiction that emerged in this study was that the teachers used Pijin for explaining concepts, yet felt it interfered with the students' learning of English. In fact, they saw code-switching practices as contributing to students' low proficiency in English and poor English curriculum achievement. This is similar to other studies such as those reported by Aitchison (1991) and Cheng and Butler (1989). This finding further supports Setati, et al.s' (2002) view of code-switching as a dilemma and Shin's (2005) view that teachers attribute code-switching to "careless language habits or laziness" (p. 18).

Another reason for the negative views regarding Pijin and vernacular, concerns the educational context within which the teachers have worked and had been educated themselves. Most of these teachers have learned English through immersion when they attended Solomon Islands schools. English was the only language of instruction in the school therefore it became the default language of learning. This is a finding that also emerged in studies by Franken and August (2011), Garcia-Nevarez, Stafford and Arias (2005), Karathanos (2009), and Richards and Rodgers (2001), where many teachers believed that monolingual instruction was the most appropriate method. It is an issue which influences teachers'

conceptualisations of language learning and teaching. Such beliefs link to society, culture and education of individuals.

7.4 Explaining teachers' code-switching practices

The teachers' extensive use of Pijin in the classroom may have been linked to their English language proficiency. Most of them being L2 speakers of English, their tendency to revert to Pijin could have been in order to balance their weaknesses in English. This observation is consistent with findings reported in Franken and August (2011) in the Papua New Guinean context where teachers' low levels of English language proficiency led them to use their own vernaculars to explain concepts. Some teachers did use English more systematically despite their proficiency levels. It may be that those teachers who used more English in the classroom did so because they were more proficient.

A factor affecting the language proficiency of the teachers and students is likely to be the limited domains of use of English outside the school. This was commented on by the teachers regarding the students, but not regarding their own language use. English is usually spoken only in the schools. It is not used by the majority of the teachers in other contexts. Therefore, speaking in English does not come naturally to teachers. This same concept was identified by Ringbom (1987) and Setati, et al., (2002) where the English language is limited to the school context. Schulz (2002) suggests that a major weakness in language classrooms is the teachers' lack of communicative competence and confidence to use the target language for classroom communication. Peyton (1997) urges teachers to maintain and improve their knowledge and skills in teaching English, in an on-going way.

7.5 Effective use of Pijin

The teachers' interviews and classroom observations demonstrated that their use of Pijin in the classroom had the purpose of scaffolding the teaching content in their lessons, rather than being based on principles of

bilingual education. As such, the strategic decision to code-switch was a "here and now" concept as suggested by Richards and Rodgers (1986; 2001), where teachers focused on addressing students' immediate knowledge needs. The teachers in the current study used code-switching to explain, elaborate and define. While they acknowledged the importance of code-switching, none mentioned their knowledge of its importance for students' ongoing language development. This may have been influenced by their lack of knowledge of the benefits of bi/multilingual education. This is consistent with Franken and August's study (2011) of "bridging" in Papua New Guinea. They found that "there was some, but not a deep understanding of the benefits of using the child's L1 as a resource to support the learning of English" (p.227). This also correlates with Willans' (2011, p. 34) research where the teachers and students acknowledged their extensive use of code-switching to help understanding.

Benson (2005) also highlighted teachers' lack of awareness of the benefits of supporting students' learning using L1. This finding emerged in her study of Nigerian primary teachers. She states that their understanding of what it means to use the mother tongue as a medium of instruction differed from their actual practice. The teachers in her study demonstrated confusion about bilingual education principles as most of them code-switched without knowing whether or not it was helpful. They acknowledged that code-switching enhanced students' understanding but appeared to have little, clear understanding about the role of code-switching in student learning in a wider sense (as cited in Igboanusi, 2008).

7.6 Students' attitudes and practices

Most of the students in this study held positive views towards the use of English in school. These were based on English being the language of educational success and opportunity (Jourdan, 1990; Setati, et al., 2002; Vea, 2010; Yu, 2007) and a perception that knowledge of English

enhances conceptual understanding in other subjects (Gersten & Baker, 2000).

Code-switching practices, both when speaking and as an internal process, were favoured and practiced by all the student participants. This finding is consistent with studies conducted by August (2010), Auguste-Walter (2011), Vea (2010) and Willans (2011) where student participants acknowledged that code-switching enhances their understanding and learning of the concepts taught in the classroom. However, code-switching was not always viewed positively, as it was thought that it caused confusion, slowed down thinking about the concepts, and led to negative transfer in academic writing. Overall the students viewed learning English as very important; and because they lacked proficiency, they saw the need for teachers to use more English.

The students' language backgrounds appeared to have an influence on their attitudes towards language use in the school. Most of the students who did not have prior exposure to the language expressed their insecurity and lack of confidence in speaking English in the classroom, for fear of being ridiculed. This same practice correlates with Vea's (2010) study in a Tongan bilingual classroom where he found students felt shy in class because of a failure to pronounce English words correctly and being uncertain about answering questions in English. Others who had had some exposure to speaking English when they were younger and those who had attended the urban school were more confident in using the language in the classroom.

In addition, the students in the current study seemed comfortable using Pijin in the classroom, justifying the view that when teachers speak Pijin in the class, it influences their students to also speak Pijin. It appears that students' language practices in this study are influenced by teachers' language use and their expectations of their students in the class. Willans (2011) also found this with her student participants in the Vanuatu context where "patterns of language use were more greatly affected by the

presence or absence of the teacher than the formality of the academic situation" (p. 34). There are several factors that may have influenced students in this study to speak comfortably in Pijin in the class. One of these was teachers' use of Pijin in the classroom. However, in general students did make an attempt to speak in English in the class and perhaps if the teachers encouraged more of that, there may have been a different pattern. A slight difference to the study in the Vanuatu context is that teachers were firm and consistent in English language use in the classroom, thus students felt that English should be the language used all the time in the classroom. However, when their teachers were not present, students tended to discuss using Bislama which Willans (2011) claims operates as an "additional learning resource" for the students (p. 23).

A final finding from interviews with the students concerns a misalignment in their perceived language use and their actual language use. While they favoured English and accepted it as the language of instruction in the schools, they appreciated teachers' code-switching practices and felt it enhanced their understanding of concepts taught in the classroom. Multiple factors contributed to their language practices, the obvious reasons being that English is spoken only in the classroom and not outside the domains of the school, their fear of being ridiculed and that teachers themselves are inconsistent role models when using English in the class.

7.7 Summary

This discussion has focused on the following major areas that are significant to the study: misalignment of teachers' conceptions and practices, explaining teachers' views, explaining teachers' practices and effective use of Pijin. Overall, the findings reaffirmed that there was a mismatch between teachers' conceptions and practices. To address this mismatch there needs to be a fuller understanding of the benefits of multilingual education and carefully scaffolding language use in the classroom for teachers and perhaps students too. Findings from the

student participants highlighted that while students held a positive and well established view towards English, the use of Pijin supported their learning of English. This suggests that teachers need to be educated in the area of bi/multilingual education and to understand the benefits of scaffolding students' L1 to attain higher achievement in their L2.

The concluding chapter will note the study's limitations, provide implications for practice in language use in Solomon Islands secondary schools and present recommendations for future research to address the most important issues that have emerged from this research.

CHAPTER EIGHT
CONCLUSION

8.1 Overview of chapter

Studies of language use in secondary schools in the Pacific have been a recent phenomenon. Therefore it has been with deep interest that this research study was conducted. The study aimed to ascertain what teachers' and students' conceptions are regarding language use in the classroom and their attitudes towards multilingual use to assist learning of English. Even though teachers demonstrated a very pragmatic and strategic use of language in the classroom, their language beliefs about academic English, the role of Pijin and/or the vernacular and the English curriculum presented a mismatch. The findings presented in this study showed that while teachers were in favour of the English medium instruction, their teaching practices accommodated the languages students were familiar and comfortable with. Code-switching and translation were regularly used where Pijin was the common language used in relation to English. In a multilingual context like the Solomon Islands the language use of both teachers and students in the education setting is somewhat complex. This poses a challenge and important pedagogical implications for the education system of the Solomon Islands. Students' language needs, teachers' knowledge of their pedagogical practices and the socio-cultural expectations of the society must all be considered.

This final chapter will note the limitations of the study and its implications for pedagogy and practice for teachers and for methodology of such research as this. It will finish by providing recommendations for future research in the area of language use and teaching English in the Solomon Islands.

8.2 Limitations of present study

Time was a limitation in this study in that there was not enough time to carry out the research in other schools apart from the two chosen schools. It would have painted a more detailed picture of the Solomon Islands setting if more schools had been studied. As this study focused only on schools under the same education authority which were familiar to the researcher, there may be some bias in the interpretation of data even though the researcher was mindful of such pitfalls. Further, despite the research being carried out in an urban and a rural school, there was still a limited range of views explored in relation to teachers' and students' beliefs about language use. Extending the boundaries to government schools, or focusing on more rural schools, or more urban schools would allow for more specific but detailed study. Also, because the observation was limited to two teachers (one per school), the analysis of teachers' language practices in the classroom and students' patterns of language use is limited. More teachers need to be observed, in more contexts and in more depth. Taking an ethnographic approach to this study would have provided different data as this research could only provide a small window on the students' language life and teachers' pedagogical practices in English.

This research was driven by my desire to study language use in English classrooms as I am an English teacher. It was only through this study that I gained a deeper knowledge of bi/multilingual teaching and education and understanding of the big picture of multilingual education and the language techniques that the teachers were using in their lessons. There are many teachers like me who although they do not have the opportunity to do research this way could conduct action research on their own practice.

8.3 Implications for teachers' professional development

Teachers in this study demonstrated a lack of knowledge about the benefits of using two or more languages of instruction, recently referred to as flexible bilingual pedagogy and/or translanguaging. Even though they

used code-switching and translation in their lessons, these approaches were used solely as teaching tools to assist understanding of the concepts taught. Thus, in order for teachers to optimise students' learning in this particular context and to be effective in their pedagogical practices with language use, professional learning needs to begin. It needs to focus on the knowledge and skills that are compatible with the new language policy. This research is timely in that it took place at the end of an era where English was emphasised as the language of education in the Solomon Islands. The new language policy recently published accommodates the use of more than one language in the learning of students, focussing more on the Primary level in education. The policy states:

> All Solomon Islanders will learn to speak, write and read in their mother tongue, and the use of our local languages will help to promote literacy and educational achievement in all sectors of our community…. We envisage that our languages will continue to be used as a medium of communication to transmit worthwhile information such as knowledge (including indigenous knowledge), skills, values and attitudes from person to person or from generation to generation. (MEHRD, 2010, p. 9)

The implication of this policy is that the MEHRD is aware of the importance of bi/multilingual education but whether or not this is clearly understood by teachers nationwide is not known. Therefore, it is important that teachers in the Solomon Islands engage in teacher education in the area of bi/multilingualism to gain knowledge on the approaches in accommodating students' L1 in the classroom. Teachers need to know and understand the theories and approaches of multilingual education. It might not happen overnight, as this is just the beginning and it is a process that must accommodate huge change to the mind-set of most teachers and students in the Solomon Islands; but it is now time that it is started.

In order for such effective change to take place in teachers' teaching practices and general understanding of bi/multilingual education, time must be devoted to support teacher training and resources must be developed. In order for the new language policy to be effective, all stakeholders must support the implementation of bi/multilingual education

and decide which languages will be used in the learning and how they will be developed. This presents great challenges for the MEHRD, language educators, and teachers.

8.4 Recommendations for future research

This study is worthwhile and has an important contribution to make to the education system of the Solomon Islands. Currently there are only a few successful candidates with outstanding examination results in the English subject, this research calls for rethinking and re-examining the pedagogical practices of teachers and learning abilities of students in a non-English speaking context. However, this study's results are not indicative of the whole country; it is recommended that this study be replicated in other areas of the nation. There are several pilot studies on vernacular education being carried out in certain provinces of the country and it would seem important that outcomes from such studies are consolidated.

It is recommended that further studies be conducted considering language ecology, looking at ways language is used in the country, the complexity of language use and its practices in the classroom. Although this study had a rich set of teachers' data, future studies could have a much more prominent focus on students' data, as in Willans (2011) work. Future research calls for full language ecology approaches, that is, encompassing the community, school and even parents. Language ecology promotes the view that the student is in a network of relationships both at the local but also increasingly at a wider community level. It would also be interesting to track students' language use outside the classroom and in their communities. This was included in my data but it was in relation to the teachers' data, to shed light on what the teachers were doing.

Because this study was carried out at the end of an era, it would be an interesting and important study to observe students' performance in

English in the coming years and see how successful the new language policy appears to be in improving outcomes.

8.5 Conclusion

Several studies (Jourdan, 1990; Keesing, 1990; Lee, 1996; Watson-Gegeo, 1987) have been conducted in relation to Pijin and/or vernacular in the Solomon Islands, but none of them has specifically looked at teachers' and students' conceptions, practices and proficiencies in depth. However, they all acknowledge the importance of accommodating students' L1 in the process learning of English. This study has unveiled teachers' beliefs about language use in the classroom, their reported practices and students' patterns of language use as well as their reported practices and assumed language proficiencies. The important findings from this research are that there is a mismatch of beliefs with practices and that there is limited understanding of bi/multilingual education pedagogies as they might support students' learning of English. This implies that there is a serious need for teachers to learn effective pedagogical approaches to teaching English as a second language without constraining the students' L1.

This is a call to a process that may not happen quickly, especially in complex multilingual context, but this study is a positive start in its relevance to the country's current language policy. The findings can contribute further insights to the implementation of vernacular education; enable teachers to reconsider their teaching practices and students to use prior knowledge and understanding of their own languages to assist them in learning, especially of difficult concepts. It will open new, challenging doors to accepting other languages, especially Pijin, to assist in the learning of English. Pijin has always been viewed previously as a hindrance to students' learning in schools, but this research will contribute to readers having a different perspective that learning should not be restricted to learning English and learning in English. Instead, they will

come to admire the power of multilingualism and recognise its place in secondary schools in the Solomon Islands.

REFERENCES

Abare, G. R., & Manukayasi, V. B. (1996). The practice of the art of literacy in Papua New Guinea. In F. Mugler & J. Lynch (Eds.), *Pacific languages in education* (pp. 143-153). Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies.

Aitchison, J. (1991). *Language change: Progress or decay?* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Alamu, A. (2010). *Teacher beliefs, knowledge, and reported practices regarding outcomes in Solomon Islands.* (Master's thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand). Retrieved from http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/handle/10063/1314

Anderson, G. (1990). *Fundamentals of educational research.* London, England: The Falmer Press.

Anfara, V. A., & Mertz, N. T. (2006). *Theoretical frameworks in qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education.* Belmont, CA : Wadsworth.

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). Retrieved from http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/4278

Auguste-Walter, B. (2011). *Teachers' and students' attitudes and practices regarding code switching in writing: A study in selected primary schools in St. Lucia* (Master's thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand). Retrieved from http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/5372

Baker, C. (2000). *A parents' and teachers' guide to bilingualism* (2nd ed.). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2006). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (4th ed.). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Bristol, England: Multilingual Matters.

Baldauf, R. B., & Kaplan, R. B. (2006). Language policy and planning in Fiji, The Philippines and Vanuatu. In R. B. Baldauf & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Language planning and policy in the Pacific, Vol. 1: Fiji, the Philippines and Vanuatu* (pp.7-21). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Basit, T. N. (2010). *Conducting research in educational contexts.* London, England: Continuum International.

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind: Collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution, and epistemology.* San Francisco, CA: Chandler.

Bell, J. (1999). *Doing your research project* (2nd ed.). Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Bell, J. (2005). *Doing your research project: A guide for first-time researchers in education, health and social science* (4th ed.). Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Bennett, J. A. (1979). Solomon Islands Pidgin. In S. A. Wurm (Ed.), *New Guinea and the neighbouring areas: A sociolinguistic laboratory* (pp. 64-72). The Hague, Netherlands: Mounton.

Bennett, J. A. (1987). *Wealth of the Solomons: A history of a Pacific archipelago, 1800-1778.* Honolulu, HI: Hawaii University Press.

Bennett, J. A. (1981). Personal work histories of Solomon Islands plantation labourers: Methodology and uses. *Pacific Studies, 5*(1), 34-56.

Benson, C. (2004). *The importance of mother tongue-based schooling for educational quality.* Retrieved from http://langpolicy.saschina.wikispaces.net/Mother+tongue+support

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (2004). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Retrieved from http://www.csun.edu/~SB4310/How%20People%20Learn.pdf

Brewer, J., & Hunter, A. (2006). *Foundations of multimethod research: Synthesizing styles.* Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.

Bruner, J. S. (1983). *Child's talk: Learning to use language.* New York, NY: Norton.

Buchanan, E. (2008). Internet research ethics questions and considerations. In M. Quigley (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of information ethics and security* (pp.397-410). New York, NY: Information Science Reference.

Buell, M. Z. (2004) Code-switching and second language writing: How multiple codes are combined in a text. In C. Bazerman & P. Prior (Eds.), *What writing does and how it does it: An introduction to analysing texts and textual practices* (pp. 97-122). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Burns, R. B. (1995). *Introduction to research methods.* Melbourne, Australia: Longman.

Burns, R. B. (2000). *Introduction to research methods* (4th ed.). French Forest, NSW, Australia: Pearson Education.

Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 7*(1), 71-87.

Cheng, L. R., & Butler, K. (1989). Code-switching: A natural phenomenon versus language deficiency. *World Englishes, 8*, 293-309.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London, England: Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). London, England: Routledge.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 402-423.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: Pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*, 103-115.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Creswell, .J W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. St. Leonards, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Crowley, T. (2006). The language situation in Vanuatu. In R. B. Baldauf & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Language planning and policy in the Pacific, Vol. 1: Fiji, the Philippines and Vanuatu* (pp. 154-239). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (1976). The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: A synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses. *Working Papers on Bilingualism, 9*, 1-43.

Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research, 49*(2), 222-251.

Cummins, J. (1980a). The construct of language proficiency in bilingual education. In J. E. Alatis (Ed*.), Georgetown university round table on language and linguistics 1980*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University.

Cummins, J. (1980b). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. *TESOL Quarterly, 14*(2), 175-187.

Cummins, J. (1981). *Bilingualism and minority language children.* Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED215557.pdf

Cummins, J. (1983). Bilingualism and special education: Program and pedagogical issues. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 6*(4), 373-386.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingualism children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 89*, 585-592.

Cummins, J. (2007a). Language interactions in the classroom: From coercive to collaborative relations of power. In O. Garcia & C. Baker (Eds.), *Bilingual education: An introductory reader* (pp. 108-136). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2007b). Rethinking monolingual instruction strategies in multilingual classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics 10*(2), 221-240.

Cummins, J. (2008). Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of language and education: Bilingual education* (2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 65-75). New York, NY: Springer Science and Business Media.

Daudau, P. (2012). Outcomes-based education and curriculum approach in the Solomon Islands. In K. Sanga & J Kidman (Eds.), *Harvesting ideas: Niu generation perspectives* (pp. 163-176). Suva, Fiji: University of South Pacific Press.

Davidson, C., & Tolich, M. (1999). *Social science research in New Zealand*. Auckland, New Zealand: Longman.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003a). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.

Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003b). *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (2nd ed.). California, CA: Sage.

Donovan, M. S., & Bransford, J. D. (2005). *How students learn: History, mathematics, and science in the classroom* (Eds.). Washington, D. C: National Academy Press.

Early, R. (1999). Double trouble, and three is a crowd: Languages in education and official languages in Vanuatu. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 20*(1), 13-33.

Eisenhart, M. (2006). Representing qualitative data. In J. Green, G. Camilli & P. Elmore (Eds.), *Handbook of complementary research methods in education research* (pp. 567-582). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Eisner, E. W., & Peshkin, A. (1990). *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Flores, B. B. (2001). Bilingual education teachers' beliefs and their relation to self-reported practices. *Bilingual Research Journal, 25*(3), 275-299.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 695-727). London, England: Sage.

Franken, M., & August, M. (2011). Language use and the instructional strategies of Grade 3 teachers to support 'bridging' in Papua New Guinea. *Language and Education, 25*(3), 221-239.

Franken, M., May. S., & McComish, J. (2008). *Pasifika languages research and guidelines project: Literature review.* Retrieved from http://leap.tki.org.nz/research_links

Freebody, P. (2003). *Qualitative research in education: Interaction and practice.* London, England: Sage.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Garcia, O. (2009a). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* Chichester, England: Wiley-Blackwell.

Garcia, O. (2009b). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In K. A. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.), *Multilingual education for social justice: Globalising the local* (pp.140-158). New Delhi, India: Orient Blackswan.

Garcia-Nevarez, A. G., Stafford, M. E., & Arias, B. (2005). Arizona elementary teachers' attitudes toward English language learners and the use of Spanish in classroom instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal, 29*(2), 295-317.

Genesee, F. (1999). *Program alternatives for linguistically diverse students* (Educational Practice Rep. No.1). Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/95t956xz

Gersten, R., & Baker, S. (2000). What we know about effective instructional practices for English-language learners. *Exceptional Children, 66*(4), 454-470.

Gibbons, P. (2002*). Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gleeson, M. (2010*). Language and content? How do curriculum teachers of year 12 English language learners combine two disciplines*? (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10063/1637/thesis.pdf?sequence=1

Gould, S. (2004). Pedagogical issues in the literate use of vernacular language in elementary education in Papua New Guinea. In J. A. Vadeboncoeur & P. Jervis-Tracey (Eds.), *Crossing boundaries: Perspectives across paradigms in educational research* (pp. 205-228). Bowen Hills Queensland: Australian Academic Press.

Grosjean, F. (2010). *Bilingual: Life and reality.* Retrieved from http://site.ebrary.com.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/lib/waikato/docDetail.action?docID=10568024

Guba, E.G. (1990). *The paradigm dialog.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Guthrie, G. (2010). *Basic research methods: An entry to social science research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hakuta, K., Butler, Y. G., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take English learners to attain proficiency?* Retrieved from http://escholarship.org/uc/item/13w7m06g

Hall, R. A. (1959). Colonial policy and new-Melanesian. *Anthropological Linguistics, 1*(3), 22-27. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/30022189.pdf?acceptTC=true

Hall, J. K., & Eggington, W. G. (2000). *The sociopolitics of English language teaching* (Eds.). Clevedon, London: Multilingual Matters

Hill, R. K. (2010). *What is the role of English transition in Maori-medium education?* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand). Retrieved from http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/4438

Honan, E. (2003). Disrupting assumptions about vernacular education in Papua New Guinea. *Reading Online, 6*(5), 1-8.

Honan, M., & Harcombe, D. (1997). *Solomon Islands.* Hawthorn, Vic, Australia: Lonely Planet.

Howatt, A. P. R. (1984). *A history of English language teaching.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Hughes, C. E., Shaunessy, E. S., Brice, A. R., Ratliff, M. A., & McHatton, P. A. (2006). Code-switching among bilingual and limited English proficient students: Possible indicators of giftedness. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 30*(1), 7-28.

Igboanusi, H. (2008). Mother tongue-based bilingual education in Nigeria: Attitudes and practice. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 11*(6), 721-734.

Jacobson, R., & Faltis, C. (1990). *Language distribution issues in bilingual schooling.* Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Johnson, R. K. (1977a). Administration and language policy in Papua New Guinea. In S. A. Wurm (Ed.), *New Guinea area languages and language study* (Vol. 3, pp. 429-468). Canberra, Australia: Australian National University.

Johnson, R. K. (1977b). English in Papua New Guinea. In S. A. Wurm (Ed.), *New Guinea area languages and language study* (Vol. 3, pp. 807-832). Canberra, Australia: Australian National University.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Jourdan, C. (1990). Solomons Pijin: An unrecognized national language. In R. Baldauf & A. Luke (Eds.), *Language planning and education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp.166-181). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Jourdan, C. (1991). Pidgins and creoles: The blurring of categories. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 20*, 187-209.

Kale, J. (1990). Language planning and the language of education in Papua New Guinea. In R. Baldauf & A. Luke (Eds.), *Language planning and education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp.182-196). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Kaplan, R. B., & Baldauf, R. B. (2003). *Language and language-in-education planning in the Pacific basin*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Karathanos, K. (2009). Exploring US mainstream teachers' perspectives on use of the native language in instruction with English language learner students. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(6), 615-633.

Keesing, R. M. (1990). Solomons Pijin: Colonial ideologies. In R. Baldauf & A. Luke, (Eds.), *Language planning and education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp.140-165). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Kenilorea, P. (2008). *Tell it as it is: Autobiography of Rt. Hon. Sir Peter Kenilorea, KBE, PC Solomon Islands' first Prime Minister*. Taipei, Taiwan: Center for Asia-Pacific Area Studies.

King, N., & Horrocks, C. (2010). *Interviews in qualitative research*. London, England: Sage.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing.* Thousad Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Lambert, W. E. (1973). *Culture and language as factors in learning and education.* Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED096820.pdf.

Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). *Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Lee, E.W. (1996). Solomon Islands Pijin in education. In F. Mugler & J. Lynch (Eds.), *Pacific languages in education* (pp. 191-208). Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies.

Lefebvre, C., White, L., & Jourdan, C. (2006). *L2 acquisition and creole genesis: Dialogues.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: Benjamins.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. Educational Research and Evaluation: *An International Journal on Theory and Practice, 18*(7), 655-670.

Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2005). Learner code-switching in the content-based foreign language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(2), 234-247.

Lincoln, Y. (2010). "What a long, strange trip it's been…": Twenty-five years of qualitative and new paradigm research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 16*(1), 3-9.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Litteral, R. (1999). *Language development in Papua New Guinea*. Retrieved from http://www-01.sil.org/silewp/1999/002/silewp1999-002.pdf

Locke, T. (2004). *Critical discourse analysis*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Lopez, L. E. (2008). Indigenous contributions to an ecology of language learning in Latin America. In A. Creese, P. W. Martin & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Ecology of language* (2nd ed., Vol. 9, pp. 141-158). Boston, MA: Springer Science and Business Media.

Lotherington, H. (1996). A consideration of the portability and supportability of immersion education: A critical look at English immersion in Melanesia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 17*(5), 349-359. doi: 10.1080/01434639608666288

Lotherington, H. (1998). Trends and tensions in post-colonial language education in the South Pacific. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 1*(1), 65-75.

Lotherington, H. (2008). Education in the South Pacific. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Bilingual education* (2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 267-280). New York, NY: Springer Science and Business Media LLC.

Lynch, J. (1996). The banned national language: Bislama and formal education in Vanuatu. In F. Mugler & J. Lynch (Eds.), *Pacific languages in education* (pp. 245-257). Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies.

Lynch, J., & Mugler, F. (1999). *English in the South Pacific*. Retrieved from http://www.vanuatu.usp.ac.fj/paclangunit/English_South_Pacific.htm

MacSwan, J., & Pray, L. (2005). Learning English bilingually: Age of onset of exposure and rate of acquisition among English language learners in a bilingual education program. *Bilingual Research Journal, 29*(3), 653-678.

Makoni, S., & Mashiri, P. (2007). Critical historiography: Does language planning in Africa need a construct of language as part of its

theoretical apparatus? In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. 62-89). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Mangubhai, F. (2003). Language-in-education policies in the South Pacific: Some possibilities for consideration. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 23*(6), 490-511.

Manyak, P. C. (2004). "What did she say?" Translation in a primary-grade English immersion class. *Multicultural Perspectives, 6*, 12-18.

Martin, P. (1996). Code-switching in the primary classroom: One response to the planned and the unplanned language environment in Brunei. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 17*(2-4), 128-144.

May, S. (2004). Māori-medium education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In J. W. Tollefson & A. B. M. Tsui, *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda? Whose agenda*? Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

May, S. (2008). Bilingual/immersion education: What the research tells us. In J. Cummins & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education: Bilingual education* (2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 19-34). New York, NY: Springer.

May, S., Hill, R., & Tiakiwai, S. (2004). *Bilingual/immersion education: Indicators of good practice.* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education.

McKinnon, R., Atkinson, B., Brash, C., Carillet, J. B., Dragicevich, P., Harewood, J., … Starnes, D. (2009). *South Pacific.* London, England: Lonely Planet.

McMillan, H. J. (2012). *Educational research: Fundamentals for the consumer.* Boston, MA: Pearson.

Mears, C. L. (2009). *Interviewing for education and social science research: The gateway approach*. New York, NY: Palgrave.

Memua, J. (2011). *The experiences, perceptions and expectations of teachers, students and parents of the Community High School Model in Solomon Islands: A Case Study* (Master's thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand). Retrieved from http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/5348

Mertler, C. A.(2009). *Action research: Teachers as researchers in the classroom.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Ministry of Education. (2010). *Vanuatu national curriculum statement: Working together for a better future*. Port Vila, Vanuatu: Curriculum Development Unit.

Ministry of Education. (2012). *Vanuatu national syllabuses: Primary years 1-3.* Port Vila, Vanuatu: Curriculum Development Unit.

Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development. (2007). *Solomon Islands national education action plan 2007-2009*. Retrieved from http://www.paddle.usp.ac.fj/

Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development. (2008). *Solomon Islands English language syllabus for secondary schools: Years 7-9*. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Curriculum Development Centre.

Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development. (2010). *Policy statement and guidelines for the use of vernacular languages and English in education in Solomon Islands*. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Solomon Islands Government.

Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development. (2011). *Solomon Islands national curriculum statement*. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Curriculum Development Division.

Morrell, D. P. & Carroll, B. J. (2010). *Conducting educational research : a primer for teachers and administrators*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Morse, J. M., & Field, P. A. (1996). *Nursing research: The application of qualitative approaches.* Retrieved from http://books.google.co.nz/books?id=_3h_Tqnp1-IC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false

Moseley, L. (1991). USP Solomon Islands centre programme for the year of literacy. In E. C. Reade Fong & J. Mamtora (Eds.), *Literacy and Pacific Women* (pp. 19-25). Suva, Fiji: Fiji Association of Women Graduates.

Mugler, F., & Lynch, J. (1996). Language and education in the Pacific. In F. Mugler & J. Lynch (Eds.), *Pacific languages in education* (pp. 1-9). Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies.

Mühlhäusler, B. S. & Mühlhäusler, P. (2005). Simple English in the South Seas Evangelical Mission. *Language Problems & Language Planning, 29*(1), 1-30.

Mutch, C. (2005). *Doing educational research: A practitioner's guide to getting started*. Wellington, New Zealand: NZCER Press.

Palmer, E. (2011, May 26). *Our population hits 515,870*. Retrieved from: http://www.solomonstarnews.com/news/national/10920-our-population-hits-515870

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Peal, E., & Lambert, W. E. (1962). The relationship of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs, 76*(27), 1-23.

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

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

Peyton, J. (1997). *Professional development of foreign language teachers*. Retrieved from http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/peyton02.html

Pickford, S. (2005). Emerging pedagogies of linguistic and cultural continuity in Papua New Guinea. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 18*(2), 139-153.

Pratt, D. D. (1992). Conceptions of teaching. *Adult Education Quarterly, 42*(4), 203-220.

Ramirez, J. (1992). Executive summary. *Bilingual Research Journal, 16*(1-2), 1-62.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. New York NY: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis* (2nd ed.). New York NY: Cambridge University Press.

Ringbom, H. (1987). *The role of the first language in foreign language teaching*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Roberts, C. A. (1995). Bilingual education programme models: A framework for understanding. *Bilingual Research Journal, 19*(3-4), 369-378.

Romaine, S. (1992). *Language, education, and development: Urban and rural Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* London, England: Sage.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schulz, R. A. (2002). Changing perspectives in foreign language education: Where do we come from? Where are we going? *Foreign Language Annals, 35*, 285-292.

Setati, M., Adler, J., Reed, Y., & Bapoo, A. (2002). Incomplete journeys: Code-switching and other language practices in mathematics, science and English language classrooms in South Africa. *Language and Education, 16*, 128-149.

Shameem, N. (2002). Classroom language use in a multilingual community-the Indo-Fijians in Fiji. *Journal of Intercultural Studies 23*(3), 267-284.

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information, 22*, 63-75.

Shin, S. J. (2005). *Developing in two languages: Korean children in America*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Siegel, J. (1986). Plantation Pidgin Fijian. *Oceanic Linguistics. 21*(1-2), 1-72. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3623154.pdf?acceptTC=true

Siegel, J. (1996a). Melanesian Pidgin in Education. In F. Mugler & J. Lynch (Eds.), *Pacific languages in education* (pp. 155-175). Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies.

Siegel, J. (1996b). *Vernacular education in the South Pacific*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Agency for International Development.

Siegel, J. (1997). Using a Pidgin language in formal education: Help or hindrance. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 18*(1), 86-100.

Siegel, J. (2006). Keeping creoles and dialects out of the classroom: Is it justified? In S. J. Nero (Ed.), *Dialects, Englishes, creoles, and educa*tion (pp. 39-67). New York, NY: Routledge.

Siegel, J. (2008). *The emergence of pidgins and creole languages*. New York, NY: Oxford University.

Siegel, J. (2010). Bilingual literacy in creole contexts. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 31*(4), 383-402.

Singh, G. (2001). Literacy impact studies in Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. *International Journal of Educational Research, 35*, 227-236.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1998). Human rights and language wrongs-A future for diversity? *Language Sciences, 20*(1), 5-27.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associations.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Toukomaa, P. (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, Finland: The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.

Smith, G. P. (2002). *Growing up with Tok Pisin: Contact, creolization, and change in Papua New Guinea's national language*. London, England: Battlebridge.

Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M. (1995). *COLT observation scheme: Communicative orientation of language teaching observation scheme: Coding conventions and application.* Sydney, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.

Stiles, W. B. (1993). Quality control in qualitative research. *Clinical Psychology Review, 13*(3), 593-618.

Swan, J., & Lewis, D. J. (1990). Tok Pisin at university: An educational and language planning dilemma in Papua New Guinea. In R. Baldauf & A. Luke (Eds.), *Language planning and education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp.210-233). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Tamata, A. (1996). Code-switching in Fiji's schools. In F. Mugler & J. Lynch (Eds.), *Pacific languages in education* (pp.155-175). Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London, England: Sage.

Thomas, A. (1990). Language planning in Vanuatu. In R. Baldauf & A. Luke (Eds.), *Language planning and education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp.234-258). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997). Two languages are better than one. *Educational Leadership, 55*(4), 23-26.

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (2002). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement*. Retrieved from crede.berkeley.edu/research/llaa/1.1pdfs/1.1_02purpose.pdf

Torres-Guzman, M. E. (2007). Dual language programs: Key features and results. In O. Garcia & C. Baker (Eds.), *Bilingual education: An introductory reader* (pp. 50-63). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but…. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 531-540.

Tyron, D. T. (1979). Remarks on the language situation in the Solomon Islands. In S. A. Wurm (Ed.), *New Guinea and the neighbouring areas: A sociolinguistic laboratory* (pp.34-51). The Hague, Netherlands: Mounton.

Tyron, D. T., & Charpentier, J. M. (1989). Linguistic problems in Vanuatu. In M. Chapman, & J. F. Dupon (Eds.), *Renaissance in the Pacific* (pp. 13-17). Paris, France: Survival International.

UNESCO. (1953). *The use of vernacular languages in education*. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0000/000028/002897EB.pdf

UNESCO (2003). *Education in a multilingual world: UNESCO Education position paper.* Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001297/129728e.pdf

Vea, P. T. (2010). *Implementing critical literacy in a Tongan bilingual classroom* (Master's thesis, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand). Retrieved from http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/handle/10289/5021

Verhaar, J. W. M. (1989). *Melanesian Pidgin and Tok Pisin*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walqui, A. (2007). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. In O. Garcia & C. Baker (Eds.), *Bilingual education: An introductory reader* (pp. 202-218). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A. (1987). English in the Solomon Islands. *World English, 6*(1), 21-32.

Watson-Gegeo, K. A., & Gegeo, D. W. (1991). The impact of church affiliation on language use in Kwara'ae (Solomon Islands). *Language in Society, 20*(4), 533-555.

Wei, L. (2011). Multilinguality, multimodality, and multicompetence: Code- and modeswitching by minority ethnic children in complementary schools. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*, 370-384.

Wellington, J. (2000). *Educational research: Contemporary issues and practical approaches*. London, England: Continuum.

Willans, F. (2011). Classroom code-switching in a Vanuatu secondary school: Conflict between policy and practice. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 14(1), 23-38.

Wisker, G. (2001). *The postgraduate research handbook: Succeed with your MA, MPhil, EdD and PhD*. New York, NY: Palgrave.

Yu, R. M (2007). Motivating English students in class. *Sino-US English Teaching, 4*(4), 11-14.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Information letter to Permanent Secretary Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development

3/42 York Street
Hamilton East
Hamilton 3216
New Zealand
Email: lot3@waikato.ac.nz
February 1st 2012

Permanent Secretary,
Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development
P. O. Box G28
Honiara
Solomon Islands

Dear Sir/Madam,

SUBJECT: PERMIT TO DO RESEARCH IN THE SOLOMON ISLANDS
My name is Lanelle Olandrea Tanangada and I have been teaching as a senior secondary school teacher at Kukudu Adventist College for the past eight years [2003-2010]. I am currently on study leave undertaking postgraduate study at the University of Waikato, New Zealand. As part of my master's thesis, I am required to complete a research project in education: language and literacy.

I am writing to seek permission to conduct a research inquiry with teachers and students in the two selected schools, Solomon Islands. The title of my project is "A study of language use in secondary school classrooms in the Solomon Islands: Conceptions, practices and proficiencies". My research focuses on what teachers and students think about academic English and language use of both teachers and students in secondary school classrooms.

I respect the authority of this government agency for granting research permits, thus I am seeking your Ministry's approval for me to conduct this study by visiting and collecting data from the selected secondary schools in the Solomon Islands.
I am planning to begin my data collection in March 2012 in two senior secondary schools in the Solomon Islands [Honiara and Western Province]. I will patiently await your response before contacting the concerned education authority and the two schools.

Should you need further information and clarification, you are welcome to contact my supervisor in this study, Dr. Margaret Franken, Department of Arts and Language Education, University of Waikato, New Zealand. She can be contacted on: phone 0064 021 532292 or email: franken@waikato.ac.nz

Thank you for considering my request. I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours faithfully,

Lanelle Olandrea Tanangada

Appendix 2: Solomon Islands Research Application Form

SOLOMON ISLANDS
RA
RESEARCH APPLICATION

1.   NAME:
2.   ADDRESS(es) (if more than one give all):
3.   Curriculum Vitae :
4.   Subject(s) to be studied:
5.   Areas/locality where research work is to be conducted:
6.   Funding:
a) Who is funding this Research?
b) What is the level of funding?
7.   Method of Research:
8.   My Research will involve …………………….. Please tick

Filming		Collecting Sample/Specimen	
Recording			
Photographing		Others (Please specify)	

Others   :
9.   Arrangements for Accommodation in the place(s) of Research:
10.   How will the research results be used? List
11.   List benefits of Research to Solomon Islands:
12.   Name and Address of any person/organisation/institution who is willing to assist you while you are doing your research. (A letter from local host will be useful).
13.   How long will the research take? Specify dates if possible.
14.   Any additional specific information you consider useful for our perusal of your application may be described below.
15.   Give us two referees certifying your research application and background. (Two separate statements expected)

Name:
Address:

Name:
Address:

16.   Applicants Signature _____Date _____

Appendix 3: Research Permit

THE RESEARCH ACT 1982
(No. 9 of 1982)

RESEARCH PERMIT

Permission is hereby given to:

1. Name: *Lanelle Olandrea Tanangada*

2. Country: *Solomon Islands*

3. To undertake research in (subjects): *Language use in secondary school classrooms in the Solomon Islands: conceptions, practices and proficiencies.*

4. Ward(s): *Honiara*

5. Province(s): *Western*

6. Conditions:

   a. To undertake research only in the subject areas specified in 3 above.
   b. To undertake research only in the ward(s) and Province(s) specified in 4 and 5 above.
   c. To observe with respect at all times local customs and the way of life of people in the area in which the research work is carried out.
   d. You must not, at any time, take part in any political or missionary activities or local disputes.
   e. You must leave 4 copies of your final research report in English with the Solomon Islands Government Ministry responsible for research at your own expense.
   f. A research fee of *SBD300.00* and deposit sum of *SBD200.00* must be paid in full or the Research Permit will be cancelled. (See sec. 3 Subject. 7 of the Research Act).
   g. This permit is valid until *30/06/2012* provided all conditions are adhered to.
   h. No live species of plants and animals may be taken out of the country without approval from relevant authorities.
   i. A failure to observe the above conditions will result in automatic cancellation of this permit and the forfeit of your deposit.

Signed: ....

Minister for Education and Human Resources Development

Date: 20-2-12

133

Appendix 4: A letter to the Education Authority

3/42 York Street
Hamilton East
Hamilton, 3216
New Zealand
Email: lot3@waikato.ac.nz
February 10th 2012

Dear Sir,

SUBJECT: PERMISSION TO DO RESEARCH IN YOUR EDUCATION AUTHORITY

I hereby would like to formally inform your good authority of my planned research project to be carried out in the two secondary schools under your authority. I have been teaching as a senior secondary school teacher at Kukudu Adventist College for the past eight years [2003-2010] under this authority and would like to conduct my research in two of your schools. I am currently on study leave undertaking postgraduate study at the University of Waikato, New Zealand. As part of my master's thesis, I am required to complete a research project in education: language and literacy.

I have received consent from the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development to conduct research in two secondary schools under your authority. Therefore, I am writing to seek permission to conduct a research inquiry with teachers and students in the two selected schools. The title of my project is "A study of language use in secondary school classrooms in the Solomon Islands: Conceptions, practices and proficiencies". My research focuses on what teachers and students think about academic English and language in secondary school classrooms. I respect the education authority of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, thus I am seeking your approval for me to conduct this study by visiting and collecting data from the selected schools.

I am planning to begin my data collection in March 2012.
Should you need further information and clarification, you are welcome to contact my supervisor in this study, Dr. Margaret Franken, Department of Arts and Language Education, University of Waikato, New Zealand. She can be contacted on: phone 0064 021 532292 or email: franken@waikato.ac.nz

Thank you for considering my request. I look forward to receiving your response.
Yours faithfully,

Lanelle Olandrea Tanangada

Appendix 5: A letter to the School Principals

3/42 York Street
Hamilton East
Hamilton, 3216
New Zealand
Email: lot3@waikato.ac.nz
February 18th 2012

Attention: Principal

Dear Sir,

SUBJECT: INFORMATION AND INVITATION
My name is Lanelle Olandrea Tanangada and I have been teaching as a senior secondary school teacher at Kukudu Adventist College for the past eight years [2003-2010]. I am currently on study leave undertaking postgraduate study at the University of Waikato, New Zealand. As part of my master's thesis, I am required to complete a research project in education: language and literacy.

My purpose of writing is to seek permission to conduct a research inquiry with teachers and students in the two selected schools, Solomon Islands. The title of my project is "A study of language use in secondary school classrooms in the Solomon Islands: Conceptions, practices and proficiencies". My research focuses on what teachers and students think about academic English and language use of both teachers and students in secondary school classrooms.

I have received consent from the Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development and the Education Director of the SDA Authority to conduct research in your school. Therefore, this letter seeks your permission to involve your English teachers and students as participants in this research. They will be involved in the following:
Individual teacher participant- semi-structured interview [maximum- 5 English teachers].

Student participants- focus group interview [maximum-8 students].
Three classroom observations [individual teacher participant, selected from the five teachers in the semi-structured interview]. This will also involve the students in the teacher's class.

Participants should be asked on voluntary basis according to the ethics approval of this research. Therefore, I ask your permission to conduct a meeting with the English teachers and students in your school. Explanation of the research and requesting for a voluntary participant will be done during the meeting. Selection of venue for this interview will be agreed on by the participants of the research.

I am planning to begin my data collection in March 12th 2012.

Should you need further information and clarification, you are welcome to contact my supervisor in this study, Dr. Margaret Franken, Department of Arts and Language Education, University of Waikato, New Zealand. She can be contacted on: phone 0064 021 532292 or email: franken@waikato.ac.nz.Thank you for considering my request. I look forward to receiving your response.

Yours faithfully,

Lanelle Olandrea Tanangada

Appendix 6: A letter to Teacher Participants (Individual Semi-Structured Interview)

3/42 York Street
Hamilton East
Hamilton, 3216
New Zealand
Email: lot3@waikato.ac.nz
March 9th 2012

Dear Sir/ Madam,

SUBJECT: INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

My name is Lanelle Olandrea Tanangada and I have been teaching as a senior secondary school teacher at Kukudu Adventist College for the past eight years [2003-2010]. I am currently undertaking postgraduate study at the University of Waikato, New Zealand. As part of my master's thesis, I am required to complete a research project in education: language and literacy.

The title of my project is "A study of language use in secondary school classrooms in the Solomon Islands: Conceptions, practices and proficiencies". My research focuses on what teachers and students think about academic English and language use of both teachers and students in secondary school classrooms. I have received consent from the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development and the Education Director of the SDA Authority to conduct research in your school.

My purpose of writing is to seek permission to conduct a research inquiry with five teachers with teaching experience in the English subject. A further class observation will be done on one of the consenting English teachers based on the information provided in the interview.

This research will involve an individual semi-structured interview and classroom observation, taking particular notice to students' language use. This serves as an interest, particularly when the school policy encourages English as the medium of instruction, but practically, both teachers and students also use the lingua franca of the country which is Pijin. Thus, this letter serves to kindly request your willingness to participate in the study. This study will involve you in an individual semi- structured interview, for approximately thirty minutes. The interview will be either in English or Pijin and tape recorded and later transcribed. A copy of the transcribed interview will be returned to you for scrutiny and confirmation. Should you wish to add further relevant details, you have the opportunity to do so. Further explanation on the procedures and expectation from both parties will be done during the formal interview session. The research activities will not conflict with the school programme or your official duties.

Therefore, each participant will come to agree on a suitable time so as not to cause any inconvenience.

It is anticipated that the interview will only be done during your free time. Location of the interview will be chosen and agreed upon by all the participants and the researcher. All the procedures for this research have been approved by the University of Waikato, Faculty of Education Research Ethics Committee, according to their ethics policy. Hence, the study will strictly adhere to these ethical expectations. The school's identity and yours will remain anonymous and confidential. It can be difficult to ensure complete anonymity because of the communal culture and the nature of my research; however, I will do my utmost to protect your privacy. You have the right to withdraw from the study up to the stage when I ask for confirmation of data. Your rights will be fully respected. The duration and security storage of non- identifying data (data sets and transcript) will be kept for a period of five years then destroyed. This research will be published and also viewed as digital copy on the university website as Masters Theses.

Please feel free to contact me should you need further clarification on my email. Alternatively you can contact my supervisor, Dr. Margaret Franken, [Department of Arts and Language, University of Waikato, New Zealand] on: phone 0064 021 532292 or email: franken@waikato.ac.nz. If you are willing to be part of this research please indicate by signing the consent form attached. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Lanelle Olandrea Tanangada

Appendix 7: Consent Form for Teacher Participants

Research Project: A study of language use in secondary school classrooms in the Solomon Islands: Conceptions, practices and proficiencies.

Giving consent

I ………………………….. of ……………………………. High School have read the introductory statement, have asked questions about the research project and understand that:

The researcher will not identify me personally in any presentations or publications reporting the research.
The researcher will delete all electronic files after transcription.
The researcher will only keep textual data (transcripts, observation schedule, and documents) for the required period of five years.

I understand that I have the right to:
Withdraw from the research at any time
Remove, change or add to the transcripts of the interviews
I understand who I can contact if I have any concerns that I feel are unable to be resolved by speaking with me directly.

I consent to:
☐ Having my contributions during the individual semi-structured interview audiotaped and transcribed.

☐ Having the researcher collect and analyse any documents, necessary for the study.

☐ Having the researcher observe my lessons and audiotape and transcribe my conversations during the class interactions with my students.

Name: _____
Signature: _____
Date: _____

Appendix 8: A letter to Student Participants (Focus Group Interview)

3/42 York Street
Hamilton East
Hamilton, 3216
New Zealand
Email: lot3@waikato.ac.nz
March 9th 2012

Dear Student,

SUBJECT: INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH PROJECT

My name is Lanelle Olandrea Tanangada and I have been teaching as a senior secondary school teacher at Kukudu Adventist College for the past eight years [2003-2010]. I am currently on study leave undertaking postgraduate study at the University of Waikato, New Zealand. As part of my master's thesis, I am required to complete a research project in education: language and literacy. The title of my project is "A study of language use in secondary school classrooms in the Solomon Islands: Conceptions, practices and proficiencies". My research focuses on what teachers and students think about academic English and language use of both teachers and students in secondary school classrooms. I have received consent from the Ministry of Education and Human Resources Development and the Education Director of the SDA Authority to conduct research in your school.

My purpose of writing is to seek permission to conduct a research inquiry with students in the two selected schools, Solomon Islands. This research will involve a focus group interview and classroom observation, taking particular notice to students' language use. This serves as an interest, particularly when the school policy encourages English as the medium of instruction, but practically, both teachers and students also use the lingua franca of the country which is Pijin. Thus, this letter serves to kindly request your willingness to participate in the study. This study will involve you in a focus group interview, for approximately one hour. The interview will be either in English or Pijin, tape recorded and later transcribed. A copy of the transcribed interview will be returned to you for scrutiny and confirmation. Should you wish to add further relevant details, you have the opportunity to do so. Further explanation on the procedures and expectation from both parties will be done during the formal interview session. The research activities will not conflict with the school programme or your official duties. Therefore, the participants will come to agree on a suitable time for everyone so as not to cause any inconvenience to anyone. It is anticipated that the interview will only be done during your free time. Location of the interview will be chosen and agreed upon by all the participants and the researcher.

All the procedures for this research have been approved by the University of Waikato, Faculty of Education Research Ethics Committee, according to their ethics policy. Hence, the study will strictly adhere to these ethical expectations. The school's identity and yours will remain anonymous and confidential. It can be difficult to ensure complete anonymity because of the communal culture and the nature of my research; however, I will do my utmost to protect your privacy. You have the right to withdraw from the study up to the stage when I ask for confirmation of data. Your rights will be fully respected. The duration and security storage of non- identifying data (data sets and transcript) will be kept for a period of five years then destroyed. This research will be published and also viewed as digital copy on the university website as Masters Theses.

Please feel free to contact me should you need further clarification. Alternatively you can contact my supervisor, Dr. Margaret Franken, [Department of Arts and Language, University of Waikato, New Zealand] on: phone 0064 021 532292 or email: franken@waikato.ac.nz. If you are willing to be part of this research please indicate by signing the consent form attached. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Yours faithfully,

Lanelle Olandrea Tanangada

Appendix 9: Consent Form for Student participants

Research Project: A study of language use in secondary school classrooms in the Solomon Islands: Conceptions, practices and proficiencies.

Giving consent

I …………………….. of ………………………. High School have read the introductory statement, have asked questions about the research project and understand that:

i.   The researcher will not identify me personally in any presentations or publications reporting the research.

ii.   The researcher will delete all electronic files after transcription

iii.   The researcher will only keep textual data (transcripts and any written documents) for the required period of five years.

I understand that I have the right to:

•   Withdraw from the research at any time

•   Remove, change or add to the transcripts of the interviews

•   Remove, or add to the transcripts that record my contributions during the classroom observations.

I understand who I can contact if I have any concerns that I feel are unable to be resolved by speaking with me directly.

I consent to:

☐ Having my contributions during the focus group interview audiotaped and transcribed.

☐ Having the researcher collect and analyse any documents, necessary for the study.

☐ Participating in classroom observations.*

☐ Having my contributions during lessons audiotaped and transcribed.

☐ Having the researcher collect and analyse any written documents, necessary for the study.

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

*For students who will be in the classes I will observe.

Appendix 10: Semi-Structured Interview Questions for Teachers

A. Demographic Questions:
a) Name: _____
b) School: _____
c) No. of years you have been teaching English: _____
d) Tell me about what your understanding is on the Education Policy of the Solomon Islands in relation to the English Curriculum?

B. Conceptions of Language Use in Secondary Classrooms

Teachers' perceptions on his/her students' language proficiencies
1. How do you find your students' learning of English in your lessons?
2. What are some barriers for students learning the academic English?
3. Tell me about your thoughts on the importance of encouraging students to use the language they are comfortable with.
4. Do you find that your students are confident in using English when speaking in the classroom? Why is this so? Could you elaborate with a classic example?
5. Do you find your students write effectively in academic English? Why do you say so?

Teachers' instructional practice
6. What language/languages do you think you use whilst teaching the subject English? Why?
7. How often do you see yourself using this language? Are you sure you do not use any other languages apart from English?
8. When do you normally use other languages apart from English? Why?
9. Do you switch between languages (code-switching)? How (In what ways do you code-switch)? Why?
10. If code-switching is encouraged in the classroom, how do you think it will affect students' learning of academic English?

Teachers' conceptions and attitudes about academic English
11. What do you understand about the nature of English you need for successful academic study?
12. Do you see it as important in the students' learning?
13. Do you think there is a role for languages other than English in the teaching of the English curriculum? Why?
14. Any further comments?

Appendix 11: Focus Group Interview Questions for Students

A. Students background in relation to their learning of the academic English

a) Could you please share with me briefly about your background

b) Were you brought up in the rural or urban setting?

c) What languages do you use at home?

d) Tell me about the languages you speak?

e) When did you first learn how to speak in English?

f) Tell me about when you were learning to speak English. Do you use any other languages other than English at school? Why?

B. Conceptions of Language Use in Secondary Classrooms

Students' conceptions and attitudes about academic English

Students' language use

1. When do you think you use English?
2. When do you think you use Pijin? Or other languages?
3. Do you understand the words 'academic English'? What do you think it means? What are your views on academic English?
4. Do you ever consider using the English language to promote your learning of academic English?

Students' assessment of proficiency

5. What do you think about your level of English? How do you find yourself performing in this subject? Are you competent enough to do extremely well in this subject?
6. What do you find difficult in relation to this subject English and your learning abilities on this subject? (Grammar, vocabulary, writing, speaking etc.)

Students' code-switching for learning

7. What do you think about the teacher using more than one language (code-switching) at any one time? Do you think you do?
8. When the teacher switches to another language does this help you in any way? Could you share your personal insight to this?
9. How do you see yourself when it comes to understanding a concept better:
   a) When it is explained purely in English?
   b) When it is explained in Pijin/ Vernacular
   c) Both a and b
10. Any further comments?

Appendix 12: Classroom Observation Schedule adapted from COLT Observation Scheme (Spada & Fröhlich, 1995)

SCHOOL:　　　　　TEACHER CODE:　　　　　CLASS:　　　　　DATE:

TIME	ACTIVITY	TEACHER TALKING												Comments
	(What is exactly going on)	Language Used					Metalinguistic							
							Making connections				Focus on aspects of language			
		V	P	E	C/S		Concepts/ Vocabulary	Structure Grammar	Discourse		Form	Function	Discourse	
					Y	N								
.00														
.10														
.20														
.30														
.40														

STUDENTS WORKING

TIME	ACTIVITIES & EPISODE	PARTICIPANT ORGANISATION							STUDENT MODALITY					MATERIALS			
		Class			Group		Indiv.										Description
		T↔S/C	S↔S/C	Choral	Same Task	Different Tasks	Same Task	Different Tasks	Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing	Other	Culturally Relevant	Authentic	Learner Material	
.05																	
.15																	
.25																	
.35																	
.45																	

Appendix 13: Students' Language Background

Year	Urban	Rural	Vernacular	Pijin	English	Pijin/Vernacular	Pijin/English	Vernacular/Pijin/English	Home	Pre-School	Primary	High School
	School		**Language background at home**						**Initial Learning of English**			
11		SR1						✓			✓	
10		SR2				✓					✓	
10		SR3	✓							✓		
12		SR4				✓					✓	
12		SR5						✓	✓			
8		SR6		✓							✓	
9		SR7				✓					✓	
9		SR8				✓					✓	
13	SU1			✓						✓		
10	SU2						✓				✓	
8	SU3							✓			✓	
10	SU4							✓	✓			
10	SU5					✓					✓	
12	SU6					✓					✓	
10	SU7			✓							✓	
9	SU8			✓							✓	