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ABSTRACT

This study investigates the attitudes towards Tok Pisin (an English-lexifier pidgin) and vernacular languages with specific focus on Tolai (an Austronesian language) in Papua New Guinea (PNG) primary schools and how these languages impact on PNG children’s learning during transition to English in the current bilingual education program. It explores the attitudes of curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students toward these languages. Based on participants’ views, the study also investigates whether the current policy on bilingual education is being implemented in schools.

Using a mixed methods framework (Creswell, 2003), the study was conducted in six primary schools in the Kokopo District of East New Britain Province, Papua New Guinea. The study involved 413 participants who completed questionnaires which were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics and 47 additional participants who engaged in in-depth interviews and whose responses were analysed using the grounded theory approach.

This study contributes to international scholarship in terms of providing evidence that there was a general feeling of appreciation and support for the use of Tok Pisin more than for vernacular languages like Tolai in the education system. Children in particular embraced Tok Pisin far more than teachers and parents as it helps them enhance their understanding of English. This confirms Siegel’s (1997) finding on Tok Pisin (and vernaculars), namely that it is a help and not a hindrance to students’ learning. The study also addresses the practicalities of bilingual education in general, supporting the notion that where bi/multilingual education exists, there remains a dichotomy between supporters of mother tongue-based education and pidgin/creole-based education compared to supporters of the English-only curriculum.

The major conclusions that emerged from this study are that, although the current bilingual education program using a modified transitional model (Ball, 2010) has been in existence for the last eighteen years, the ultimate goal of the program has not yet been achieved due to many deficiencies. The current education reform seems to be encouraging bilingual education only as a bridge to learning English, and this does not help with the development of Tok Pisin and/or vernacular languages and their cultures. Secondly, there are a number of mismatches between policy and practice which need attention. The evidence shows that, among the schools that participated in this study, none are bilingual schools as initially envisaged by the National Department of Education’s (NDOE) language policy. Instead the schools have trilingual and/or multilingual classes.

The thesis concludes with five recommendations for practice, two recommendations for policy, and two implications for future research and directions.
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CHAPTER ONE

An Introduction to the Study

1.1. Introduction
The genesis of this study emerged out of the concerns and interests of the researcher relating to the dilemma that parents, teachers and the general public in Papua New Guinea (PNG) are facing with regards to what language(s) best suit children in the formal school system in the country. With due respect to the people of PNG the researcher, who has been a secondary school teacher, teacher-educator, lecturer in the Linguistics and Modern Languages Strand at the University of PNG (UPNG) and an International English Language Testing System (IELTS) examiner in PNG and Australia, set out on this PhD journey to explore the various dimensions of this language issue involving the multilingual use of Tok Pisin\(^1\), the local vernaculars (tokples\(^2\)) and English in PNG primary schools, and how they impact on PNG children’s learning.

The researcher, well versed with the language situation from her experiences in the learning institutions where she worked, embarked on this mission as a result of her observations on: a) the decline in standards of English since the inception of the bilingual education program commonly known as “the education reform” (Matane, 1986) in 1995; and b) the reasons why this education reformed program had become an issue of national debate. The concept of bilingual education in PNG which is detailed in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3.) was introduced to combat the English-medium education which was propagated by the Australian administration during the pre-independence era. Prior to this introduction, pressure on the National Department of Education (NDOE) had been building up for many years as it had been expected to provide a relevant education for many different sections of society (NDOE, 2002a, p. 13). The researcher’s involvement in the IELTS in PNG and Australia during the last ten years was used as a ‘personal’ bench mark to compare the level of English of students who are products of the current bilingual program, and was the main motivating factor which contributed to her growing interest in the topic of this thesis.

---

\(^1\) An English-based expanded pidgin and/or creole spoken by the majority of Papua New Guineans.

\(^2\) A Tok Pisin term for a local vernacular.
This chapter provides the background of the study (Section 1.2), the aims of the research (Section 1.3), research questions and design (Section 1.4), significance and contribution of the study (Section 1.5) and organization of the study (Section 1.6).

1.2. Background of the Study

Bilingual/trilingual or multilingual education which includes either a vernacular language or a lingua franca and for instance English for children and starting at an early age is now a common practice in many countries around the world. Increasingly, the world over, different cultural groups are realising the need to ensure the transmission of cultural heritage to their younger generations through education systems, and PNG is no exception. This conforms to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation’s (UNESCO) mandate and strong commitment to quality education for all and to cultural and linguistic diversity in education (UNESCO, 2003). Although some researchers still contend that bilingual education is an ineffective teaching tool (Duignan, 1988, p. 7), and that it is too costly to implement and thus impedes children’s academic success (Ball, 2010), a large body of international research has demonstrated the importance of instruction in the mother tongue in the early years of a child’s schooling. It is now well established that when a child begins learning in his or her first language (L1), this child is more likely to succeed academically and is better able to develop similarly high levels of conceptual abilities in their second language (L2) (Benson, 2000; Cummins, 1991; Kale, 2005; Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000). Some researchers, for example Baker (2006), Benson (2000), Cummins (2000), Dutcher (2001), and Youssef (2002), have provided evidence that bilingual schooling can improve basic education in developing countries, with a demonstration of the pedagogical advantages of bilingual education (Igboanusi, 2008).

Bilingual education models and/or approaches which were discussed in detail by García (1997) and Baker (2006) were categorised by Ball (2010, p. 18) into eight different approaches which are briefly summarised as follows:

---

3 In the Papua New Guinean context, a vernacular language refers to any of the 850+ indigenous languages spoken in the country.

4 A lingua franca is a language used by different populations to communicate when they do not share a common language (e.g. Tok Pisin).
1) **Mother tongue-based instruction** where the language is delivered entirely in the children’s L1.

2) **Bilingual education** (a.k.a. ‘two-way-bilingual education’ or ‘dual language instruction’) in which minority and majority language children are taught in both minority and majority languages.

3) **Mother tongue-based bilingual education** (a.k.a. ‘developmental bilingualism’) in which L1 is used as the primary medium of instruction for the years of primary school while L2 is introduced as a subject of study in itself and in preparation for its eventual use as the means of instruction for academic participants.

4) **Multilingual education** which involves the formal use of more than two languages in the curriculum.

5) **Transitional bi/multilingual education** (also called ‘bridging’) in which the objective is a planned transition from one language of instruction to another. ‘Short cut’ or ‘early-exit’ is a term given to programs that involve an abrupt transition to L2 instruction after only two or three years in school. ‘Late transition’ or ‘late exit’ refers to a switch to L2 instruction after a child has become fully fluent academically in L1.

6) **Maintenance bi/multilingual education** (also called ‘additive or heritage bilingual education’). After the L2 has been introduced, both (or all) chosen languages are media of instruction. L1 instruction continues, often as a subject of study, to ensure children become academically proficient in L1. Even though one or two more languages are added, they do not displace L1.

7) **Immersion or foreign language instruction** involves the entire education program being provided in a language that is new to the child.
8) Submersion (a.k.a. ‘Sink or Swim’) occurs when speakers of non-dominant languages have no choice but to receive education in languages they do not understand. This approach promotes subtractive bilingualism: that is L2 learning at the expense of L1.

The scope of the above definitions indicates that a wide variety of bilingual education programs have been and are currently implemented in multilingual countries. However, the choice of approach lies heavily with the language education policies of a country. This study explores bilingual education in PNG primary schools which follow the fifth approach, ‘transitional bilingual education’ (‘bridging’) in the first three years of primary education using Tok Pisin and vernacular languages as a bridge to English. This is further discussed in Section 3.2.3.

1.3. Aims of the Research
The primary purpose of the study was: a) firstly, to examine the attitudes of curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classrooms b) secondly, to find out if the current policy of bilingual education is being implemented in schools based on the participants’ views.

Although pidgins and creoles have been condemned by some linguists as illegitimate languages (Rickford & Traugott, 1985), Kale (1990) argues that pidgins and creoles are linguistically speaking languages with equal status to other languages and not merely broken forms or second-rate varieties of some other language (p. 107). For these reasons, Kale (1990) claims that there are no well-founded reasons why pidgins and creoles could not be part of a school program. Siegel (1997) supports this view by stating that there have been numerous reported cases of favourable outcomes of pidgin and creole education in other parts of the world such as by Murtagh (1982) on Australian Kriol, Kephart (1992) on Carriacou Creole in the Caribbean, and Siegel (1997) on Tok Pisin in preschools in PNG. There are also some unfavourable views presented by researchers such as Shnukal (1982) on Torres Strait Creole and Charpentier (1997) on Bislama in Vanuatu.
This study adds to the existing literature on the use of pidgins and creoles by examining the use of Tok Pisin and Tolai, a local vernacular (also known as Kuanua) spoken by the Tolai people of East New Britain Province in PNG’s education system.

The next section discusses the research questions and design of this study.

1.4. Research Questions and Design
In order to achieve its purpose, the study is guided by the following research questions:

Research Question One:
What are the attitudes of curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classroom?

Sub – Questions:

1.1. What are the similarities between the curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classroom?

1.2. What are the differences between the curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classroom?

Research Question Two:
Based on participants’ views, is the current policy on bilingual education being implemented in schools?

The study involved 413 respondents in a questionnaire survey undertaken at six schools in the Kokopo District of East New Britain Province. The questionnaire data was collected from primary teachers (n=85), parents of children in participating schools (n=86), and Grade 3 students (n=242). The interviews (47) consisted of curriculum/education officers based in the
Curriculum Development Division (CDD) in Port Moresby (n=8), teachers (n=18), parents (n=15), and students (n=6) from the six participating schools.

The study employed a mixed methods approach (see Chapter 4.1.1) in order to provide a holistic and comprehensive view of the type of bilingual program currently practised in PNG schools.

1.5. Significance and Contribution of the Study
This study contributes to language education in PNG in a number of ways. Firstly, it adds to research on the PNG context of transitional bilingual education. A small number of studies similar to the present research have been undertaken in the past (Badenoch & Chandler, 2004; Paraide, 2002; and Siegel, 1997) but they were focused primarily on students’ academic achievements. By comparison, this present study focuses on the attitudes of curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the languages used for learning in the classroom and how these languages are used to transition to what Malone and Paraide (2011) term “the national language of education, English” (p. 717). Arguably, there remains a need to incorporate observations of actual classroom behaviour of teachers and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages in the classroom in order to verify the findings from the questionnaires and interviews with actual practices in the classroom. However, this was not done in this study due to time constraints. Therefore, this study will be a starting point for exploring the conflicting attitudes towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages and how they are used to bridge to English during the ‘bridging’ year (in Grade 3) using multiple groups of cohorts in any given study.

Secondly, the study adds to the literature discussing the decline in the quality of education in PNG. The standard of English has dropped drastically in all levels of education since the inception of the transitional bilingual education eighteen years ago (Rena, 2011). According to Malone and Paraide (2011), there is very little evidence of successful implementation of the bilingual program so far. They claim that by now parents, teachers and other stakeholders should have been aware of, and understand fully, the rationale and benefits of using a familiar language for instruction in the early years of formal instruction. At the same time there should have been
an increased production of reading and teaching materials in most of the vernacular languages of PNG with improved professional preparation for elementary teachers. Furthermore, the government should have been in a position to document a generally increased acquisition of basic English skills and an increase in the percentage of children who complete Grade 8. Sadly, not all of these signs of successful implementation are yet in place (Malone and Paraide, 2011).

Thirdly, this study suggests ways to address the increasing numbers of students dropping out of school. This alarming trend (Rena, 2011), clearly indicates that there are major deficiencies in the current transitional bilingual education program. This calls for a major review in the current language education policy. The findings of this study highlight the need for quality teachers in the school system. This means traditional English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers from the previous English-only curriculum need considerable re-training in bilingual education and its pedagogies so that they are able to comply with the current transitional bilingual education language policy and be on par with the recently trained and certified bilingual teachers.

Fourthly, the study shows the dynamic aspect of ‘language shift’ that is permeating all schools, causing more and more Papua New Guinean children to abandon their vernacular and shift to Tok Pisin. This study will explore the reasons why this phenomenon is taking place and suggest recommendations on how this issue can be best addressed in schools. It will add to the existing literature by providing new data on language shift from vernacular to Tok Pisin in PNG classrooms and the use of pidgins and creoles in education.

Furthermore, this study provides evidence of several mismatches in policy and practice also known as the ‘policy gap’ (Sayed, 2002, p. 9) within the current bilingual education program which uses a modified version of the ‘early exit model’ and the ‘late-exit model’ (see Section 3.2.3). These mismatches include a) the transition to English period (in Grade 3-5) is not being adhered to, which results in children completing Grade 8 with very little knowledge of basic English skills, b) ‘bridging’ (to English) teachers in Grade 3 do not speak the L1 of the students thus encouraging teachers to use Tok Pisin instead of the L1 which is supposed to be used in elementary schools to enhance smooth transition to English, c) teachers are teaching bilingual lessons without formal training in bilingual education, and d) teachers in village schools who the
NDOE assume are teaching in Tolai in its bilingual programs were found to be using Tok Pisin instead.

More importantly, this study will assess the views of Papua New Guineans on whether or not they accept the transitional bilingual program in the current education system and whether they want to see it continue in future.

Overall, it is expected that the findings of this study will contribute to the improvement of the bilingual education programs in PNG. Although there have been reported cases of early successes of the bilingual education programs in PNG by Litteral (2004), Klaus (2003), Kale and Marimyas (2003), due to greater funding and support at the initial phase, the future of this continued success is now at stake. The findings of this study will also be beneficial to governments elsewhere that are yet to introduce bilingual education programs in their countries. Moreover, this study will contribute to the existing literature on pidgins and creoles in education, specifically on people’s attitudes towards pidgins and/or creoles as the medium of instruction in the classroom.

1.6. Organization of the Study

This thesis consists of eight chapters. Chapter 2 provides the context of the study. It specifically discusses PNG’s cultural and linguistic backgrounds by emphasizing its cultural diversity and highlighting the main languages spoken in Papua New Guinea. It provides a historical overview of the educational changes that have taken place in the country, culminating in a discussion of the current education reform that has been in existence for the last eighteen years.

Chapter 3 reviews the existing literature and research that motivated and helped generate the research questions addressed in this thesis. It begins by exploring the theories on language attitudes and the literature on bilingual education and then explores the literature on attitudes towards languages used in the bilingual education programs in PNG. The chapter also considers, from a variety of perspectives, how pidgins and creole languages represent a new trend in bi/multilingual education, and reviews major findings from empirical research studies of the use
of pidgins, creoles and vernacular languages and how they relate to PNG’s bilingual education program.

Chapter 4 depicts the methodological approach adopted for the study. In order to deeply explore the phenomenon under investigation, a mixed methods approach was adopted and justification of this approach is provided.

Chapter 5 provides the key findings from an analysis of the questionnaire data. It comprises descriptive statistical findings and the findings of an inferential statistical data analysis which was employed to determine whether there were any significant differences among the language attitudes of the different groups of cohorts who took part in this study.

Chapter 6 provides the key findings from an analysis of the in-depth interviews.

Chapter 7 includes a detailed account and an interpretation of the findings of the study with reference to each of the research questions and in relation to previous relevant research.

Chapter 8 summarizes the findings of the study, focuses on both pedagogical and research implications of the study, indicates its limitations and offers recommendations for future research and practices.
CHAPTER TWO
The Context of the Study

2. Introduction
This chapter provides the context of this study. Section 2.1 discusses the background context of PNG, Section 2.2 provides a historical overview of major educational changes in the country, Section 2.3 discusses the current state of education reform in PNG, and Section 2.4 presents a summary of this background material.

2.1. Background Context of Papua New Guinea
PNG is an independent Melanesian island nation in the eastern South Pacific which is located to the north of the eastern tip of Australia and just below the equator. The country comprises more than 600 islands, which together cover a total land mass of 462,840 square kilometres (New Guinea Gold Corporation, 2011). It shares a land border to the west with Irian Jaya, a province of Indonesia, and a water border with Australia to the South and the Solomon Islands to the east. Most of the country consists of tropical forests and grasslands on rugged, mountainous terrain. PNG is divided into four regions commonly known as: the Southern Region, the MOMASE Region, the Highlands Region and the New Guinea Islands (NGI) Region.

2.1.1. Papua New Guinea’s Cultural Diversity
PNG has often been described by many as ‘the land of the unexpected’ (a common phrase now used by Air Niugini on its flyers). PNG is a unique land of diversely complex cultures which includes ceremonies, rituals, beliefs and customs that have continued to be passed on from the

---

5 The Southern Region comprises the following Provinces: Central, Gulf, Milne Bay, National Capital District, Oro (previously known as Northern Province) and Western (or Fly).

6 The MOMASE Region comprises: Morobe, Madang and the two Sepik Provinces (East and West Sepik).

7 The Highlands Region is made up of: Eastern Highlands, Western Highlands, Southern Highlands, Simbu, Enga, Jiwaka and Hela Provinces.

8 The NGI Region encompasses: East New Britain, West New Britain, New Ireland, Manus and Bougainville (which is now an Autonomous Region).

9 PNG’s National airline
older generation to the younger generation through oral traditions such as story-telling and cultural initiations (August, 2010, p. 3). There is much diversity between the cultures in Papua Guinea; for example there is the colourful Huli tribe who inhabit the southern highlands of Papua New Guinea. Colourful clay is used for traditional body decoration by the Hulis. In contrast the young men of the Sepik region undergo painful skin cutting on their backs. This is a symbol of strength and power to resemble the much worshipped water spirit (crocodiles) of the Sepik (Trans Niugini Tours, 1996). While 85% of PNG’s population remains in rural communities whose main source of livelihood is subsistence farming and small community-based small enterprises, 15% of the population find formal employment in the slowly increasing government, business and service industries (Kale and Marimyas, 2003).

2.1.2. Papua New Guinea’s Linguistic Situation
PNG’s indigenous population is one of the most heterogeneous in the world, comprising several thousand separate communities, most with only a few hundred people. What is striking about this Melanesian island nation is that it has been described by many linguists as the most linguistically diverse country in the world. It has a population of 7 million (World Bank, 2011), who speak more than 850 local vernaculars with different dialects (Sumbuk, 1993). Some of the languages have few speakers, while the larger languages have upwards of 200,000 speakers. But none is numerically or politically dominant (Kale, 2005, p. 1). Enga is the largest with 180,000 speakers and is spoken in the Province bearing its name in the Highlands Region. Four other vernaculars are fairly sizable: Tolai (Kuanua) with 80,000 speakers located in Rabaul in the East New Britain Province, the vernacular that this study focuses on; Melpa, with 75,000 speakers located in the Western Highlands Province; Kuman in the Simbu Province with 70,000; and Huli with 65,000 speakers among the Tari of the Southern Highlands. Many vernaculars are small, many with 100 or less speakers (Nekitel, 1998, p. 49).

Languages spoken in PNG belong to two main language groups. One third of the languages belong to the Austronesian language family group (Ahai, 2004, p. 3). Austronesian vernaculars show evidence of lexical, phonological and, to a large extent, structural similarities which in turn suggest a genetic relationship. They are mostly found along the coastal, near coastal and insular
areas of the country. According to Nekitel (1998, p. 49) each has approximately three hundred speakers and is usually spoken in small communities. Exceptions are Tolai and Motu with more than 10,000 speakers in the villages of the Port Moresby area. The total number of Papua New Guineans who speak Austronesian vernaculars constitute a small fraction of the total indigenous population.

The remainder of languages, many of which are unrelated, belong to the Papuan or Non-Austronesian linguistic group. These languages are part of as many as eight major phyla and many different language families. A very few have, by Papua New Guinea standards, a great number of speakers (e.g., Enga, Melpa, Kuman, Huli) but most are small. Papuan vernaculars differ quite considerably and belong to a number of unrelated linguistic groups. They are spoken in the interior of the Highlands of New Guinea (with the exception of Gulf, Western and some areas of the Oro Provinces), parts of East New Britain, some parts of the East and West Sepik Coasts, and some parts of the North Solomons Province. In total, they account for the overwhelming majority of the indigenous population. As well as these two large groups of languages, PNG is home to Tok Pisin, an English-based expanded pidgin, and Hiri Motu a Motu-based lingua franca. When the country gained independence on 16th September 1975, these two lingua francas gained recognition as national languages, and English became the official language like in many countries around the world with British, United States and/or Australian colonial histories.

English is the dominant language of administration, commerce, mass media, the judiciary and the legislature, and it is the principal medium of instruction in the education system, from preschool and kindergarten in privately run institutions and from Grade 3 onwards in the public schools. Despite the fact that PNG has witnessed a major overhaul in its education system and moved from an English-only curriculum to the current bilingual ‘early exit’ model, opinions regarding English as the medium of instruction remain favourable. The association with prestige, power and opportunities has been the driving force for many parents to want education in English for their children. A study by Igboanusi and Lothar (2005, p. 18), which found that Nigerians see English as an important resource for self enhancement, social and political empowerment and job access opportunities, shares certain similarities with the Papua New Guinean situation. English
has continued to be a tool for advancement and power, and proponents believe that learning it allows for upward social mobility (Mfum-Mensah, 2005, pp. 80-4).

2.2. A Historical Overview of Education in Papua New Guinea
This section gives a historical overview of major educational changes in the country in two parts. In Section 2.2.1, traditional education is highlighted while Section 2.2.2 describes formal or western education.

2.2.1. Traditional Education in Papua New Guinea
One of the western myths about developing countries like PNG is that colonization brought the first education system. However, PNG, like many other similar traditional societies, had its own formal approaches to teaching and learning long before colonization began. Although these approaches were not as systematically organized as the introduced western-style school system, the overall intentions and the underlying principles were similar to those of formal western education and schooling.

According to Crossley (1994), traditional education in PNG included the teaching of ‘technical knowledge’ (skills needed for daily life) and ‘revealed knowledge’ (traditional beliefs and rituals). Transmission of technical knowledge to children in the local vernacular was mostly informal with much learning taking place through observation. Revealed knowledge, on the other hand, was transmitted through instruction. Traditional education was relevant to the everyday lives of the learners. It was practical in that it taught young people how to function as adults in the community and how to be protected from malevolent spiritual forces. It served as a way of transmitting and therefore preserving people’s cultural heritage. While traditional education continues to play an important role in many language communities, including those who have migrated to urban centres, most Papua New Guinean parents desire an education that will also provide their children with the means for gaining social mobility and future prosperity.

2.2.2. Formal and Western Style Education in Papua New Guinea
The introduction of formal and western-style education in PNG closely followed the arrival of expatriate missionaries into the country in the 1870s. First established in 1873 by the London Missionary Society (LMS) working on the islands off the north coast of mainland PNG to teach
islanders to read the scripture, mission schools spread gradually to coastal areas of the main island, and later to the interior. After 1884, German and British missionaries established primary schools to teach Western concepts of morality, the German and English languages, arithmetic and the Christian doctrine. During the early 1900s, the British government encouraged missionaries to develop vocational education programs to produce better farmers, crafts people, and skilled labourers (NDOE, 1991). These mission schools formed by missions from Germany, Britain, Australia and the United States continued to provide the most basic education to Papua New Guineans. Many developed one or more vernaculars as church lingua francas mainly for village people, teaching religion and improving the quality of life of the indigenous population (Litteral, 2001, p. 2).

Before World War II, the colonial government’s objectives for education and literacy were to pacify the indigenous population, to prepare workers for low level government and business positions and to teach in primary schools. They also wanted to extend their social, political and economic control over those in their colonies (Ahai, 2004, p. 4). The Germans, who controlled the northeastern part of New Guinea and several nearby island groups from 1884 until 1914, chose German as the language of education in New Guinea; the British and Australians, who controlled the southeastern quarter of the island from 1883 to 1949, chose English for Papua. New Guinea switched to English after World War I (Wurm, 1971). When Australia finally took control of the German colony in northeastern New Guinea with Papua and New Guinea under its reign in 1914, it established English as the official language of instruction and laid the foundation for modern education in PNG.

After World War II, the government sought to extend its control over education. One action involved setting up the Education Department for the combined territories of PNG. W.C. Groves became the first Director of Education for these territories. He formulated a government policy meant to combine aspects of Christian, traditional, and secular education in “blended” schools (Malone, 1987). Groves’ (1936) plan was for the first four years of primary school to be in village schools and taught in local language. This was to be followed by four years in government schools where students would bridge into English. From these schools, students would then proceed to English-language high schools.
In 1953, a committee review of the Department of Education set up by the Australian minister for territories concluded that in a situation of such linguistic diversity, the only hope for an independent and united nation was to use English as a means of communication (Hasluck, 1976). In 1962, all government and government-supported schools were obligated to use English only, and mission-sponsored primary schools that used local languages were no longer eligible for government subsidies. This policy effectively banished indigenous languages completely from the formal education system so that by 1970 students were forbidden to use any language other than English on school grounds. The reasons for the pro-English policy were:

1. English was regarded as more convenient and, for some, “superior” than any of the indigenous languages. If civilization was to be transferred, it was argued, it must be done in English and not the local vernaculars.

2. English was the most convenient language for colonial officials because they did not have the time, the compulsion nor the consideration to learn and use local vernaculars and pidgins which they, generally speaking, deprecated (Nekitel, 1998, p. 175).

Many Papua New Guineans were not happy with the directions that the colonial administrators set for education. Therefore in 1974, a committee chaired by the then Director of Education, Sir Alkan Tololo, and with an entirely Papua New Guinean membership drafted a post – Independence five year education plan which proposed that the use of vernaculars be emphasized in community-based schools and should be linked to development more widely and more equally provided. They planned to expand primary schooling to Grade 8 and expand access to Grades 9 and 10. They were also concerned that greater access to education should be given to females and to those from disadvantaged areas. However, these ideas were overturned (Waters, 1995).

English continued to be the medium of instruction in schools until 1975 (independence), when PNG found itself with a need for a high percentage of skilled manpower to run its economy. In order to solve this, there was a need to set up a Commission that could survey existing
educational resources and to advise the government on the formation and implementation of human resources and the labour market (NDOE, 1999). This led to the growth of enrolments, especially in primary and secondary schools, a growth which continued to be experienced in later years. Although formal education was expanding during this period, it was not directly accompanied by economic growth. Thus not all school graduates could find employment and the many school drop outs were left with neither jobs nor training (Rena, 2011).

In the 1980s, the government realized that the formal education system was not serving the majority of PNG’s population and was a major contributor to social, cultural, spiritual and economic alienation. In response, a committee spearheaded by Sir Paulias Matane compiled the renowned ‘Matane Report’ of 1986, which stressed that school can help educate children but cannot and should not be regarded as the only agent of education. They further stated that the home, the churches, the community, the police and the politicians are also influences on a child’s life and must contribute to the integral human development of the child (Matane, 1986). The process of integral human development calls for an education system that helps individuals:

- Identify basic human need,
- Analyse situations in terms of needs,
- See these needs in the context of spiritual and social values of the community,
- Take responsible action in co-operation with others.

(NDOE, 2002b, p. 8)

Therefore, after the country witnessed the success of the piloted Viles Tok Ples Pri Skul\(^{10}\) (VTPPS), village vernacular schools in the North Solomons Province as well as some other parts of the country (Litteral, 2005, p. 3), PNG saw the rebirth of its education system and the introduction of all 850+ vernacular languages and Tok Pisin. A parent in the North Solomons Province like other community members welcomed the changes he saw in his child and the reconnection of language, culture and identity:

---

\(^{10}\) A Tok Pisin term for village vernacular preschools (used in the works of Delpit and Kemefield, 1985).
When our children go to school, they go to an alien place. They leave their parents, they leave their gardens, they leave everything that is their way of life. They sit in a classroom and learn things that have nothing to do with their own place. Later because they have learned other things they reject their own. They don’t want to dig kaukau (sweet potato) they say it’s dirty, they don’t want to help their mothers fetch water. They look down on those things. There are big changes in the children now. They don’t obey their parents, they become rascals and this is because they left the things that are ours. Now my child is in Tokples school. He is not leaving his place. He is learning in school about his customs, his way of life. Now he can write anything he wants to in Tokples. Not just the things he sees but things he thinks about too. And he writes about his place. He writes about helping his mother carry water, about going to the garden. When he writes these things, they become important to him. He is not only writing about things outside but learning through reading and writing to be proud of our way of life. When he is big, he will not reject us. It is important to teach our children to read and write, but it is more important to teach them to be proud of themselves and of us.

(Parent in North Solomons Province, PNG, quoted in Delpit and Kemefield, 1985, pp. 29-30).

The change was an attempt to curb the irrelevant education propagated by the Australian Administration and educate an elite group of Papua New Guineans to continue to run the country after independence (Kale and Marimyas, 2003, p. 2). This was the beginning of what is called today the ‘education reform’ which incorporated the bilingual education program in Lower primary schools.

2.3. The Current Education Reform

The main purpose of the restructure in the 1990s was to increase access to education at all levels. Most importantly, a village-based, three-year vernacular elementary level consisting of preparatory and Grades 1 and 2 was introduced, changing the community school level to Grades 3-8 (which previously used to be from Grades 1-6). Secondary schools (which used to be from Grades 7-10) were then to be changed to Grades 9-12 in all provinces (Litteral, 1999, p. 5).
The key reason for this restructure was the difficulties faced by graduates of the previous education system, most of whom could not be absorbed into the shrinking labour market (Rena, 2011). Besides, there was a low enrolment and high dropout rates, significant gender and regional disparities and a curriculum lacking relevance to most Papua New Guinean children. The long-term goal of the reform was to achieve sustainable, quality, universal basic education, and a more productive, skilled population. The educational reform advocated for a more practical curriculum that would offer a wide range of employment opportunities, ensuring equitable distribution of educational resources throughout the country (Rena, 2011).

The education system (see Figure 1) was expected to ensure that students graduating at every level had some scientific and practical knowledge that could be utilized for self-employment, salaried employment or further training. It placed a greater emphasis on practical and technical aspects of education. Education under this reform policy was designed to provide lifelong skills and make individuals self-sufficient and productive in agriculture, industries and commerce (Waiko, 1996). The aims of this major reform in the education sector are as follows:

1. To provide basic schooling for all children as this becomes financially feasible.
2. To help people understand the changes that are occurring in contemporary society through the provision of formal education and literacy programs.
3. To adequately prepare school leavers to return to their communities where there is, and always has been, traditional work and opportunities for community-based employment which covers approximately 85 percent of the population. The major source of employment of these citizens will be their own subsistence and small-scale community-based commercial enterprises. Their education will have provided them and/or their children for this reality.
4. To adequately prepare a small but growing number of marginalised urban youth for the realities of life in an urban situation.
5. To identify the manpower needs in the public and private sectors and to provide appropriate higher education and training programs (NDOE, 1996, pp.2-3).
As mentioned above, the current language education system begins at the elementary school which follows the transitional bilingual education approach using either a local vernacular or Tok Pisin. The purpose of the three-year initial education in local vernaculars and Tok Pisin is to establish strong cultural bonding between children and their community (Waiko, 2003). Tok Pisin and vernacular education allows students to use what is already known to learn new skills such as reading, writing and numeracy in familiar contexts, enhances active interaction and communication in school from the first day, and enables students at a later time to use their abilities to learn a foreign language (English) and to gradually transition to education in that language when they are ready.

As children enter lower primary school (Grades 3-5) at the age of nine, they are introduced to the transitional bilingual program in Grade 3 which uses one of PNG’s vernacular languages or Tok Pisin with English. This bridging period is expected to continue up to the end of Grade 5. When students enter upper primary school (Grades 6-8) typically at the age of twelve, the main
emphasis in their classroom is on English as the language of instruction; however, the use of the local vernaculars and Tok Pisin is still encouraged. By the end of Grade 8, when students are fourteen years of age, they are expected to have mastered the basic skills in English and be ready to enter secondary school (Grades 9-12). This study focuses on the important phase when students enter primary school and transition to English in Grade 3. This is discussed further in Section 3.2.3 in the next chapter.

2.4. Conclusion
This chapter provided the context of this study. It began by discussing the geographical location of PNG as a Melanesian island nation in the Eastern South Pacific (Section 2.1) and summarized how PNG has been described as a country of diversely complex cultures (Section 2.1.1). The country’s linguistic situation was then discussed which highlighted the fact that languages in PNG belong to either the Austronesian family group or the larger Papuan language group. English is the country’s official language, whereas Tok Pisin and Hiri Motu are the two national languages (Section 2.1.2). The chapter then provided a historical overview of the types of education systems (Section 2.2) PNG has witnessed, showing how these evolved from traditional education to mission education which used Tok Pisin and vernacular languages. This was followed by the introduction of the western formal education system imposed by the Australian administration which emphasized the use of English-only up until the early 1990s. Section 2.3 then discussed the restructure of PNG’s education system which saw a change from the English-only curriculum to vernacular/indigenous education after the government realized that the previous system was not serving PNG’s population. Advocates of this structural reform included in a revised language policy the need for lifelong skills for students and a system that would achieve sustainable, quality and universal education for all Papua New Guineans. This education system involves MT-based bilingual education at the elementary school and transitional bilingual education at the lower primary school. This chapter set the scene for this study on the transitional bilingual education programs in PNG primary schools. The following chapter reviews the literature that underpins this study.
CHAPTER THREE
Literature Review

3. Introduction

This chapter reviews theory and research in the areas that underpin the present study. Section 3.1 reviews theories on language attitudes, which is the key focus of this study; Section 3.2 reviews the literature on bilingual education; Section 3.3 discusses the use of vernaculars in bilingual programs in PNG; and Section 3.4 focuses on pidgins and creoles and their use in education. The chapter concludes (Section 3.5) by pointing out the research gap that exists in the literature and thus, the justification for the focus of this study.

3.1. Theories on Language Attitudes

Studies regarding attitudes towards a certain language are now receiving considerable attention the world over from both L1 and L2 researchers. Since this study focuses on attitudes towards bilingual education in PNG, this section sets out to explore the theories that underpin this area of study. Firstly, Allport (1954) defines attitudes as a “mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations with which it is related” (as cited in Gardner, 1985, p. 8). This definition refers to the essence of attitude, while a definition based on an operational point of view, according to Gardner (1985), is: “an evaluative reaction to some referent or attitude object, inferred on the basis of the individual’s beliefs or opinions about the referent” (pp. 91-93). Gardner (1985) developed a theory on attitude in second language learning, while Baker (1992) further developed this theory with a focus on attitudes towards bilingualism. This theory is focused on positive or negative attitudes toward the idea of language co-existence and its synchronization. Baker (1992) establishes that attitudes toward bilingualism depend upon the student more than on his or her family. He proposes that age and peer influence are what primarily define a student’s attitudes toward bilingualism. Nevertheless, parents still influence their child’s bilingual learning in their early years.
There is a great amount of research on attitudes towards different languages and languages used in school systems in other parts of the world compared to PNG. However, before highlighting some of these studies, the *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics* (Richards, et al., 1985) defines *language attitude* as:

> the attitude which speakers of different languages or language varieties have towards each other’s languages or to their own language. Expressions of positive or negative feelings towards a language may reflect impressions of linguistic difficulty, ease or difficulty of learning, degree of importance, elegance, social status etc. Attitudes towards a language may also show what people feel about speakers of that language. (p. 199)

The definition above associates well with multilingual and/or multicultural nations, especially school children attending bi/multilingual education programs where a number of different languages are used as mediums of instruction. Most research on language attitudes have concluded that students’ attitude is an integral part of learning and that it should, therefore, become an essential component of second language learning pedagogy. There are several reasons why research on students’ attitudes towards learning is important. This is further discussed in the next section (3.1.1) which encompasses learners’ attitudes, parents’ attitudes and teachers’ attitudes.

### 3.1.1. Students’ Attitudes

Research on students’ attitudes towards learning is a very important phenomenon. First, attitudes towards learning are believed to influence behaviour (Kaballa & Crowley, 1985 cited in Weinburg, 1998), such as selecting reading books and speaking in a foreign language just to name a few. Second, a relationship between attitudes and achievement has been shown to exist. Schibeci and Riley (1986 cited in Weinburg, 1998) report that there is support for the proposition that attitudes influence achievement, rather than achievement influencing attitudes. The different aspects of language attitude studies that have been carried out so far have been many and varied which include: Shin and Krashen (1996), who wrote about beliefs and attitudes about the principles of bilingual education and the participation of students in bilingual education; Shameem (2004), who investigated the use of languages and language attitudes in bi/multilingual

---

11 ‘Learners’ refers to students, and both words are used interchangeably in this thesis.
primary schools in Fiji; Wright (1999), who wrote about the influences on learner attitudes towards foreign language and culture; Shin & Gribbons (1996), who studied Hispanic parents’ perceptions of, and attitudes to, bilingual education; Gonzales (2000), who worked on teachers’ beliefs, attitudes and knowledge and their effects on instruction for English language learners in transition; and Dakwar (2005), who investigated students’ attitudes in first, second, and third grade towards Modern Standard Arabic using an interview paradigm. The findings of Dakwar’s study provide insight into children's attitudes toward Modern Standard Arabic, its perceived proximity or distance from Palestinian Colloquial Arabic, as well as the perceived difficulties of learning Modern Standard Arabic. In addition, Gardner’s (2001) contribution in the understanding of attitudes and its relation to language teaching and learning cannot be ignored. Gardner’s studies in language attitudes and motivation have been cited by professionals and experts in language acquisition (Cook, 1996; Ellis, 1985; Hashimoto, 2002; Romaine, 1995; Spolsky, 1989). In sum, research regarding language attitudes has yielded information that is valuable in determining the language to be used as the medium of instruction in schools. In other works, Skehan (1989) and Stern (1985) theorize that there is a dynamic relationship between learners’ motivation, and their specific attitudes to the target language and its speakers, and the manner in which learners approach and conduct their learning, and hence their ultimate language learning success.

It is apparent that in language learning, as in many other areas of children’s learning, children are similar to adults in that they are strongly influenced by those who are significant to them; people such as their friends and family. However, children may also be influenced by their peers, their teachers and the general school environment. For instance, Cummins (1993) suggests that the use of a learner’s L1 at school strongly affects whether or not they maintain that language. Similarly, a family’s attitude to a language and their use of it in the home will influence a child’s success in that language. This then leads this discussion to highlight parents’ attitudes towards languages in the next section.

3.1.2. Parents’ Attitudes
Parents are a key element in an educational setting, and successful bilingual education programs have involved parents in their design and implementation (Howard, Sugarman & Christian,
There are subtle but important aspects related to parental involvement and participation with the school, such as their attitude and motivation toward language learning and bilingualism/biliteracy. For an educational program to be successful, certain elements must be in place. Apart from effective teachers, well-developed curriculum and efficient administrative staff, there must also be supportive parents and a supportive community (Luján & Armendáriz, 2002).

Research clarifies that a very important element in program success is parent involvement (Epstein & Sanders, 2000; Li, 1999; Zelazo, 1995). Parents have an important and remarkable influence on a child’s school achievement. Parent involvement and attitudes show a positive difference in a child’s achievement, attitude, and school attendance regardless of social class, race or ethnicity (Henderson, 1987 as cited in Zelazo, 1995). The literature further suggests that parental encouragement is an important element when children learn a second language (Baker, 1992; Gardner, 1985; Sung & Padilla, 1998). Successful L1 learners who become bilingual and biliterate have parents who are involved in their second language learning. As Shibata (2000) quotes; “A child does not become bilingual spontaneously. Children need parents who want them to become bilingual and who give their effort and patience toward that goal” (p. 340). The next section discusses teachers’ attitudes. According to Silin and Schwartz (2003), teachers’ attitudes are important to study because teachers are the agents of change in the classrooms.

3.1.3. Teachers’ Attitudes

Research on teachers’ attitudes and beliefs are important to study if one is to implement a new bi/multilingual program successfully. When policies (such as the one stated in PNG’s education system) are adopted that affect curriculum and instruction, teachers are the key components in the implementation of such reforms (Stritikus, 2002). Teachers are the ones that are closest to the students, and their influence on students is crucial to the success these students have in their educational careers (Silin & Schartz, 2003). Some studies have directly examined teachers’ attitudes towards bilingual education (Lee & Oxelon, 2006; Ramos, 2007; Shin & Krashen, 1996). When examining bilingual teachers’ beliefs, Flores (2001) related their attitudes to self-reported practices and found that prior experiences influenced bilingual teachers’ attitudes and beliefs about how their students learn. Varghese (2008) argued that bilingual teachers’ beliefs
about teaching and language emerged within the cultural worlds in which they were embedded, thus inseparable from their lives and their practices. In a sense, teachers’ ideologies about language and teaching were co-constructed through interactions throughout their lives and within their school contexts, district contexts, and state policy contexts. Their practice as bilingual teachers (e.g. their enactment of policies carried down from their districts and schools) was intimately tied to their own beliefs.

Teachers with bilingual training have also been found to have stronger beliefs in bilingual education. Shin & Krashen (1996) surveyed 794 teachers in elementary and secondary schools to find out about their attitudes towards bilingual education. The significant finding was that teachers who had supplementary training about bilingual education supported bilingual education and students more than those teachers that did not have much experience with this training. Shin & Krashen (1996) also found that less than the majority of teachers in their study supported English language learners developing literacy and subject matter in the first language in school. Their study found that teachers were opposed to continuing first language development for children who were already bilingual. Such issues are important in the current study of the attitudes teachers in Papua New Guinea have towards the languages used in the bi/multilingual classrooms.

3.1.4. Attitudes towards languages in Papua New Guinea

Studies on language attitudes are rare in Papua New Guinea. Among the few studies that have been carried out so far are: Nidue (1988) who surveyed the attitudes of teachers towards the use of Tok Pisin in PNG primary schools. The survey showed that teachers agreed that using Tok Pisin would facilitate teacher-student communication, improve students’ understanding of subject matter, enable parents to participate in their children’s education and promote traditional cultural activities in the schools. Yet over 90 percent of teachers surveyed were strongly in favour of English-only medium schools.

A study by Buschenhofen (1998) investigated the attitudes towards English among 537 year 12 school students (in four national high schools in PNG) and 734 first-year university students at the two largest universities in PNG: UPNG and the University of Technology (Unitech). Using
almost identical survey questionnaires for both groups, the findings were contrasted in terms of the students’ tolerance towards the use of English in a variety of contexts. The study found that the students generally had positive attitudes towards English even though there were some significant attitudinal differences in terms of specific English language contexts between the two groups. While the first-year university students strongly expressed the view that the use of English plays a crucial role in the country's development, neither the national high school nor the university students associated the use of English with threats to their ethnolinguistic identity. Buschenhofen (1998) attributes the patterns of differences to the changing social, educational, and linguistic conditions which characterise the transition from year 12 to university education.

Swan and Lewis (1990) conducted a study on university students' attitudes towards the usage of Tok Pisin at UPNG and Unitech. The findings of this study confirmed that there is widespread use of Tok Pisin by students at PNG's two universities. The study found that Tok Pisin is used widely, not only for social purposes, but also to some extent for study purposes. Swan and Lewis (1990) also state that there was no sign of antipathy to Tok Pisin among students who participated in this study (p. 224).

The PNG Curriculum Reform Implementation Project (CRIP) also conducted an Impact Study (Papua New Guinea Curriculum Reform Implementation Project, 2004) on Grade 4 students’ attitudes to schooling which revealed inconclusive findings. The types of careers to which children generally aspired did not match well with what they could reasonably expect. Ultimately, this mismatch could lead to dissatisfaction amongst children and parents. There was no indication from these data that the reform which involved the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages was leading to a better appreciation of education for the purpose of especially rural life.

To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, there have not been any studies carried out in PNG on attitudes towards the multilingual use of languages in a bilingual classroom while focusing on four different cohorts of participants at any one time (curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students in this study). Therefore, this study fills a gap in PNG’s literature in this area as it is the first of its kind which used multiple cohorts as participants.
The next section discusses bilingual education in general which includes the two types of programs used in the current bilingual education system in PNG: MT-based bilingual education (used in elementary schools) and transitional bilingual education (in primary schools).

3.2. Bilingual Education

MT-Based Bilingual education is a form of schooling that uses the L1 for teaching beginning literacy (reading and writing) and content area instruction (such as mathematics), while teaching the L2 as a second/foreign language. Using the L1 as a medium of instruction implies that teachers plan and teach lessons in that language and have textbooks and/or support materials in that language (Benson, 2005, p. 2). Research has demonstrated that bilingual education has cognitive, academic, social, and cultural benefits for elementary school students (Cummins, 2000; UNESCO, 1953). At the cognitive level, research in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) has shown that literacy in a child’s native language can facilitate learning of an L2 (Cummins, 2000; Dawes, 1988; McLaughlin, 1987). These researchers argue that children who are literate in their L1 can transfer their literacy skills into the L2 learning situation, thereby making the situation easier. Cummins’ (1981) Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) model stipulates that the two languages of bilingual children operate through the same central processing system. Even though both languages may look different at the surface, they are fused underneath. The implication of this theory is that when the child’s L1 reading, writing, speaking and listening skills are sufficiently developed, they can serve as the basis for learning the L2.

At the academic level, bilingual education allows children to access the curriculum and perform better in lower primary schools. Past studies have demonstrated that children learn academic content faster in their L1 than in an unfamiliar foreign language (UNESCO, 1953). Other studies such as Ngara (1982) and Chaudron (1988) argue that learners not only have to understand the task that they have to complete, but also the language of the task. Cummins (1984) also introduced the concept of basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) in order to explain the linguistic and academic difficulties that children speaking a minority language experience in schools. According to Cummins’s theory, children who have developed BICS may be able to communicate fluently,
but may not have their advanced language skills (CALP) which are necessary to cope with complex academic content. The researcher argues that schools should develop the CALP skills of children in both their L1 and L2 in order to allow them to fully access the curriculum and succeed. When L1 and/or L2 are poorly developed, children experience serious academic difficulties, which can lead to poor academic performance and dropout.

At the social level, bilingual education has the advantage of producing individuals who are often tolerant of other people and cultures (Baker, 2006). For example, many students in bi/multilingual programs interact with their peers who are from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds and learn to depend on each other in order to learn the academic content taught in both languages. Through this interaction, the students improve their social skills and become more tolerant of other people.

Furthermore, bilingual education preserves the students’ native language (vernacular) and culture (Baker, 2006), which increases the students’ self-esteem and cultural identity. One of the arguments for using vernacular languages in education is that it will help save indigenous cultures, and saving indigenous cultures is necessary to preserve a nation’s intellectual and aesthetic creativity (Pattanayak, 1991). But to others, the relationship between the use of vernacular languages in education and the preservation of ethnic identities is exaggerated and not supported. Even if a positive relationship is clearly demonstrated, the use of threatened vernacular languages in formal and non-formal literacy and education programs will not preserve them or their related cultures unless the threatened languages and cultures are used and promoted in the wider society as well.

In changing socio-cultural situations, making a threatened language part of the school curriculum could preserve its living form until such time as its value is once again recognized. Such revitalization efforts would also include on-going promotion of the language within the larger society - especially in the domains in which it was traditionally used. Paulston (1993) cites two contrasting examples to make a similar point. She describes the revival of the Hebrew language in Israel, which was facilitated by a number of social forces (most significantly the desire for a single language to symbolize the new nation’s unity) and careful language planning. Conversely,
government attempts to promote Quechua as a national language in Peru were unsuccessful because of the social stigma attached to Quechua’s ‘Indian identity’. Paulston views Peru’s case as an example of language planning which conflicts with socio-cultural forces. Paulston’s argument is that schools can facilitate existing social trends, but on their own cannot successfully counteract them.

Expanding on the above discussions of why bilingual education is important, it is necessary to understand the types of bilingual programs that exist. In the context of this thesis, transitional bilingual education requires the use of the student’s L1 (Tok Pisin or any other PNG indigenous language which he or she knows very well) along with English. However, before focusing on the type of bilingual education program used in PNG, it is important to have a deeper understanding of the models of bilingual education outlined by Ball (2010) and in Chapter One section 1.2, and additional literature on bilingual/multilingual program models. This is the focus of the next section (3.2.1).

3.2.1. Bilingual/Multilingual Program Models

Forty years of research and literature on bilingual education has produced a broad array of descriptions, analyses and models. Although these program models have been categorized into meaningful categories that highlight broad agreements among researchers, many variations exist in the delivery of each approach, such as the number of months spent in transition and the amount of time devoted to mother tongue maintenance. Also, as some scholars note, the approach that educators say they are using does not often match what they are actually doing (Thomas & Collier, 2002).

The first general rule according to May (2008) is that programs can be defined as either subtractive or additive. A program is considered subtractive if it promotes monolingual learning in the dominant language, either losing or replacing one language with another, whereas a program can be considered additive if it promotes bilingualism and biliteracy over the long term, usually by adding another language to the student’s existing repertoire (May, 2008). Expanding on these definitions, Baker (1993 cited in García, 1997), explains that educational programs that support additive bilingualism are also referred to as strong, whereas those which engage in
subtractive bilingualism are referred to as *weak*. According to García (1997), whether bilingual education promotes additive or subtractive forms of bilingualism is related to the reasons why the educational system uses the two languages. Often, bilingual education for the language majority promotes additive bilingualism, whereas that for the minority develops subtractive bilingualism. Yet, as Fishman (1976 cited by García, 1997) has argued, bilingual education with additive bilingualism as a goal can be beneficial for the minority, as well as the majority.

Secondly, according to Skutnabb-Kangas (1999), a good educational program accomplishes the following goals from a language and identity perspective: a) high levels of multilingualism, b) a fair chance of achieving academically at school, and developing a strong, positive multicultural identity, and c) positive attitudes towards self and others. The models of bilingual education as presented in section 1.2 can be evaluated according to their attainment of these three goals and categorized under weak and strong models as described by Baker (2001), García (1997), and Skutnabb-Kangas (1999).

### 3.2.2. Strong Models of Bilingual Education

Strong Models of bilingual education include six of Ball’s (2010) approaches, namely: Mother tongue-based instruction (Approach 1), Bilingual education or ‘two-way bilingual education’ (Approach 2), Mother tongue-based bilingual education or ‘developmental bilingualism’ (Approach 3), Multilingual education (Approach 4), Maintenance bi/multilingual education or ‘additive bilingual education’ (Approach 6) and Immersion (Approach 7). In these programs the promotion of two or more languages is attempted and the aim is to enrich the child, particularly linguistically (Baker, 1996). According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1999, pp. 187-190) the main principles that make these models effective at accomplishing multilingualism, fair academic achievement and positive multilingual and multicultural identity and attitudes through bilingual education are:

- They offer support by using as the main medium of education at least during the first eight years that language which is least likely to develop to a high formal level. For
minority children, this is their own mother tongue. For majority children, it should be a minority language.

- All children, not only minority children, are to become high-level bilinguals. This is especially important where minority children and majority children are in the same class.
- There must be equality in every area including the status of mother tongues and the roles the languages are accorded in class schedules.
- Teachers must be bilingual or multilingual. Every child in a school must be able to talk to an adult who speaks the same first language.
- Both languages have to be used as the medium of instruction in some phase of the children’s education.

3.2.3. Weak Models of Bilingual Education

Weak models of bilingual education include two of Ball’s (2010) approaches: Submersion (Approach 8) and transitional bilingual education (Approach 5). The outcomes of these models include monolingualism in the majority language and assimilation into the mainstream culture, values and attitudes.

*Submersion education:*

Submersion education represents the weakest form of bilingual education. It concerns children from language minority homes who are taught immediately through the majority language. According to Baker (2001), there are many problems with this type of education, which includes the following:

- Both teachers and students will be expected to use only the majority language, not the home language of the child.
- Considerable variations in students’ language ability in a classroom may often create problems in teaching and classroom management for the teacher.
- There is no reason to assume that children will quickly and effortlessly acquire the majority language skills necessary to cope with the curriculum material.
- There may also be problems of social and emotional adjustment.
The identity of the child, the parents, the home, community and culture appear to be disapproved of, disparaged and discounted. Such a model often denies or denounces their language, their relationships and often their race.

There can be enormous stress: listening to a new language demands high concentration and is tiring with constant pressure to think about the form of language and less time to think about curriculum content because the child has to take in information from different curriculum areas and learn a language at the same time. Submersion education may occur with the addition of withdrawal classes to teach the majority language, but still appears ineffective in producing bilingual children.

**Transitional Bilingual Education**

The second weak model of bilingual education differs from submersion education in that language minority students are initially instructed through their mother tongue until they are thought to be proficient enough in the majority language to cope with mainstream education (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999). To use the swimming pool analogy, transitional bilingual education is a brief, temporary swim in one small pool until the child is perceived as capable of moving onto the mainstream pool. Transitional programs are also marked by the fact that the learner’s mother tongue is seen as having little or no intrinsic value in society, only an instrumental value. Teaching through the medium of the mother tongue is not seen as a right to which the child is entitled. The mother tongue is seen as useful only in so far as its auxiliary use enhances the knowledge of the dominant language. Transitional bilingual education is a more subtle form of assimilation, as it does encourage dominance and often monolingualism in the majority language (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999) while proportionally decreasing the use of the home language. Since transitional bilingual education is a weak form of bilingual education, not supporting the home language and culture, it attempts to discourage children’s acceptance of the cultural and linguistic norms of their ethnic group. At the same time, the early-exiting of children into the mainstream classroom tends to result in a relative lack of full linguistic, cultural and educational accomplishments.
Types of Transitional Bilingual Education

According to Ramirez and Merino (1990, cited in Baker, 2006, p. 221), there are two types of transitional bilingual education programs: *Early-exit* and *Late-exit*. In the early-exit model, students use their L1 to help the acquisition of the L2 only for two to three years, while in the late-exit model, students’ use of L1 to help build up L2 can be for approximately six years (Ramirez and Merino, 1990, cited in Baker, 2006, p. 221). The major problem with the early-exit model is related to the time set to learn the L2. According to Ovando and Collier (1985), students perform better when they stay longer in bilingual programs and perform poorly when they stay for just two to three years. According to Cummins (1998, cited in Linquanti, 1999), the late-exit model benefits students by encouraging their proficiency in both languages, promoting students L1 literacy skills, which helps develop conceptual foundation for academic progress and clearly communicates students the value of their cultural and linguistic background.

Interestingly, the bilingual education model used in PNG (discussed in Chapter Two, Section 2.3) is a somewhat modified version of the transitional bilingual model described above as it incorporates both the ‘early exit’ and ‘late exit’ approaches. According to the NDOE Lower Primary Language Syllabus (2003, p. 4 as cited in Litteral 2005), “bridging to English is a gradual change from vernacular/Tok Pisin at the elementary level to English instruction in the lower primary school”. The suggested percentages of teaching, learning and assessment in vernacular and English in both the lower primary and upper primary are as follows:

- Grade 3: vernacular - 60% and English - 40%
- Grade 4: vernacular - 50% and English - 50%
- Grade 5: vernacular - 30% and English - 70%
- Grade 6: vernacular - 20% and English - 80%
- Grades 7-8: vernacular -10% and English - 90%

Adapted from Litteral (2005, p. 9)

Vernacular languages and Tok Pisin are thus still encouraged in the upper primary (Grade 6-8), but the emphasis is on English. This is what makes the transitional bilingual model in PNG unique from other bilingual programs elsewhere in the world as it neither uses the early-exit
model on its own nor the late-exit model on its own. PNG children’s education in their L1 for three years is followed by six years of decreasing usage of L1 in the classroom.

Policy planners in PNG believe that “using vernacular language for continued learning and development, while English is being learned, is an effective way for Papua New Guinean students to develop full potential” (NDOE, 1999, p. 4).

However, upon close investigation, the main problem with each program described above as a weak model of bilingual education is that they are “based on seeing the minority child as deficient and education as trying to compensate for deficiencies” (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1999, p. 47).

3.2.4. Studies on the Shortcomings of Bilingual Education Programs

In addition to the discussion above on the weak models of bilingual education, most studies on the relationship between the use of mother tongue and learner’s cognitive development concentrate on the weaknesses and/or shortcomings of bilingual education programs rather than on literacy or pre-primary education. Early relevant research in the United States, for example, grew out of questions concerning the possible negative effects of bilingual education on learners (Hakuta, 1986). The prevailing attitude was that children in bilingual education classes fail to attain a good grasp of English and, therefore, end up speaking neither English nor their mother tongue adequately (Cummins, 1993). A further complaint was that participation in bilingual education programs confused and hampered the development of children’s intellect and personality (Hakuta, 1986).

Another study completed in North America was a longitudinal study into Spanish-English bilingual programs (Ramirez, Yuen, and Ramey, 1991). This study focused on Hispanic children in two types of bilingual programs. One type involved early-exit transition programs where children are taught by bilingual teachers using both Spanish and English but the emphasis is on moving the children into structured immersion programs. English is used exclusively for teaching content while Spanish is used informally by the teacher for giving or clarifying instructions and by students for conversing among themselves. The other type included late-exit
programs, which allow students the use of their mother tongue, with English added incrementally over the length of the program, an approach thought to promote student’s cognitive development.

Malone (1997) claimed that such studies influenced significantly the PNG government’s decision to initiate the current elementary education program in which children are taught in their mother tongue in the first three years of school, with transition to oral English beginning in the third year and to written English upon entering primary school as discussed previously. However, this model of bilingual education as described by Baker (2001), García (1997), and Skutnabb-Kangas (1999) is a weak model. What then does this mean for PNG’s progress in the current bilingual education program? Did PNG choose the correct bilingual education model and has this model been successfully implemented? Answers to these pressing questions are found in Chapters Seven and Eight. The next section discusses the use of vernaculars in bilingual programs PNG.

3.3. The Use of Vernaculars in Bilingual Programs in Papua New Guinea

As discussed in Chapter Two, Section 2.3, the change from the English-only policy to bilingual education arose from the fact that the English-only policy provided for the manpower needs of an independent nation but ignored the socio-economic and cultural needs of the rural majority (Ahai, 1984). Siegel (1996, p. 35) points out that 85 percent of the country’s population continued to reside in rural communities, yet the system was geared for training people for jobs in urban centres. He further states that only 1 percent of children entering school were able to go on to Grade 11, and only 25 percent of school leavers were able to find paid employment. Surveys in the North Solomons Province in the late 1970s confirmed parental concern about the social alienation of the graduates. Parents wanted schools that supported local languages and cultures.

As a result, a community-based non-formal education movement was formed and started to teach initial literacy and numeracy in the local vernacular in preschools (see Section 2.2.2 in Chapter Two). According to Siegel (1996), the first village vernacular school began in the North Solomons Province in 1979 and later spread to the East Sepik in 1981, Eastern Highlands in 1982, East New Britain and Milne Bay Provinces in 1983, and Enga Province in 1985. By 1991,
there were 386 VTPPSs in every province in the country, and these served as a platform for the introduction of vernacular education in PNG’s reformed education system.

While acknowledging that there are no longitudinal studies of differing educational outcomes in PNG, Klaus (2003) claims that there is an overwhelming amount of anecdotal evidence that children become literate more quickly and easily in their mother tongues than they did in English. Klaus (2003) also states that students learning in their mother tongues appear to learn English more easily than their older brothers and sisters did under the monolingual English-only system. Taking into consideration the fact that PNG not only uses its 850+ vernacular languages in its education system but also the English-based expanded pidgin (Tok Pisin), the following section (3.4) discusses pidgins and creoles and their use in education.

3.4. Pidgins and Creoles and their Use in education
Holm (1988) defines *pidgin* as a reduced language that findings from extended contact between groups of people with no common language. Smith (2002, p. 3) also defines pidgin as a language which develops to meet a specific communication need among groups of people who lack a common language. The vocabulary and grammar of a pidgin language is derived from one dominant language, which in most cases is the language of the colonizer in countries which were once colonized by a colonial power (Siegel, 1997). There are, for instance, pidgin varieties of French, Spanish and Portuguese spoken in all parts of the world by people who were formerly colonized by these European powers (Crowley, 1987, p. 112). A *creole* on the other hand, is a pidgin which has become the native language (or mother tongue) of a group of speakers, being used for all or many of their daily communicative needs. Usually the sentence structures and vocabulary range of a creole are far more complex than those of a pidgin language (Richards, et al., 1985).

3.4.1. The Origins of Pidgins and Creoles
Pidgins and creoles are language varieties that emerged around the Atlantic and in the Indian and Pacific Oceans during the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, mainly as a result of colonialism (Mufwene, 1998). Pidgins arose in trade colonies, around trade ports, or along trade routes (Mufwene, 1998). However, during colonialism when European communities became
established in Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific, the contacts between different speech communities took place not only in the direct context of trade but also in plantations, ports, indentured labour or on ships. Today some pidgins have expanded into regular creoles, which are also known as expanded pidgins in urban settings (Mufwene, 1998). Examples include Bislama (Vanuatu) and Tok Pisin (PNG), which are Melanesian creoles, and Nigerian and Cameroon Pidgin English. The next section discusses the origin of Tok Pisin in PNG.

3.4.2. The Origin of Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea

Tok Pisin in PNG is a clear example of a pidgin language which has been creolized. Tok Pisin arose when speakers of a number of New Guinea and Bismarck Archipelago languages were put together on the sugar plantations in Samoa in the 1880s, along with people from the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. As these people had no common language, they took the English that they heard from their English-speaking bosses and used it as a basis for communication amongst themselves on plantations (Smith, 2002). When these people were taken back to New Guinea at the end of their contracts, they took with them the knowledge of the stabilized pidgin that already existed in these plantations and spread the language throughout the country.

Tok Pisin has expanded drastically in PNG, and various linguists have described it as a very important lingua franca in the country (Smith, 2002, p. 13). Mühlhausler (2003) describes Tok Pisin as a language that is used in a wide range of public and private functions in PNG, and it is very widely spoken across a population of 5.1 million people according to the 2000 Census (Tryon & Charpentier, 2004, p. 9). At the moment, Tok Pisin has official status alongside English and Hiri Motu, an indigenous pidgin. However, unlike English (which is spoken by a small fraction of the population, mostly the PNG intelligentsia and educated elite along with the overseas community in the country) and Hiri Motu (spoken only in the Southern Region of the country) (Nekitel, 1998, p. 50), Tok Pisin is the only language that is acquired by the overwhelming majority of Papua New Guineans and is spoken in both rural and urban areas. Like other Melanesian creoles (Solomon’s Pijin & Vanuatu’s Bislama), Tok Pisin is very much used in everyday life on radio and television, in Government and Parliament, and plays a large role in spreading the Christian message (Tryon & Charpentier, 2004, p. 10). According to Smith (2002), Tok Pisin is now the first language for thousands of Papua New Guinean children. The
next section discusses pidgins and creoles in education.

3.4.3. Pidgins and Creoles in Education

Pidgins and creole languages are usually marginalized and are not commonly used in formal education because they are often viewed as 'primitive', 'bastard jargon', 'contact', 'makeshift' or 'hybrid' language, 'broken English', 'mongrel lingo', or 'grammarless' (Adler, 1977, p. 4). Reports from around the world decrying the use of pidgins and creoles in education include the work of Mbufong (2001), who claims that a very common warning teachers give their students in Cameroon is: ‘Don’t speak pidgin’. In addition there is the fear that this might cause students to despise the language of their community which is ‘Pidgin English’. Mbufong (2001) further points out that instead of pursuing a sound mother-tongue education policy in Cameroon, the tendency is to go straight into English (and French) due to the enormous prestige English and French have.

According to Mbufong (2001), parents are naturally anxious that their children become doctors, lawyers, engineers, architects, graduate teachers and such like. They feel that the earlier their children start to learn English rather than Pidgin English, the greater will be the chances of getting on in life. Dunford (1999, p. 11) also reported that poor performance by Hawaiian students in a national writing test had left some people questioning whether pidgin English is undermining the learning of standard English. As a result, school leaders immediately focused on pidgin as the culprit. McCourtie (1998, p. 121) also reports that although Jamaican creole is the first language children learn in Jamaica, English has remained the official national language and the medium of instruction in schools as it is seen as essential to pupils’ success.

Siegel (1999, p. 510) reported a number of studies on pidgins and creoles that showed negative outcomes in pidgin/creole-based education. This included the work of Pratt-Johnson (1993), in which it is stated that teachers in New York City are often unfamiliar with Jamaican creole and that children speaking it are sometimes referred to special education classes. Similarly, Winer (1993) states that Caribbean children are perceived as having 'language problems' and are placed in speech therapy classes. Malcolm (1982) describes classroom communication breakdown between teachers and Aboriginal English-speaking students. Whilst in the Pacific, Charpentier
(1997) claims that pidgins and creoles are not suitable for literacy and use in formal education in Vanuatu due to the negative transfer that occurs when pupils subsequently learn English. Furthermore, Crowley (2005, p. 37), describes Vanuatu’s language education situation as one which attempts to follow PNG’s success in vernacular-medium literacy programs for children. However, it appears that programs set up without a significant degree of local community involvement do not have guaranteed success.

Despite these negative reports, there are also reported cases of positive outcomes. Among them is Murtagh’s (1982) study conducted in Australia which compared the oral proficiency of students in a bilingual program which uses Kriol and English with an English-only school where the children are also Kriol speakers. The overall findings indicated that Grade 3 students at the bilingual school performed better than those at the monolingual school.

Siegel (1992, 1999) also reported some positive findings in several education programs that have used pidgins and creoles. One of them is his study in PNG on the use of Tok Pisin which examined the performance of three cohorts of preschool children on school term tests in English, mathematics and general participants over a six-year period. Of the students who learned Tok Pisin and those who had learned only in English, the former scored significantly higher in all participants, including English. A report by the PNG Curriculum Reform Implementation Project (PNG CRIP, 2004) also shows that Grade 4 students who had an English and Tok Pisin experience in Grade 3 performed, on average, better in both mathematics and language assessments than those with an English and vernacular experience. The difference was statistically significant in mathematics. This finding suggests that the transition to English in lower primary may be easier if supported by Tok Pisin rather than vernacular languages; the reasons, however, are not clear.

These negative and positive outcomes involving students' achievements in the use of pidgins and creoles in education shows that more research is needed to find out ‘who is right’ and to understand why there are conflicting findings. Research is also needed on the attitudes of teachers, parents and students towards the use of pidgins and creole languages since attitudes can affect outcomes. Siegel (1999) for example, points out that because of “continuing negative
attitudes about creoles and minority dialects it would still be difficult to get parents and teachers to accept using any of these varieties as a medium of instruction” (p. 524). In the next section (3.4.4), the use of Tok Pisin in PNG schools is discussed.

3.4.4. **The Use of Tok Pisin in Schools in Papua New Guinea**

Tok Pisin has been described by many linguists, including Swan and Lewis (1990), as a language that has continued to develop as an effective national language in PNG. Though it was marginalized in the education system for a long time by previous governments, Nidue (1988) claims that Tok Pisin was used unofficially by many, perhaps most, teachers in primary schools prior to its formal acceptance in the current education reform, alongside Hiri Motu and the local vernaculars as a bridge to English at a later stage. This observation is supported by evidence from Jimi District in the Western Highlands Province (Yarupawa, et al., 1992, p. 11). Moody (1992) points out that multilingual children such as those in PNG tend to prefer teachers who are multilingual themselves, presumably because mutual understanding is increased through the use of two or more languages.

Tok Pisin continues to spread throughout PNG as a lingua franca and a growing national language. This is attested by Nekitel (1995), Mühlhausler (1979), Wurm and Mühlhausler (1985), and Dutton (1976). However, at the same time there is a general feeling of uncertainty on whether the language is appropriate for use in the current education reform. This is in line with Seller’s (2007) views on Pidgin in Education in Ghana which she describes as a language not seriously considered as a medium of instruction (p. 7).

3.5. **Conclusion**

This chapter reviewed the literature that underpins this study. It began by reviewing the literature on attitudes focusing on the attitudes of learners, parents and teachers towards bilingual education programs in general. The review found that studies on language attitudes in PNG are rare and that this study is the first of its kind to conduct a language attitude research focusing on four different types of cohorts at any one time. The chapter then focused on the different models of bilingual education. This discussion noted how Ball’s (2010) eight different approaches to bilingual education can be categorized into Skutnabb-Kangas’ (1999) ‘strong’ and ‘weak’ forms,
and situated the type of model being used in PNG as a weak model of bilingual education. This modified version of transitional bilingual education seems to be encouraging the use of bilingual education only as a bridge to learning English, and not much focus is given on preserving or expanding children’s knowledge of their L1 as enshrined in PNG’s philosophy of education. What this current model conveys both to schools and the community is the ‘higher’ value of English compared to other languages, which is typical of a subtractive model. This was noted in certain studies which indicated that bilingual education classes did not work and that students failed to attain a good grasp of English. Other studies, like the one in North America on Hispanic students comparing the ‘early exit model’ and the ‘late exit model’, revealed that the latter (late exit mode) was more beneficial for the students. The chapter then pointed out that the introduction of the bilingual education program in vernacular languages in PNG was influenced by the successes of the VTPPS that were piloted in the North Solomons Province and later spread to other parts of PNG.

The chapter also explored the role and use of pidgins and creoles in formal education. Since the bilingual education model in PNG uses a pidgin/creole (Tok Pisin) as well as local vernaculars, the chapter highlighted previous studies of the use of creoles in terms of both positive and negative attitudes. Since there has been very little research on peoples’ attitudes towards Tok Pisin and its usage in PNG’s bilingual education program, this study will add to current knowledge. The next chapter describes how the study was conceptualised and conducted.
CHAPTER FOUR
Methodology

4. Introduction
This chapter begins with a discussion of research methodology in an attempt to develop a methodological framework for this study. The whole chapter has been divided into eight main sections. Section 4.1: Selection of Research Design and Research Methodology, Section 4.2: Reliability and Validity of the Study, Section 4.3: Selection of Location of Fieldwork and Participants, Section 4.4: Data Collection Methods, Section 4.5: Data Collection Procedures, Section 4.6: Data Management, Section 4.7: Data Analysis, and Section 4.8: Conclusion.

4.1. Selection of Research Design and Research Methodology
The selection of the research design and methodology is of paramount importance to every researcher as it sets a platform on which the raw data is elicited and analysed. In this study, a combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods was used, hence a ‘mixed methods’ approach.

4.1.1. A Mixed Methods Research Methodology
The mixed methods approach is purported to be the third research paradigm, alongside quantitative and qualitative research (Johnson, et al., 2007). Although not labeled as such, mixed methods research was used by early researchers, for example anthropologists and sociologists over the last century to undertake their studies (Sieber, 1973). The more recent movement, in which the term mixed methods was coined, has over the last two decades seen a growth in the use of mixed methods within education and health research (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007). Mixed methods research is said to enhance the depth of data and provide research validity to the topic being studied (Creswell, 2009; Creswell and Plano Clark 2007; Johnson, et al., 2007).

This study used a mixed-methods design because it allowed the researcher to use multiple world views and was a practical and natural approach to the study. This view thus confirms Creswell (2007) who suggests that “the complexity of research problems calls for answers beyond simple numbers in a quantitative sense or words in a qualitative sense. A combination of both forms of
data can provide the most complex analysis of problems” (p. 13). Creswell (2009) further states that the mixed method approach provides a specific perspective of the world. It also incorporates a combined qualitative and quantitative approach in which its overall strength is seen to be more beneficial than using qualitative or quantitative research individually. In other words, combining the two approaches preserves the strengths and reduces the weaknesses in both approaches (Bergman, 2009). Using a mixed method thus increases the possibility of achieving findings that are more trustworthy and relevant than using the approaches separately.

Expanding on this discussion, Denscombe (2007) describes the mixed methods approach as having three characteristic features that set it apart from other strategies for social research. They are a) the use of qualitative and quantitative approaches within a single research project (as already mentioned); b) explicit focus on the link between approaches (triangulation); and c) an emphasis on practical approaches to research problems (pragmatist) which allows it to bring together methods drawn from paradigms of research conventionally regarded as incompatible.

Mixed methods research, however, has limitations. The approach can be labour intensive, costly and time consuming (Collins, et al., 2006). Researchers need to be trained equally in quantitative and qualitative approaches, and difficulties can arise in developing adequate expertise in both (Collins, et al., 2006; Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007). Moreover, there can be difficulties in integrating the analysis and findings of quantitative and qualitative data (Bryman, 2007). Within the current research, these constraints were addressed by seeking advice from experts in each individual approach during each stage of the data collection and analysis phases.

The benefits of the mixed methods approach for this study are as follows:

1. It allows for multiple forms or research methods well suited to the diversity of participants (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007, p. 18).
2. It allows for cross validation and complementarity of findings from qualitative and quantitative parts of the research (Bergman, 2009, p. 19).
3. It assists in creating a synergistic effect “whereby the findings from one method help develop or inform the other method” (Greene, et al., 1989, p. 259).
4. It allows for the use of different worldviews. It does not claim to bridge the gap between
post-positivism and social constructivism; rather the mixed-methods design provides an alternative to a mono-methods design (Bergman, 2009, p. 19).

5. It provides a fuller understanding of the research question and helps to clarify research findings (Hesse-Biber, 2010, p. 4).

6. It allows for method connection to examine the same dimensions of a research problem so that it enhances the credibility of the research findings (Bergman, 2009, p. 3).

7. It leads to a better understanding by offsetting the weaknesses of separate applied quantitative and qualitative research methods (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007, p. 18).

8. It allows for new insights into the research question and extends the breath and range of the enquiry (Greene, et al., 1989, p. 259).

9. It allows for the collection of more comprehensive evidence for addressing the study problem (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2007, p. 18).

10. It provides stronger evidence for a conclusion through the convergence and corroboration of findings (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

Given that the focus of this study is an investigation of the attitudes of four different cohorts towards the use of Tok Pisin and Tolai as the language of instruction in primary classrooms, the mixed methods approach appeared most befitting. This involved collecting and analysing data through questionnaires that included both ‘open-ended’ (i.e. qualitative) questions and ‘close-ended’ (i.e. quantitative) questions and open-ended interviews (qualitative data collection).

4.1.2. Triangulation

The study has adopted what Shipman (1971) calls the 'triangulation' method. Triangulation involves the use of multiple approaches and independent sources to investigate the topic of interest (Denscombe, 2007; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2009). Triangulation includes the use of different methods, different sources of data or even different researchers within the same study. According to Denscombe, the principle behind this is that the researcher can get a better understanding of the phenomenon that is being investigated if he/she views it from different positions. Social researchers have applied the principle of triangulation in a variety of ways. Building on the work of Denzin (1970), below are four approaches:
Methodological Triangulation (use of different methods)
Data Triangulation (use of contrasting sources of information)
Investigator Triangulation (use of different researchers)
Theory Triangulation

This present study uses ‘methodological triangulation’ by using quantitative and qualitative research methods, and ‘data triangulation’ by using information from different groups of research participants (curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students) collected through questionnaires and in-depth interviews. The choice of questionnaires and interviews was influenced by the researcher's academic and research background with previous experience in using questionnaires and in-depth interviews.

4.2. Reliability and Validity of the Study

According to Ritchie and Lewis (2003, p. 270), the concepts of reliability and validity were developed in the natural sciences. Because of this, and the very epistemological basis of qualitative research, there are real concerns about whether the same concepts have any value in determining the quality or sustainability of qualitative evidence.

Nevertheless, Denscombe (2007) points out that the verification of qualitative research is an important issue; the researcher must have some way of demonstrating that their findings are true. If verification is missing, the research would lack credibility and, as pointed out by Silverman (1985, 1993), credibility is essential for all research whether it be qualitative or quantitative in nature. It is something that needs to be demonstrated as part and parcel of the research process itself and it should not be taken for granted. The bases for judging the quality of research have been:

Reliability: This refers to whether a research instrument is neutral in its effect and consistent across multiple occasions of its use. This is frequently translated as the question ‘Would the research instrument produce the same findings on different occasions (all other things being equal)?’ The goal of reliability is to minimize the errors and biases in a study.
Validity: This refers to the accuracy and precision of the data. The validity of findings or data is traditionally understood to refer to the ‘correctness’ or ‘precision’ of a research reading. It is often explained as a concept with two distinct dimensions. The first is known as internal validity, concerned with whether you are investigating what you claim to be investigating (Arksey and Knight, 1999). The second, termed external validity, is concerned with the extent to which the abstract constructs or postulates generated, refined or tested are applicable to other groups within the population (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982) or to other contexts or settings (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Generalizability: This refers to the prospect of applying the findings from research to other examples of the phenomenon. It concerns the ability of research findings to explain, or arise from similar phenomena at a general or universal level rather than being something that is unique to the particular case(s) used for the research.

In this research, its quality has been ensured by taking account of all three criteria above. This chapter provides ample detail about all research instruments used (reliability) and the data collected (validity). In Chapters 7 and 8, the issue of generalizability will be discussed.

4.3. Selection of Location of Fieldwork and Participants
Another important step was the selection of field work location and participants. Participants included curriculum/education officers based in the Curriculum Development Division (CDD) of the NDOE (National Department of Education) in Port Moresby, and teachers, parents and students from six primary schools in the Kokopo District of East New Britain Province (See Appendix 1 for all participants interviewed).

4.3.1. Location of Participating Schools
Kokopo is a small bustling town in the Kokopo district (See Figure 2) in Papua New Guinea. It became the provincial capital of East New Britain province in 1994, when Rabaul (the previous provincial capital) was destroyed by a twin volcanic eruption. The choice of using Kokopo schools was due to the following factors: 1) It is the researcher’s home area and, being an L1 speaker of Tolai, it was possible for her to collect the field data with ease and comfort when she
conversed with parents and students in the village and the general public areas in Kokopo town; 2) The researcher could reside in her own private residence without cost; 3) East New Britain’s good road network made it possible to reach the participating schools easily.

![Location of Kokopo](http://www.freeworldmaps.net/oceania/papua-new-guinea/political-map.html) Retrieved: 6/03/13

The primary schools that were chosen to participate in this study were: 1) Kokopo 2) Kabaleo 3) Kalamanagunan 4) Takabur 5) Kabagap and 6) Raluana. The schools are further categorized as follows:

a) Three village (rural) schools which included Takabur, Kabagap (see Figure 3), and Raluana where Tolai was assumed to be the predominant language used in school compared to Tok Pisin and English.

![Kabagap Primary School - a Rural School](KDC Fieldwork Photo File, 2009)
Takabur and Kabagap primary schools are both 15 minute drive from Kokopo town, whereas Raluana primary school is about 20 minute drive away from Kokopo. Children who attend these schools are from the villages where the schools are located and their surrounding communities.

b) One semi-urban/village school located in a village that is in very close proximity to Kokopo town. The school identified under this category was Kalamanagunan where the use of Tolai is on par with Tok Pisin compared to English. Kalamanagunan primary school is situated in Vunamami village which is adjacent to Kokopo town and is about 4-5 minute drive from Kokopo’s commercial centre. Children attending this school are from Vunamami and its neighbouring villages plus Kokopo town. Children who live in the nearby coconut and cocoa plantations in Kokopo where their parents work as labourers (mainly non-Tolais) also attend Kalamanagunan.

c) Two urban schools were Kokopo (See Figures 4 and 5) and Kabaleo, where Tok Pisin is used predominantly, compared to Tolai and English. Kokopo, a government-run primary school caters mainly for children of the working class in Kokopo town, and children whose parents work on nearby cocoa and coconut plantations and are from different ethnic backgrounds and language groups. Kabaleo, a Catholic mission school gets subsidies from the NDOE and is known as a ‘demonstration school’. It is located adjacent to Kabaleo Teachers’ College and is used heavily by the college for teacher trainee practical sessions. It takes 5 minutes to drive from the school into the main town centre of Kokopo. Students who attend this school are mainly from Kokopo town, the surrounding plantations, and the Kabaleo Parish.
4.3.2. Selection of Participants

At the beginning of this research, no prior decision was made on the exact number of participants from each group as this depended entirely on how many agreed to take part in the study when the researcher made her initial visits to each school and the CDD.

Curriculum Officers

This group consisted of curriculum and education officers who hold specific job descriptions ranging from elementary teacher trainers, primary unit officers, professional studies unit officers (vocational section) to officers from the school journals project. Officers in the school journals project deal with the production of the PNG school journal, which is a support material for the curriculum (especially for students). Elementary unit officers, primary unit officers and vocational unit officers, on the other hand, deal mainly with the writing of curriculum materials and providing training/in-service training and monitoring of teachers in their respective divisions throughout the country. All curriculum officers had been teaching either in primary/high schools or teachers colleges prior to their commencement at the CDD. This cohort was only involved in the in-depth interviews.

Teachers

All teachers in the six participating schools were invited to participate in both the questionnaire survey and in-depth interviews. These teachers were categorized under two labels, namely Tok Pisin teachers and Tolai teachers. ‘Tok Pisin teachers’ were those who claimed they used mostly Tok Pisin in their lessons and taught in a Tok Pisin dominated classroom. ‘Tolai teachers’ on the other hand, were those who claimed they used mostly Tolai in their lessons and taught in a Tolai dominated classroom. It was also important to distinguish between traditional ESL teachers who were educated and taught in the previous English only curriculum and newly graduated bilingual certified teachers of the current education reform. Teachers who agreed to take part in the follow-up interviews were interviewed after completed questionnaires had been collected from all the teacher participants.
Parents

Parents who participated in the questionnaire survey and in-depth interviews were those who had a child who participated in the study. Designated Grade 3 teachers in each school were asked to help distribute questionnaires to parents through their Grade 3 students. If they agreed, then they filled out the questionnaires. ‘Tok Pisin parents’ refers to parents who had children attending Tok Pisin dominated classrooms whereas ‘Tolai parents’ were those whose children were attending Tolai dominated classrooms. Parents who agreed to take part in the follow-up interviews were interviewed after completed questionnaires had been collected from all participants. All parents were educated in the English only era and attended a wide range of educational institutions ranging from primary, high/national high schools to teachers/technical colleges and/or universities. The majority of these parents were employed by the government, private sector, the church (the mission) or were self-employed.

Students

Student participants involved in the survey questionnaires were selected according to the willingness of Grade 3 teachers who were prepared to engage their classes in this study. These students had previously attended either a Tok Pisin or Tolai elementary school and were in their first year of transition (bridging) to English. ‘Tok Pisin students’ refers to students who were taught in a predominantly Tok Pisin classroom, whereas ‘Tolai students’ refers to students in a predominantly Tolai classroom.

Figure 5: A Grade 3 language lesson in Tok Pisin at Kokopo Primary School (KDC Fieldwork Photo File, 2009)
These labels were determined by the choice of the teachers whose classes were used in this study. The selection of students for in-depth interviews was also done in liaison with class teachers according to their availability and appropriacy of time. The ages of these students (some shown in Figure 5) were between 9 and 11 years old.

4.4. Data Collection Methods

4.4.1. Questionnaires

There are a variety of strategies for measuring language attitudes, one of the most common being the questionnaire (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970). Questionnaires have a number of benefits over other forms of data collection: they are usually inexpensive to administer; little training is needed to develop them; and they can be easily and quickly analysed once completed (Wilkinson and Birmingham, 2003). However, there are limitations in using questionnaires, and these were considered during the construction of the questionnaires. These limitations include the use of: a) leading questions: when one knows one’s research topic and issues, it is difficult to avoid leading questions, b) complicated questions, c) intrusive and irritating questions, d) ambiguous and unclear questions and e) too many open-ended questions, which can become problematic during analysis of the data.

The questionnaires were designed to satisfy the first main aim of this study which was to investigate the attitudes of parents, teachers and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages in primary schools in PNG. The design of the questionnaires was adapted from three earlier studies on language attitudes which included Lai's (2005) study on language attitudes of the first post colonial generation in Hong Kong secondary schools, Mparutsa, et al.'s (1990) investigation into language attitudes of secondary school students in Zimbabwe, and Buschenhofen's (1998) study on English language attitudes of year 12 students in four national high schools and first year university students in the two biggest universities in PNG.

A total of six questionnaires were designed for the six different categories of participants in the study namely: a) Tok Pisin Teachers (see Appendix 2), b) Tolai teachers (see Appendix 3), c) Tok Pisin Parents (see Appendix 4), d) Tolai Parents (see Appendix 5), e) Tok Pisin students (see Appendix 6), and Tolai students (see Appendix 7). All questionnaires were written in
English as the survey was targeted at educated stakeholders. However, in situations where there was a need for translations or clarification, the researcher and/or the class teacher who are native speakers of both Tok Pisin and Tolai orally translated the sections that were unclear to parents and students.

The questionnaires were designed similarly in that they all had four different sections namely: Part 1. Background information, Part 2. Language Use, Part 3. Language Attitudes and Part 4. Open-ended questions. The questions for each cohort were identical except in Part 3 and 4 where the questions were confined to either Tok Pisin or Tolai. For example, question 27 in Part 3 in the Tok Pisin teachers’ questionnaire (Appendix 2) was ‘Teaching Tok Pisin in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society’. In the Tolai teachers’ questionnaire (Appendix 3), on the other hand, it read as ‘Teaching Tolai in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society’. Another exception was Question 28 in the Tolai teachers’ questionnaire where ‘maintaining’ their local vernaculars seemed to make more sense than ‘losing’ in Question 28 of the other questionnaires. The parents’ questionnaires also had 42 questions but again with slight differences depending on what language was used in their child’s class i.e. Tok Pisin or Tolai. The same also applied to the students’ questionnaires. There were 30 questions in each, and they were worded differently in certain sections depending on the language used in the school.

All six questionnaires employed primarily closed questions (questions that had a fixed number of responses) as the primary means of data gathering; only the last three questions in each questionnaire were open-ended. The primary measurement for the closed questions was a five-point Likert scale, a form of measurement in which participants are asked to “agree or disagree" with a sample of propositions about personal perceptions and beliefs, evaluations and actions held by an individual (Bradburn, et al., 2004). The Likert summated rating scale was used specifically to measure the participants' reactions and/or attitudes towards the use of Tok Pisin, Tolai and English.
4.4.2. In-depth Interviews

In-depth interviewing is a qualitative research technique that involves conducting intensive individual interviews with a small number of respondents to explore their perspectives on a particular idea, program, or situation (Boyce and Neal, 2006). In-depth interviews are useful when we want detailed information about a person’s thoughts and behaviours or want to explore new issues in depth. Interviews are often used to provide context to other data (such as outcome data), offering a more complete picture of what happened in a program and why.

In this particular study, the purpose of the in-depth interviews was to obtain a more in-depth understanding of the attitudes and perceptions that curriculum officers, teachers, and parents had towards students’ use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages in the classroom as well as that of the students themselves. The in-depth interview questions for curriculum officers, teachers and parents were entirely original questions devised by the researcher whereas students’ interview questions were adapted from Dakwar’s (2005) study on ‘Children’s attitudes towards a diglossic situation in Arabic and its impact on learning’.

The in-depth interviews were administered face-to-face after the questionnaires had been administered and collected back by the researcher. All curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students’ interviews had a minimum of ten questions each as more than ten questions was seen as potentially stressful for the participant (See Appendix 8 for curriculum officers’ interview questions, teachers’ interview questions in Appendix 9, parents’ interview questions in Appendix 10, and children’s interview questions in Appendix 11). This type of interview (in-depth interview) was selected because of the advantages the face-to-face interview offers such as probing responses, controlling the order of question answering, and determining a high response rate (Babbie, 1990).

4.5. Data Collection Procedures

The data collection for this study was carried out between March and May 2009. The main deciding factor for selecting this time-frame (see Table 1) was that the study had to be conducted during the school teaching terms in order to obtain data from the anticipated participants.
### Table 1. Data Collection Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July '08</td>
<td>Initial contact made with Head Teachers of Kokopo, Kabaleo, Kalamanagunan, Takabur, Kabagap and Raluana Primary Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug - Dec '08</td>
<td>Planning for data collection, Initial contact, Designing research instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan - Feb '09</td>
<td>Work on application form for ethical approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb - Mar '09</td>
<td>Await Ethical Clearance, Continue doing readings for the literature chapter throughout the duration of the study program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 1 March '09</td>
<td>Travel to PNG - East New Britain Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organize accommodation and transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews with curriculum officers at the CDD in Port Moresby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First meetings with Head Teachers and class teachers of the bilingual classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make arrangements for questionnaires to be distributed to the selected participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 2 March '09</td>
<td>Arrangement made for interviews with teachers, parents and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 3 March '09</td>
<td>Collect back questionnaires from all participants and sort them out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 4 March - Wk 3 April '09</td>
<td>Interviews with teachers, parents and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 4 April '09</td>
<td>Start transcribing interview data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 1 - Wk 3 May '09</td>
<td>Continue with transcriptions of interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wk 4 May '09</td>
<td>Travel back to University of Canberra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning for the data collection commenced in June 2008 after the researcher presented the research proposal of this study project. Work was carried out on designing the various tools for data collection which included questionnaires and interview questions while preparing for ethical approval. Initial contact with the head teachers (school principals) of the six participating schools was done in July 2008 when the researcher had awareness meetings with them during a one-week special trip to PNG. A letter (see Appendix 12) was sent to the East New Britain Provincial Education office, and to all head teachers (see Appendix 13) after this visit seeking formal approval as evidence to support the ethics application.

Responses received from the head teachers were all positive and are in the following order in the Appendices: letter from the head teacher of Kokopo Primary school (Appendix 14), letter from the head teacher of Kabaleo Primary School (Appendix 15), letter from the head teacher of Kalamanagunan Primary School (Appendix 16), letter from the head teacher of Takabur Primary School (Appendix 17), letter from the head teacher of Kabagap Primary School (Appendix 18), and letter from the head teacher of Raluana Primary School (Appendix 19). Information and consent forms for participants were designed and are in the following order in the Appendices: Participation information for teachers and parents-cover page (Appendix 20), Participant information for teachers and parents (Appendix 21), Informed consent forms for teachers and
parents (Appendix 22), Parents Information for children (Appendix 23), Parent consent form (Appendix 24) and Participant Information for students (Appendix 25). After the Ethics Committee met in March 2009, approval for this study was granted (see Appendix 26).

4.5.1. Questionnaires
A total of 600 questionnaires were disseminated to all participants across the six schools. These questionnaires were given out to participants after prior arrangements had been made. This included a pre-meeting with the head teacher and Grade 3 teacher/coordinator of each school to decide on when, where and how the questionnaires were to be disseminated and collected back from the participants. An allowance of two weeks was given for the completion of the questionnaires.

Teachers
Teachers’ questionnaires were given out during a morning tea session in the staff room (in the first week upon the researcher’s arrival in each school). The researcher used 10-15 minutes of this time (after prior arrangements with head teachers) to elaborate on the research project and the questionnaires (the different sections of the questionnaire) and explained in detail the cover letter and participants’ consent form.

Parents
The parents’ questionnaires together with cover letters and participants’ consent forms were then given to Grade 3 students by their teachers to hand deliver to their parents to complete and return.

Students
Students’ questionnaires were also disseminated at the end of the first week and after students had become accustomed to seeing the researcher in and around the school grounds. The researcher made prior arrangement(s) with selected Grade 3 class teachers to use the last 10-15 minutes of their nominated lessons to go through the questionnaire, explaining in detail what was expected of the students. Questionnaires were then taken home for completion.
The time allocated for the completion of all questionnaires was two weeks. All completed questionnaires were brought to the schools' administrative offices where the researcher then collected them.

4.5.2. In-depth Interviews
Arrangements for the in-depth interviews with the four different cohorts (curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students) differed from each other and are discussed below. All interviews were taped onto a digital voice recorder and downloaded to the password protected researcher’s laptop and then transcribed.

*Curriculum officers*
Arrangement for interviews with curriculum officers based in the CDD in Port Moresby was done between the researcher and a senior curriculum officer prior to the researcher’s field trip to PNG in March 2009. By the time the researcher arrived in Port Moresby, curriculum officers were ready to be interviewed. Eight in-depth interviews were completed. The first part of the interview (see Appendix 8) required curriculum officers’ to provide background information on the jobs they held at the CDD and the number of years in their profession. The second part sought curriculum officers’ views on the bridging concept from Tok Pisin/vernaculars to English, and the third part sought their views on the issue of teaching resources in schools. All interviews were conducted in English and lasted between 20-30 minutes.

*Teachers*
Interview arrangements with teachers took place during the researcher’s first visit to each school. Teacher interviewees were selected according to their experiences with the bridging concept in lower primary schools, and these interviews were conducted depending on the availability of the teachers concerned. The teachers’ interview guide (see Appendix 9) included four sections: Part one, teachers’ background information, Part two, the ‘bridging concept’, Part three, teaching resources and Part four, the issue of ‘Tok Pisin’. All interviews were conducted in English and lasted between 20-30 minutes.
Parents

Parent interviews were conducted either at a school location or in the village depending on the responses they gave to their children’s teachers upon returning the questionnaires as to whether or not they wanted to be interviewed. Since the researcher was residing in the village, some interviews were conducted in the village while the rest were conducted in the school grounds. The parents’ interview guide (see Appendix 10) was organized into two sections; Part 1. Background information and Part 2. Perceptions on language use. Interviews were conducted in either English or Tok Pisin depending on the choice of the parent. None of the parents chose Tolai. All interviews lasted between 15-20 minutes.

Students

Interviews with students were conducted at recess and lunch in the staffroom. Students were selected by their class teachers depending on their level of confidence in speaking to strangers. Students’ interview questions (see Appendix 11), consisted of three parts. Part 1, Background Information, Part 2, Perceptions of language use, and Part 3, Students’ suggestions. The interviews were conducted in either Tok Pisin or English depending on the student’s preference. Tolai was also offered but no students chose this option. All interviews lasted between 5-20 minutes.

4.6. Data Management

At the end of the data collection process, questionnaire data was collected from primary teachers (n=85), parents of children in participating schools (n=86), and Grade 3 students (n=242). The interview sample consisted of curriculum/education officers (n=8), teachers (n=18), parents (n=15), and students (n=6).

4.6.1. Questionnaires

When all the completed questionnaires were collected, they were sorted into six different groups namely: Tok Pisin teachers, Tolai teachers, Tok Pisin parents, Tolai parents, Tok Pisin students and Tolai students. Each questionnaire was coded and tagged with a coloured sticker and number for identification purposes. For example: a) RAL1 (25) = Raluana primary school, 1 referred to teacher, red = Tok Pisin and 25 referred to the 25th teacher in the batch, b) KALA2 (13) =
Kalamanagunan primary school, 2 referred to parent, blue = Tolai and 13 referred to the 13th parent in the batch, c) KPO3 (18) = Kokopo primary school, 3 referred to student, red = Tok Pisin and 18 referred to the 18th student in the batch. All questionnaire findings were analysed using the SPSS Statistical program (see further discussion in Section 4.7.1).

4.6.2. In-depth Interviews
All recorded interviews (see Appendix 1 for overview) were transcribed using the Microsoft word program. All participants were labelled with pseudonyms for confidentiality as in the following convention: IV12/teach/William/21.05.09. This is described in detail as follows:

- The first 2 letters of the pseudonym IV referred to ‘interview’.
- 12 referred to the ‘12th participant’ to be interviewed.
- Teach referred to ‘teacher’.
- The pseudonym William referred to ‘the name of the teacher interviewed’.
- 12.05.09 referred to ‘the date when the interviewed was conducted’.

The following conventions on the transcripts were also used and/or considered:

- ‘R’ to identify the researcher who was the interviewer.
- ‘Z’ to identify the interviewee.
- Each turn taken by both the interviewer (researcher) and the interviewee was numbered.
- Wherever possible, the transcription was verbatim, although in cases where grammatical corrections seemed necessary for a clearer understanding, correction to non-standard sentences was executed (see Appendix 27 for a sample transcript).
- After the initial transcription of each interview, translations from Tok Pisin to English were done for those interviews conducted in Tok Pisin. No participant chose to be interviewed in Tolai.

4.7. Data Analysis
The data from questionnaires and data obtained from the in-depth interviews required different analysis techniques.
4.7.1. Questionnaires

Findings of the questionnaires were analysed using statistical analysis. Defined as quantitative descriptors, statistics summarise the quantitative observations of the topic under investigation (Groves, et al., 2009). Statistics may be descriptive (enumerative) or inferential (analytical). Two types of statistical analyses were used in this research to determine the overall trends in attitudes towards languages used in the lower primary classrooms. The statistical database and analysis package (IBM Statistics Version 21) also known SPSS, was used in this study.

Descriptive statistics describe the details or attributes of a given population such as size, frequency and mean (Gravetter and Wallnau, 2005; Groves, et al., 2009). Simple descriptive statistics (frequencies) were used in this study to provide counts of the factors underpinning the analysis of the questionnaire data and the demographic responses as discussed in Chapter Five.

Inferential statistics measure the relationship between two or more variables and include tests such as the Mann Whitney U (or Wilcoxon Rank Sum) which is used in this research. Rowntree (1981), like other researchers, places much emphasis on the aspect of inferential statistics which involves generalising from a sample to make estimates and inferences about a wider population (p. 19). However, Gayle (2000) places them in a wider theoretical context by saying that ‘inferential statistics’ allow us to make some statistical generalisations about an aspect of the social word (p. 385). Inferential statistics enable hypotheses to be tested and generalisations to be made as shown in Chapter Five.

To answer the first research question “What are the attitudes of curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the Lower primary classrooms?”, the questionnaires were sorted and analysed using the different colour coding and pseudonyms as described in Section 4.6.1. The Likert summated rating scale was used in some sections of these questionnaires to measure the participants’ attitudes and reactions. Statements of beliefs that had been formulated by the researcher were responded to by the participants indicating how strongly they agreed or disagreed on a 5 point scale. Points (1-5) were awarded to participants’ choices and the total scores of each one was calculated and recorded. Data was analysed by looking at the distribution of the responses to
each attitudinal question. The Likert summated scale was read as follows: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = disagree, 4 = strongly disagree, and 5 = undecided. All the items in the questionnaire were analysed using the IBM SPSS Statistics Version 21. Descriptive statistics for the continuous variables were demonstrated as case number and percentage. The non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test at a confidence level of 0.05 was used to determine the statistical differences between the attitudes towards the languages used in the current bilingual education program of the following groups:

- Tok Pisin teachers vs Tolai teachers (5.1.3)
- Tok Pisin parents vs Tolai parents (5.2.3)
- Parents vs Teachers (5.2.3.2)
- Tolai parents vs Tolai teachers (5.2.3.1)
- Tok Pisin Students vs Tolai students (5.3.3)

4.7.2. In-depth Interviews

The in-depth interviews were also used to answer the first research question as well as the second research question which is “Is the current policy on bilingual education being implemented in schools based on the participants’ views?” In order to analyse the transcripts from the interviews, the researcher used some ideas from the “Grounded Theory Approach” (Glaser and Strauss, 1967) adapted for use by Hesse-Biber, et al. (2004). The steps that were taken to analyse the data are described as follows:

1. Open Coding

Open Coding (like all coding) is labelling, putting labels on pieces of data. This is the first level of conceptual analysis with the data where initial coding (Hesse-Biber, et al., 2004) takes place. Here the researcher began by fracturing or breaking open the data (Punch, 1998) where each interview transcript was read and re-read in order to look for descriptive codes and eventually hoping to generate a set of key concepts (themes and eventually categories, see Tables 22-26 in Chapter 6). As the researcher read through the data, she started marking up or highlighting anything she thought was relevant to her understanding of pidgins, creoles and vernacular education in relation to the current education reform in PNG. These pieces of data according to Punch (1998) are a word, or phrase, sometimes a line, sometimes a paragraph, sometimes more, depending on the data. (See Appendices for the ‘initial coding’ samples called ‘identifying
chunks’: Curriculum officer - Appendix 27, teacher - Appendix 30, parent - Appendix 33, student - Appendix 36).

The marking up of the text was to locate those segments the researcher believed were important. At this stage, the researcher then applied a name or code to each of these segments. According to Hesse-Biber, et al. (2004), some segments of text may contain more than one code so the researcher’s coding procedure was open-ended and holistic and her goal was to gain insight and understanding. Her analysis procedure was primarily inductive and required immersion in the text until themes, concepts, or dimensions of concepts arose from the data, an idea adapted from Hesse-Biber, et al. (2004). (For an ‘open coding’ sample, see Curriculum Officer - Appendix 28), teacher - Appendix 31, parent - Appendix 34, student - Appendix 37.

2. Focused Coding

Hesse-Biber, et al. (2004) point out that sometimes codes turn out to be literal codes – these words also appear within the text and are usually descriptive codes. Others can be more interpretive and are not tied as tightly to the text itself, but they begin to rely on the researcher’s insights for drawing out interpretation. So this is where the researcher began more focused coding. At this stage, she examined and compared each piece of data with every other piece, and finally built a clear working definition of each concept, which she then named. The name becomes the code (Charmaz, 1983, p. 117). According to Hesse-Biber, et al. (2004) focused coding requires that a researcher develop a set of analytical categories rather than just labelling data in a topical fashion. (See Appendices for the following focused coding samples: curriculum officer - Appendix 29, teacher - Appendix 32, parent - Appendix 35, student - Appendix 38).

3. Memoing

As the coding progressed, and more and more interviews were analysed, the researcher then began to memo what was going on in her data. By memoing the ideas and concepts that emerged, she then started theorizing about the meanings of these concepts and the ways in which they were related to other factors. The codes allowed her to formulate (emerging) themes that were, eventually grouped into categories.
The findings of these analyses are displayed in the Tables 22-26 in the Findings Chapter (Chapter 6).

4.8. Conclusion
This chapter began with a discussion of the mixed methods approach used for the collection of data for this study. The reliability and validity of the study was then discussed followed by a detailed discussion of the selection of location and fieldwork participants. The data collection method which involved survey questionnaires and in-depth interviews were then discussed. The procedures of data collection and how the data was managed, was then described and finally, the approach to data analysis closed the chapter with a detailed description of what was involved in each data source (questionnaires, in-depth interviews) was provided.
CHAPTER FIVE
Findings of Questionnaires

5. Introduction
This chapter presents the findings of the data obtained from survey questionnaires from teachers, parents and students in the six primary schools which took part in this study: Kokopo, Kabaleo, Kalamanagunan, Takabur, Kabagap and Raluana. The following graph (Figure. 6) shows the complete dataset collected = 413.

Figure 6: An overview of the participants who took part in the study

Findings from the descriptive analysis are discussed in this chapter starting with teachers (5.1) followed by parents (5.2) then students (5.3). The findings of inferential statistical data analysis which was employed to determine whether there were any significant differences among the language attitudes of the different groups are presented in: Section 5.1.3 Tok Pisin teachers vs Tolai teachers, Section 5.2.3 Tok Pisin parents vs Tolai parents, Section 5.2.3.2 parents vs teachers, Section 5.3.3 Tok Pisin students vs Tolai students. The chapter ends with a conclusion in section 5.4.

5.1. Teachers’ Questionnaire Analysis
Teachers’ questionnaires (N=85, see Appendices 2 and 3) had a total of 39 closed questions and 3 open-ended questions. Part one (Q1-10) required teachers to provide their background
information. Part two (Language Use Q11-26) sought teachers choice of the languages they use in different domains of society. Although all questions were recorded and analysed, for Part two only Questions 17-20 are discussed in this thesis as they directly relate to languages used in school which is in line with the research questions (compared to Questions 11-16 and Questions 21-26 which relate more to language use in other domains. Part three (Q27-39) was on teachers’ attitudes towards languages used in the classroom and the current curriculum, and was organized as follows: a) General language attitudes, b) Language for schooling, c) Teachers’ competency in language skills, and d) Teaching material. Part four (Q40-42) was the open-ended questions section which required teachers to provide detailed explanations to given questions on the current education system.

Findings of the descriptive analysis of Tok Pisin teachers are presented first followed by Tolai teachers. A comparison of Tok Pisin and Tolai teacher findings using an inferential statistical analysis is presented at the end of this section.

5.1.1. Tok Pisin Teachers’ Questionnaire Analysis

Findings obtained from the descriptive analysis of Tok Pisin teachers’ questionnaires are presented in Tables 2-4 and graphs in Figures 7-13, and are described in detail in their immediate subsequent sections. Note that percentages (%) do not always add up to 100% due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Demographic Variables for Tok Pisin Teachers (N = 48)</th>
<th>Questions 1-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School</strong></td>
<td>Raw Figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokopo</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabaleo</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takaber</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabagap</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raluana</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1. Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2. Age Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30 yrs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 yrs</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50+ yrs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.1.1. Tok Pisin Teachers’ Background Information (Q1-10)

A total of 48 teachers, who were aged between 22-50+ years old and most of whom were females, completed the Tok Pisin teachers’ questionnaires. The majority of these teachers (n=36, 75%) were from East New Britain Province (see Table 3) who spoke Tolai as their mother tongue, while n=12 (25%) were from other Provinces of PNG. They were also asked about how long they had been teaching and what language(s) they were educated in. All Tok Pisin teacher participants had a Diploma in teaching (primary) and were educated in English. Most were base level teachers (n=32, 66.7%). The remainder (n=16, 33.3%) were senior teachers (head teachers and deputy head teachers).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Tok Pisin Teachers’ Personal Background Information (N=48)</th>
<th>Questions 3-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Position in school</td>
<td>Raw Figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Base level Teacher</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Home Province</td>
<td>East New Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5and6. Number of years teaching (old and new curriculum)</td>
<td>2-10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30+ years</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Level of Education</td>
<td>Diploma in Teaching (primary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. Language Educated in</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. Mother Tongue</td>
<td>Tolai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. What other languages do you speak?</td>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that twenty-one teachers (43.75%) were bilingual certified teachers who had been teaching for 2-10 years, fifteen (31.25%) had been teaching for 11-20 years (a group of teachers which comprised bilingual certified teachers and teachers who were trained under the English-only system) and twelve (25%) were older teachers. When this group of teachers were asked if they spoke another language apart from their mother tongue (Q10), 54.2% said they spoke Tok Pisin, 16.7% said they spoke Tolai, 18.8 % said they spoke English, and 10.4% said they spoke another PNG language. This data added to the depth of perspectives on the attitudinal statements (see Table 4) in 5.1.1.3.
5.1.1.2. **Tok Pisin Teachers’ Language Use (Q17-20)**

This subsection, which addresses the key question “what languages do teachers use amongst themselves and with their students?” revealed a number of differences among teachers.``

Firstly, as shown in Figure 7, more than half (58%) preferred using the bilingual mode of English and Tok Pisin amongst themselves while 21% indicated they use English only and 13% use English, Tok Pisin and Tolai. This suggests that teachers value English at the workplace since it is the official language (Kale, 2005). However, they use Tok Pisin with their colleagues as it is a growing lingua franca (Nekitel, 1998) in PNG today.

![Figure 7: Languages used by Tok Pisin teachers with colleagues at work](image)

Secondly, the preference for Tok Pisin is further evidenced in the findings on teachers’ language preferences after school. As shown in Figure 8, the majority of the teachers chose Tok Pisin. They preferred using Tok Pisin either on its own (38%), with English (21%), with Tolai (19%) or with both English and Tolai (15%). This indicates that Tok Pisin is an important language among teachers compared to English, Tolai and other mother tongues.
A similar trend was seen with teachers’ language use with students in the classroom (see Figure 9). More than half of the teachers (54%) use Tok Pisin bilingually with English or Tok Pisin in a trilingual mode with English and Tolai (19%). Only 21% on the other hand, use English only.

In terms of teachers’ choice of language use with students after school, it was not surprising that Tok Pisin yet again stood out to be the most favoured medium (see Figure 10). It is used either monolingually (46%), bilingually with Tolai (25%), with English (19%), or trilingually with English and Tolai (2%).
This data further suggest that overall, teachers are more comfortable using Tok Pisin compared to English amongst themselves and with students. This could pose a threat to the language maintenance of vernacular languages, which is in line with concerns raised by Sumbuk (2006). It is important to understand the choice of languages teachers use both in and after school as they are ‘role models for students’, in line with Sinha (2011, p. 1). This was also mentioned by a student (see section 6.4.3).

5.1.1.3. **Tok Pisin Teachers’ Language Attitudes (27-39)**

This subsection addresses the key question, ‘what are the attitudes of Tok Pisin teachers towards the current bilingual education program’. Using the Likert summated rating scale (5 point scale) the findings are shown in Table 4. Questions 27-29 sought ‘general language attitude statements’, Questions 30-32 were on ‘language for schooling’, Questions 33-37 sought ‘teachers’ competency on language skills’ and Questions 38-39 sought ‘teachers’ attitudes towards teaching materials’.

**Tok Pisin Teachers’ Attitudes towards Language(s) in General (Q27-29)**

The majority (n= 32, 66.7%) supported Tok Pisin as an important language for use in elementary schools for children’s survival in PNG’s society (Q27). They (n=34, 70.9%) also did not think the bilingual use of Tok Pisin and English would affect children in terms of losing their vernacular languages (Q28). This suggests that these Tok Pisin teachers valued the use of both languages in the classroom as well as the local vernaculars. They also highly supported the idea
of children being introduced to English at an early age at the elementary schools (Q29) in order to have a successful future. This was evidenced among 40 teachers who agreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Attitudinal Statements (Tok Pisin Teachers) (N=48)</th>
<th>Questions 27-39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Statements</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27. Teaching Tok Pisin in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society</td>
<td>9 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28. Using Tok Pisin and English in the classroom will result in students losing their local vernaculars</td>
<td>6 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29. English is an international language therefore children should acquire English at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life</td>
<td>30 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. Students are keen to learn English during the bridging stage (Gr 3)</td>
<td>14 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31. Heavy use of Tok Pisin in the classroom contributes to students’ lacking proficiency in English</td>
<td>25 (52.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32. The use of Tok Pisin alongside English in the classroom helps students acquire English easily</td>
<td>22 (45.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33. I speak Tok Pisin very fluently but I am less fluent in reading and writing Tok Pisin</td>
<td>14 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34. I find it difficult to plan for the integration of learning in two languages (Tok Pisin and English) across the curriculum</td>
<td>14 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35. I only have little knowledge of how to plan for two languages in use in one classroom, to assist in ‘bridging’ students from the home language to the language of the wider communication</td>
<td>12 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36. Teachers training colleges should introduce a unit on literacy in Tok Pisin for teachers in the bilingual education program (Grade 3-5)</td>
<td>18 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37. Bridging teachers need specialized training in teaching English as second language</td>
<td>33 (68.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38. I spend a lot of time preparing and designing my own teaching materials in Tok Pisin because the education department does not provide us with teaching materials</td>
<td>30 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39. There is an abundant supply of teaching materials in Tok Pisin in primary school</td>
<td>6 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tok Pisin Teachers’ Attitudes towards Language(s) for schooling (Q30-32)

There was a general consensus among Tok Pisin teachers (n=40, 83.4%) that students were keen to learn English during the ‘bridging period’ (Q30) and that the use of Tok Pisin alongside English helped students acquire English (Q32). However, a lot of teachers (n=37, 77.1%) were concerned that a heavy use of Tok Pisin in the classroom (Q31) interfered with students proficiency in English.

Tok Pisin Teachers’ Competency in Language Skills (Q33-37)

Findings on ‘competency in language skills’ revealed three major concerns. Firstly, it was found that more than 60% of teachers were very fluent in speaking Tok Pisin but not in reading and writing the language (Q33). Secondly, the majority (n=33, 68.8%) had difficulties planning for the integration of learning in two languages (Tok Pisin and English) across the curriculum (Q34) and thirdly, the majority (n=38, 79.2%) admitted they only had little knowledge on how to plan...
for two languages in use in one classroom to assist in bridging students from the home language to English (Q35). Two suggested solutions which teachers were asked to give their views on were: (Q36) whether teachers’ colleges should include a unit on literacy in Tok Pisin for teachers in the bilingual education training program, and whether ‘bridging teachers’ must be specialized in teaching English as a second language (Q37). In response, it was found that the majority of the teachers supported the two ideas (n=38, 79.2% and n=41, 85.5% respectively), which indicates the need for more in-service training programs for practicing teachers and a revised training program for trainee-teachers at teachers’ training colleges in the country.

Tok Pisin Teachers’ Attitudes towards Teaching Resources (Q38-39)

There were also pressing issues in terms of teaching resources. Firstly, an overwhelming majority (n=40, 83.3%) agreed that they spent a lot of time preparing teaching and learning materials for their lessons due to the lack of teaching resources in schools (Q38). Secondly, 34 teachers (70.8%) disagreed that there is an abundant supply of teaching materials in schools (Q39) suggesting that the school administrations and NDOE need to work together to resolve the issue of lack of resources in schools throughout the country.

5.1.1.4. Tok Pisin Teachers’ Responses to Open-ended Questions (Q40-42)

This subsection discusses the findings of the three open-ended questions which sought teachers’ views on the current vernacular and Tok Pisin education in an expanded and more elaborative manner. Question 40 required teachers to do two things. First, to indicate whether they had either a positive or negative view of the impact of teaching and learning in Tok Pisin on the educational achievements of their students and secondly, to provide in detail their reasons for their view.

![Figure 11: The impact of teaching and learning in Tok Pisin on students’ academic achievements](image-url)
As shown in Figure 11, most teachers (68.8%) claimed that the teaching of Tok Pisin has negative impacts on students’ academic achievements while 31.2% stated they have seen positive impacts. Examples of reasons that teachers provided about the negative impacts of Tok Pisin included the following:

- ‘It has created a lot of confusion amongst our little children and they find difficulties in English sentence structure, pronunciation and spelling of words and general grammar and usage. That I assume has caused the level of students’ academic performance to drop drastically’.
- ‘Students cannot speak fluent English and even write English correctly. This is because students have been accustomed to speaking and learning in Tok Pisin. It has an effect also on reading and understanding English’.
- ‘From experience I would say that the teaching of Tok Pisin has caused students to lack grammar skills especially in spelling English words correctly or even understand simple English instructions’.
- ‘When translating words to English, students still find it difficult to write English words correctly due to the confusion they have with Tok Pisin words. Example ‘boy’ in English is being perceived by some students as ‘boi’ in Tok Pisin’.
- ‘It has a disastrous effect on students’ performance and has contributed to a drop in students’ academic achievements’.

Examples of reasons that teachers provided for the positive impacts of Tok Pisin, on the other hand, included the following:

- ‘From my observation, students who speak pidgin and were taught pidgin in elementary school, pick up English very easily and understand better and faster, read, write, spell and communicate well both in oral and written English whereas those who were taught in tokples are slow learners and cannot speak and write well. They find it hard and resort to the vernacular to communicate better but most times they communicate in Pidgin’.
- ‘Students who come to school with an understanding of Tok Pisin understand English better than those who only speak the vernacular’.
‘As a Grade 3 teacher, I see that students who attended Tok Pisin elementary school perform better than those who attended a village elementary school in Tolai’.

‘I see that students are learning better in Tok Pisin as it is an everyday language used in the school and the community. It helps students to construct sentences in English’.

‘Using Tok Pisin in the classroom helps students acquire knowledge and skills in English especially when explaining things in Tok Pisin’.

In sum, the majority of this cohort of teachers claimed that Tok Pisin has a negative impact on students’ academic learning. Interestingly, several of the teachers who supported the use of Tok Pisin stated that it had advantages over the use of vernaculars.

Question 41 required teachers to choose between the bilingual mode of ‘Tok Pisin and English’ and English-only and give reasons for their choice. The findings (in Figure 12) showed that the majority (79.2%) were in favour of the monolingual English-only education whereas 20.8% were in favour of bilingual education in Tok Pisin and English.

![Figure 12: Tok Pisin teachers’ preferences on languages used in school](image)

Reasons that teachers provided in support of English-only included the following:

‘I prefer English only education because students who are now in Grade 7 and 8 still do not know how to spell and construct good English sentences because they were not taught enough phonics and grammar in English’.

‘I prefer English only because as a new/foreign language, it will be interesting and fun for the students to learn. Students will be eager to speak and listen and most importantly, they
will explore possibilities along with other students, provided they are given help and guidance as they are instructed in English compared to Tok Pisin which is already a known language to the students and less interesting to learn’.

- ‘I prefer English because it is the language used world-wide. Teaching English is easier as all teaching materials are written in English and not in Tok Pisin and vernacular - what a contradiction!’

- ‘I prefer English only as it has put me where I am today. Learning English only, helps the students read and write well and there is no confusion learning in two languages as what the current bilingual education is creating’.

- ‘I strongly prefer English only because it prepares a child for this modern technological world’.

- ‘English is the only language used in any written form of assessment in the country guaranteeing a learner to move to the next level, example Grade 8 National examinations to move onto High schools’.

- ‘I would prefer English only because all students’ text books are written in English. It does not make sense when we teach in Tok Pisin and ask students to read books written in English’.

Examples of reasons that teachers provided in support of Tok Pisin and English included the following:

- ‘I prefer the use of Tok Pisin alongside English as it has advantages over other PNG languages. It is a bit similar to English and therefore children relate to it better than Tolai. Children translate Tok Pisin words easily to English than Tolai words, examples haus in Tok Pisin’ and house in English, naip/naïf in Tok Pisin and knife in English’.

- ‘The use of Tok Pisin alongside English is effective as it helps students understand concepts in English better. It is of great help to slow learners’.

- ‘I prefer Tok Pisin to be taught together with English as it helps students understand better. But this should take place only in elementary school’.

- ‘Nowadays Tok Pisin is widely spoken right across PNG due to intermarriages, transmigration and different cultural backgrounds in workplaces and communities in urban
centres. Therefore it is only right that Tok Pisin should be used in schools together with English. Also not all teachers can speak the vernaculars of the students they teach so they resort to using Tok Pisin instead”.

It is interesting to note that teachers who supported bilingual education again mentioned that using Tok Pisin and English was better than using a vernacular and English.

In answer to the next question (Q42), respondents began by indicating whether they were in favour of the current education system or not.

![Figure 13: Tok Pisin teachers’ views on the current education reform](chart)

Reasons that Tok Pisin teachers’ gave in support of the current reform system included:

- ‘As a citizen of this country, I am in support of the reform. The only problem I see is the bridging period from Tok Pisin and the vernaculars to English. There must be a special training program given to bridging teachers to resolve the existing problems in bridging’.
- ‘Using Tok Pisin in the current bilingual education helps students understand better and students find translations in Tok Pisin to English easier because some Tok Pisin words have similar sounds to English while others are English words borrowed into Tok Pisin’.
- ‘The teaching of Tok Pisin and later bridging to English is good however PNG should produce teaching materials in its home grown languages so that students can learn better’.
Provinces should produce their own curriculum in their own mother tongue alongside Tok Pisin and English so curriculum functions should be decentralized to its provinces in order to maintain language and culture and that should be the way forward’.

Tok Pisin teachers’ views against the current reform system were as follows:

- Problems are encountered during the bridging to English period. Languages used during bridging need careful attention. Students who were taught in Tok Pisin must be in a Tok Pisin bridging class and students who were taught in a vernacular (e.g. Tolai) must be in a Tolai bridging class and they should not be combined as what’s currently practiced as it creates confusion in both groups’.
- As a result of combining students who attended Tok Pisin and Tolai elementary schools in Grade 3 bridging classes, children are confused and therefore mix up English words with Tok Pisin and Tolai (or another vernacular)’.
- Children educated in the current education system cannot even read, write or speak perfect English compared to us who were educated in the English only system. Example, trainee teachers from teachers college make a lot of mistakes when presenting lessons. Where is the quality of English language? How can we measure against the quality of academic standard?’
- Curriculum writers should review the current syllabus and teachers’ guides and put more emphasis on the teaching of grammar because without grammar, written English will not be done well. In the current reform, what we taught in grade 1 in the previous English curriculum is now being taught in Grades 3 and 4. The level of comprehension in English is way too low. It’s pathetic’.
- English should be introduced and taught to children at a much earlier age in elementary prep because children learn better and faster at this stage than Grade 3 which is late’.

To sum up, in Question 42, only 25% of Tok Pisin teachers indicated that they were in support of the bilingual education reform, whereas the majority of the teachers were against it. Both groups provided a wide range of reasons for their opinions which will be further analysed in the discussion Chapter (Chapter 7).
5.1.2. Tolai Teachers’ Questionnaire Analysis

In this subsection, findings obtained from the analysis of Tolai teachers’ questionnaires are presented in Tables 5-7 and graphs in Figures 14-20, and are described in detail in their immediate subsequent sections.

5.1.2.1. Tolai Teachers’ Background Information (Q1-10)

A total of 37 teachers from four schools, three village schools and one semi-urban/village school (shown in Table 5) completed the questionnaires. These were schools where these teachers claimed they used Tolai predominantly with their students in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalamangunan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takabur</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabagap</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raluana</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. Gender</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. Age Groups</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-30 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50+ years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar to the Tok Pisin teacher findings, the majority (n=30, 81.1%) of these Tolai teachers were females (aged between 25-50+ years) since all participating schools had an imbalanced proportion in gender which saw female teachers out-weighting male teachers. As shown in Table 6, most teachers (n=33, 89.2%) were from East New Britain Province and spoke Tolai as their mother tongue.

In terms of years of teaching experience, the majority of teachers (n=27, 73%) had been teaching for up to 20 years and were base level teachers. All teachers had an education in English and were all diploma holders except for one who had a certificate in teaching. Responses that teachers gave when they were asked about other languages they spoke apart from their mother
tongue (Q10) showed that the use of the trilingual medium consisting of Tok Pisin, Tolai and English was highly practiced (54%) compared to other languages or language combinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 3-10</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Position in school</td>
<td>Senior Teacher</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant/Teacher</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Home Province</td>
<td>East New Britain</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 and 6. Number of years</td>
<td>1-10 years</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching (Old and New Curriculum)</td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30+ years</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Level of Education</td>
<td>Diploma in Teaching (primary)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate in Teaching (primary)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. Language Educated in</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. What other languages do you speak?</td>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tok Pisin and Tolai</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolai and English</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tok Pisin, Tolai and English</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2.2. Tolai Teachers’ Language Use (Q17-20)

Similar to Tok Pisin teachers (see 5.1.1.2) this subsection discusses Tolai teachers’ language usage. As shown in Figure 14, an equal proportion (35.1%) of teachers used the bilingual mode of English and Tok Pisin, and English, Tok Pisin and Tolai to converse with their colleagues at work.

![Figure 14: Languages Tolai teachers used with colleagues at work](image-url)
While 18.9% claimed they used English only, 8.1% preferred using only Tok Pisin. Interestingly, the use of Tolai alone was least preferred.

Figure 15 on the other hand, shows that Tok Pisin stood out to be the most preferred language used by Tolai teachers after official duties in school. That is, they either used Tok Pisin on its own (32.4%), Tok Pisin together with Tolai (21.6%) or Tok Pisin together with English and Tolai (18.9%). The choice of using Tok Pisin alongside English was less favoured and the use of English-only was the least common.

![Figure 15: Languages Tolai teachers used with colleagues after work](image)

Several interesting observations were made in respect to what languages the teachers said they used with their students in the classroom. An equal percentage, 29.7% (see Figure 16) used Tok Pisin and English and the trilingual medium of English, Tok Pisin and Tolai. While the use of English ‘only’ was preferred by another group of teachers (27%), the use of Tolai alongside English was relatively uncommon (2.7%). Only 5.4% of Tolai teachers used Tolai alone as a medium of instruction in the classroom, and the same percentage used Tok Pisin on its own (5.4%).
When these teachers were asked about what languages they used with their students after school hours (Q20), several differences were observed. As shown in Figure 17, one third (32.4%) stated they used both Tok Pisin and Tolai when conversing with their students after school. An equal percentage (24.3%) preferred using Tok Pisin on its own or Tolai on its own. The same small proportion of teachers (2.7%) preferred using English alone and using Tok Pisin alongside English. The trilingual usage of English, Tok Pisin and Tolai constituted 13.5% of the total sample.

Further to the unexpected findings on the low usage of Tolai in the classroom, this data indicates that Tolai (24.3%) is on par with Tok Pisin (24.3%) during teacher-student conversations after school. The bilingual mode of Tok Pisin and Tolai was more frequent (32.4%). The use of English was most common when spoken together with Tok Pisin and Tolai (13.5%).
5.1.2.3. Tolai Teachers’ Language Attitudes (Q27-39)

This subsection addresses the key question, ‘what are the attitudes of Tolai teachers towards the current bilingual education program’ using the Likert summated rating scale (5 point scale) as shown in Table 7. Questions 27-29 sought ‘general language attitude statements, Questions 30-32 were on ‘language for schooling’, Questions 33-37 sought ‘teachers’ competency in language skills’ and Questions 38-39 sought teachers’ attitudes towards ‘teaching materials’.

**Tolai Teachers’ Attitudes towards Language (s) in General (Q27-29)**

Findings revealed just over half (n=20, 54%) of the teachers in this sample agreed that the teaching of Tolai in elementary school was important for a child’s survival in the PNG society (Q27). 17 teachers (46%) on the other hand, claimed that the teaching of Tolai was not important. It was also observed that while the majority (n=24, 64.8%) were in favour of Tolai being used alongside English to help maintain local vernaculars (Q28), 12 teachers (32.4%) disagreed. It was also noted that an overwhelming majority (n=35, 94.6%) were in favour of students acquiring English at an early age at the elementary level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Attitudinal Statements (Tolai Teachers) (N=37)</th>
<th>Questions 27-39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Statements</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27. Teaching Tolai in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society</td>
<td>10 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28. Using Tolai and English in the classroom will result in children maintaining local vernaculars</td>
<td>7 (18.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29. English is an international language therefore children should acquire it at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life</td>
<td>23 (68.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. Students are keen to learn English during the bridging stage (Grade 3)</td>
<td>14 (37.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31. Heavy use of Tolai in the classroom contributes to students lacking proficiency in English</td>
<td>29 (78.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32. The use of Tolai alongside English in the bridging program helps students acquire English easily</td>
<td>10 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33. I speak Tolai very fluently but I am less fluent in reading and writing in Tolai</td>
<td>14 (37.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34. I find it difficult to plan for the integration of learning in two languages (Tolai and English) across the curriculum</td>
<td>17 (45.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35. I only have little knowledge of how to plan for two languages in use in one classroom, to assist in ‘bridging’ students from the home language to the language of the wider communication</td>
<td>17 (45.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36. Teachers training colleges should introduce a unit on literacy in Tolai for teachers in the bilingual education program (Grade 3-5)</td>
<td>11 (29.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37. Bridging teachers need specialized training in teaching English as second language</td>
<td>28 (75.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38. I spend a lot of time preparing and designing my own teaching materials in Tolai because the education department does not provide us with enough teaching materials</td>
<td>25 (67.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39. There is an abundant supply of teaching materials in Tolai in primary schools</td>
<td>8 (21.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Tolai Teachers’ Attitudes towards Language(s) for Schooling (Q30-32)**

The first of the three questions in this section sought teachers’ views on whether or not their students were keen to learn English during the bridging period in Grade 3 (Q30). Findings revealed that 27 (72.9%) teachers supported the notion whereas ten (27%) did not. It was also noted that when teachers were asked whether the heavy use of Tolai resulted in students lacking proficiency in English (Q31), an overwhelming majority (n=32, 86.5%) agreed while four teachers (10.8%) disagreed. In response to the third question (Q32), as can be seen from Table 7, slightly more than half (54%) of the respondents indicated that they agreed that using Tolai alongside English in the classroom helped students acquire and comprehend English easily.

**Tolai Teachers’ Competency in Language Skills (Q33-37)**

As regards competency in language skills, a number of concerns similar to the Tok Pisin teacher findings are highlighted in this subsection. Firstly, findings revealed that a majority (n=27, 72.9%) of Tolai teachers could speak Tolai very fluently but were less fluent in reading and writing in Tolai (Q33). Secondly, an equal number (n=27, 72.9%) had difficulties planning for the integration of learning in two or more languages (Q34). Thirdly, the majority (n=30, 81%) again admitted they encountered problems bridging students from their home language to English as they had little knowledge of the concept of bridging. Five teachers (13.5%) on the other hand, indicated they did not face any difficulties at all while two (5.4%) were undecided.

In response to Question 36: ‘Teachers training colleges should include a unit on literacy in Tolai for teachers in the bilingual education training program’, 24 teachers (64.8%) agreed and 11(29.7%) did not. Most remarkably, when teachers were asked whether or not bridging teachers needed specialized training in teaching English as a second language (Q37) all teachers (100%) claimed there was a real need in this area. This suggests that the school administration and the NDOE need to allocate funds for training and re-training teachers in order to gain positive outcomes of the bilingual education program in the country.

**Tolai Teachers’ Attitudes towards Teaching Resources (Q38-39)**

When teachers were asked if they spent a lot of time on preparing teaching materials for their lessons (Q38), the vast amount of respondents (91.9%) claimed they did as there was a lack of
resources in schools. However, when teachers were asked specifically about the availability of resources in their individual schools (Q39), findings showed a split in the views: 48.6% stated there was an abundant supply of teaching materials, whereas 48.6% claimed they did not have enough teaching resources.

5.1.2.4. Tolai Teachers’ Responses to Open-ended Questions (Q40-42)

This subsection provides the findings of the three open-ended questions which sought further views from teachers on the current bilingual education system. The first question (Q40) required teachers to do two things. Firstly, to indicate whether they had a positive or negative view of the impact of teaching Tolai and secondly, to give reasons for their view.

![Bar chart showing the impact of teaching and learning in Tolai on students’ academic achievements](image)

Figure 18: The impact of teaching and learning in Tolai on students’ academic achievements

As shown in Figure 18, the majority (83.8%) of the teachers claimed Tolai had a negative impact on students’ academic achievements while 13.5% stated it had a positive impact. One teacher said it had both positive and negative impact. Reasons that teachers gave in terms of negative impact include the following:

- ‘The impact is that it is severely destroying students’ learning progress. This is shown in the Grade 8 Examination findings’.
- ‘The use of Tolai in the classroom has influenced the children a lot that when they move on to primary school they still spell words in Tolai instead of English’.
- ‘It shows that students will not go far in their education because Tolai is not required in this modern world of technology’.
‘The teaching of Tolai has resulted in students dropping in many subject areas especially English. They cannot construct simple sentences, read and understand a text and answer simple English questions correctly’.

‘Student’s oracy is very bad, so is their written language, poor spelling, poor grammar, poor punctuations, poor reading, they cannot interpret simple graphs, charts and tables and their comprehension level is very limited, talking from experience from Grade 3 up to Grade 8’.

Tolai teachers who claimed Tolai has positive impacts on their students’ academic achievements provided reasons such as:

‘Teaching of the Tolai language has helped a lot especially for the survival of the child only in the Tolai society so that traditional myths and beliefs, customary land and boundaries, family tree and ancestors traditional rights and obligations are learned well and inherited in a child’s life’.

‘The impact of the teaching of Tolai has encouraged students to know and understand their culture well and it has helped the children to read the bible in the vernacular and to speak it fluently’.

‘Children have enjoyed much and have pride in learning their own language and culture so I think the present system of education in PNG is fair’.

In response to Question 41, the majority (86.5%) of Tolai teachers were in favour of monolingual ‘English-only education’ whereas only one teacher was in favour of bilingual education in Tolai and English (see Figure 19). Interestingly, four other teachers spoke favourably about both bilingual education in Tolai and English and the monolingual English only system.
Figure 19: Tolai teachers’ preferences on languages used in school

Reasons that Tolai teachers gave in favour of English-only included the following:

- ‘I prefer English since all text books are in English and not in the local vernaculars’.
- ‘English only. It’s a waste of time teaching Tolai again when the children already know it as acquired in their home environment. It is just a waste of time when we should be focusing on teaching English to the children for a better future’.
- ‘English only. Because children fail in Grade 8, 10 and 12: lack of understanding English concepts, there’s heavy use of Tolai which hinders the learning process in English and confuses the children. There’s no practice in speaking English and children are being ignored’.
- ‘English only. Because it is an international language of communication and therefore should be taught at a child’s early age’.
- ‘Teaching Tolai at an early age is a stone block because this will only stop children from acquiring English at this early stage. Children have been brought up in their own vernacular society so there is no need to teach them their vernacular again. It’s useless’.

Tolai teachers’ who gave reasons in support of Tolai and English included:

- ‘The use of Tolai alongside English is OK as it helps students with the explanation of English concepts’.
‘I think teaching in Tolai helps my Grade 3 understand better. If I use only English, they would sometimes do the wrong thing altogether. So teaching in Tolai to explain English concepts helps my students’.

‘The teaching of Tolai is OK but the bridging of it in Grade 3 is a major problem’.

‘I prefer both languages so that the language and culture is maintained’.

In this section, it was found that the majority of the Tolai teachers were in favour of the English-only curriculum whereas only a very small portion supported using Tolai and English. Among the latter, some indicated that there were problems with implementation.

Question 42 concerned the current bilingual education system in PNG. In answer to this question, respondents began by indicating whether or not they were in favour of the current education system and then provided detailed reasons for their answers. As shown in Figure 20, only 5.4% of the respondents were in favour of the current reform using vernacular and Tok Pisin compared to the 78.4% who opposed it. 16.2% on the other hand, had mixed views, as reflected in their comments below.

![Figure 20: Tolai teachers’ views on the current education reform in PNG](image.png)

Tolai teachers’ views in favour of the current reform system included the following:
‘The current education reform is good however the only problem that we’re facing is lack of teaching materials and there’s very little to be used in the classroom’.

‘Teaching Tok Pisin and Tolai is good but if the government can spend more money on logistic support and human resources or examinations written in one of the spoken languages commonly used, (Tok Pisin or Tolai), then we would be more happier and maintain teaching in Tolai and Tok Pisin, otherwise English is more preferable at this time since all text books and examinations are written in English’.

‘We need more bridging teachers who have a lot of experience in bridging and must be committed to bridging alone (in lower primary school)’.

‘The current system of education is good, however, it just needs to be fully supported by the NDOE with teaching resources and materials for students which is currently lacking which in turn discourages teachers’.

Tolai teachers who held negative views against the current education system gave comments such as the following:

‘There’s great difference in students’ learning today compared to the past. The old system produced many good people, leaders who could write and speak some of the best English whereas today, only a few are good while the bulk of the students have difficulties speaking and writing English’.

‘The reform curriculum has victimised most of our students in schools throughout PNG. The Reform curriculum has only changed a little since it was established in 1992 however not much experience has been given for each era of change thus resulting in a drop in education standard in the country. Teachers are being pressurized in programming and less time given to impart content knowledge to students. Teaching resources for Grades 3-8 are not consistently distributed which is yet another major issue’.

‘We teachers have been exhausted with so much work especially planning our programs and teaching a little with less teaching and learning resources’.

‘I suggest that policy makers send an assessment team to assess the implementation and progress of the reform curriculum in the schools. From the feedback they receive,
recommendations should be made based on the findings either to make adjustments or a complete overhaul of the current education system’.

5.1.3. Comparison of Tok Pisin and Tolai Teachers’ Findings

Demographic Data and Language Use

A total of 85 teachers completed the survey questionnaires. As noted above, in most schools, female staff greatly outnumbered male teachers. It was noted that most Tok Pisin teachers said they used the bilingual mode of English and Tok Pisin or English-only with their colleagues and students during school hours whereas the use of Tok Pisin only was the most common option after school compared to other languages and/or language combinations. Similarly, Tolai teachers frequently used the bilingual mode of English and Tok Pisin at school but, unlike Tok Pisin teachers, they also used the trilingual mode of English, Tok Pisin and Tolai both with their colleagues and students at school. Their main language preference after school was Tok Pisin alone with colleagues and the bilingual mode of Tok Pisin and Tolai with students.

Language Attitudes - Findings of An Inferential Statistical test

In terms of language attitudes, the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test at a confidence level of 0.05 was used to determine the statistical differences between the attitudes of Tok Pisin teachers and Tolai teachers towards the languages used in the current bilingual education program. Of the 12 attitudinal statements that were tested (see Tables 4 and 7), findings revealed that there were statistically significant differences in only three of the statements as shown below (See Appendix 39a for details):

Q31. Heavy use of Tok Pisin/Tolai in the classroom contributes to students lacking proficiency in English.

Findings showed a statistically significant difference (p = .033) in attitudes to this question. A significantly greater proportion of Tolai teachers thought heavy use of Tolai contributed to students lacking proficiency in English compared to Tok Pisin teachers’ views towards Tok Pisin.

Q32: The use of Tok Pisin/Tolai alongside English in the classroom helps students acquire English easily.
Findings also showed a significant difference (p= .009) in the attitudes of the teachers towards this statement. The Tok Pisin teachers are more in favour of the use of Tok Pisin alongside English than Tolai teachers are towards the use of Tolai alongside English.

Q39. There is an abundant supply of teaching materials in Tok Pisin/Tolai.

Another statistically significant difference (p= .030) showed that the majority (70.8%) of Tok Pisin teachers did not support the statement compared to Tolai teachers. Tolai teachers’ views were divided. 48.6% thought there was a good supply of Tolai materials whereas 46.8% disagreed.

5.2 Parents’ Questionnaire Analysis

Parents’ questionnaires had a total of 39 closed questions and 3 open-ended questions. Part one required parents to provide their background information. As in Section 5.1, only the two questions (Q12-13) that focus on the languages parents use with their children are discussed in this thesis as these are the most relevant to this study on children’s education. The other questions though recorded and analysed, are not discussed as they relate more to language use in other domains. Part three explored parents’ attitudes towards languages and Part four was the open-ended question section which required parents to provide detailed explanations to given questions on the current education system. All questions for both Tok Pisin and Tolai parents were identical (see Appendices 4 and 5) except in Part 3 and 4 where the questions were confined to either Tok Pisin or Tolai. Note that percentages (%) do not always add up to 100% due to rounding.

5.2.1 Tok Pisin Parents’ Questionnaire Analysis

In this subsection, findings are presented in Tables 8-10 and in figures 21-23 and are described accordingly under each specified sub-heading.

5.2.1.1 Tok Pisin Parents’ Background Information (Q1-10)

As shown in Table 8, a total of 40 parents from the six participating schools completed the questionnaires. Raluana had the highest participation rate (n=15, 37.5%), Kabaleo (n=9, 22.5%),
Kokopo (n=8, 20%). While Kabagap had 6 questionnaires (15%) completed, Kalamanagunan and Takabur only had one each. Unlike the teachers, there were slightly more males (n=21, 52.5%) compared to females (n=19, 47.5%). Most parents (n=28, 71%) were in the 31-50 age group. The majority (n=34, 85%) were from East New Britain Province (see Table 9) and spoke Tolai, whereas only 6 parents (15%) were from other parts of PNG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kokopo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabaleo</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takabur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabagap</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raluana</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 1-2</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Age Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30 yrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 yrs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 yrs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 yrs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All parents (100%) were educated in the English only curriculum. While a minority of these respondents (n=8, 20%) had an education level at or below Grade 9, the majority 32 (80%) had completed Grade 10 and/or above and had attended institutions which included high/national high school, teachers’ college, nursing college, technical college and university. 16 (40%) parents were government employees while an equal number (11=27.5%) were employed in the private sector or self-employed. A low 5% were mission/church workers who constituted the remainder of the sample.

A further question (Q10) asked parents what other languages they spoke beside their mother tongue. Responses included: the trilingual mode of Tok Pisin, Tolai and English with the highest proportion (32.4%), followed by Tok Pisin alone (27.5%), then Tok Pisin and English (17.5%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 3-10</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Home Province</td>
<td>East New Britain</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Level of Education</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Type of Institution</td>
<td>High School and National High School</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical College</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Occupation</td>
<td>Government Employee</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Employee</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self - Employed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission (church worker)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Number of years working</td>
<td>3-10 years</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30+ years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. Language Educated in</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. Mother Tongue</td>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. What other languages do you speak?</td>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and Tolai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin, Tolai and English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin, English and another vernacular</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin, Tolai, English and another vernacular</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the use of Tok Pisin and Tolai was infrequent (2 parents) only one parent reported speaking Tolai and English in addition to their mother tongue.
5.2.1.2. **Tok Pisin Parents’ Language Use (Q12-13)**

As shown in Table 10, the majority of parents preferred to use Tolai with their children, either alone (25%) or together with Tok Pisin (20%) or with Tok Pisin and English (20%). Over 30% used Tok Pisin alone (17.5%) or Tok Pisin with English (15%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Type of language used</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q12. Language used with children</td>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tok Pisin and Tolai</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tok Pisin, English and Tolai</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13. Language used with family during dinner</td>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What was interesting was the revelation that only two languages were used during dinners with their families: Tok Pisin (60%) and Tolai (40%).

5.2.1.3. **Tok Pisin Parents’ Language Attitudes (Q27-39)**

This subsection discusses the findings (see Table 11) on Tok Pisin parents’ responses towards thirteen attitudinal statements.

**Tok Pisin Parents’ Attitudes towards Language(s) in General (27-29)**

The first three questions sought parents’ general attitudes towards the languages their children were taught at school. The majority (n= 26, 65%) of parents considered that the teaching of Tok Pisin in elementary school was important for their children’s survival in the Papua New Guinean society (Q27), whereas 14 (35%) disagreed. In response to Question 28, an equal number did not think that the use of Tok Pisin alongside English resulted in their children losing their local vernaculars. Only 14 parents (35%) thought that children were losing competence in their local vernaculars due to the use of Tok Pisin and English. On the other hand, 24 of the parents indicated that they thought that Tok Pisin hindered the learning process of their children in English (Q29).
Table 11: Attitudinal Statements (Tok Pisin Parents) (N=40) Questions 27-39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudinal Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27. Teaching Tok Pisin in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society</td>
<td>16 (40%)</td>
<td>10 (25%)</td>
<td>10 (25%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28. Using Tok Pisin and English in the classroom will result in students losing their local vernaculars</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>11 (27.5%)</td>
<td>17 (42.5%)</td>
<td>9 (22.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29. Tok Pisin hinders the learning process of a child when attempting to learn English in the bridging program</td>
<td>7 (17.5%)</td>
<td>17 (42.5%)</td>
<td>11 (27.5%)</td>
<td>5 (12.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. English is an international language therefore children should acquire English at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life</td>
<td>22 (80%)</td>
<td>5 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31. The use of Tok Pisin in schools elevates the child’s pride in his/her culture</td>
<td>8 (15%)</td>
<td>13 (25.5%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32. Tok Pisin helps my child to excel in his/her school work</td>
<td>7 (17.5%)</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>11 (27.5%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33. My child finds work in Tok Pisin easy to understand</td>
<td>8 (17.5%)</td>
<td>10 (22.5%)</td>
<td>5 (112.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34. The use of Tok Pisin should cease at the end of lower primary (Grade 5) as stipulated in the curriculum guidelines and only English should be used in the upper primary level (Grades 6-8)</td>
<td>17 (42.5%)</td>
<td>11 (27.5%)</td>
<td>6 (15%)</td>
<td>5 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35. Teachers must be literate in Tok Pisin in order to assist my child well in bridging to English</td>
<td>18 (42%)</td>
<td>13 (28.5%)</td>
<td>3 (6.5%)</td>
<td>4 (10%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36. Grade 3 bridging teachers must be fully bilingual in English and Tok Pisin</td>
<td>25 (62.5%)</td>
<td>15 (37.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37. Lower primary teachers must attend regular in-service training on the planning and integration of two languages in one classroom (i.e. Tok Pisin and English)</td>
<td>29 (72.5%)</td>
<td>11 (27.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38. The NDOE must provide bilingual teaching materials to all schools</td>
<td>28 (70%)</td>
<td>8 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39. Teachers must be multi-skilled in both Tok Pisin and English to produce a variety of teaching materials</td>
<td>27 (67.5%)</td>
<td>11 (27.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tok Pisin Parents’ Attitudes towards Language(s) for Schooling (Q30-34)**

An overwhelming majority (92.5%) of parents supported the statement that English should be introduced to their children at an early age (Q30), whereas a relatively low number (7.5%) did not. Responses to question (Q31) indicated that 55% of parents agreed that using Tok Pisin in school gave a child pride in his/her culture while 37.5% were against the view. It was interesting to note that Question Q32, which sought parents’ views on whether the use of Tok Pisin helped their children excel in their school work, saw an equal number of parents who agreed (47.5%) and parents who disagreed (47.5%). In response to Question Q33, which sought parents’ views on whether their children found work in Tok Pisin easy to understand, a majority (60%) agreed while 37.5% disagreed. A similar trend was seen when parents were asked whether Tok Pisin teaching and usage should end at the end of Grade 5 and English only should be used in upper primary school (Q34).
Tok Pisin Parents’ Attitudes to Teachers’ Competencies in Language Skills (Q35-37)

When asked whether teachers must be literate in Tok Pisin in order to assist their children well during the bridging to English period (Q35), an overwhelming majority (82.5%) stated that they should be. Question 36 saw all parents agreeing that teachers should definitely be bilingual in order for successful outcomes to take place.

A similar result was seen when parents were asked to give their views on whether teachers should attend regular in-service training on planning in two languages; Tok Pisin and English (Q37).

Tok Pisin Parents’ Attitudes towards Teaching Resources (Q38-39)

When parents were asked whether the NDOE should provide bilingual teaching materials to all schools (Q38), an overwhelming majority (90%) supported the statement. When asked (Q39) whether teachers should be multi-skilled in both Tok Pisin and English to produce a variety of teaching materials to supplement their teachings, the great majority of the parents (95%) agreed.

5.2.1.4. Tok Pisin Parents’ Responses to Open-ended Questions (Q40-42)

In this subsection, the findings of the three open-ended are displayed and discussed. Question 40 asked Tok Pisin parents whether they had a positive or negative view towards the impact the teaching of Tok Pisin has had on their children’s academic achievements. As displayed in the graph (in Figure 21), there was a balanced view on the issue with 52.5% of the parents claiming that the teaching of Tok Pisin had a negative impact on students’ academic achievements, and 47.5% seeing some positive impacts on their children’s performances.
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Figure 21: The impact of the teaching of Tok Pisin on students’ academic achievements

Examples of reasons which Tok Pisin parents gave why Tok Pisin has *positive impacts* included:
‘Using Tok Pisin in school has helped our children understand English better’.

‘It is ok to use Tok Pisin because some of the English words have already been incorporated into Tok Pisin’.

‘I think the teaching of Tok Pisin at the elementary level is good because it helps our children understand English better during the bridging from Tok Pisin to English’.

‘Tok Pisin helps children understand English better since there are already English words in Tok Pisin which children know’.

Parents who were not in favour of Tok Pisin gave reasons why they thought it had a negative impact on their children’s learning. These included the following:

‘We need to educate our children in English starting from elementary school since English is an international language. Children are finding it difficult to spell English words correctly due to the heavy use of Tok Pisin. Most of the English words are still spelt in the Tok Pisin way’.

‘Most students fail in written and spoken English. They hardly speak English at all. The only time they speak English is during lessons’.

‘Children do not speak fluent English and also they mix English with Tok Pisin’.

‘They tend to become slow learners in English and struggle to excel in English when it comes to reading and writing. Some children cannot even write a simple story in English or even speak English’.

‘My child’s performance is not that good. She makes so many spelling errors due to Tok Pisin phonics learned which confused her with English words’.

When parents were asked about what language they preferred in school (Q41), over half (60% as seen in Figure 22) stated they preferred English only to be taught in school, while 22.5% indicated they would like to see both languages used side by side in a bilingual mode. 17.5% supported both systems.
Tok Pisin parents who were in support of English only provided reasons such as:

- ‘English must be taught to our children starting from elementary up to primary school because it is the only language that is used and taught in higher institutions’.
- ‘I prefer English only because it is an international language and the only language that we can use to talk to foreigners and tourists’.
- ‘I would prefer the English only education because at the moment we are seeing children who cannot even read or write English in primary schools. We would like to see English being taught to our children starting from elementary school and not introducing it in Grade 3 in primary school as it is late’.
- ‘I prefer English to be taught in all levels of education because everything in primary and high school including exams are written in English and not Tok Pisin’.
- ‘English only because all text books are written in English not Tok Pisin’.
- ‘I strongly believe that educating our children in English only will enable them to have a good job and a better future compared to Tok Pisin’.

Tok Pisin parents who were in favour of the bilingual use of Tok Pisin and English gave positive comments such as the ones below:

- ‘I prefer the use of both Tok Pisin and English because they complement each other’.
- ‘I would like to see both languages (Tok Pisin and Tolai) used in schools because Tok Pisin helps our children understand English better’.
‘I prefer both languages because learning in Tok Pisin helps my child catch up quickly with English’.

In sum, over half of Tok Pisin parents preferred the English-only curriculum.

Question 42 sought views about the current bilingual education reform. As shown in the graph in Figure 23, it is clear that a majority (75%) of the parents were against the current system while 25% indicated that they were happy to see Tok Pisin and local vernaculars being used in primary schools.

Tok Pisin parents who were against the current education reform gave the following comments:

- ‘There is a big problem where a child finds it difficult to read simple instructions in English. Speaking Tok Pisin a lot does not even help the child in reading and doing activities correctly. Sometimes a child spells English words in Tok Pisin according to the way they are pronounced in Tok Pisin’.
- ‘English is an international language and it should be introduced to children from as early as elementary school’.
- ‘The government should reassess the use of Tok Pisin and local vernaculars in school as I have seen that my children who went through this system are not excelling in their school work especially in the English language’.

Figure 23: Tok Pisin parents’ views on the current bilingual education reform
‘From my observations, the teaching of Tok Pisin in lower primary schools is not effective because we are witnessing students in the upper primary level who still cannot spell simple English words correctly and speak, read and write English correctly’.

‘My biggest concern is to do away with the use of Tok Pisin in schools because all text books are written in English and if they cannot read in English then all their learning is jeopardized’.

‘English bridging should be done in elementary schools (E1 and E2) and schools must have libraries so that students can be encouraged to read books during recess or lunch break in order for them to read and understand English better’.

Tok Pisin parents’ who were in favour of the current education reform gave the following reasons:

‘It is much better to use Tok Pisin in school alongside English. In this way, children will understand English concepts better if explanations are done in Tok Pisin by their teachers’.

‘Tok Pisin usage in the classroom will only help students understand what their teachers are saying and/or teaching’.

‘I strongly feel that Tok Pisin should be taught in elementary schools and later bridge to English at a later stage in primary school. In this way children will be equipped with basic education before learning a foreign language’.

In sum, it was found that despite the few favourable comments towards the current bilingual education reform, there was a general feeling of discontent among the majority of parents.

5.2.2. Tolai Parents’ Questionnaire Analysis

In this subsection, findings obtained from the analysis of Tolai parents’ questionnaires are presented in Tables 12-15 and graphs in Figures 24-26 and are described accordingly under each specified sub-heading.
5.2.2.1. Tolai Parents’ Background Information (Q1-10)

A total of 46 parents (see Table 12) from four of the six participating schools completed the Tolai parents’ questionnaires. As shown in Table 12, 43.5% of the parents were from Kalamanagunan primary school, 26% each from Takabur and Raluana, and only 4.3% from Kabagap primary school. Similarly to the Tok Pisin parents, males outnumbered female respondents (56.5 and 43.5% respectively) and most Tolai parents were in the 31-50 age group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takabur</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabagap</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raluana</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1. Gender**

| Male          | 26          | 56.5%   |
| Female        | 20          | 43.5%   |

**Q2. Age Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27-30 yrs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 yrs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 yrs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 yrs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This group of parents also had a wide range of education levels ranging from grade six to degree level at university (see Table 13). While almost half (47.8%) were government employees, 28.3% were self-employed, 21.7% were private sector employees and 2.2% worked with the mission. It was also noted that 45.6% of the parents were in their first 10 years of employment, 30.6% had been in the workforce for over 20 years, and 23.8% had been working for 11-20 years. Like the Tok Pisin parents (see Table 9), the majority (80.4%) of the Tolai parents had Tolai as their mother tongue (Q9) but almost one in five had other Papua New Guinean languages as their mother tongue.

Question 10 (see Table 13) which required this group of parents to indicate other languages that they spoke beside their mother tongue saw responses which included the trilingual use of Tok Pisin, Tolai and English with the highest proportion (37%), followed by Tok Pisin and English (32.6%), then an equality of percentages (8.7%) for Tok Pisin and Tolai, and Tolai and English. Of the three remaining parents, one spoke English in addition to their native language, one spoke Tok Pisin Tolai and another vernacular and the third spoke Tok Pisin, English and another vernacular.
### Table 13: Tolai Parents’ Personal Background Information (N=46) Questions 3-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Home Province</td>
<td>East New Britain</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Level of Education</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Type of Institution</td>
<td>High School/ National High School</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers College</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical College</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Occupation</td>
<td>Government Employee</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Sector Employee</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self - Employed</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission (church worker)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Number of years working</td>
<td>2-10 years</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-30+ years</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. Language Educated in</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. Mother Tongue</td>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. What other languages do you speak?</td>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tok Pisin and Tolai</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolai and English</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tok Pisin, Tolai and English</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tok Pisin Tolai and another vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tok Pisin, English and another vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2.2.2. Tolai Parents’ Language Use (Q12-13)

This subsection displays the findings of the questions that asked Tolai parents to indicate what languages they used with their families at home. Responses to Question 12 showed that 34.8% said that they used Tolai with their children whereas the next largest group (26.1%) stated they used Tok Pisin. 15.2% claimed they used all three languages Tok Pisin, English and Tolai, while 13% used Tok Pisin and Tolai, 6.5% used Tok Pisin and English, and only one parent used English alone. When parents were asked what languages they used with the family during dinner (Q13), Tolai was the most popular choice (50%) followed by Tok Pisin (21.7%) and Tok Pisin...
and Tolai (17.4%). Only 8.7% used Tok Pisin, English and Tolai, while one parent reported using Tok Pisin and English (2.2%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q12. Language used with children</th>
<th></th>
<th>Q13. Language used with family during dinner</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw Figures</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Raw Figures</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. Language used with children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and Tolai</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Tolai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin, English and Tolai</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13. Language used with family during dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and Tolai</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin, English and Tolai</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2.2.3. Tolai Parents’ Language Attitudes (Q27-39)

This subsection discusses the findings (see Table 15) on Tolai parents’ attitudes towards thirteen attitudinal statements.

Tolai Parents’ Attitudes towards language(s) in General (Q27-29)

The first three questions sought parents’ views on the languages their children were taught in at school. The majority (76.1%) of the parents were against the view stated in Q27 that the teaching of Tolai in elementary school was important for their children’s survival in the Papua New Guinean society (47.8% disagreed and 28.3% strongly disagreed). Less than a quarter (23.9%) thought that teaching Tolai was important for the children’s survival. In response to Question 28, the majority (65.2%) of parents did not think that the use of Tolai and English resulted in their children losing their local vernaculars. 28.3 % on the other hand thought it did. When parents were asked about whether heavy use of Tolai hindered the learning process of children when attempting to learn English (Q29), the great majority (82.7%) agreed while only 17.3% disagreed.
Table 15: Attitudinal Statements (Tolai Parents) (N=46)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 27-39</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27. Teaching Tolai in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
<td>5 (10.9%)</td>
<td>22 (47.8%)</td>
<td>13 (28.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28. Using Tolai and English in the classroom will result in students losing their local vernaculars</td>
<td>4 (8.7%)</td>
<td>9 (19.6%)</td>
<td>22 (47.8%)</td>
<td>8 (17.4%)</td>
<td>3 (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29. Tolai hinders the learning process of a child when attempting to learn English in the bridging program</td>
<td>18 (39.1%)</td>
<td>20 (43.6%)</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. English is an international language therefore children should acquire English at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life</td>
<td>38 (84.8%)</td>
<td>4 (8.7%)</td>
<td>1 (2.2%)</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31. Using Tolai in school gives a child pride in his/her culture</td>
<td>7 (15.2%)</td>
<td>15 (32.6%)</td>
<td>13 (28.3%)</td>
<td>9 (19.6%)</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32. Tolai helps my child excel in his/her school work</td>
<td>1 (2.2%)</td>
<td>5 (10.9%)</td>
<td>16 (34.8%)</td>
<td>23 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33. My child finds work in Tolai easy to understand</td>
<td>5 (10.9%)</td>
<td>5 (10.9%)</td>
<td>10 (21.7%)</td>
<td>25 (54.3%)</td>
<td>1 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34. The use of Tolai should cease at the end of lower primary (Grade 5) as stipulated in the curriculum guidelines and only English should be used in the upper primary level (6-8)</td>
<td>7 (15.2%)</td>
<td>8 (17.4%)</td>
<td>9 (19.6%)</td>
<td>17 (37%)</td>
<td>5 (10.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35. Teachers must be literate in Tolai in order to assist my child well in bridging to English</td>
<td>10 (21.7%)</td>
<td>15 (32.6%)</td>
<td>8 (17.4%)</td>
<td>11 (23.9%)</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36. A Grade 3 bridging teacher should be fully bilingual in English and Tolai</td>
<td>17 (37%)</td>
<td>18 (39.1%)</td>
<td>3 (6.5%)</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37. Lower primary teachers must attend regular in-service training on the planning and integration of two languages in one classroom (i.e. Tolai and English)</td>
<td>15 (32.6%)</td>
<td>15 (32.6%)</td>
<td>5 (10.9%)</td>
<td>4 (8.7%)</td>
<td>7 (15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38. The NDOE must provide bilingual teaching materials to all schools</td>
<td>18 (39.1%)</td>
<td>14 (30.4)</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39. Teachers must be multi-skilled in both Tolai and English to produce a variety of teaching resources</td>
<td>17 (37%)</td>
<td>18 (39.1%)</td>
<td>6 (13%)</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
<td>3 (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tolai Parents’ Attitudes towards Language(s) for Schooling (30-34)**

Responses to Question 30 indicated that the majority of parents (93.5%) agreed that their children should acquire English at an early age. The remainder (6.5%) disagreed with the statement, claiming that the current bilingual system which required children to bridge to English at a later stage in Grade 3 was appropriate. There was a split in the views of the parents when they were asked to indicate whether or not using Tolai in school gave pride to their children’s culture (Q31); while 48.8% agreed, 47.9% disagreed.

Responses to Question 32 indicated that most parents (84.8%) did not think the use of Tolai helped their children excel in their school work. Furthermore, the majority (76%) of parents disagreed with the view that their children found work in Tolai easy to understand (Q33). Only 21% stated that their children found work in Tolai easy to understand, while 2.2% were undecided. However, when parents were asked whether the teaching and usage of Tolai should cease at the end of Grade 5 and the focus should be on English only in upper primary school (Q34), over half (56.6%) disagreed, 32.6% agreed and 10.9% were undecided.
Tolai Parents’ Attitudes towards Teachers’ Competencies in Language Skills (Q35-37)

Parents’ views on whether teachers must be literate in Tolai in order to assist their children well during the bridging to English period (Q35) were divided, with 54.3% of parents agreeing that Tolai literacy was required whereas 41.3% disagreed. In contrast, a much larger proportion of parents (76.1%) agreed that Grade 3 bridging teachers should be fully bilingual in English and Tolai (Q36). In response to Question 37, which asked parents whether teachers in the lower primary should attend regular in-service training on the planning and integration of two languages, the majority (65.2%) agreed while 19.6% disagreed. 15.2% were undecided.

Parents’ Attitudes towards Teaching Resources (Q38-39)

Question 38 sought parents’ views on whether schools should be provided with bilingual teaching and learning resources by the NDOE (Q38). The majority (69.5%) stated the NDOE should provide these materials, while 17.3% were not in favour of this view and 13% were undecided. Responses to Question 39 showed that a majority of the parents (76.1%) were in favour of the view that teachers should be multi-skilled in both Tolai and English to produce a variety of teaching materials to supplement their teachings.

5.2.2.4. Tolai Parents’ Responses to Open-ended Questions (Q40-42)

In this subsection, the parental responses to the three open-ended questions (Q40-42) are discussed in detail in relation to the graphs (Figures 24-26) below.

Question 40 required parents to provide their views on the impact of the teaching of Tolai in their children’s schools. As displayed in the graph (in Figure 24), the majority of the parents (78.3%) thought the teaching of Tolai had impacted negatively on academic achievements whereas 21.7% claimed they had seen some positive impacts on their children’s performance.
The reasons Tolai parents gave for the negative impacts of Tolai on their children’s learning included the following:

- ‘The use of Tolai in the classroom has given a poor result in my child’s ability to learn English. In reality my child will not only grow up and remain in the Tolai society. He will in fact move on and if he cannot speak and write good English, he will not progress in other participants’.
- ‘The educational achievement of my child is poor. Example, my child mixes Tolai and English when attempting to spell English words and also when speaking English’.
- ‘The current education system has robbed my children years of which they should have immediately started learning English in prep at the elementary school. It slows down our children in learning English and children seem confused when they are bridged to English at a later stage in Grade 3’.
- ‘The teaching of Tolai has brought very poor achievements upon my son. The problems I’ve seen are: teachers are not qualified to bridge our children from Tolai to English, no proper teaching aids and resources are provided by the NDOE for our children’s learning and the government of the day is not really concerned about students education’.
- ‘My child has not progressed much as a result of vernacular education. It is a joke to teach our children in Tolai and sit in an exam room answering questions in English’.
- ‘I have observed that children’s achievements have been very poor because their education foundation was in Tolai at an early age so when they are being bridged to English at a later stage in Grade 3 they get mixed up with the pronunciation and spelling of English words’.
The minority group of Tolai Parents' who claimed Tolai has positive impacts provided reasons such as:

- ‘I notice that using both Tolai and English in the classroom helps children understand English better’.
- ‘I see that the teaching of Tolai is OK, but the bridging of it to English in Grade 3 is a major problem for children if bridging teachers are not trained well’.
- ‘I think teaching in Tolai helps Grade 3 students understand better. If a teacher uses only English, children would sometimes do the wrong thing altogether. So teaching in Tolai to explain English concepts helps students’.

As seen from the above quotes, the majority of parents are not convinced of the benefits of using Tolai in elementary school. What they would like to see is an education system which uses English at a very early age in order for their children to excel in English. These parents are also worried about the continuous use of Tolai in primary schools as they believe it only confuses the children. Other parents support the current system providing views such as: a) Tolai usage assists children understand basic concepts in English, and b) it enhances children’s understanding of the varied aspects of Tolai society.

In Question 41 parents were asked to indicate which languages (English, Tolai and English, or both which meant they did not mind which were used) they thought was important for use in schools. As shown in the graph in Figure 25, the vast majority of the parents (84.8%) were in favour of English alone.

Figure 25: Tolai parents’ preferences on languages used in school.
The reasons that Tolai parents’ provided for supporting English-only included:

- ‘I prefer English because when children start learning English early they will speak good English and write grammatically correct sentences in English’.
- ‘English-only education because we want to see students having jobs after leaving school therefore they must start learning English at a very early age’.
- ‘English should be the only language taught in schools and not Tolai as teaching both languages only confuses the child’.
- ‘English only as it is an international language which students need to acquire for communication purposes internationally’.
- ‘English only as it is the language that warrants students good jobs in future’.
- ‘English only. Children do not need to be taught in vernacular language as they already know the language as part of their up-bringing in the societies.

The small number of Tolai parents who supported the bilingual usage of Tolai and English gave the following reasons:

- ‘Vernacular education is fine as long as it is being implemented well, which includes teaching and learning materials to be provided for all schools by the NDOE and bridging teachers to be highly qualified’.
- ‘Both languages so that the language and culture is maintained’.
- ‘A separate subject should be introduced in the elementary curriculum to maintain culture’.

Question 42 sought parents’ views on the current education reform. As shown in Figure 26, almost three quarters (73.9%) of the parents who completed the questionnaire were against the current education reform.
Tolai parents who had negative views of the current reform system provided the following reasons:

- ‘More bridging teachers are needed in schools with a lot of experience in bridging and must be committed to bridging alone (in Lower primary school)’.
- ‘Vernacular education should be abolished since there is no support materials provided on it by the NDOE. All learning materials are in English so English only should be used in schools’.
- ‘Bridging to English should be done in Elementary one so that children can have a good foundation of English from an early age’.
- ‘Heavy exposure to Tolai in the classroom confuses the students when attempting to spell English words. Example, the word ‘Book’ is often spelled as ‘Buk’ using Kuanua/Tolai phonics.’

Tolai Parents who were in favour of the current system gave the following reasons:

- ‘Teaching Tok Pisin and Tolai is good, but if the government can spend more money on logistic support and human resources or examinations written in one of the spoken languages commonly used, (Tok Pisin or Tolai), then we would be more happier seeing teachers maintain teaching in Tolai and Tok Pisin; otherwise English is more preferable at this time’.
- ‘Teaching the local vernacular and Tok Pisin is OK in elementary, however, English should also be introduced at an early age in order for children to have a good foundation in English too’.
‘Children’s learning will improve in the current education reform if there’re sufficient materials to support the teaching of the curriculum and also training for especially bridging teachers which is currently lacking’.

As seen from the comments above, the majority of Tolai parents had major concerns about the current bilingual policy and how it is being implemented. Even supporters of the use of Tok Pisin and Tolai in schools noted the need for more support from the government, more teacher training and earlier introduction of English.

5.2.3. Comparative Analysis of Tok Pisin and Tolai Parents’ Language Attitudes and Parents vs Teachers’ Language Attitudes.

This section comprises: 5.2.3.1; a comparison between Tok Pisin parents and Tolai parents and 5.2.3.2; a comparison between parents and teachers.

5.2.3.1. Comparison of Language Attitudes: Tok Pisin and Tolai Parents

Demographic Data and Language Use

The majority of the 86 parents (40 Tok Pisin and 46 Tolai) who completed the questionnaires were from East New Britain. Male parents outnumbered female parents in both groups, and all parents had an all-English education which equipped them with qualifications ranging from primary year 6 certificates to university degrees, enabling them to gain a wide range of jobs in the government and non-government agencies or self-employment.

Both Tok Pisin and Tolai parents said they used mainly Tolai, Tok Pisin, or the bilingual mode of Tolai and Tok Pisin with their children at home. However, during family dinners, Tok Pisin parents preferred Tok Pisin more than Tolai, whereas Tolai parents preferred Tolai more than Tok Pisin. English was the least used language in their homes.

Language Attitudes – Findings of an Inferential Statistical test

With regards to language attitudes, a Mann-Whitney U test (see Appendix 39b for details) revealed that there were significant differences between the answers given by parents of students
in Tok Pisin dominated classrooms and parents of students in Tolai dominated classrooms for ten of the thirteen attitudinal statements in Q27 to Q39. These are listed below:

Q27. *Teaching Tok Pisin/Tolai in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society.*

There was a highly statistically significant difference (p< .001) in attitudes to this question. The Tok Pisin parents were much more in favour (65%) and thus appreciated the use of Tok Pisin in elementary school seeing its importance for their children’s survival in PNG compared to the Tolai parents who generally viewed Tolai usage as less important in elementary schools (24.9%).

Q29. *Tok Pisin/Tolai hinders the learning process of a child when attempting to learn English in the bridging program.*

Although both groups agreed with the statement, Tolai parents have significantly more negative attitudes (82.7%) toward the use of Tolai compared to parents of children in Tok Pisin dominated classrooms, 40% of whom view the use of Tok Pisin as an aid to learning English (p= .007).

Q32. *Tok Pisin/Tolai helps my child to excel in his/her school work.*

There was a significant difference (p= .006) between the two groups of parents’ attitudes towards this statement. Significantly more Tok Pisin parents consider that the use of Tok Pisin in school helps their children in their school work compared to Tolai parents, who hold strongly negative attitudes towards Tolai usage in the classroom.

Q33. *My child finds work in Tok Pisin/Tolai easy to understand.*

There was a highly significant difference (p< .001) between the two groups of parents regarding this statement. While 60% of Tok Pisin parents agreed that their children find work in Tok Pisin easy to understand, only 21% of Tolai parents thought Tolai helped their children.

Q34. *The use of Tok Pisin/Tolai should cease at the end of Lower primary.*

Tok Pisin parents were highly significantly more supportive (p< .001) of ending the use of Tok Pisin in Grade 5 and using only English in Grade 6 and upper levels. Tolai parents varied more in their responses to this question, indicating they were not sure if the use of Tolai should end in Grade 5 or whether it should be continued in the upper levels of learning.
Q35. *Teachers must be literate in Tok Pisin/Tolai in order to assist my child well in bridging to English.*

Tok Pisin parents were significantly more supportive of the notion that teachers must be literate in Tok Pisin than Tolai parents, who indicated it was less vital for teachers to be literate in Tolai (p= .003).

Q36. *Grade 3 bridging teachers must be fully bilingual in English and Tok Pisin/Tolai.*

Again there was a significant difference (p= .003) between the two groups of parents. While all Tok Pisin parents (n= 40, 100%) agreed that Grade 3 bridging teachers should be fully bilingual in English and Tok Pisin, significantly fewer Tolai parents considered it essential for teachers to be fully bilingual in English and Tolai.

Q37. *Lower primary teachers must attend regular in-service training on planning in Tok Pisin/Tolai and English.*

Tok Pisin parents saw a much greater need (100%) for regular in-service training on planning in two languages than Tolai parents (p< .001).

Q38. *The NDOE must provide bilingual teaching materials to all schools.*

Tok Pisin parents (n= 36, 90%) were significantly more supportive of the notion that ‘The NDOE must provide bilingual teaching materials to all schools’ compared to Tolai parents (p< .001).

Q39. *Teachers must be multi-skilled in both Tok Pisin/Tolai and English to produce a variety of teaching materials.*

While both groups agreed with this statement, Tok Pisin parents (n= 38, 95%) considered the need for teachers to be multi-skilled in the two languages to be significantly more important than Tolai parents did (p= .002).

5.2.3.2. **Comparison of Language Attitudes: Parents vs Teachers**

The Mann-Whitney U test (see Appendix 39: c, d and e) was also conducted to test the null hypothesis of no significant differences in the overall attitudes of parents compared to teachers.
Two attitudinal statements which had the same wording across the groups were tested for significant difference. The findings are shown below:

1) Tok Pisin Parents vs Tok Pisin Teachers

*Q27. Teaching Tok Pisin in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society.*

There was no significant difference in this question (p = .268). This suggests that both Tok Pisin groups agreed that the use of Tok Pisin in elementary schools is important for children’s survival in PNG.

2) Tolai Parents vs Tolai teachers

*Q27. Teaching Tolai in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society.*

Unlike the responses of the Tok Pisin respondents, there was a statistically significant difference (p = .014) in the attitudes of the two Tolai groups. Over half (54%) of Tolai teachers considered the use of Tolai in elementary school to be important for a child’s survival in the PNG society, which is significantly more than the 24% of parents who supported the statement.

3) All Parents vs All Teachers

*Q29 in the teachers’ questionnaire and Q30 in the parents’ questionnaire.*

‘English is an international language therefore children should acquire it at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life’.

The Mann-Whitney U test revealed a highly significant difference (p < .001) in the attitudes of the parents compared to the teachers indicating that parents had much more positive attitudes towards English being taught to their children at an early age compared to teachers.

5.3. Students’ Questionnaire Analysis

Findings of the analyses of the students’ questionnaires are presented in this section. There were 30 questions consisting of 26 closed questions and 4 open-ended questions. Part one required students to provide their personal background information, Part two asked them to indicate from a list of choices the languages they used for different domains in society, Part three asked about their attitudes towards languages they used in school, and Part Four required them to provide detailed explanations to specific questions on languages used in the current bilingual education.
program. The order of discussion is as follows: 5.3.1. Tok Pisin students’ Questionnaire Analysis, 5.3.2. Tolai students’ Questionnaire Analysis and 5.3.3. Comparison of Tok Pisin and Tolai students’ findings.

5.3.1. **Tok Pisin Students’ Questionnaire Analysis**

In this subsection, findings of the analysis on Tok Pisin students’ questionnaires are displayed in Tables 16-18 and graphs in Figures 27-30, followed by detailed discussions of each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16: Background Information of Tok Pisin Students (N = 124)</th>
<th>Part 1 Q 1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokopo</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabaleo</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takabur</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabagap</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raluana</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1. Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2. Age Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3. Province</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East New Britain</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4. Mother Tongue</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q5. Other languages spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vernacular</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and Tok Pisin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and English</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai, Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and another vernacular</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and another vernacular</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1.1 Tok Pisin Students’ Background Information (Q1-5)

As shown in Table 16, 124 students completed the Tok Pisin questionnaires. The majority of these students (n=86, 69.3%) were from the two urban schools (Kokopo and Kabaleo) where the main language used among students and teachers is Tok Pisin. Tok Pisin questionnaires were also filled out by students in village schools where teachers claimed they used mostly Tok Pisin in their classrooms, 37 (29.9% of Tok Pisin respondents) in Takabur, Kabagap and Raluana schools and one student in Kalamanagunan. Most of these students (n=98, 79%) were from East New Britain and 26 (21%) were from other provinces of PNG. The number of male students was slightly higher than females and their ages ranged between 9 and 14 years of age. It was interesting to note that there was not much difference in the proportion of students who spoke Tok Pisin (n=60, 48.4%) as their mother tongue compared to the n=58 (46.8%) who spoke Tolai. In terms of other languages or language combinations spoken by the children, Tok Pisin and English were the most frequent (n=38, 30.6%) followed by Tok Pisin only (n=34, 27.4%), English only (n=15, 12.1%), Tolai only (n=14, 11.3%), and English and Tolai (n=10, 8.1%). The remainder (10.4%) indicated they used other local vernaculars, Tolai and Tok Pisin, Tolai combined with Tok Pisin and English, English and another local vernacular, or Tolai and another vernacular.

5.3.1.2. Tok Pisin Students’ Language Use (Q6-10 and 14-15)

Details of student responses to Questions 6-10 are shown in Table 17, and the findings of Questions 14-15 in Figures 27 and 28. As with the teachers’ and parents’ questionnaires, some questions (Questions 11-13, 16-17) are not discussed in this thesis as they refer to language domains outside school and family.

Responses to Question 6, which sought students’ preferences of the languages that they used with their mother, show that the majority (n=54, 43.5%) claim they used Tok Pisin. The use of Tolai was the next biggest group (n=25, 22.6%) followed by 13 respondents (10.5%) who claimed they used Tok Pisin and English. While 12 (9.7%) stated they used Tolai and Tok Pisin, only 24 (3.2%) reported they used English when conversing with their mother. An equal number (2.4%) use Tolai, Tok Pisin and English combined and Tok Pisin with another vernacular.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 6-10</th>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6. Language used with mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and Tok Pisin</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai, Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and another vernacular</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q7. Language used with father | | |
| Tolai | 26 | 21.0% |
| Tok Pisin | 56 | 45.2% |
| English | 9 | 7.3% |
| Other Vernacular | 2 | 1.6% |
| Tolai and Tok Pisin | 16 | 12.9% |
| Tok Pisin and English | 10 | 8.1% |
| Tolai, Tok Pisin and English | 2 | 1.6% |
| Tok Pisin and another vernacular | 3 | 2.4% |

| Q8. Language used with brother | | |
| Tolai | 25 | 20.2% |
| Tok Pisin | 66 | 53.2% |
| English | 7 | 5.6% |
| Other Vernacular | 1 | .8% |
| Tolai and Tok Pisin | 10 | 8.1% |
| Tok Pisin and English | 12 | 9.7% |
| Tolai, Tok Pisin and English | 1 | .8% |
| Tok Pisin and another vernacular | 2 | 1.6% |

| Q9. Language used with sister | | |
| Tolai | 24 | 19.4% |
| Tok Pisin | 64 | 51.6% |
| English | 9 | 7.3% |
| Other Vernacular | 1 | .8% |
| Tolai and Tok Pisin | 12 | 9.7% |
| Tok Pisin and English | 11 | 8.9% |
| Tolai, Tok Pisin and English | 1 | .8% |
| Tok Pisin and another vernacular | 2 | 1.6% |

| Q10. Language used with family at dinner | | |
| Tolai | 30 | 24.2% |
| Tok Pisin | 50 | 40.3% |
| English | 8 | 6.5% |
| Other Vernacular | 3 | 2.4% |
| Tolai and Tok Pisin | 14 | 11.3% |
| Tolai and English | 1 | .8% |
| Tok Pisin and English | 12 | 9.7% |
| Tolai, Tok Pisin and English | 4 | 3.2% |
| Tok Pisin and another vernacular | 2 | 1.6% |

A similar trend was seen in response to Question 7 where the use of Tok Pisin with their father again stood out as the most common language spoken (n=56, 45.2%). Similarly, Tolai was the second highest, with a proportion of 21%, then Tolai and Tok Pisin 12.9%. The remaining language combinations chosen by students for use with their father comprised Tok Pisin and...
English (8.1%), English only (7.3%), Tok Pisin and another local vernacular (2.4%) and Tolai, Tok Pisin and English (1.6%).

Question 8, which asked students to indicate what languages they used with their brother and Question 9, which asked about the languages used with their sister had unsurprisingly very similar findings. Just over half (53.2%) spoke Tok Pisin with their brother and 51.6% spoke Tok Pisin with their sister.

Again the proportion of students that used Tolai with their brother (20.2%) was very close to the proportion of students who used Tolai with their sister (19.4%). 8.1% used Tolai and Tok Pisin and 9.7% Tok Pisin and English with brothers while 9.7% used Tolai and Tok Pisin and 8.9% used Tok Pisin and English with their sisters. The use of English only was not frequent, only 5.6% chose to use it with their brother and 7.3% used it with their sister.

When students were asked to indicate the languages that they used with their family during dinner (Q10), findings showed that Tok Pisin was again the most common choice (40.3%) followed by Tolai (24.2%) then Tolai and Tok Pisin (11.3%). While 9.7% spoke a mixture of Tok Pisin and English, English only during family dinner was only reported by 6.5% (eight students) of the total sample.

Several differences were observed with respect to which languages students used with their class teachers in the classroom (Q14).

![Figure 27: Languages Tok Pisin students use with their teachers in the classroom](image)

Figure 27: Languages Tok Pisin students use with their teachers in the classroom
As shown in the graph in Figure 27, much more English was spoken with teachers. An equal number of students reported using English only (33.1%) and Tok Pisin and English (also 33.1%). This is in sharp contrast to the 1.6% who said they were most likely to speak Tolai and the 1.6% who stated they spoke Tolai and English. In addition, while 28.2% of the sample stated they used Tok Pisin with their teachers, only 2.4% stated they used the bilingual mode of Tolai and Tok Pisin.

Responses to Question 15, which asked students which languages they used with their friends during recess and lunch in school are displayed in the graph in Figure 28. As can be seen, a majority of the respondents (60.5%) stated that they spoke Tok Pisin to their friends.

It can also be seen that there was not much difference in the percentage of students who spoke Tolai (12.1%) and those who spoke Tolai and Tok Pisin (11.3%). Interestingly, the students’ use of English with friends in the school grounds is very minimal. While English is spoken together with Tok Pisin by a handful of students (9.7%), the use of English alone is only 4.8%.

5.3.1.3. Tok Pisin Students’ Language Attitudes (Q18-26)
As shown in Table 18, the majority of students (76.6%) stated that the use of Tok Pisin alongside English in the classroom helped them understand English concepts better whereas only 23.4% disagreed (Q18). While the majority (81.5%) said they used Tok Pisin most of the time, 18.5% claimed they used other languages (Q19). Furthermore, a majority (89.5%) stated they found it
easier talking to their teachers in Tok Pisin than in English. Only a handful of students (10.5%) said they could speak English with ease to their teachers (Q20).

96% of students agreed that learning English was important to learn (Q22). When asked whether Tok Pisin was more important to learn than English, only 16.1% agreed, while 83.9% disagreed (Q21). In addition, the majority (65.3%) of the respondents agreed that writing a sentence in English was harder than in Tok Pisin whereas 34.7% did not agree (Q23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18: Attitudinal Statements (Tok Pisin Students) (N=124)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18. Using Tok Pisin in the classroom helps me understand English better</td>
<td>95 (76.6%)</td>
<td>29 (23.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. I speak Tok Pisin most of the time in school</td>
<td>101 (81.5%)</td>
<td>23 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20. I find it easier talking to my teacher in Tok Pisin than in English</td>
<td>111 (89.5%)</td>
<td>13 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. Tok Pisin is more important to learn than English</td>
<td>20 (16.1%)</td>
<td>104 (83.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22. It is important to learn English</td>
<td>119 (96%)</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23. Writing a sentence in English is harder than writing in Tok Pisin</td>
<td>81 (65.3%)</td>
<td>43 (34.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24. If I don’t speak English well, I will not get a good job in future</td>
<td>103 (83.1%)</td>
<td>21 (16.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25. Most children in my class like learning English</td>
<td>115 (92.7%)</td>
<td>9 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26. I only speak English during class time and nowhere else</td>
<td>70 (55.5%)</td>
<td>54 (34.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to Question 24, 83.1% agreed that they would not get a good job in the future if they did not speak good English, whereas 16.9% did not agree. Interestingly, when students were asked whether students in their class liked learning English, an overwhelming majority (92.7%) agreed that they did; only 7.3% said they did not. Two thirds of students also agreed that they only spoke English during class time and not outside the classroom (65.5%) while 34.5% indicated that they spoke English elsewhere (Q26).

5.3.1.4. Tok Pisin Students’ Responses to Open-ended Questions (Q27-30)

Question 27 sought students’ views on what language they thought was important to them. As shown in the graph in Figure 29, it is obvious that the majority of the respondents (91.1%) in this sample stated English was important whereas only 2.4% thought Tok Pisin was important.
Reasons that students gave for choosing English over Tok Pisin (Q28) are shown below, with translations from Tok Pisin to English in parantheses.

- ‘Bikos emi impotent long spelim ol wod long English’.
  
  (Because it is important to spell words in English).

- ‘English em i impotant bikos em bai helpim mi lo school wok na fuja blo mi’.
  
  (English is important because it will help me in my school work and my future).

- ‘Bai helpim mi long rid na rait na tu bai helpim mi lo kisim gutpla marks’.
  
  (It will help me to read and write and will also help me to achieve good marks).

- ‘Because em bai helpim mi lo understandim wonem samting teacher speakim lo me’.
  
  (Because it will help me understand what my teacher says to me).

- ‘English important bikos i helpim mi lo rid na rait’.
  
  (English is important because it helps me to read and write).

Examples that students provided in English are as follows:

- ‘Because it is an international language’.

- ‘Because the grade 8 exam is in English’.

- ‘Because it will help me understand my exams, go to higher institutions and get a job’.

- ‘English is important because it is used world-wide and will help me communicate with foreigners and people from other places’.

- ‘All books are written in English and I have to learn it to read and understand these books’.

- ‘English is important because everything the teacher speaks and writes on the blackboard is in English’. 

Figure 29: Languages Tok Pisin students perceive as important
Findings of Question 29, which asked Tok Pisin students which language they thought was not important to them is shown in Figure 30.

![Figure 30: Tok Pisin students’ views on languages not important to them](image)

As shown above, the majority of these students (86.3%), who speak mostly Tok Pisin, did not think that the language was important to them. Examples of reasons these students gave in support of their view are shown in the following direct quotes with English translations in brackets:

- ‘Bikos i no nap helpim mi long rid na rait’.
  (Because it will not help me to read and write).
- ‘Bikos ino save helpim mi long spelim ol wod long Englis’.
  (Because it will not help me to spell words in English).
- ‘Bikos mi no nap spikim long bikpela skul’.
  (Because I won’t speak it in high school).

Reasons students gave in English include:

- ‘Because it will not help me to find a paid job in future’.
- ‘It is not important to me because all my tests are written in English, not Tok Pisin’.
- ‘Tok Pisin is not a world-wide language’.
- ‘Because all the books are not written in Tok Pisin’.
- ‘Because I will not get a good job in future’.
- ‘Grade 8 exam is not written in Tok Pisin’.
5.3.2. Tolai Students’ Questionnaire Analysis

In this subsection findings obtained from the analyses of Tolai students’ questionnaires are presented in Tables 19-21 and in Figures 31-34, with detailed discussions of each under specified sub-headings.

5.3.2.1. Tolai Students’ Background Information (Q1-5)

As shown in Table 19, a total of 118 students completed the Tolai questionnaires. Just over half (n=63, 53.4%) of these students were from Kalamanagunan school. The rest were from Takabur (n=22, 18.6%), Kabagap (n=16, 13.6%) and Raluana (n=17, 14.4%). Slightly more Tolai respondents were female (n=63, 53.4%) than male n=55 (46.6%). The majority were 10, 11 and 12 years old.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 19: Background Information of Tolai Students (N = 118)</th>
<th>Part 1 Q 1-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td>Raw Figures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takabur</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kabagap</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raluana</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q1. Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q2. Age Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3. Province</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East New Britain</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East New Britain and Another Province</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4. Mother Tongue</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vernacular</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q5. Other languages spoken</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and Tok Pisin</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and English</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai, Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin, English and another vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of these students were from East New Province and spoke Tolai as their mother tongue (68.6%). However, almost one third spoke Tok Pisin or another PNG vernacular as their mother tongue. In addition Q5, 42.4% of these Tolai students spoke Tok Pisin and further 33.9%...
reported speaking Tok Pisin and English. The remainder stated they spoke Tolai either bilingually with Tok Pisin (5.1%) or with English (5.1%) or trilingually with Tok Pisin and English (2%).

5.3.2.2. Tolai Students’ Language Use (Q6-10 and 14-15)

This section discusses the findings of questions that relate to the languages that students reported they used with family members at home and with their teachers and friends in school (Q6-10 and Q14-15).

Table 20: Tolai Students’ Language Usage (N=118) Questions 6-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Figures</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q6. Language used with mother</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vernacular</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and Tok Pisin</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai, Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and another vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin, English and another vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q7. Language used with father</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and Tok Pisin</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai, Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and another vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q8. Language used with brother</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and Tok Pisin</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai, Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin, English and another vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q9. Language used with sister</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vernacular</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and Tok Pisin</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai, Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin, English and another vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q10. Language used with family at dinner</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai and Tok Pisin</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolai, Tok Pisin and English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and another vernacular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to Questions 6-10 were similar for each question with students indicating that 50-60% used Tolai at home with family members. The next most common language used was Tok Pisin (25%-30%) followed by Tolai and Tok Pisin.

When students were asked to indicate the languages they used with their teacher(s) in the classroom (Q14), nearly half of the students (48.3%) stated that English was the main language used (see Figure 31). The next most common medium of communication reported was the bilingual usage of Tok Pisin and English (22.9%) followed by Tok Pisin (13.6%). Surprisingly, only 15.2% reported that they spoke Tolai with their teachers either alone (5.9%), with Tok Pisin (6.8%) or with English (2.5%).

![Figure 31: Languages Tolai students use with their teachers in the classroom](image)

When students were asked to indicate the languages that they used with their friends during recess and lunch outside the classroom, nearly one third (31.4%) claimed they used Tok Pisin (see Figure 32). The next most common languages used were Tolai (20.3%) and Tolai and Tok Pisin (19.5%). English or Tok Pisin and English were the next most frequently reported languages (11.9% and 11% respectively).


5.3.2.3. Tolai Students’ Language Attitudes (Q18-26)

When students were asked to indicate whether using Tolai in the classroom helped them understand English better, less than half (43.2%) agreed (Q18). When they were asked about the language they spoke most in school, 69 (58.5%) stated it was Tolai while 49 (41.5%) said they spoke other languages (Q19). On a similar note, the majority (61%) said they found it easier speaking Tolai to their teachers (Q20) compared to English (39%), and 69.5% agreed that it was more difficult to write in English than Tolai (Q23). Nevertheless, 92.4% of students disagreed with the statement that Tolai is more important than English (Q21), and nearly all the Tolai students (97.5%) agreed that it was important to learn English (Q22).

Table 21: Attitudinal Statements (Tolai Students) (N=118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18. Using Tolai in the classroom helps me understand English better</td>
<td>51 (43.2%)</td>
<td>67 (56.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. I speak Tolai most of the time in school</td>
<td>69 (58.5%)</td>
<td>49 (41.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20. I find it easier talking to my teacher in Tolai than in English</td>
<td>72 (61%)</td>
<td>46 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. Tolai is more important to learn than English</td>
<td>9 (7.6%)</td>
<td>109 (92.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22. It is important to learn English</td>
<td>115 (97.5%)</td>
<td>3 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23. Writing a sentence in English is harder than writing in Tolai</td>
<td>82 (69.5%)</td>
<td>36 (30.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24. If I don’t speak English well, I will not get a good job in future</td>
<td>111 (94.1%)</td>
<td>7 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25. Most children in my class like learning English</td>
<td>109 (92.4%)</td>
<td>8 (6.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26. I only speak English during class time and nowhere else</td>
<td>80 (67.8%)</td>
<td>38 (32.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, 94.1% agreed that if they did not speak English well they would not get a good job in future (Q24). While 92.4% said most children in their class liked learning English (Q25), 67.8% of the respondents said they only spoke English during lessons and nowhere else (Q26).
5.3.2.4. Tolai Students’ Responses to Open-ended Questions (Q27-30)

In this section, the findings obtained from the open-ended questions are presented in the graphs in Figures 33 and 34 with subsequent explanations of each graph.

Question 27 asked students to indicate whether English or Tolai was important to them. As shown in Figure 33, an overwhelming majority of respondents (90.7%) stated English was of great importance to them while only 9.3% opted for Tolai.

When this group of students presented reasons (Q28) for their choice, they wrote in three different languages; a) Tok Pisin, b) Tolai, and c) English.

![Figure 33: Languages Tolai students perceive as important](image)

There were a number of difficulties in understanding these responses because they included:

a) Non-standard sentences - example: ‘English halps me to be beta’
   (English will help me to be better), and
b) Illegible sentences - example: ‘beglesc I’m eippim English is heppm der jildran’.

However, through her knowledge of Tolai and Tok Pisin, the researcher was able to identify their meanings and translated some of them accordingly. Illegible sentences such as in b) above were discarded. Examples of students’ responses in Tok Pisin are shown below and English translations are in the parentheses:
‘English bai alivem [halivim] mi long skul wok blo me na em bai elevem [halivim] me long tok long ol vaitman’.
(English will help me in my school work and it will help me to speak to the white-man/foreigner).

‘Englis bai karim mi i go antap long bipela skul na mi bai kisim bipela wok na bipela save long behain taim’.
(English will bring me to high school to gain a vast amount of knowledge which will enable me to get a good job in future).

‘Bikos olgeta buk oli raitim long English olsem na mi mas lanim English long kisim save lo ridim ol buk’.
(Because all books are written in English so I must learn English in order to read these books).

‘Mi laik go long univasiti long behain taim so mi nid lo lanim English’.
(I would like to go to university in future so I need to learn English).

Examples in Tolai which students gave are as follows:

‘Tago na maravut iau ure kaugu vartovo ma na mal iau upi ina kap ta bona papalum’.
(Because it will help me with my schoolwork in order to get a good job).

‘A inglis na maruvut iau pi ina nunure bula ra umana enana subjek’.
(Learning English will help me to understand other participants also).

‘Iau mainge pi ina wartovo ta ra English tago iau mainge pi ina pilot namur’.
(I want to learn English because I want to become a pilot later/in future).

Examples in English that students gave included the following:

‘Because it is used world-wide’.

‘Because of modern technology, we must learn English’.

‘Because all books are written in English’.

‘Because the tests are written in English’.

‘Because it will help me when I sit for my grade 8 exam’.

As seen from the quotes above, these reasons were similar to those that Tok Pisin students stated about the importance of English. These included: it is a world-wide language, important for
future job prospects, a key language to understanding and/or master other participants, a medium of communication with outsiders and/or foreigners, to improve reading and writing skills, and that all text books and all exams are written in English.

In line with the above, the majority of students (87.3%) stated that Tolai was not important (as shown in Figure 34) whereas only a very small proportion (2.5%) thought English as unimportant (Q29).

Figure 34: Tolai students’ views on languages not important to them

Reasons given in Tok Pisin for this response included the following (Q30):

- ‘Tolai bai no nap karim mi go long bikpela skul’. (Tolai will not bring me onto high school).
- ‘Bikos emi no nap helpim mi lo ridim ol book we ol i raitim olgeta long English’. (Because it will not help me read the books which are all written in English).

Examples students gave in Tolai included the following:

- Tago kir i maravut iau ure kaugu vartovo. Ma na vakaina kaugu vartovo’. (Because it will not help me with my schoolwork and it will spoil my learning).
- ‘Tago pi ina nunure ra English upi ina nunure ra niluluk ma a tutumu’. (I will have to learn English in order to know how to read and write).
Examples in English students gave were as follows:

- ‘Tolai is only spoken in East New Britain’.
- ‘I speak Tolai everyday as my mother tongue so it is not important for me to learn it again in school’.
- ‘My Tolai language is not important because it cannot describe everything that English can name and describe’.
- ‘Tolai is not important because you cannot speak it in other countries like English’.
- ‘Modern technology is not in Tolai’.
- ‘The Grade 8 exam is not written in Tolai’.
- ‘Tolai will not give me a good job in future like English’.
- ‘Because no book is written in Tolai, all books are in English’.
- ‘Tolai is not important because we won’t use it when we go for further studies’.
- ‘I will not use Tolai at university and when I work in future’.

It must be noted that although Tolai students had some difficulties writing responses in English and Tok Pisin, they managed to convey their ideas in Tolai despite a few students whose responses were illegible. The common reasons that students gave for the lack of importance they attached to Tolai included: Tolai does not enhance students’ progress in reading, writing skills or learning in general, Tolai is not an international language, and is not used in exams, text books, and further studies such as at universities or for future job prospects.

5.3.3. Comparison of Tok Pisin and Tolai Students’ Findings

Demographic Data and Language Use

Overall, a total of 242 students (n=124 Tok Pisin and n=118 Tolai) most of whom were from East New Britain and spoke either Tok Pisin or Tolai as their mother tongue, completed the survey questionnaires. However, more of the students in Tolai classes had Tolai as their mother tongue (68.6%) as compared to 46.8% among the students in Tok Pisin classes. The ages of students were between 9 and 14, and the proportion of girls to boys were about the same, with girls slightly outnumbering boys among the Tolai students.
With regards to the languages used at home, it was found that Tok Pisin students used Tok Pisin more at home with their family members compared to Tolai students, who used more Tolai. Nevertheless, a variety of other languages were also spoken, including English, though this was the least spoken language at home. In respect to languages used in the classroom, Tok Pisin students claimed that English only and the bilingual mode of Tok Pisin and English were the most common mediums used, closely followed by Tok Pisin. Tolai students on the other hand, had an interesting revelation. While they claimed that they spoke mainly English with their teachers, the most common language spoken alongside English in a bilingual manner was not Tolai but Tok Pisin. This suggests that Tok Pisin plays a greater role in bilingual Tolai/English classes than may be officially acknowledged.

In terms of languages students used with their friends in the school grounds during recess and lunch, the majority of the students in both groups stated they preferred using Tok Pisin to the other languages or language combinations. It was interesting to note that the use of English or English in a bilingual or trilingual mode with other languages was minimal among Tok Pisin students whereas a good number of Tolai students used English with their friends.

**Language Attitudes – Findings of an Inferential Statistical Test**

A Mann-Whitney U test (see Appendix 39f) was conducted to test for significant differences in the attitudes of the students who attended a Tok Pisin dominated classroom and those who attended a Tolai dominated classroom. Of the nine attitudinal statements (as shown in Tables 18 and 21) that were tested, four had statistically significant differences which are discussed below:

**Q18. Using Tok Pisin/Tolai in the classroom helps me understand English better.**

Findings revealed a highly significant difference (p< .001) in the attitudes of the two groups of students towards the statement. Far more Tok Pisin students (76.6%) agreed that using Tok Pisin in the classroom helped them understand English better than Tolai students, only 43.2% of whom agreed that using Tolai helped with English comprehension.
Q19. *I speak Tok Pisin/Tolai most of the time in school.*
It was found that significantly more (p= .025) Tok Pisin students agreed with this statement than Tolai students.

Q20. *I find it easier talking to my teacher in Tok Pisin/Tolai than in English.*
Findings revealed that there was a highly significant difference (p< .001) between the Tok Pisin and Tolai student groups. While the majority of Tok Pisin students (89.5%) agreed that speaking Tok Pisin with their teachers was easier than using English, only 61% of Tolai students found speaking Tolai easier than English.

Q21. *Tok Pisin/Tolai is more important to learn than English.*
Far fewer Tolai students (n=9, 7.6%) agreed that ‘Tolai is more important to learn than English’ compared to Tok Pisin students, 20 (16%) of whom stated Tok Pisin was more important to learn (highly significant p< .001).

5.4. Conclusion
The findings of the questionnaire analysis show the multilingual nature of the society in which the respondents live and the influence this has on what languages are used at home and school. In answer to the first research question “What are the attitudes of teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classrooms?” findings indicate a wide range of attitudes among the different groups who participated in this study. Questionnaire responses also indicate the continuous high status of English and the growing importance of Tok Pisin as a lingua franca in both formal and informal situations. This was further evidenced in the findings of the inferential statistical analysis using the Mann-Whitney U test, which revealed a number of significant differences, some of which were highly significant. This has implications for bilingual programs based on Tolai and other vernaculars and can be used to explore Research Question 2: Is the current policy on bilingual education being implemented in schools, based on participants’ views? All these findings will be further discussed in the Discussion Chapter (Chapter Seven).
CHAPTER SIX
Findings of Interviews

6. Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings of the interviews that were conducted with curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students. These interviews were carried out to obtain more in-depth data in order to answer the research questions; 1) “What are the attitudes of curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classrooms in PNG?” and 2) “Based on participants’ views, is the current policy on bilingual education being implemented in schools?”

In reporting the findings of the interviews, the attitudinal statements pertinent to each area and key categories and themes are summarized in tables by showing the frequency of the specific occurrences. Subsequently, each theme is discussed in depth.

In order to read the tables in each section, the numbers at the top refer to the names (pseudonyms) of the interviewees which are explained in the key below each table. Hence reading from the top of Table 22, 2 refers to Nola and a tick (√) next to support for Tok Pisin under the column ‘Themes’, means Nola is in favour of Tok Pisin.

The chapter is divided into four sections and will be discussed as follows: 6.1. Interviews with Curriculum Officers, 6.2. Interviews with Teachers, 6.3. Interviews with Parents, and 6.4. Interviews with Students. The chapter then concludes (6.5) with an assessment of the overall views of all stakeholders in relation to the two main research questions of this study.

6.1. Interviews with Curriculum Officers
This section focuses on the findings of the interviews with the eight curriculum officers (see Section 4.6.2) regarding Tok Pisin and vernacular education which were organized into categories presented in Tables 22 and 23.
6.1.1. Curriculum Officers’ Views of Languages in Education

Two main categories are discussed in this section: ‘Languages in Education’ and ‘Reformed Education System’. Each category is further subdivided into themes with subsequent sub-themes as shown in Table 22 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 22. Curriculum Officers’ Attitudes towards Languages in Education and the Reformed Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORIES, THEMES AND SUB-THEMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGES IN EDUCATION:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Tok Pisin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Tok Pisin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardize Tok Pisin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with Tok Pisin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in learning and bridging to English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with English in old system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Vernaculars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for vernacular languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserves and maintains identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in vernacular languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFORMED EDUCATION SYSTEM:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Education Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for current education reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in current education reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Multilingualism and Bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for multilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for bilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual education issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Vernacular/Tok Pisin Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for vernacular education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Tok Pisin education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1=Lani, 2=Nola, 3=Tanita, 4=Mavis, 5=Delilah, 6=Jessie, 7=Anita, 8=Doreen

6.1.1.1. The Use of Tok Pisin

The majority of the officers agreed that since Tok Pisin is now the most preferred medium of communication in PNG and also the mother tongue of thousands of Papua New Guinean children, it should be considered together with local vernaculars as a language of instruction in schools. The collective view of these officers was to standardize Tok Pisin so that there is uniformity in teaching the language across the nation. This stemmed from a growing concern by most officers that there are many varieties of Tok Pisin spoken in the different linguistic regions
of PNG. Statements such as the following clearly express this strong support for Tok Pisin and the need for standardization:

Line 6: ‘My view is that Tok Pidgin I agree is becoming a language of most of our multilingual children and at the moment it should be standardized in a way for use for teaching and learning’. (IV1/Curricoff/Lani/5.05.09)

Line 14: ‘and then you know when it comes to what you are going to teach for example if they want to teach Tok Pisin in the elementary school then which standard Tok Pisin are they going to be following? May be it would be ok if there was a standardized Tok Pisin’. (IV3/Curricoff/Tanita/5.05.09)

Line 54: ‘you see now today you can hear Tok Pisin too it’s slightly changing using mostly English words. Today’s young people children they changing the words to suit their standard. You know to suit the way they speak so I think it’s good it’s wise if people can really have a study in this and come up with what with what dialect what language because it’s really confusing children in the elementary school with the phonics and when it comes to English and here we say this sounds like this and that you will see that even a term or two, they feel right the same way again and again so maybe it’s wise for us to do a research throughout the country and see what we can do so that teachers can speak the right pidgin’. Line 56: ‘children can come from their homes with all sorts of pidgin but teachers can speak one standardized pidgin’. (IV7/Curricoff/Anita/6.05.09)

However, there was a concern that Tok Pisin could eventually erase local vernaculars if parents did not practice the vernacular language with their children at home, and that Tok Pisin does not have an identity compared to local vernaculars. Nevertheless, officers accepted Tok Pisin as the language children resort to when they encounter problems in either English or the local vernacular.

6.1.1.2. The Use of English
In the current education reform in PNG, English is the language that has to be mastered at the end of the bilingual education journey. However, discussions with the curriculum officers about English usage in the classroom and when to introduce English produced mixed findings (see Table 22). Most supported the current policy of providing initial education in Tok Pisin and the local vernacular, with English being introduced at a later stage. English was described by one of
the officers as a language that alienates children from their culture and that it did not work for all students in the previous English-only system. This attitude is shown below:

Line 4: ‘... I observed at that time and um with the English only um it was alienating our children from their cultures from their um background from their cultural backgrounds and not only that but there was a gap there where they learnt. The children go to school they learnt English when they go home there was no opportunity to practice that English at home...’ (IV8/Curricoff/Doreen/6.05.09)

Another officer described her days in school as ‘learning English by force to remember and memorize concepts’:

Line 6: ‘…when I went to school we um we came straight from the village and we were we were taught English. We were not encouraged to use vernacular. We were to use just begin learning from day one English words. They were foreign to us. We didn’t know what those words were and we were just like you know following um what teachers said to us and we said what they said to us back and may be it was the wrong meaning um but because we were um we were punished when we spoke our vernacular. We were we were forced into this situation and may be learning wasn’t um the best. Um as I see it now um the kids who go to school begin their schooling their formal schooling in a language they know. Um it’s more um comfortable for them may be if I would say that, they um they feel that they are not forced or pressured to do something that they have yet to learn because they are using, they are encouraged to use the language of the home and that may be Tok Pisin. It may be Motu it may be English. May be um the vernacular, so I see that it makes a big difference to the learning of the child um when they are not pressured by this foreign language…’ (IV3/Curricoff/ Tanita/5.05.09)

As shown above, Tanita described learning English in the previous education system as a difficult foreign language which students were expected to memorise in order to do well in other participants, unlike the current education system where learning English is now done without pressure. She concluded that the present system is preferable as children are taught in the language they know and are encouraged to use it in school with ease.
6.1.1.3. The Use of Vernaculars

Six curriculum officers (see Table 22) were in favour of seeing children starting their initial education in a local vernacular in elementary schools. The quote from Doreen below describes this attitude:

Line 4: ‘...children are educated in their vernacular for the first three years of their schooling it is a better way because they are using their knowledge. They have been using it in their homes they bring it to school and when they are taught in their own vernacular it adds on to what they have already learnt at home and um in that way I believe we are setting a foundation. They have that knowledge in them and they go to the school and there are skills that they learn, there are ways of talking and then when it comes to Grade 3 they are slowly introduced into English and they come into the English world with skills they have already skills learnt, the skills of writing, the skills of reading because that’s what they were doing in their vernacular in the elementary and when they come in they have all that. They have all that skills and the knowledge and so on...’ (IV8/Curricoff/Doreen/6.05.09)

Vernaculars were also perceived by five officers as languages which gave an individual an identity, and the current education system helps maintain culture. The two examples below illustrate this:

Line 6: ‘In terms of fully implementing the reasons for the reform in terms of vernacular education we are trying to maintain and promote the cultural values and identity. The use of our languages or vernaculars must be used in education…’ (IV1/Curricoff/Lani/5.05.09)

Line 52: ‘that’s a shame like on your own land your own people it’s important to maintain your culture and vernacular so I think elementary education is good, vernacular education is good because it’s helping to maintain our culture and vernaculars’. (IV2/Curricoff/Nola/5.05.09)

As shown above, Lani and Nola maintain that the current education reform should be embraced as it promotes PNG’s culture and prevents the 850+ languages from extinction.

Six officers commended the current bilingual education system as less stressful because children are encouraged to use their home language in the school grounds whereas in the past they would be punished if they were found speaking their local vernaculars.
As Tanita said,

Line 6: ‘... um we were punished when we spoke our vernacular’. (IV3/Curricoff/ Tanita/5.05.09)

Despite the fact that these officers were educated in the English-only system, the collective view was that the present education system is more conducive to learning with ease compared to the English-only system where children were forced to learn in English.

6.1.2. Curriculum Officers’ Attitudes towards the Reformed Education System

As shown in Table 22, three main themes are discussed under this category: 6.1.2.1. Education Reform 6.1.2.2. Multilingualism and bilingualism and 6.1.2.3. Vernacular/Tok Pisin education.

6.1.2.1. Education Reform

As policy planners, curriculum officers showed not surprisingly, an overwhelming support for the current education reform commending initial education in Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars. An example from one of the curriculum officers in favour of the reform is shown below:

Line 4: ‘...I think the reform system of education I believe is in the right direction for PNG to provide the relevant education that um we are hoping to achieve for the children of this country’.

(IV1/Curricoff/Lani/5.05.09)

Nevertheless, six officers pointed out a number of pitfalls that needed to be considered in order for the current bilingual education to be a success. Two officers claimed the current education reform was ‘rushed’ stating there was lack of preparation at the school level resulting in teachers not receiving enough in-service training to prepare for the changes, and those worst affected were the remote schools. Three other officers supported the need for awareness of the current education system to educate the general public as shown below:

Line 36: ‘um. May be the only thing that I would like to add um we really need to be doing awareness among the stakeholders a lot of people who are stakeholders they don’t really understand how the reform works um because if they did may be they wouldn’t be saying a lot of the things that they say. And even
(coughs) myself I had to learn when I join this unit I had learn all about the um reform about what’s done in elementary and a lot of the things that people say that’s because they are not informed correctly (coughs) and a lot of people you know they say all these negative things but if they get down to what the reform is all about and what elementary is all about they’d know it well enough they’d appreciate it because we’ve got success stories out there’. (IV3/Curricoff/ Tanita/5.05.09)

An officer who was very vocal about the lack of awareness and the unpreparedness of teachers towards the reform is quoted below:

Line 30: ‘The first thing is lack of awareness uhm there was like CDD went out, they went out and talked to people. They got picked randomly, teachers and they were involved in the interviews but they did not go far and wide. They did not go to all the stakeholders to collect their views so that’s one. Lack of um lack of awareness and two the teachers were not properly prepared to take on board the OBE curriculum. Today I tell you they haven’t done anything. They are the ones talking to the parents about the OBE curriculum. They’re telling them they cannot do it because there’s a lot of work. They haven’t done it and the process has not been done by the teachers. May be because they lack the knowledge and the skills of planning and doing the unit of work down to weekly and daily lesson plans. There’s a lot more to be done to be given to the teachers so that they can make this OBE a success’. (IV5/Curricoff/Delilah/6.05.09)

This data suggest that teachers are confronted with an overwhelming amount of work daily because they lack the knowledge and skills of planning. Another concern raised by a curriculum officer was that if there is no co-operation from all stakeholders, this current system will not progress.

6.1.2.2. Multilingualism and Bilingualism

Four officers spoke favourably of using two or more languages during initial education in elementary schools and lower primary schools to help students transition to English better in Grade 3. Speaking favourably of multilingual education Lani said:

Line 4: ‘I strongly believe in multilingual education in PNG because of the current multilingual communities in PNG not bilingual but multilingual education…’ (IV1/Curricoff/Lani/5.05.09)

The collective view of these officers suggests that the use of more languages in the classroom for explaining concepts in English enables the child to comprehend English better. Given the
multiplicity of languages spoken in certain complex linguistic areas such as an urban setting, it is only right that two or more languages can be used to bridge to English depending on the understanding of both the teachers and students.

Another officer pointed out that using three languages (e.g. Tolai, Tok Pisin and English) in a transitional bilingual education program was good. See Mavis’ response below:

Line 6: ‘Tok Pisin should go hand in hand with English. Vernacular will soon phase out because in elementary and all these (X) the language in the world is English. Tok Pisin in PNG, Tok Pisin should come hand in hand with English when instruction is given because from my experience when I am explaining to the teachers, they don’t fully understand what I’m explaining so I go back to Tok Pisin and I explain it. So what I see is Tok Pisin should come hand in hand with English. Vernacular will come up to Grade 3 and then will phase out but Tok Pisin should come hand in hand with English because the exam papers everything is written in English. So Tok Pisin should be in there as well to assist English for better understanding’. (IV4/Curricoff/Mavis/5/05/09)

In other words, Mavis suggested that a bilingual program should begin with a local vernacular at the elementary level and phase out in Grade 3. From Grade 3 onwards the medium of instruction should be Tok Pisin, which would assist English up to upper primary where it then eventually phases out, too, leaving English only to be carried to upper levels of learning.

6.1.2.3. Vernacular/Tok Pisin Education

Most curriculum officers expressed their support for both vernacular languages and Tok Pisin education as shown in Table 22.

Positive comments in favour of the use of local vernaculars included that a vernacular:

- Maintains language and cultural identity
- Enables children to fully express themselves in their classrooms
- Allows for smooth transition to English during the bridging period

Positive comments in favour of the use of Tok Pisin focussed on Tok Pisin as:
Despite the overwhelming support for the current education reform, a number of pitfalls were identified by the officers. Firstly, the data suggest that most officers view Tok Pisin as an appropriate medium of instruction in the classrooms alongside local vernaculars. However, as already seen in 6.1.1.1 they are concerned about its degree of dissimilarity in the different regions of the country. These officers wanted to see a standardized Tok Pisin that can be used for teaching and learning with uniform national exams throughout PNG. Secondly, teachers were not prepared for the change that had taken place to accommodate the innovations in curriculum and material design for teaching. Thirdly, it was emphasized that unless there was co-operation and awareness among all stakeholders and the general public, people will not appreciate the true meaning of the OBE which includes vernacular and Tok Pisin education. Findings also suggested that officers were in favour of both multilingual education and bilingual education as they helped children break down complex concepts in English in the languages they knew best. Although support for vernacular/Tok Pisin education was obvious among curriculum officers, one of the major drawbacks highlighted was lack of teaching and learning materials in all schools due to lack of funding from the NDOE.

6.1.3. Curriculum Officers’ Attitudes towards Teachers and Teaching

This section discusses two main categories: ‘Training and Qualification’ and ‘Curriculum Resources’. Under the Category ‘Training and Qualification’, curriculum officers’ responses were categorized under three themes: ‘Training’, ‘Qualification’, and ‘Monitoring and Evaluation’ (see Table 23). The category ‘Curriculum and Resources’ comprises the following themes: ‘Curriculum Unit’, ‘Resources’ and ‘Challenges’
### Table 23. Curriculum Officers’ Attitudes toward Teachers and Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES, THEMES AND SUB-THEMES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAINING and QUALIFICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in English</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills in developing resources in own vernacular</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills in planning in 2-3 languages</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training lacks financial support and other issues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade teachers’ qualification</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ multilingual background</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring by Provincial Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring lacks financial support</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRICULUM and RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Curriculum Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider of teaching and learning strategies</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching resources (school journals) written in English</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of resources in Tok Pisin and vernaculars</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources in schools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Challenges for Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues ‘Bridging to English’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in teachers’ vernacular language background</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in creating teaching resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large class sizes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code-switching issues</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of teaching style</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** 1=Lani, 2=Nola, 3=Tanita, 4=Mavis, 5=Delilah, 6=Jessie, 7=Anita, 8=Doreen

#### 6.1.3.1. Curriculum Officers’ Attitudes towards Teacher Training

In the interviews most curriculum officers said that the medium used during training and retraining, in-services and workshops for teachers at the CDD is English. Officers collectively stated that during these sessions, teachers are taught to design and develop teaching resources and are trained on the skills of planning in two or more languages. Two examples of responses from the officers regarding this issue are shown below:

Line 14: ‘we do not provide materials for classroom teaching and learning, we only train them how to improvise at the school level. The main teaching strategy we use is teach them how to use the big books for participants including literacy in an integrated manner so that they have a theme in all the other participants and language is part of the theme and they develop the literacy skills’. (IV1/Curricoff/Lani/5.05.09)
Line 14: ‘we expect the teachers to help themselves to become innovative creative to develop resources in order to help them disseminate or use that uhm medium of communication Tok Pisin. They are finding it difficult to develop those they need help in developing those materials and the resources to actually teach the bilingual education. (IV5/Curricoff/Delilah/6.05.09)

Five curriculum officers also talked about the constraints on training in this current education system. Three mentioned that there is lack of financial support from the government to carry out workshops and in-service training in schools and those most disadvantaged are the teachers in remote parts of PNG. There is a need to replenish resources in schools since the CDD does not produce teaching materials. This then puts the onus on teachers in schools. This is illustrated in the two examples below:

Line 6: ‘seriously if the government is really serious about this reform and they say that the reform is really a good thing then they have to put money where their mouth is by, you know, training teachers, training teachers coming here to upgrade themselves to diploma. This is where they go through the in-service units the reform curriculum, yes and also the resources out there in the schools’. (IV6/Curricoff/Jessie/6.05.09)

Line 28: ‘… at the unit here we do not produce materials um we train the teachers to make their own materials um although that that is not enough. We should we really need some support um with material production. A lot of them don’t have just the basic paper, the basic things to be able to do that and a lot of them fall back on their own, you know. They buy their own things if they are keen otherwise they are lazy and they don’t do anything’. (IV3/Curricoff/Tanita/5.05.09)

Other officers pointed out that teacher training fees at the PNG Education Institute (PNGEI) are very costly, which discourages practising teachers as shown below:

Line 70: ‘… A lot more improvement is needed. They just come here for fourteen weeks, fourteen weeks exactly and now starting now this trimester two these poor teachers are going to be paying about six thousand plus to be here for fourteen weeks and I don’t think they will come and stay on campus. They’ll be living out there with relatives and if they are not really comfortable how do we know what their attention span will be towards their studies? So these are some of the things uh resources um they need. I think they really need to come here one year and I think what the elementary section is going do is next year is train them for one whole year, that’s the right way to go and I think for us in-service unit here, I think we need to go for one whole year too rather than trimesters in a year’. (IV6/Curricoff/Jessie/6.05.09)
6.1.3.2. Curriculum Officers’ Attitudes towards Teachers’ Qualifications

Teachers’ qualification was another concern noted by all officers. They claimed that most primary school trained teachers only have teaching certificates or diplomas. These officers would like to see an upgrade of their own qualifications to degree, masters and even doctorate level so they can better help improve the quality of education in primary schools. Below is a quote from Delilah:

Line 28: ‘… the first thing that should have been done was to develop the teachers at the primary school level and to develop lecturers here so that we can understand the outcome based education. The concepts about outcome based principles so we can do it well but we are trying our best, we have done our best to transmit what we know to the students. I am encouraging the department to put more funds into taking care of us so that we can upgrade our qualifications to degree level, masters level and doctorate level’. (IV5/Curricoff/Delilah/6.05.09)

Anita was more concerned about the level of qualification and training of elementary teachers. See her response below:

Line 32: ‘my observation is at the moment due to the training or if our elementary teachers were taught the concept of teaching at early age, I mean at that level, and knowing their own vernacular that should be it that should help. But today with the training part of it, the teachers are only taken from Grade 8 when it started off and Grade 10 coming from that uh education level they come in straight and they are sent into a classroom and with that six weeks of training with the elementary’. Line 34: ‘they come in for six weeks and they go into the field and come back again’. Line 36: ‘with that training I don’t think they have the most content knowledge so even if we train them if the trainer I mean they are trained for let’s say a year in fact like for college training and then they go back again may be they would be equipped more’ (IV7/Curricoff/Anita/6.05.09)

The issue of teachers being deployed to schools where the language of instruction is unknown to them is another major obstacle in the current education reform. Five officers stated that since the current education system emphasizes bilingual teaching using the child’s L1 and English, it was important that the NDOE addressed this issue by sending appropriate teachers to schools to combat the issue of using Tok Pisin instead which is a threat to children’s transition to English. This is illustrated in Anita’s response below:

Line 20: ‘… bridging teachers should be the local teachers’. Line 22: ‘we have teachers coming from all parts of PNG’. Line 24: ‘especially in NCD Central Province you can see teachers from the Highlands teaching there’.
Line 26: ‘how can they if they don’t know the real culture background of these children the values and beliefs they have and then with the language that they come from uh a person who is trying to impose pidgin in here on the Motuan speakers’. (IV7/Curricoff/Anita/6.05.09)

In the previous system, primary schools teachers were trained at teachers’ training colleges and then deployed nationwide (Klaus, 2003, p. 108). At that time, the language of instruction was English so it was easy to deploy teachers anywhere, thus solving the problem of deployment. Today it is more difficult as the language of instruction is the local vernacular of the people where the school is located. However, the NDOE lacks funds to train teachers to teach in a multiplicity of languages. This confirms Klaus (2003, p. 108) who stated that a barrier to several languages in formal education in many countries has been the difficulty of training teachers to teach in various languages and then deploy them throughout the country.

6.1.3.3. Curriculum Officers’ Attitudes towards Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation are two other important elements in the current education reform as they are used as yard sticks to measure the performances of individual teachers and at the same time raise an awareness on the progress of the curriculum reform. Six officers reported that in all provinces, there are provincial curriculum committees which are responsible for inspections, monitoring and evaluations in schools in each province. Members of these committees are also responsible for organizing and running cluster workshops and in-services for teachers in different zones or districts. Tanita explains this in detail below:

Line 32: ‘We have a provincial, we have we really have three people three people who are in charge of elementary in the province. One is occupying our position while the other two are occupying provincial positions. And then we have with that one occupying our positions um we have about five to ten trainers in each of the provinces depending on the districts and they are the ones who are um mentoring and monitoring what goes on with our elementary teachers. The department is now also using them as inspectors or standard officers as what they call them now. They have um site leaders and the reports goes to the one who’s coordinating inspections and the reports come in at the end of the year. So they are also using them for that purpose apart from all the other things that they have to do’. (IV3/Curricoff/ Tanita/5.05.09)

In her description, Tanita points out that there are three people in-charge of the elementary unit in each province and about five to ten elementary trainers depending on the size of the districts. These trainers are also in-charge of mentoring and monitoring the performances of elementary
teachers in each province and act as inspectors or standard officers who write reports on elementary teachers’ performances.

Interestingly, four other officers pointed out that the monitoring of teachers’ performances by provincial inspectors is currently not very effective due to the lack of financial support from the NDOE, and those worst affected are again teachers in the remote schools. Below is an account of what one of the officers had to say:

Line 60: ‘there’s a problem with monitoring there’s no very effective way of monitoring they keep on saying there is no money, no money and you know I have heard students telling me you know Ms we have to contribute money for this standard officer to come to carry out an inspection evaluation and monitoring in our schools should they do that? Teachers do not get a lot of money like standard officers’

Line 64: ‘like in elementary in their management meeting the manager of elementary Lani was saying for four years now she has not been going out to monitor all her trainers in the provinces because of no money’.

Line 68: ‘four years is a long time and those teachers are not and my village, my village they have hardly gone up there the supervisors to go and check them and my people tell me the children are just running around. They playing all day that is why when they go to Grade 3 the poor Grade 3 teacher has a very hard time in some of these schools, some of these rural schools’. (IV6/Curricoff/Jessie/6.05.09)

In summary, curriculum officers in this study were very vocal about the issues concerning training, qualification, and monitoring and evaluation for teachers. Despite the fact that CDD provide the basic skills for material production in vernacular languages and Tok Pisin for teachers to utilize back in their schools, the collective concern raised was funding and support from the government which was seen as the major hindrance to the progress in the current education reform. Teachers’ low salary packages, escalating training and in-service training fees, the need for teachers’ qualifications to be upgraded, deployment of teachers to schools and source of funding for monitoring and evaluation were other vexing issues that were highlighted by the curriculum officers.

6.1.4. Curriculum Officers’ Attitudes towards the Curriculum and Resources
Three main themes are discussed under this category “Attitudes towards Curriculum and Resources”: 6.1.4.1. Curriculum Unit, 6.1.4.2. Resources, and 6.1.4.3 Challenges for teachers.
6.1.4.1. **Curriculum Unit**
The majority of the officers described the CDD as a provider of mainly teaching and learning strategies without resource materials to supplement teaching. The CDD’s task is to basically guide and give training to teachers to develop their own teaching materials back in their schools in Tok Pisin and/or their own vernaculars. Teachers are expected to utilize the skills they gain during training and implement what they learn back in their schools.

6.1.4.2. **Resources**
Although the CDD only focuses on providing teaching and learning strategies for teachers, two curriculum officers reported that there is a section which houses a project called the ‘school journals project’. This project, which was originally an initiative of the New Zealand and PNG government in the early 1990s, is now solely run by the NDOE. These two officers stated that the school journals project is the only form of supplementary teaching resources that are produced in huge quantities at the CDD. They explained that these journals (series of story booklets) consist of PNG stories which are written by Papua New Guinean writers in English. The officers further reported that no material production is done either in Tok Pisin or vernacular languages at the CDD.

The majority of the officers also raised concerns about the lack of funding resources in schools, a similar issue to the lack of funding for monitoring and evaluation discussed in 6.1.3.3. They pointed out that although teachers are instilled with the skills and strategies in producing their own teaching resources, there are no funds to support these resources. Apart from teachers creating their own teaching aids to supplement their teaching, the biggest problem is lack of student text books. As a result, teachers especially those in remote schools are still using student texts and resources from the English-only era such as ‘the Minenda series’ and ‘Our English Series for Melanesia’ (OESM). This situation is shown in Jessie’s response below:

Line 6: ‘we have teachers who come and we take them and you know some of them from the remote areas. They don’t know anything about the reform and also they are saying they still using the *Minenda* and *Pacific series*.

Line 8: ‘yes especially those in the very remote areas, they’re still using them. And you know with the reform, there is something. The teachers are so busy planning with no resources. Where are they going to
This is a very serious problem that needs to be addressed immediately by the NDOE in order to achieve positive outcomes from the current education reform.

6.1.4.3. **Challenges for Teachers**

The curriculum officers were very vocal about the various challenges that teachers are currently faced with. Firstly, teachers posted to schools must be able to speak the language(s) of the children to enable bridging to English and creating teaching resources. Further, overcrowding in the classroom is now a growing concern. An officer pointed out that the increasing number of students in classes which have up to sixty or seventy students in urban centres is becoming unbearable for teachers. Also revealed was the trend teachers have on code-switching from vernacular to Tok Pisin either to explain English words that are not present in the local vernacular or to explain concepts in the vernacular if there is a lack of clarity in English. There are teachers who are still confined to the old teacher-centred approach and it is very difficult to change them. In addition to this, teachers in remote schools are still using the old curriculum as a result of no or very limited funds and visits by education authorities to give them in-service training on the new changes in the current bilingual education.

The interviews with curriculum officers show that the CDD provides teaching and learning strategies to teachers in the current education reform unlike the English only curriculum where it provided resource materials for all schools throughout the country. It was found that the major drawback was lack of funding. However, with the assistance from the New Zealand government, the CDD was able to fund the School Journals Project which has continued to provide supplementary reading materials to all schools in the country. The officers also stated that teachers who had undergone in-service training have tried to implement what they gained creating their own teaching resources. However, due to their limited income, many are not able to utilize the learned skills resulting in them resorting to teaching materials from the previous English-only curriculum. Among the challenges that were highlighted for teachers, the use of a
student-centred approach is not being followed as most teachers are still using a teacher-centred approach which thus contradicts the current bilingual education policy.

6.2 Interviews with Teachers

This section provides the findings of the analysis of interviews with eighteen teachers covering the current bilingual education curriculum and its implementation in PNG (see Table 24).

| Table 24: Findings of Cross Case Analysis of Teachers |
|-----------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CATEGORIES, THEMES AND SUB-THEMES**          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 |
| **VIEWS on BILINGUAL EDUCATION**              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1) Positive views towards initial education in a child’s vernacular or Tok Pisin | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| 2) Negative views towards the current bilingual education curriculum | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| **LANGUAGE in EDUCATION**                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1) English                                    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Bridging to English early in elementary school is essential | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| 2) Tok Pisin                                  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Tok Pisin is useful and helpful               | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| The pitfalls and disagreement with Tok Pisin usage | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| 3) Vernaculars                               |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Vernaculars are useful and helpful            | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| The pitfalls and disagreement of vernacular usage | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| **TEACHING and LEARNING RESOURCES**           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1) Lack of teaching and learning resources    | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| 2) Resource funding needed                    | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| **TEACHING STRATEGIES**                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Planning and teaching in two or more languages | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| **EDUCATIONAL CHALLENGES**                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 1) Vernacular and Tok Pisin materials         | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| 2) Monitoring and assessment                  | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| 3) Providing remedial classes for students    | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |

*Key:* 1=Tanya, 2=Belinda, 3=John, 4=William, 5=Martha, 6=Judith, 7=Dorah, 8=Sharon, 9=Max, 10=Mathew, 11=Simaima, 12=Elvina, 13=Molly, 14=Valerie, 15=Damarish, 16=Emil, 17=Melanie, 18=Tammy.

The discussion is organized into five main categories namely: 6.2.1 Views on Bilingual Education, 6.2.2 Language in Education 6.2.3 Teaching and Learning Resources, 6.2.4 Teaching
Strategies, and 6.2.5 Challenges. Each of these categories is further sub-divided into themes and sub-themes, which are discussed accordingly.

6.2.1. Teachers’ Attitudes towards Bilingual Education

Two main themes were identified when teachers were asked to provide their views on the reformed curriculum. These themes are reported in the following two subsections:

6.2.1.1. Positive Attitudes towards Bilingual Education

It was found that seven teachers agreed with providing initial education in Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars. Their general views were that providing background knowledge in a child’s first language helped facilitate English instruction in the classroom. This is illustrated in the following three quotes:

Line 16: ‘… I do believe that as English is not our mother tongue and we’re starting up education in our own languages it will help the students in bridging them onto English so it will always be going back to uh especially for clarification for their understanding’. (IV15/teach/Dorah/09.06.09).

Line 8: ‘I’d like to say using that uh language Tok Pisin in the school is of a very great help. It helps me when I’m explaining concepts in English. The students bridge in to English very well with the help of Tok Pisin. It depends on the teacher too how you are going to actually get them through their language (Minigir) and then into the transition period into English’. (IV14/teach/Judith/09.06.09)

Line 18: of course I would say it is important to use the local languages uh why because uh looking at most of the students uh in here at Kabagap primary school if you go only using English you will not get anywhere with that. I’m speaking in terms of explaining things so you have to use both Tok Pisin and Kuanua to bridge to English’. (IV12/teach/William/21.05.09)

Despite the fact that they embraced the use of Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars, most of them felt that bridging to English should also begin at the elementary level together with Tok Pisin and the vernaculars before moving onto primary level. By doing so, children will have learnt some English skills and be ready for transition to English in Grade 3. This is shown in the two teacher quotes below:
Line 12: ‘uhm I think bridging from the students’ mother tongue in Grade 3 is a bit late. It should come in at about uhm when say elementary prep. It should come in there so in a way we are teaching the local language and at the same time straight from there bridging them to English at an early age’.

(IV22/teach/Elvina/17.06.09)

Line 10: ‘I think bridging to English should start early in elementary school because the way I see it now is that when they come up to lower primary, many of these students don’t pick up English well. So I think in the elementary may be in year two, teachers should start them off. So when they come into Grade 3 then it will be easier for them to grasp English’ (IV16/teach/Sharon/09.06.09)

6.2.1.2. Negative Attitudes towards Bilingual Education

Older-serving teachers provided negative statements regarding the hardships they had gone through since the introduction of the reform. Teachers who had previously taught in the English-only curriculum expressed their disgust and remorse towards the current system stating they were not aware at the beginning that they were eventually going to be faced with the difficulties that they were facing at the time of the interview.

Firstly, there was lack of preparation. Dorah, who had been teaching for eight years, was very vocal about the changes in the education system and claimed the changes had been very rapid causing confusion and un-preparedness among teachers, students and the general public. Secondly, two teachers raised concerns that elementary schools should be built near primary schools to foster better understanding among teachers and progress in children’s transition from local languages/Tok Pisin to English. Thirdly, it was found that teachers assigned by provincial authorities to teach in schools where the language of instruction was unknown to them was a growing concern, which is line with the views of curriculum officers (see 6.1.3.2). Below is an example of quotes from a concerned teacher who faced this problem.

Line 14: ‘The only problem that I have encountered is that I am not from this Province and not a Kuanua [Tolai] speaker.

Line 18: ‘OK the only problem that I encounter is how I can bridge students from the language they already know so that I can help bring them up to the next level of learning?’

Line 22: ‘I use pidgin OK I have to admit here when I use pidgin and the kids that I am teaching may be Grade 3 who already went through elementary in their own vernacular Kuanua OK the problem that I have encountered is that they were taught using Kuanua and then when they come to the primary level I teach
with pidgin that’s the problem then I make them confuse when I teach them as these are two different things’

Line 28: ‘so there is a breakdown there adding on to that, I believe that those children should be allocated to separate classes when moving from elementary to Grade 3. There should be a Grade 3 Tok Pisin teacher allocated to teach children who were taught entirely in Tok Pisin in elementary school and the same with children taught in Kuanua at elementary school to have a Kuanua teacher in their bridging class.’ (IV9/teach/Tanya/21.05.09)

Six other teachers maintained that the previous English-only curriculum was better than the current bilingual curriculum giving the following reasons:

Line 26: ‘Current leaders and people in high ranking jobs in the government went through this old system which was very effective and was a success for many in terms of their high proficiency levels in English’. (IV47/teach/Melanie/05.12.09)

Line 32: ‘Teaching and learning resources were in abundance as they were all provided by the education department’. (IV19/teach/Simaima/16.06.09)

Line 77: ‘Using English-only in the classroom elevated the English proficiency levels of students in the past compared to the current bilingual education system where there are currently poor outcomes’. (IV24/teach/Molly/17.06.09)

Line 4: ‘Compared to the English-only system the current bilingual education does not have any incentives for the children and therefore children do not work hard as they know they will be returning to their villages at the end of primary education’. (IV29/teach/Valerie/03.12.09)

Line 10: ‘The current OBE requires a lot more work and effort by teachers and yet teachers are among the very lowly paid people in the country’. (IV30/teach/Damarish/03.12.09)

Line 8: ‘Unlike the English-only education, children in the current system have a poor command of both spoken and written English, a lot of pressure is put on teachers who work tirelessly everyday’. Line 20: ‘The current bilingual curriculum was written and dispatched to schools without proper in-services for the teachers… Compared to the previous curriculum, it is now very difficult to teach the current curriculum that does not provide resources for itself’. (IV48/teach/Tammy/05.12.09)
In summary, teachers who were in favour of using Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars pointed out that the system needs commitment and effort into integrating all necessary areas required by the curriculum. Despite their support in this area, certain teachers claimed that bridging students’ from L1 to English should begin at the elementary level. The four major concerns about the current bilingual education reform identified by teachers were: Firstly, there was lack of awareness about the reformed curriculum before it was introduced and implemented in all schools throughout the country. Secondly, more attention was needed to ensure good will and smooth transition for students from elementary schools to primary schools. Thirdly, deployment of teachers to schools needed serious attention and fourthly, more teaching resources, support and funding are required.

6.2.2. Teachers’ Attitudes towards Language in Education
Discussion in this section is divided into three parts: 6.2.2.1. English in Education, 6.2.2.2. Tok Pisin in Education, and 6.2.2.3. Vernaculars in Education.

6.2.2.1. Teachers’ Attitudes towards English
Teachers were also very vocal about English and its usage in school. There was overwhelming support from teachers for an early start to bridging children from their home languages to English. Teachers claimed that bridging students from vernacular and/or Tok Pisin to English in Grade 3 was late, and that they would rather see bridging to English early at the elementary level in order for children to master basic English skills before entering primary school. Reasons these teachers provided included that most children are not able to read and speak English after they have gone through the transition to English period.

As a reminder, the Ministerial Policy Statement No 3/99, as quoted in the NDOE Primary Reform Curriculum, Bridging to English Study Guide (2007, p. 9), clearly states that:

“At the lower primary level (Grades 3-5) the learning and teaching will be conducted in a bilingual situation, in which there is planned, gradual bridging from vernacular (or a lingua franca) to English. Oral and written vernacular language development will continue throughout lower primary. Oral and written English development will gradually be introduced and
established as the major language of instruction by the end of Grade 5, using “Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages” (TESOL) methodology”.

Furthermore, the fact that all tests in schools are written in English caused problems for teachers, as Martha said:

Line 12: ‘they cannot read and they cannot write it like in my teaching I cannot give them uh so many activities which we could do together because they cannot read so I have to read to them especially doing tests or small workbook activities I have to read to them word by word and the instructions together with the activities and in most cases I just give out the answer’.

Line 14: ‘I’m giving them the answers to everything so mostly here our tests (XXX) to me it’s not like a test anymore because we are reading to them everything we give them the instructions instead of them doing them we are reading to them’. (IV13/teach/Martha/9.06.09)

Martha pointed out that in her class of forty students, only ten know how to read in English, thirty are struggling, and that students with a good English background supported by educated parents at home are the only ones that perform better in tests.

Max and Emil also commented on this problem.

Line 44: ‘bridge yeah from vernacular or Tok Pisin to English is the problem’

Line 46: ‘that is why students find it very difficult to uh during exams to understand the instructions’.

(Line17/teach/Max/16.06.09)

Line 16: ‘… it’s difficult for them to translate from pidgin or vernacular into English and they find it more difficult to speak English which most of the time the teacher finds it very difficult for them to interpret such lessons to them and in return when such activities or assessment is given there is no good result at the end’. (IV31/teach/Emil/04.12.09)

Difficulties in reading instructions in tests are also seen in upper grades, which contribute to the overall poor academic performance of students in the end.
Another reason which teachers provided in relation to their concerns about children mastering basic English skills at an early age was that strong village influence prevents children from a successful bridging from vernacular to English.

Somewhat surprisingly, given the strong support for English experienced by parents in the questionnaires, teacher interviews indicated that some children and their families did not see the importance of learning English at school. As one teacher said:

Line 10: ‘uh there is problem if there is no attention the very thing that students lack today is the concepts now to really get things over into their minds they really need to be instructed uh in a way that they’ll understand it really better and slowly drive them into English but today I find that uh the influence the village influence had made a lot of students to ignore the importance of why they have been bridged from vernacular to English’. (IV10/teach/Belinda/21.05.09)

A Grade 3 teacher who had previously taught a Grade 7 class said:

Line 38: ‘OK with the language use, English in Grade 7 which is an upper primary class um most students cannot speak uh fluent English OK uh they prefer using Tok Pisin even their everyday little close to close communication is all in Tok Pisin. We tried our best to enforce English because speaking English is one of our rules, but these students cannot even speak English. There are a few there who can speak fluent English especially those students who come from well-educated uh parents but for those who are living in the villages and in uh settlements they cannot speak English and in writing also that is a problem um we saw that uh the problem there is the structure of the sentence in English and the spelling those are the two main problems in language in upper primary especially with grade sevens’. (V15/teach/Dorah/9.06.09)

This is a total contradiction to the policy which states that in Grade 7 and 8 (upper primary), students are supposed to be well acquainted with the basic skills in English. Even more concerning is evidence that lack of proper English skills does not only lie within the primary school boundary but has now reached tertiary learning institutions, which is detrimental to PNG’s future workforce. As Molly, a Grade 3 teacher said:

Line 36: ‘uhm I would advise that we get especially those teachers with higher grades to go through teachers colleges because at the moment now from my own observations and supervision of new teacher
This data suggest that there is an urgent need to review the current bilingual education policy and also selection procedures of new intakes for teacher training in PNG.

6.2.2.2. Teachers’ Attitudes towards Tok Pisin

In terms of teachers’ attitudes towards Tok Pisin, findings revealed that three teachers applauded its use in the classroom and provided positive feedback on its usefulness at the school level as the following quotes show:

Line 22: “Tok Pisin is an excellent language which helps bridge children to English during the transition period”. Tok Pisin should be enforced in schools because providing background knowledge in this language facilitates English instructions”.

Line 23: “Students who have bright ideas and cannot express themselves well in English find code switching to Tok Pisin very helpful”. (IV16/teach/Sharon/9.06.09)

Line 22: “English is not the children’s mother tongue so the use of Tok Pisin helps student understand concepts in English”. (IV15/teach/Dorah/9.06.09)

Line 22: “The use of Tok Pisin is embraced in urban schools as a lingua franca for children who come from different linguistic backgrounds and those who now speak the language as their mother tongue”. (IV12/teach/William/21.05.09)

Despite the benefits of Tok Pisin above, hostility towards the language was also evident amongst other teachers. Belinda stated that Tok Pisin should only be used at home and not in the classroom and preferred English-only to be used in children’s initial education. Martha also pointed out that bridging from Tok Pisin to English is not working for some children and has become a very big problem for bridging teachers. This view was supported by Sharon, who stated that parents have complained to her regarding Tok Pisin in the classroom as it confuses and hinders their children’s progress in learning English. Similarly, Simaima stated that the use of Tok Pisin should be discouraged as students get confused when constructing or formulating English sentences when they move to upper grades. She also pointed out that some teachers
(including her) find it very difficult to explain English concepts in Tok Pisin. Below are three direct quotes showing teachers’ views against Tok Pisin:

Line 14: ‘I don’t agree with that for a lot of things uh mainly because we are not seeing any good findings when we start children off with the so called vernacular or uh Tok Ples or Tok Pidgin I don’t think we will get through…’. (IV18/teach/Mathew/16.06.09)

Line 20: ‘uhm it was very hard to teach them English language they couldn’t read they couldn’t write they couldn’t comprehend even short stories so that is why I am strongly against vernacular and Tok Pisin I strongly like English to be re-introduced’. (IV24/teach/Molly/17.06.09)

Line 4: ‘uhm I will say I will say uhm providing language and Tok Pisin to our children is uhm I believe it won’t work and it’s not working as I’ve been taking our upper primary students since I started in that school since teaching I have struggled a lot with their English especially in grammar skills thank you’. (IV48/teach/Tammy/05.12.09)

In addition, it was pointed out that there is no guarantee that Tok Pisin will be stabilized as it will continue to change like other pidgin and creole languages due to massive exposure to its lexifier language (English).

6.2.2.3. Teachers’ Attitudes towards Vernaculars

Only six of the teachers interviewed stated that the use of Tolai in the schools was helpful to both the teacher and the student. These teachers were mostly new graduates who were bilingual certified teachers and were in their first few years of teaching. While Tanya commented that providing background knowledge in Tolai was good as it helped with transition to English, she pointed out (as in 6.2.1.2) that children who were taught in Tolai in elementary school should also continue to be taught in Tolai in Grade 3 rather than being taught in Tok Pisin so that there is a smooth transition from the local vernacular to English and to prevent confusion between English and Tok Pisin concepts. Four teachers made further positive comments on the use of vernaculars in the classrooms. They pointed out that a) using the local vernacular in the classroom is appropriate, especially when bridging the children onto English, and b) since English is not the children’s L1, it is better to teach them first in a language they know (i.e. Tok Pisin or Tolai) and then use these languages to bridge onto English.
A further concern was that vernacular languages are now being threatened. Max stated that although PNG boasts about its leadership in being the most linguistically diverse country in the world, there are dangers that vernaculars will slowly lose their current forms and eventually die out due to their heavy exposure to the development and modernization of Tok Pisin and English.

Findings also indicated that the eight teachers who had been teaching for more than ten years and had not undergone any form of bilingual education training had negative perceptions towards the use of vernacular languages in the classroom. Belinda described vernacular languages as languages that should not be taught in schools as children had already acquired them at home. Martha commented that from her own experiences, the use of vernacular languages during the bridging to English period was not working for some children in her class and had become a big problem to her. The views of three other teachers are reported in the quotes below:

Line 38: ‘...you see that uh that local vernacular or something pidgin it’s already practiced at home and why should we ask a student to get something again in elementary because it’s already the mother tongue somewhere’. (IV18/teach/Mathew/16.06.09).

Line 10: ‘I would say uh to my observation I think I was one of those teachers who started teaching at those times classes from Tokples to uh English I found it was good at times but it also has disadvantages because at the prim uh elementary level they learn a lot of Tokples and when it comes to bridging them to English uh some get use to the habit of speaking Tokples that they know language and they don’t catch English and don’t pay much attention English’. (IV22/teach/Elvina/17.06.09)

Elvina described her experiences with bridging children from Tokples to English stating that as a result of heavy mother tongue influence on the children, they do not pay attention to learning English, which was a disadvantage.

Valerie was also very vocal against the use of local vernaculars in the classroom. She spoke negatively about the impacts that the current curriculum has brought upon her students and embraced the re-introduction of the English-only curriculum.
In summary, while many teachers acknowledged the practical usefulness of using Tok Pisin in class, not all teachers were happy with the current language policy which stipulates that Tok Pisin should be one of the languages of instruction in children’s initial education. They would prefer an education system where Tok Pisin is eventually replaced by English as children progress onto upper grades. They claim that the current curriculum is producing students who have not mastered basic English at the end of Grade 8 and move onto Grade 9 in high school with very little knowledge of English.

With regards to vernacular languages, new graduates who are bilingual certified teachers were highly in favour of their usage in the school stating that the languages do help when they are bridging the children to English and thus play a very important role in children’s education. Like in other bilingual education programs elsewhere in the world, these teachers maintained that it is better to teach children first in a language that they know and then use this language to bridge them onto English at a later stage. Based on the interview data, however, it is evident that other teachers oppose the use of the local vernacular in the classroom. Rather than seeing it as a basis for initial literacy which will help with English literacy later they see it as a hindrance. In place of an L1 education for initial literacy, they would rather see the English-only curriculum being re-introduced in the country.

6.2.3. Teaching and Learning Resources
Under this category, the researcher reports on two issues highlighted by the teachers in this study. They are: 6.2.3.1 Lack of teaching and learning resources and 6.2.3.2 Resource funding needed.
6.2.3.1. Lack of Teaching and Learning Resources

All teachers (except one) expressed their dissatisfaction with the lack of teaching resources claiming it was one of the major drawbacks in the current bilingual curriculum. The issues that emerged are reported in two parts below:

a) Teachers’ Resources

The participating teachers claimed that teaching resources for teachers were available in schools but not in abundance. In most schools there were not enough text books for all teachers in the various grades and therefore teachers had to share and use their own personal funds to make photocopies of sections of the books that they needed for their lessons. An example of this is given in Dorah’s responses when she was asked to give her view:

Line 32: ‘teacher’s resource book we don’t have most of these we have a copy and that is not enough’.
Line 34: ‘it is for the teacher and the students don’t have any so what we do is we have to photo copy and sometimes we write things up on the blackboard which is also time consuming and students have to get to know how to read from the book and that will give them a practice from the book and the paper uh it is a problem in our school’. (IV15/teach/Dorah/9.06.09)

In another school, teachers reported that due to the unavailability of certain teachers’ guides which they were required to use, teachers had to borrow from other schools that had them and again used their own funds for photocopying which they were not too happy with. An example is shown in Sharon’s response below:

Line 40: ‘… we don’t have much of the materials are not in here especially to do with language have language here last time I borrowed one material from that was from Kalamanagunan about grammar skills...’. (IV16/teach/Sharon/9.06.09)

It was further reported by a long-serving teacher that there was a growing concern among senior teachers in schools on the issue of pirated copies of text books that teachers were purchasing with their own funds from some retailers in town which were not approved by the NDOE. Although teachers know that it is illegal, they do not have much choice as they are in dire straits in search of teaching materials for their lessons. An example is shown in Mathew’s response below:
Line 108: ‘what we discovered was that some OBE materials are there but uh they do not have the secretary’s message or signature or something and the only two that we have now are MAL [Making a Living] teaching resource book and personal development those ones have the secretary’s signature the others nothing. So we are uh thinking that the thing is that it is produced by a company that is not recognized by the department’. (IV18/teach/Mathew/16.06.09)

In summary, there is certainly lack of teaching resources in all schools that took part in this study. The most vexing issues were reports on teachers purchasing pirated copies of resource books from retail outlets and teachers resorting to the old OESM series that were used in the previous curriculum. However, those who were able to fund their resources managed to produce ‘big books’ for their classes.

b) Students’ Learning Resources

The issue of lack of students’ learning resources was also one of the recurring topics in the interviews. While one teacher commented that there was a shortage of students’ text books due to the increasing number of students in her class, all other teachers claimed that there was hardly any text books for students in their schools. In the current curriculum, funding is only available to produce and supply to schools the teaching syllabus and teachers’ resources. Confirming the views of curriculum officers, teachers claimed that they are trained/re-trained at the PNGEI to produce their own student learning resources in the local vernaculars or Tok Pisin when they return to their school. However, due to the limited salary that teachers earn today, some teachers are not able to purchase the necessary stationary. However, for those who are able to fund these resources, ‘big books’ (story books in the local vernacular or Tok Pisin) have been created and are being used in class as supplementary materials. Martha pointed out during the interview that she has been using her own funds to create big books for her students.

Line 60: ‘here at Kokopo no we don’t have enough resources they are very scarce at the moment we provide our own books and stories we make up our own big books we write our own for the children’. (IV13/teach/Martha/9.06.09)

An example of the cover of a big book produced by one of the teachers during an in-service training session on creating own teaching materials which the researcher attended during her
field work in June 2009, is shown in Figure 35 below. ‘A nilaun tara balanagunan’ (Tolai) means ‘Life in the village’ (English).
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Figure 35: Sample of a big book

Other teachers admitted that teachers have gone back to using the resources from the previous English-only curriculum such as the *Our English Series for Melanesia* (OESM) books which are in complete student sets sitting idle in their storerooms, confirming what curriculum officers told the researcher. See two examples from Mathew and Molly below:

Line 80: ‘I have discovered that because of no not enough adequate materials the teachers down there let’s say a good example here is a classical example that I have discovered in English teachers down in Grade 3 four five they are using the OESM’. (IV18/teach/Mathew/16.06.09)

Line 62: ‘oh we don’t have resources you hardly see resources in the classrooms or any students books’.
Line 64: ‘very empty exactly’
Line 66: ‘Melanesia mhm’.
Line 68: ‘some of us are still using that’.
Line 70: ‘but they are very good resources they are very helpful they teach all the skills in English that is why we still keep that’. (IV24/teach/Molly/17.06.09)

Another teacher Elvina, who comes from a remote area in PNG and previously taught in a remote school, expressed her disappointment in the lack of resources in these schools which were usually out of reach most of the year by officers from the headquarters. As she stated:

Line 40: ‘student resources are not available in order for uniform teaching across the board’.
Line 42: ‘…they, the policy makers have to really come down from their offices and conduct a survey all throughout the country in all the schools especially remotes areas because they are the most affected ones
and I come from a remote area that’s why I’m saying these from what I have experienced they have to come and conduct a survey and find out the disadvantages…’.

Line 44: ‘Uhm Mrs we only teaching the old curriculum because there are no resources for the new bilingual curriculum’ (IV22/teach/Elvina/17.06.09).

Elvina also pointed out that as a result of the different approaches, tasks and activities that teachers were doing with their students there was no uniformity across all schools in the district, province and country as a whole.

6.2.3.2. Resource Funding Needed
Teachers were very vocal about the need for funding of resources in their schools. The unanimous view of all teachers was for funding to be provided by the following two bodies:

Funding by the NDOE
A number of teachers stated that the NDOE should provide resources for both teachers and students instead of just providing the syllabus and teachers’ guides, if the current curriculum was to become a success. Four teachers maintained that the previous English-only education was better since teaching and learning resources were supplied to schools compared to the current system. Examples of these views are shown below:

Line 104: ‘yes the old system was very nice because everything was uh supplied by the education the old system was, nowadays it’s not happening…’ (IV18/teach/Mathew/16.06.09)

Line 70: ‘the education should department should provide like before’. (IV14/teach/Judith/9.06.09)

Several other teachers claimed that the result of the NDOE’s failure to provide teaching resources branched out into yet other problems such as no uniformity in teaching across all schools when in the end students were required to sit for a national exam (in Grade 8). This was a worrying factor to most teachers. Also remote schools are now worst affected as there was no follow-up as to whether or not the funded teachers’ resources ever arrived in the schools.
Funding by the School Board of Management (BOM)

In addition, nine teachers called for assistance from their school’s BOM. They emphasized the need for teaching and learning resources as crucial and that instead of the BOM diverting funds to other projects in schools, the funding priority should go to purchasing resources for the children.

6.2.4. Teachers’ Attitudes towards Teaching Strategies

The change from teaching only in English in the previous curriculum to teaching in two or more languages in the current bilingual curriculum has had a big impact on the teaching strategies of teachers in PNG. Two issues relating to planning and teaching that emerged from the teacher interview data are discussed as follows: 6.2.4.1: Advantages of planning in two or more languages and 6.2.4.2: Disadvantages of planning in two or more languages.

Advantages of Planning in Two or More Languages

It was obvious from the interview data that bilingual certified teachers were more in favour of planning and teaching in two or more languages compared to long-serving teachers who had a lot of experience in planning only in one language in the previous system. A number of these teachers mentioned that it was good teaching in more than one language such as Tok Pisin and Tolai as it helped with the clarification of concepts when bridging children into English as stated by William below:

Line 22: ‘you will not get anywhere with them I’m speaking in terms of explaining things so you have to break it down Tok Pisin and a bit of Kuanua’. (IV12/teach/William/21.05.09)

Another teacher, Judith, reported that she found it helpful using four languages to bridge to English:

Line 32: ‘yeah last year I taught in four languages. it was like I was teaching a grade four class so it was hard to go straight to English, so what I did was before I switched onto English I had to speak uh Tok Pisin and Kuanua and then Minigir and then onto English’. (IV14/teach/Judith/9.06.09)

An example from another bilingual certified teacher on planning programs is shown below:
Line 30: ‘OK I could say that planning and programming in two languages makes it easier for me as a teacher to bring across the concepts and for the students to see clearly how they can link the concepts or their understanding that there is a sort of something like from the known to the unknown situation from what they do know just going in deeper trying to connect so programming in two languages two things side by side talking about the same thing is OK’. (IV9/teach/Tanya/21.05.09)

Disadvantages of Planning in Two or More Languages

In contrast, teachers who had been teaching for many years had a lot of negative things to say about planning lessons in the current curriculum. The collective view was that teachers felt they were heavily loaded having to plan in two or more languages. They pointed out that ‘the planning’ alone became very laborious and time consuming. Mathew, a senior teacher who had been teaching for more than twenty years, expressed his views as follows:

Line 40: ‘I actually did not have a lot of uh experience on planning the two’.
Line 42: ‘planning the two but uh from what I have seen, the teacher is doing sort of double work.’
Line 46: ‘on those two things the same plan that is they doing in English the same thing is interpreted into language or whatever the language the teacher is using pidgin or something because that will that will be just the same’.
Line 52: ‘and it’s a load to the teacher if we choose only one that is English. I’m going for English if we teach only one that would be something good and the teacher uh I am saying this because from our experiences as supervisors in the field. Uh the teachers tell us that we are loaded and cannot do other things because they prepare things here and there and then they cannot do the teaching well’.

(IV18/teach/Mathew/16.06.09)

Another teacher also expressed her dismay below:

Line 26: ‘…like normally we have a story to read and if we plan then we have to plan in Tok Pisin with that one lesson and the next one then we plan in English quite a lot’.
Line 28: ‘we plan in pidgin we plan in English but then we teach in pidgin and then do a repeat’.
Line 34: ‘we do it in English we teach it in pidgin and then the next day we do it in English’.
Line 38: ‘it’s time consuming, it’s a lot and then if the children don’t catch up especially English then it depends how many more lessons so nearly in one week we are just reading the same story’.
Line 42: ‘sometimes we can go for two weeks especially the stories if it is a long story or complicated most lessons especially in grades three and four is a repeat’.
Line 52: ‘they can I mean in the end sometimes I wish they could speak English’.

(IV13/teach/Martha/9.06.09)
In summary, bilingual certified teachers who had been trained how to plan and teach in two or more languages saw the usefulness these languages had in the area of bridging to English. These teachers maintained that clarification of concepts in English was done better in the children’s first language or lingua franca. Teachers who objected this idea were mostly teachers who had taught in the previous system. They complained they were being heavily burdened and heavy loaded with the task of planning, which impacted a lot on teaching delivery. These teachers further complained that it was very time-consuming for teachers who had to teach lessons repeatedly for weeks until the intended outcomes of the lessons were accomplished.

6.2.5. Educational Challenges for Teachers

Three other educational challenges for teachers emerged during the interviews and are discussed as follows: vernacular and Tok Pisin materials, monitoring and assessment and providing remedial classes for students.

6.2.5.1. Vernacular/Tok Pisin Materials.

As discussed in section 6.2.3.1, teachers expressed their dissatisfaction on the issue of lack of resources, but the main challenge was to create teaching resources in the local vernaculars and lingua franca which was pointed out by several teachers. Litteral (2004, p. 7) first highlighted this issue of lack of vernacular materials when the education reform was newly introduced by reporting what the NDOE and Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) had done in terms of sets of printed pictures and “Shell Books” to supplement teaching resources that were produced locally. “Shell books” refers to reading material that begins as already illustrated pages with the text omitted. According to Ahai (2004, p. 11), each language group, on receiving a Shell book, translate, adapt, or re-write the text in the appropriate vernacular following the attached samples in English, Tok Pisin, or Hiri Motu. Interestingly, it is now over eighteen years into this education reform but most teachers in this sample are still complaining.

Two teachers who had previously taught in remote schools in the country where the language of instruction was a minority language claimed that they had difficulties teaching as the language lacked written alphabets, confirming yet another issue Litteral (2004, p. 7) pointed out, which
involved the notion that many smaller languages in PNG had yet to have their alphabets developed. With SIL’s assistance, alphabets for another 135 smaller languages were developed in alphabet design workshops (Wroge and Hoel, 2003). According to Kale (2005, p. 10), over 400 languages now have orthographies and are being used in Elementary schools throughout the country. However, the remaining 400 plus languages representing smaller language communities are most in need of support.

6.2.5.2. Monitoring and Assessment

Litteral (2004, p. 8) also spoke about the issues of monitoring and assessment in the current bilingual education system. He clearly highlighted the fact that with so many languages involved in the current system, trying to develop equivalent means for monitoring national standards was difficult compared to the English system which emphasized standardized testing so assessment was not complicated.

From the discussions with teachers, it was found that conflicting issues emerged regarding assessment in the schools they were teaching in. Teachers claimed that certain teachers who had taught in the English only system still had not fully embraced the new ‘on-going assessment’ approach and thus continued using the old assessment guidelines. William, a new bilingual certified teacher, explains this situation in his response:

Line: 58: ‘At teachers’ college we were taught to do on-going assessment because assessment supposed to be on-going in the bilingual curriculum whereas here in this school, I find that they are still going on with the old system so it’s a big issue here’.

Line 64: ‘we are depriving the students’ rights because they are scheduled for that assessment so at this period of time the on-going assessment is due after this week but we are still on with testing assignment project which is to do with the old system’.

Line 66: ‘they still (XXX) with the old system to do with the old system what we got from the college supposed to be on-going so whatever we teach them to do with the outcome we straight away assess them but this is not happening here’. (IV12/teach/William/21.05.09).

It is clear from William’s comments that he was frustrated for not implementing what he was taught in college regarding on-going assessment. Clearly, this is another challenge that long-serving teachers who had grown accustomed to the English-only curriculum have to face.
6.2.5.3. Providing Remedial Classes for Students

Another big challenge for teachers in the current bilingual education curriculum is the issue of providing assistance to slow learners, especially in the area of literacy skills in English through the use of Tok Pisin and/or the local vernacular. Those teachers who spoke on this topic indicated that most teachers were hard working, creative, productive and very concerned about the performance and progress of their students’ proficiency levels in English.

An example of this is shown in Sharon’s responses below:

Line 32: ‘… students cannot even read or write and they find it hard so we have to go back again to basics with them phonics and all those we find time we engage them with we put them with we put them with students who are well advanced so that they help them out in the classroom’.

Line 38: ‘mhm sometimes for those like for those ones remedial work we get the exercises according to their levels may be the exercise for these grade eights here it will be for Grade 3s brought up to them again for them to do…’. (IV16/teach/Sharon/9.06.09)

It is evident in Sharon’s responses that slow learners are a big worry to her and as a result she goes out of her way to assist these students. She does this by pairing off slow learners with advanced learners doing assigned tasks together and in other occasions, she provides remedial exercises according to the levels of each student.

In sum, the data suggest that teachers continue to face a number of challenges which need to be resolved by the appropriate authorities. Firstly, teachers face difficulties in designing teaching materials in the local vernaculars and Tok Pisin due to either lack of training or teachers’ different levels of understanding. Secondly, the ability and/or willingness to implement the current assessment policies and thirdly, providing remedial classes for slow learners remain challenges for PNG’s education system.

6.3. Interviews with Parents

This section presents the findings of the interview discussions with fifteen parents. Themes emerging from the interviews are discussed under three main categories (Table 25): 6.3.1:
Bilingual Education 6.3.2: Languages in Education and 6.3.3: Challenges for Teachers and Parents.

6.3.1. Bilingual Education

Parents’ views on the current education system are discussed in two parts in this sub-section: 6.3.1.1: Positive attitudes towards bilingual education and 6.3.1.2: Negative attitudes towards bilingual education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 25: Findings of Cross Case Analysis of Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORIES, THEMES AND SUB-THEMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIEWS ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Positive attitudes towards initial education in vernacular and Tok Pisin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Negative attitudes towards the current bilingual education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) English in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of English and consequences of lack of basic English skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging to English in primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging to English in elementary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Tok Pisin in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin is useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pitfalls of and disagreement with Tok Pisin usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Vernacular in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernacular is useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The pitfalls of and disagreement with vernacular usage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHALLENGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers: qualifications and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents: providing assistance to children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:** 1=Osila, 2=Elda, 3=Amanda, 4=Patrick, 5=Jacklyne, 6=Blaise, 7=Theckla, 8=Ida, 9=Nellie, 10=Nemika, 11=Maureen, 12=Konio, 13=Donna, 14=Annette, 15=Sonia
6.3.1.1. Positive Attitudes towards Bilingual Education

All parents who were interviewed had been educated in the English-only curriculum. As shown in Table 25, only five parents were in favour of the current bilingual program. Two examples of views from these parents are provided below:

Line 4: ‘OK in my view I can tell you that in our Tolai society, Kuanua is the main language especially around East New Britain but it’s true that in primary education most students are mixed. Because of this Tok Pisin is used as the main language in all primary and elementary schools so in my opinion it is a good thing that Tok Pisin is introduced because not all students are Tolais but are all mixed students’.

Line 6: ‘... some students don’t understand English much so since Pidgin is the most common language that can be used as they can understand what the teacher is talking about as they can mix English with Pidgin, however in elementary schools where the local language is used and children come to primary school they don’t normally grasp English but do understand pidgin best so it’s better for pidgin to be taught widely in schools compared to English’. (IV32/par/Elda/03.12.09)

Blaise made the following positive remarks:

Line 8: ‘I think that we still have uh the local vernacular in there uh but it’s just that may be we start the kid earlier on so that we have a time for transition where we can gradually introduce English along the way before uh entering into the primary schooling but because uh why I say that is uh our identity and all that uh in terms of our language uh it’s most likely that we’ll be losing our own language which in the long run if we neglect that in with the kids and all that’. (IV36/par/Blaise/03.12.09)

Despite his support for the local vernaculars being used in children’s initial education, Blaise also suggests in Line 8 that children should be introduced to English at an earlier age at the elementary level. This is in line with the views of most teachers.

6.3.1.2. Negative Attitudes towards Bilingual Education

The remaining ten parents all spoke against bilingual education. Seven claimed that the system was not helping their children gain good English skills compared to when they themselves were in school. These parents wanted the current system abolished and the English-only curriculum re-introduced as their ultimate goal was to see their children get a good education in English in order to get good jobs in future. In the contemporary PNG society, getting a job after school
elevates the status of a family and children who do not succeed are seen as a disgrace to the family. Parents indicated the following concerns:

Line 4: ‘in my opinion I think that this new reform which starts in elementary prep to elementary two is not really good when these lower preps go on to primary schools they don’t really grasp English in Grade 3 that’s why Tok Pisin, our local vernaculars and English don’t go well together in this new reform’. (IV31/par/Osila/03.12.09)

Line 6: ‘the view of us parents is that we should remove the use of local vernaculars and go back to English only so that our children can have a good education’. (IV33/par/Amanda/03.12.09)

Line 6: ‘uh my view is I think we have to abolish this uh system I think we have to go back to other old system where we teach we learn English from the beginning right to I mean grade twelve’.

Line 8: ‘OK some of the issues which I myself observed is most of the grade eight from primary to high school find it very difficult to understand English’.

Line 12: ‘yes the grammar is very poor’. (IV37/par/Theckla/03.12.09)

6.3.2. Parents’ Attitudes towards Languages in Education

The category on languages in education is discussed under three themes according to the different emerging views. These are as follows: 6.3.2.1: English in Education, 6.3.2.2: Tok Pisin in Education and 6.3.2.3: Vernacular in Education.

6.3.2.1. English in Education

Three main themes about English in education emerged and will be discussed as follows: a) The importance of English and consequences of lack of basic English skills, b) Bridging to English in primary school and c) Bridging to English in elementary school.

a) The importance of English

As shown in Table 25, all fifteen parents who were interviewed addressed this issue. The fear that most parents had was that their children would lack important English skills and as a result would not be successful in life. Three examples of what parents in Kokopo said about English in this current education system are shown below:
Line 20: ‘it looks like we need to change this system and go back to the system that we had before because at the moment our children cannot go on to high schools simply because they did not have a good foundation in English and now most of them drop out of school and do nothing in the village’. (IV46/par/Sonia/04.12.09)

Line 12: ‘I think it’s best if we stick to the English curriculum or whatever yeah’.
Line 14: ‘OK there’s plenty of things that contribute to this like the students don’t go for further studies like they only finish at grade 8 they don’t continue on to grade nine ten eleven and twelve most of them are dropouts in grade eight’. (IV41/par/Nemika/04.12.09)

Line 18: ‘in my view most of the children who finish grade eight and come back to the village don’t know how to read and write they come home without having learnt much in school and so they cannot go back to further their education in grade nine so they create problems in the village’.

The above data indicate that these parents are dissatisfied with the current vernacular/Tok Pisin education claiming that most children from their village today do not go beyond Grade 8 compared to the past. They prefer seeing the English-only curriculum re-introduced, which is in line with the views of older-serving teachers interviewed in this study. They would further claim that the contributing factors to the increased dropout rate of children from their village includes poor foundation in English skills, hence children are either still illiterate or semi-literate in English by the time they complete Grade 8 and thus are denied places in high school. The repercussions that are highlighted by the three parents are serious and have now become a threat to the village community as there are no job opportunities for these dropouts in such an environment.

b) Bridging to English in primary school

When parents were asked to give their views on the issue of bridging from the local vernaculars and/or Tok Pisin to English in Grade 3, five out of the seven parents who talked about bridging to English in primary school expressed their concerns about the negative impact of this policy on their children. Below are four examples from parents regarding this situation:

Line 20: ‘OK I can tell you that when I see our children move up to primary school they find it very hard to speak or catch up with English or even understand English. I feel sorry for them because at least they
should be introduced to English at the elementary so by the time they come to primary school it will be easy for them to speak English. When we go to the school market to sell food we feel sorry for the students when we hear them speaking broken English, but what can we do it’s all part of this new system’. (IV45/par/Annette/04.12.09)

Line 18: ‘when the child goes to Grade 3 he/she does not grasp English well and therefore revert back to the local vernacular’. (IV33/par/Amanda/03.12.09)

Line 4: ‘uh in my opinion uh I think that this tokples thing that is being taught uh elementary schools is like you know some children when they come up to primary and go to grade six seven eight they don’t even know English and they cannot even write simple words’. (IV40/par/Nellie/04.12.09)

According to the Bridging to English Study Guide (NDOE, 2007, p. 15), children moving into Grade 3 in primary schools after leaving elementary schools should be able to read simple English instructions as they will have had some exposure to English at the end of Elementary Two (E2). The views expressed by the parents above suggest that this syllabus is not being followed in schools.

c) Bridging to English in Elementary School

Ten parents said that they thought bridging to English in Grade 3 in primary schools was late. They claimed that too much exposure to the local vernacular and Tok Pisin at the elementary level prevented their children from grasping English during the bridging period in primary schools. The view that emerged from the discussions was that parents wanted to see their children being introduced to English from the beginning of their formal education at the elementary level. The following quotes exemplify this view:

Line 6: ‘…I think we should go back to the old system which we were part of where we started off with English in preschool then went on straight to primary schools and onto high schools in this way children will learn English well’. (IV31/par/Osila/03.12.09)
Line 8: ‘I think that English should be put back again like us when we went to school we started off in
English so we understood English when we grew up and went to high schools and all that we didn’t have
problems in learning English and speaking in English so I think it should be re-introduced’.
(IV40/par/Nellie/04.12.09)

Line 6: ‘… like before when we were I was in grade one we started off with English so that’s what we want
uh because nowadays you see many students if you speak to them in English when they are in grade five
they wouldn’t understand (laughs) what you are talking about (laughs) so we should go back to what we
were in before in grade one we just go on with English no more tokples’.
(IV34/par/Patrick/03.12.09)

6.3.2.2. Tok Pisin in Education
The issues that emerged from parent interviews about Tok Pisin are discussed under the
following two themes: a) The usefulness of Tok Pisin and b) The pitfalls of and disagreement
with Tok Pisin usage.

a) The Usefulness of Tok Pisin
Tok Pisin was not discussed at length as parents preferred to spend more time talking about the
significance of English in school. Five out of the fifteen who were interviewed embraced the use
of Tok Pisin in the current education system. Below are examples of three positive responses
from parents:

Line 6: ‘in my view I think it’s alright to use Tok Pisin in the classroom because it does help the child to
learn better in school’.
Line 10: ‘OK one good thing about pidgin is that it is close to English so when the teacher teaches them
something they catch up quickly’. (IV42/par/Maureen/04.12.09)

Line 6: ‘…some students don’t understand English much so since Pidgin is the most common language that
can be used as they can understand what the teacher is talking about as they can mix English with Pidgin,
however in elementary schools where the local language is used and children come to primary school they
do’t normally grasp English but do understand pidgin best so it’s better for pidgin to be taught widely in
schools…’. (IV32/par/Elda/03.12.09)

Line 6: ‘…reflecting back on the time my children went to school they did not learn Tok Pisin and English
only Tokples It was hard for them to catch up with English…’
b) The pitfalls of and disagreement with Tok Pisin usage

Five other parents provided negative responses when they were asked to give their views on using Tok Pisin as the medium of instruction in schools. The following are examples of their views:

Line 4: ‘…when these lower preps go on to primary schools they don’t really grasp English in Grade 3 that’s why Tok Pisin our local vernaculars and English don’t go well together in this new reform…’

(Line31/par/Osila/03.12.09)

Line 6: ‘mhm about Tok pidgin and uh vernacular uh the it is a problem we go straight into Grade 3 in primary ah with no or little knowledge of what English ah so uh I think it’s a problem at the moment but what I think is that there should be something that uh we have a transition period or something like that so that it will help the kid to acquaint himself with much with a bit more English before he enters uh the primary school or studies or schooling’. (IV36/par/Blaise/03.12.09)

6.3.2.3. Vernacular Languages in Education

One of the main reasons why vernacular education was introduced in the mid 1990’s was to preserve PNG’s 850+ languages and cultural identity (Waiko, 2003). While the change has made its mark in PNG’s education history for more than eighteen years, parents are still debating the significance of these languages in schools. In this section two main themes emerged which are discussed as follows: a) Favourable Attitudes towards the Vernacular and b) Unfavourable Attitudes towards Vernacular Usage.

a) Favourable Attitudes towards the Vernacular Usage

When parents were asked to give their views on the usefulness of vernaculars in PNG classrooms, six provided favourable responses during the interviews. Three parents are quoted below:

Line 8: ‘I think that we still have uh the local vernacular in there uh but it’s just that may be we start the kid earlier on so that we have a time for transition where we can gradually introduce English along the way before uh entering into the primary schooling but because uh why I say that is uh our identity and all that
uh in terms of our language uh its most likely that we’ll be losing our own language which in the long run if we neglect that in with the kids and all that’. (IV36/par/Blaise/03.12.09)

Line 16: ‘they understand the local vernacular best but they should use English and Tok Pisin too’. (IV38/par/Ida/04.12.09)

Line 14: ‘in my view I think it’s good to teach them how to write in English and how to translate Kuanua to English’.

Line 18: ‘that’s it I think it’s been hard for them trying to speak English and so they go back to speaking Kuanua’. (IV42/par/Maureen/04.12.09)

These parents thus supported the use of vernacular languages in primary school while also emphasising the need to learn English. They saw no problem in using two or more languages and believed that the vernacular could help children learn.

b) Unfavourable Attitudes towards Vernacular Usage

Nine parents gave negative responses towards the use of vernacular languages in school. Three examples of such responses are shown below:

Line 6: ‘the view of us parents is that we should remove the use of local vernaculars and go back to English only so that our children can have a good education’. (IV33/par/Amanda/03.12.09)

Line 4: ‘I am not happy that teachers are teaching our children in elementary with pidgin and the local vernacular because when they move up to primary school they don’t grasp English quickly and I am not happy with this’. (IV43/par/Konio/04.12.09)

Line 4: ‘uh to my opinion uh I think that this tokples thing that is being taught uh elementary schools is like you know some of our children when they come up to primary and go to grade six seven eight they don’t even know English and they cannot even write simple words’. (IV40/par/Nellie/04.12.09)

Such responses indicate that the majority of parents are unaware of or unconvinced by educational arguments about the usefulness of using vernacular languages in school. Rather than helping children learn English they consider that the use of local vernacular in elementary school findings in children having a poor command in English.
In summary, most of the parents interviewed were not in favour of the current bilingual policy. They either wanted re-instatement of English as the medium of instruction or earlier introduction of English alongside vernacular/Tok Pisin to ease transition to English upper grades. They believe that children will only have a good foundation in English when they are introduced to the language earlier at the elementary level alongside Tok Pisin and/or vernacular languages.

6.3.3. Challenges

The themes that emerged in this section will be discussed under the following two main sub-headings: 6.3.3.1: Challenges for Teachers, and 6.3.3.2: Challenges for Parents.

6.3.3.1. Challenges for Teachers

A number of challenges were identified by parents in this study. Firstly, lack of teaching qualifications at the elementary level and of bridging teachers. Responses from parents indicated great dissatisfaction with the way teachers were being selected to teach in elementary schools. They claimed that the selection processes of elementary teachers were flawed, highlighting the fact that those selected were grade eight or grade ten dropouts from the villages. Three examples of negative reactions from parents regarding this issue are shown below.

Line 12: ‘there are now many complaints about the current teachers who are teaching in elementary schools’.
Line 20: ‘mhm if they had proper training they would be teaching the children well’.
Line 24: ‘It’s only a short time that they go for training’.
Line 26: ‘my view is to take back ex-teachers to teach’. (IV33/par/Amanda/03.12.09)

Line 22: ‘from my observation I have seen that teachers teaching in elementary schools are either grade six or eight leavers which is not right in the eyes of us parents and some of these teachers are not even concerned about the education of our children’. (IV35/par/Jacklyne/03.12.09)

Line 18: ‘uh I think they should train the elementary teachers like this real trained teachers so that they can do well do’.
Line 20: ‘well I don’t know if they are collecting Grade 12 and those others but most of them are Grade 10 leavers that were collected to teach these elementary schools’.
Line 22: ‘well they give them training but I think they have to give them more training on how to teach how to bridge the students from elementary up to the Grade 3’. (IV37/par/Theckla/03.12.09)
The above data show that parents are not happy with the way elementary teachers are selected. These parents pointed out that if these teachers underwent proper long-term elementary teacher training rather than the short courses that are currently in existence, their children would have a good foundation in their first language and be ready for bridging to English in Grade 3 in primary schools. Theckla and Ida specifically highlighted the issue of lack of bridging to English skills among Grade 3 bridging teachers.

The second issue was teaching resources. One male parent, Patrick, was very vocal, pointing out the shortage of teaching resources in the schools that he visited while performing his duties as a copier technician. As he said below, teachers complained about the lack of teaching materials for themselves as well as for students:

Line 14: ‘I think in this system I’ve seen uh what’s it’s a bit helping but uh to my understanding and view like some teachers have been commenting on this uh it’s good but for the back up from the government and all those things materials, nothing at all so that’s why it’s good but uh how can we continue when there is no materials no backup for those poor children uh trying to learn something new yeah and uh also those teachers are also suffering from this type of lack of what materials for them to use in order for them to teach the children with uh with their heart well there is no materials it’s always hard for them so I think that’s my point I have to comment on’. (IV34/par/Patrick/03.12.09)

Patrick emphasised that although teachers were committed to teaching students, the major setback for them was lack of teaching materials which he believed should be supplied by the NDOE.

6.3.3.2. Challenges for Parents
According to Litteral (2004), parents are supposed to play a key role in the decision making process at elementary schools. This involves management of the school by a board of management selected by the community in which the elementary school is located. The community selects individuals they see fit to be trained as elementary teachers and they get to
choose the appropriate language to be used for instruction. During the interviews five parents challenged other parents to at least play a part in the education of their children if they wanted to see them excel in their school work. They also provided examples of what they did to assist their children despite difficulties such as obtaining resource materials like newspapers and magazines for their children’s homework and/or projects. Four examples are shown below:

Line 14: ‘yes I’m happy but it depends on us parents at home to teach them also English and Maths or other things that they would also learn in school we parents should teach them too at home as they are so precious to us and would want to see them have a good future in education so we as parents have to take part too’.

Line 10: ‘…parents will have to become the children’s first teachers in helping out with homework’.

Line 12: ‘at times they find it hard to do the homework so they ask us again to help them’.

Line 14: ‘it’s hard for us to find newspapers or other materials for doing their homework/projects’.

Line 16: ‘I observed that it was still difficult for the child to comprehend what the teachers gave them to work on so I would correct him on some of the things that he didn’t know’.

The data above reveals that parents who are concerned about the education of their children and would like to see them have a good future, go out of their way to help them progress. Osila and Annette challenged other parents to play their part by helping out their children at home if they found difficulties in school. Konio and Sonia on the other hand, provided examples of what they did to assist their children despite the fact that there were major difficulties such as looking for resource materials like newspapers and magazines for their children’s homework and/or projects.

6.4 Interviews with Students
This section presents the findings of the interviews with six students regarding their attitudes towards the languages that they use in school. Prior to progressing onto primary schools, these students had attended various elementary schools. While four had attended a Tok Pisin elementary school, one had attended a Tolai elementary school and another had attended an
English-only elementary school. The findings of the interview analysis (in Table 26) are organised into three categories: 6.4.1: Attitudes towards Languages Used in School, 6.4.2: Language Proficiency and 6.4.3: Learning English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORIES AND THEMES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTITUDES TOWARDS LANGUAGES USED IN SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Attitudes towards Tok Pisin</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Attitudes Tolai</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Attitudes towards English</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Language Proficiency (Tok Pisin)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Language Proficiency (Tolai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Language Proficiency (English)-Easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Language Proficiency (English)-Difficult</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING ENGLISH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Happy to learn English</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Start Learning English early</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Practice speaking English with friends and/or at home</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** 1=Kerry (Tok Pisin) 2=Lynna (Tolai) 3=Leah (English) 4=Alanna (Tok Pisin) 5=Arabella (Tok Pisin) 6=Bradley (Tok Pisin). **Note:** The information in the brackets indicate the language the student was taught in at elementary school.

### 6.4.1. Students’ Attitudes towards Languages in School

**Tok Pisin**

As shown in Table 26, all six students who were interviewed spoke favourably about Tok Pisin. One student mentioned that the teachers’ use of Tok Pisin in the classroom is well understood by students, while another two stated that they enjoyed lessons in their elementary schools as they were taught in Tok Pisin, their mother tongue. This is illustrated in the following quotes:

Line 16: ‘… when the teacher speaks Tok Pisin in the classroom at elementary school, we the students use to understand him well’ (IV/stu/Alanna/18.06.09)

Line 14: ‘I use to enjoy my lessons in Tok Pisin because Tok Pisin is my first language’. (IV/stu/Arabella/18.06.09)

Line 12: ‘Tok Pisin is my first language so when the teacher teaches us in Tok Pisin in the classroom, I enjoy it very much’. (IV/stu/Bradley/18.06.09)
Dunford’s (1999, p. 1), work on Pidgin and Education in Hawaii is in line with these students’ views. It states in Part C: “Some children come to school with a pidgin. The language of these children deserves as much respect as any other language” and in Part D it states: “No one should be prevented from using Pidgin where it works as in the learning process”.

_Tolai_

Lynna, the only student who was interviewed in this study who attended a Tolai elementary school, had conflicting attitudes towards Tolai at the elementary level. Although she stated that students in her class embraced Tolai as their mother tongue which helped them understand English concepts better, her response to whether she enjoyed her lessons in Tolai was not very convincing as illustrated below in English:

Line 14: ‘…sometimes I enjoy my lessons in elementary with my teachers but sometimes I didn’t enjoy the lessons’.

Line 26: ‘Now that I am in Grade 3, no more Kuanua, I speak only Tok Pisin and English…sometimes I answer in English but when I find it hard I answer in pidgin’. (IV23/stu/18.06.09)

Lynna further explained that she had shifted from using Tolai to Tok Pisin and English when conversing with her Grade 3 teacher in the classroom but did not provide any reason.

_English_

Leah, the student who had attended an English-only elementary school pointed out that she preferred English over Tok Pisin and Tolai (which is not her mother tongue). She stated that she enjoyed her lessons in English at the international school which she last attended and that her family has a positive attitude towards English and speaks English at home as shown below:

Line 8: ‘I was not taught in elementary in either pidgin or Kuanua. I was taught in English’.

Line 12: ‘and yes I enjoyed my lessons in English’.

Line 22: ‘yes my family also like English and they speak it at home’. (IV21/stu/Leah/17.06.09)

Although the other five students did not have a lot of exposure to English at their elementary schools like Leah, they all spoke positively about English as the language they wanted to excel in order to find employment in the future.
6.4.2. Students’ Language Proficiency

The four students who received initial education at the Tok Pisin elementary schools and the one who had attended the Tolai elementary school are all proficient in either Tok Pisin and/or Tolai. However as shown in Table 26, they all talked about the difficulties that they were facing with English and how hard they tried to understand their teachers. While two confessed that they did not speak English at all in school except when they were being asked to do so by their teachers in the classroom, another two stated that they always asked the teachers to elaborate on difficult English concepts in Tok Pisin during lessons.

An earlier study on the development of literacy and numeracy skills at elementary level using children’s own language, Tok Pisin, and English by Paraide (2002, quoted in PAC Newsletter On-line), reveals similar findings. In her study, Paraide found that students were not mastering the basic concepts in Mathematics and were having difficulties applying these basic concepts to more complicated concepts that teachers were introducing in Grade 3.

The only student who did not encounter any problems at all in English was the student who had attended initial education in English at an international school.

Another student mentioned that she uses Tok Pisin rather than English when conversing with her friends in school. Four students also said Tok Pisin was the language spoken in their homes with their families. The only student who attended the Tolai elementary school did not speak much about Tolai apart from it being the language of instruction at the elementary school.

6.4.3. Learning English

As shown in Table 26, all six students stated they were happy to learn English. However, only the student who attended the English-only elementary school talked about encouraging other students to speak English both in and out of the classroom and at home and at the same time stated that she wanted to see teachers lead by examples by speaking English and not Tok Pisin or the local vernacular as shown below:

Line 27: ‘uhm I speak English most of the time in school so when I hear other teachers speaking Kuanua and pidgin like in upper grades it’s not good because we not gonna use that language to write exam papers so I want them to be speaking English also as we students look up to them as our role models.’ Line 30:
‘…I think that they should also speak English inside and outside of the classroom’.

(IV21/stu/Leah/17.06.09)

The other five students stated that it would have been helpful if they had been introduced to English at a much earlier age (like Leah) in their elementary schools so that by the time they moved onto Grade 3 in primary schools they would have already had a better understanding of English. Two students stated specifically that if they had been taught English at the elementary school, they would not have found so many difficulties learning English at the primary school:

Line 30: ‘I have to learn English in elementary school so by the time I come to primary school I will already know and won’t find it difficult’.

(IV25/stu/Alanna/18.06.09)

Another student mentioned that she was very keen to learn English but wished her parents spoke English with her at home where she could practice her English skills. Bradley even mentioned that learning English at an earlier age would give him the competence in speaking the language when working in the workforce in future:

Line 20: ‘I should have learnt it at elementary so that when teachers here speak English to me I should be able to reply to them well’.

Line 42: ‘if they talk to me in my future job I will be able to speak English to them confidently’.

(IV27/stu/Bradley/18.06.09)

In summary, all students had a very positive attitude towards learning English in school despite the fact that five of them found difficulties understanding the language. Although they embraced Tok Pisin and Tolai as the languages which they became literate in, they described English as a much more important language which they had to master in order to use in the workforce in future. These students were concerned about their personal abilities in acquiring English. They mentioned that if they had been introduced to English at a much earlier age at the elementary schools it would have lessened the difficulties they were facing at the time of the interviews. One student spoke about her wish to see all teachers speaking English at school and not Tolai as they are role models to the students and also her wish to see her parents speaking English to her at
home to help her with her oral skills in English. Another spoke about the need for English for future employment. The use of Tok Pisin and Tolai at the elementary school was embraced by most students but the collective wish of most of them was to be literate in English in order to have a successful future.

6.5. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the attitudes and perceptions held by curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards policy and practice in the current bilingual education program in PNG. Analysis of the interview data revealed that curriculum officers were more in favour of the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages in the lower primary classroom compared to teachers and parents, who had a split in their perceptions. In line with data from the questionnaires, the majority of teachers and parents had grave concerns about the outcomes of the current bilingual education reform, with many wishing to abolish the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages and return to English-only. A minority on the other hand, were supportive of the bilingual policy and agreed with the views of curriculum officers. The students interviewed were in favour of using both Tok Pisin and the local vernacular in the classroom as the languages helped them understand English concepts better. However, all the students acknowledged the importance of learning English. This again mirrors the questionnaire findings.

In general, the analysis of the interviews added substance to the findings of the questionnaire data. The interviews did, however, also highlight some additional interesting findings: the observations from teachers that not all families and children saw the need for, or usefulness of English, and the role of parents in the education of children - pointed out by some of the parents and children.

The interviews also provided some useful data on the participants’ views on whether the current bilingual education policy is being implemented in schools (Research Question 2). The findings revealed a number of mismatches in policy and practice which includes: the transition to English period (from Tok Pisin and Tolai) is not always being adhered to; the deployment of teachers to schools where teachers do not speak the L1 of the students is an increasing problem; an increase in student numbers resulting in overcrowding in classrooms needs attention; shortage of bilingual
teachers and the need for more funding to re-train teachers from the English-only system, and finally, the need for improvement in monitoring and evaluation of bilingual teachers’ performances and the bilingual programs and the lack of teaching resources need to be addressed to close the gap between the goals of PNG’s bilingual education policy and the current situation.
CHAPTER SEVEN
DISCUSSION

7. Introduction
The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the languages used in the current bilingual education program in PNG. In particular it examined the participants’ attitudes towards the use of Tok Pisin and Tolai in six primary schools in East New Britain Province and explored similarities and differences between the different groups. The study also investigated the perceptions and attitudes of these participating groups on whether the current policy on bilingual education is being implemented in schools.

The findings revealed conflicting views amongst the participants’ attitudes towards the languages used in the current bilingual program. It found that the concept of using Tok Pisin and vernacular languages in PNG classrooms has not been fully accepted thus creating ambivalence among Papua New Guineans. This is a similar trend to the literature on Pidgin English in Cameroon (Mbufong, 2001), classroom pidgin in Hawaii (Dunford, 1999), creole language education in Jamaica (McCourtie, 1998), mother-tongue based bilingual education in Nigeria (Igboanusi, 2008), language of instruction in Ghana (Sellers, 2007), and literacy in two languages in South Africa (Holmarsdottir, 2003), where the dichotomy between indigenous languages (including pidgins and creoles) and English has continued to be of paramount debate.

The findings of this study provide evidence that there was a general feeling of appreciation and support for the use of Tok Pisin in the classroom, however, the use of Tolai was not as strongly supported. In terms of the practices and delivery of bilingual teaching in the participating schools, it was found that trilingual teaching in Tok Pisin, Tolai and English was a common trend in contrast to bilingual teaching, particularly in Tolai and English programs. The study also found that although some participants embraced the current bilingual education program in the country, they were concerned about the increasing problems which affected both the teachers at the teaching level and the worrying outcomes that were seen amongst the students at the end of Grade 8 in primary schools.
This chapter provides a discussion of the key research findings presented in chapters five and six with reference to each of the research questions. The findings of this study are also discussed in relation to previous research studies. The first section (7.1) addresses the first research question by focusing on the attitudinal similarities and differences towards languages used in the current education reform. It also discusses important factors influencing attitudes to the current bilingual education program. The second section (7.2) addresses the second research question which aims to find out if the current policy on bilingual education is being implemented in schools based on the participants’ views. The third section (7.3) discusses the unexpected findings of this research and the fourth section (7.4) is the conclusion of this chapter.

7.1. Key Findings of Research Question One
As introduced in Section 1.4, the first research question is: ‘What are the attitudes of curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classroom?’ The key findings are presented under two sub-questions: 7.1.1: Sub - Question 1 and 7.1.2: Sub - Question 2.

7.1.1. Sub – Question One
What are the similarities between the curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classroom?

Support for Tok Pisin
This study revealed that there was general support for Tok Pisin usage among curriculum officers. They contended that since Tok Pisin is now the most preferred medium of communication in PNG and the mother tongue of thousands of Papua New Guinean children (Smith, 2002), it was only proper that it was used as a medium of instruction just like the local vernaculars in schools. However, curriculum officers argued that if Tok Pisin was to remain successful as a language of instruction, it must be standardized to minimize the degree of dissimilarity in the different linguistic regions of the country (Devette-Chee, 2011) and to enable uniformity in teaching and assessment across all schools nationwide.
Like curriculum officers, the majority of teachers applauded the use of Tok Pisin in the classroom, claiming that it helped a lot in situations where teachers do not speak the students’ mother tongue and as a medium of communication in school settings where children come from different linguistic backgrounds, and additionally as a ‘tool’ that students use for self-expression when they exhaust English words in their mental lexicons. This confirms Siegel (1997) who found that “initial instruction in Tok Pisin in PNG is a help and not a hindrance to learning English and other participants” (p. 86).

Some parents also supported the use of Tok Pisin in the classroom. These parents claimed that Tok Pisin is important for children to learn as it is a growing national language and children needed it to survive in all domains of society in PNG, which is in line with Tryon and Charpentier (2004). Further confirming this positive attitude are the findings of a Mann-Whitney U test which tested for significant differences between Tok Pisin parents and Tok Pisin teachers. Findings revealed that there was no significant difference (p=.784) in attitudes of both groups towards Q 27. ‘Teaching Tok Pisin in elementary school is important for a child’s survival in PNG society’.

Like teachers and parents, students were more supportive of Tok Pisin usage in the classroom compared to Tolai. They said Tok Pisin helped them speak to teachers and understand English better. Interestingly, findings showed that children were more supportive of the use of Tok Pisin than some teachers and parents. Among the students (n=242) who were surveyed through questionnaires, the majority reported that Tok Pisin was in fact helping them understand basic English concepts through self-expression, which again supports Siegel’s (1997) findings. Further findings from the statistically analysed data revealed that children use Tok Pisin heavily in their homes with their families, in the classroom with teachers (in a bilingual mode with English), and in the school playground and after school with their friends. This indicates that Tok Pisin plays an important role in the lives of Papua New Guinean children today and confirms Smith’s (2002) finding on Tok Pisin being the L1 for many PNG children.

**Support for Vernacular Languages**

The study also revealed that curriculum officers were generally in favour of using the local vernaculars in children’s initial education as it sets a foundation in children whereby they can
utilize and transfer the skills they learnt in their first language to other languages that they later learn in life such as English. These officers believed that bilingual education (in local vernaculars and English) facilitates the development of both the L1 and L2. A number of studies have confirmed that students who develop higher levels of literacy in their L1 have an easier time developing literacy in the L2 (Krashen, 1996). In agreement with previous studies (Shin and Gribbons 1996; Shin and Krashen, 1996) there was strong support for this idea among curriculum officers in this study. Another reason for the support for vernacular languages by these officers was that it helps maintain and preserve culture and gives children an identity, the latter in line with McCarty (2008), who states that the mother tongue symbolizes a deep, abiding, even cord-like connection between speakers and their cultural identity.

Teacher findings revealed that a small number of teachers (new graduates who are bilingual certified teachers) also supported the use of vernacular languages, stating that the languages do help when they are bridging the children to English and therefore play an important role in children’s education. These teachers maintained that like other bilingual education programs elsewhere in the world, it is better to teach children first in a language that they know, and then use this language to bridge them onto English at a later stage confirming Kale (2005) and Ball (2010).

Findings also confirmed that a small group of parents, like teachers, were in favour of the use of vernacular languages in the classrooms. This group claimed that using the children’s L1 helped preserve and maintain the languages and cultures similar to the views of curriculum officers in line with the findings of Igboanusi (2008).

Findings from the questionnaires also revealed that Tolai students appreciated the use of Tolai as part of their cultural heritage and identity in agreement with the literature and confirming the perceptions of Baker (2006) and the curriculum officers and some parents and teachers. However, only a minority of Tolai students reported that they only used Tolai with their teachers in the classroom for clarification and enhancing their understanding of English concepts, which supports Klaus (2003).
The next subsection presents the findings of the participants’ attitudinal differences towards Tok Pisin and vernacular languages.

7.1.2. Sub – Question Two
What are the differences between the curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classroom?

This study revealed a number of issues on Tok Pisin and vernacular languages in relation to Sub-Question 2. As a result of their differing attitudes, the concerns raised by the different groups of participants varied. These are discussed below:

Conflicting views about Tok Pisin

Tok Pisin, a threat to vernacular languages
As discussed in 7.1.1, curriculum officers were very supportive of the use of Tok Pisin in the current bilingual education program; however, they were concerned about Tok Pisin threatening vernacular languages due to its dominance in all domains of society thus resulting in language loss.

The call for Tok Pisin to be standardised
The curriculum officers also raised concerns about the need for Tok Pisin to be standardized in schools. These concerns were raised as a result of what they claimed as a rapid increase in different varieties of Tok Pisin in the major urban centres and regions around the country, as discussed by Devette-Chee (2011, pp. 96-97).

Tok Pisin hinders students’ learning
Like curriculum officers, teachers raised a number of concerns about the use of Tok Pisin but they were slightly different. A small group contended that using Tok Pisin as a medium of instruction in the classroom only interfered and confused students, thus hindering their learning progress in English. This supports Charpentier (1997), who argued that pidgins and creoles are not suitable for literacy and use in formal education in Vanuatu due to negative transfer that occurs when pupils subsequently learn English. This feeling of uncertainty among this minority
of teacher participants led them to question whether the language is appropriate for use in the current education reform, which is in line with Seller’s (2007) views on pidgin in education, which she describes as a language not seriously considered as a medium of instruction (p. 7). On a similar note, Siegel (1999), points out that because of “continuing negative attitudes about creoles and minority dialects it would still be difficult to get teachers and parents to accept using any of these varieties as a medium of instruction” (p. 524).

The views of the parents towards Tok Pisin were more similar to the teachers than to the curriculum officers. They acknowledged its prevalence and usefulness for life in PNG but queried its appropriateness as a medium of instruction in schools. However, they were less convinced than either teachers or students of statements that Tok Pisin could help with the learning of English. They saw it as more of a hindrance than a help. Nevertheless, like teachers and students, parents rated the educational value of Tok Pisin significantly higher than the educational value of Tolai.

Conflicting views about vernacular languages

*Attitudes towards local vernaculars (Tolai)*

Unlike curriculum officers, who strongly supported the use of vernacular languages in the classroom, the majority of teachers were not very supportive of the use of local vernaculars. In addition, findings of a Mann-Whitney U test revealed that Tolai teachers had a significantly lower level of agreement (p=.009) to the statement Q32 ‘The use of Tolai alongside English in the classroom helps students acquire English easily’ compared to Tok Pisin teachers’ attitudes towards Tok Pisin alongside English. This suggests that Tolai teachers in general have a low regard of Tolai usage in children’s education.

These negative attitudes towards Tolai were also evidenced in the parents’ interviews where nine parents spoke vocally against the use of local vernaculars in the classroom. Although worldwide research has proven that literacy in the child’s first language (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000) enables the child to learn the dominant language (English) better, many parents in this particular study had a completely different perspective. What parents wanted to see, similar to what Skutnabb-
Kangas (2000) pointed out as claimed by other researchers, was a good education in English which would enable their children to get paid jobs in the future.

An important finding was that students appreciated the use of vernacular languages more than teachers and parents. However, as discussed in Chapter 5, some Tolai students do not appear convinced of the importance of Tolai for speaking with their teachers or understanding English. This is perhaps not surprising given that the findings of this study revealed that Tok Pisin plays a large role in classrooms that are supposedly Tolai/English bilingual settings.

7.1.3. Important Factors Influencing Attitudes towards the Bilingual Program
The following is a detailed discussion of other factors that influence attitudes towards the bilingual education program in PNG. The discussion is organised under the following subtopics: 7.1.3.1: The importance of English, 7.1.3.2: Transition from Tok Pisin and Vernacular Languages to English, 7.1.3.3: Awareness of the Provisions of Bilingual Education Programs, 7.1.3.4: The Influence of Training on Attitudes, and 7.1.3.5: Lack of Resources and Resource Funding.

7.1.3.1. The Importance of English
Like many multilingual countries around the world, English has been viewed as a cornerstone to prosperity and good will which exerts power and status, and PNG is no exception. A study by Mazrui (2002) on the language scenario in African countries (which were former British and French colonies) resembles the current perception that Papua New Guineans have about the role of English today.

Curriculum officers described English as a difficult language to learn, recalling their own learning experiences during the period of Australian administration where they were forced to learn English. This alienated them from their culture which confirms Matane (1986). This is one of the reasons they so strongly support the current education system where students are learning with ease in a language they know. Their views support Skutnabb-Kangas’ (2000), contention that when children’s education is in a language they do not know, whether due to family choice or lack of an alternative, it violates the child’s rights.
Teachers, on the other hand, were more vocal about the significance of English in the current education system alongside the use of Tok Pisin and vernaculars (see Section 6.2.2.1). This is similar to the findings of a study in Arizona by Garcia-Nevarez, et al (2005) that the significance of English, which ESL teachers were taught to believe to be ‘the key to success’, a common slogan on most classroom noticeboards and hallways (which often read: ‘English is the key to success’ or ‘Speak English only and you will succeed’) during pre and post independence days in PNG, is still colouring the attitudes of traditional ESL teachers in contrast to bilingual certified teachers. This no doubt influences teacher attitudes towards the bilingual education program in PNG.

Teachers’ attitudes to the bilingual policy are also affected by the link between the current educational reform and falling standards of English and high drop-out rates. Teachers are overwhelmed by the fact that most children are failing to master the basic skills of English (not being able to read and speak English) after having gone through the transition and bridging to English period enshrined in the bilingual program in the lower primary years. There are alarming scenarios where entire classes fail to read and comprehend English. As reported by a female teacher (IV13/teach/Martha/9.06.09), out of her class of forty students, only ten knew how to read in English while thirty were struggling. Worse still were concerns raised about the nature of tests which are all written and conducted in English which students have great difficulties comprehending. Such reasons explain why many teachers do not support bilingual education.

Many parents also fail to see the benefits of bilingual education claiming that their children are being deprived of their rights of not being fully literate in English by the time they complete primary school. A similar sentiment was expressed by parents in Hawaii (Dunford, 1999), Jamaica (McCourtie, 1998), and Cameroon (Mbufong, 2001). These past studies revealed that parents thought that using Pidgin English and mother tongue in the classrooms undermined the learning of Standard English. Interestingly, the parents who participated in this research were far more supportive than teachers of the statement ‘English is an international language therefore children should acquire it at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life’. There was a highly significant difference (p< .001).
Further confirming this strong demand for English were parents from a particular village in Kokopo (see 6.3.2.1) who showed their dissatisfaction with the current situation by pointing out that most children from their village today do not go beyond Grade 8 compared to the past. They claim that the contributing factors include poor foundation in English skills, and that their children are either still illiterate or semi-literate in English by the time they complete Grade 8 and therefore are denied places at high school and are forced to go back to the village as drop-outs. This is a real problem in this village as more and more children now drop out of Grade 8 and become a threat to the village community as there are no job opportunities for them in such an environment (see also Rena, 2011).

These children may be literate in their mother tongue, Tolai and/or Tok Pisin, but what good will these bring them if there are no job opportunities using their own tokples? Honan (2003, p. 7) highlighted this very question in her paper on ‘Disrupting assumptions about vernacular education in PNG’. She questioned what would happen in PNG communities in twenty years’ time when most people have had a basic education using their own mother tongue. She also questioned what social practices would change or arise with the development of tokples literacy practices. The reality of this scenario is now dawning in one village in Kokopo as described by three parents where children have returned to the village with the feeling of regret, humiliation and denigration of their rights of gaining a good education, thus adding to the already existing social and economic ills in the village.

This study showed an equally strong demand for English among students as young as 9-14 years old in lower primary schools, probably a ‘flow-on effect’ from their parents on how they should perceive English. Such views influenced their attitudes towards the languages they used in the classroom. From the students’ questionnaire data, it is clear that although they appreciated learning Tok Pisin and Tolai as part of their cultural heritage, they saw English as a language of high importance in terms of reading their exam papers (which are all written in English), English being an international language and most importantly, the expectations of their parents to be literate in English in order to secure future job opportunities, the ultimate goal of most parents. This conforms to past studies such as Mbufong’s (2001), who stated that “parents are naturally anxious that their children should become doctors, lawyers, engineers, architects, graduate
teachers etc” (p. 2), and Igboanusi’s (2008), who reiterated that English is important in securing jobs and that the association of English with prestige, power and opportunities has been the driving force for the preference of many parents to wish education in that language for their children.

However, responses from teachers in the interviews indicate that not all parents are as convinced of the importance of English as those who participated in this study. Some teachers reported a strong village influence undermining the schools’ attempts to transition to English. One teacher spoke of the need to make children aware of the importance of learning English in order for them to stay focused and appreciate why they are learning the language. The parents who took part in this study may have been particularly concerned about the current system.

The findings also revealed that there was a lack of parental support in English for their students/children at home. The study found that in most homes, Tok Pisin was the most common medium of communication, followed by Tolai, whilst the use of English was either very minimal or non-existent. It was also found that English usage in the classroom was very limited in its quantity and there was a narrow focus on specific vocabulary and English concepts thus encouraging ‘rote-learning’ (which should have been phased out) to dominate the lesson, especially in classes taught by traditional ESL teachers. Students’ responses in English, if they responded at all in English, were limited to one-word answers with no explanations in most cases. Evidence from the questionnaire data showed that students seldom used English outside the classroom with their peers.

It is clear from the data that students need help in English both in and out of the classroom. Teachers and parents are the key players in helping their students/children achieve the ultimate goal of securing job opportunities and, therefore, need to play their part if they wish to see their students/children become successful in life. Parents in particular could provide an avenue at home where their children are able to practise English, a wish that was expressed by a student in this study (IV25/stu/Alanna/18.06.09) who wishes to see her parents speak English to her at home in order to help her with her oral skills in English. However, using English at home might conflict with the family’s identity in a Tolai or Tok Pisin-speaking community.
7.1.3.2. Transition from Tok Pisin and Vernacular Languages to English

A second contributing factor towards the participants’ attitudes to the languages used in bilingual education was the timing of transition from Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars to English in Grade 3. There was a general feeling of dissatisfaction among teachers and parents about the age at which students are bridged to English. The majority wanted an earlier transition to English. However, it was surprising to find that parents were far more discontented with the current age of transition than teachers. As the Mann-Whitney U test showed (see 5.2.3), parents were significantly more in agreement with the statement ‘English is an international language therefore children should acquire it at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life’ than teachers (p< .001).

As a reminder, according to the Philosophy of Curriculum Reform (2007, p. 9), English is first introduced to children towards the end of grade two (in elementary schools), which involves simple oral English. By the time they reach Grade 3 in primary school, the actual bridging in a bilingual mode takes place up until Grade 5 when they are supposed to have mastered all English basic skills and are ready for an all-English classroom in upper primary (Grade 6-8). Many participants in this study believe that children are not achieving the English outcomes stipulated in the national primary reform curriculum on bilingual education, and they attribute these poor outcomes to English being introduced too late.

An important finding in this study is that some participants prefer either an education system where English is introduced together with Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars from day one in elementary school or where English is the sole language of instruction from elementary prep up to Grade 12, in other words a re-introduction of the English-only curriculum.

These views are clearly at odds with the literature which shows that requiring children to transition too soon to education in a new language (such as English) can be detrimental to their learning processes and their academic achievement (Porter, 1990). This is further supported by UNESCO (2008) which suggests that the transition to a language of instruction other than the child’s L1 should not be required of students before 6 to 8 years of formal schooling. Other
studies have also concluded that children who learn in L1 for the first 6-8 years of formal schooling have better academic performance and self-esteem than those who receive instruction exclusively in the official language or those who transition too early from the home language to the official language.

7.1.3.3. Awareness of the Provisions of Bilingual Education Programs
Thirdly it was found that lack of awareness was another factor which influenced the attitudes of stakeholders towards the current bilingual education. From the interviews, questionnaires and personal acquaintances with parents in participating schools, it was found that often they do not understand the nature of bilingual programs and the mechanisms of learning a second or foreign language. While teachers are trying to assist their children learn English through the use of Tok Pisin and the vernacular languages with limited teaching and learning resources, they are at the same time defending themselves explaining the rationale of the program to parents who continuously criticise the poor outcomes they witness in their children. This is a very similar situation to the one Garcia-Nevarez, et al. (2005) found in their study on Arizona elementary teachers’ attitudes towards English language learners. The influence of lack of awareness is also in line with the views of Ball (2010), who emphasizes the importance of ‘parent education and community awareness’ as shown below:

Parents need to be assisted, through parent education, demonstration projects, and community-wide awareness raising campaigns, to see the value for children to continue to develop proficiency in L1, and reassured that, despite some initial delay in the lingua franca, their children are more likely to succeed in acquiring both L1 and additional languages if they are given the opportunity to participate in mother tongue-based bi/multilingual pre-primary and primary education (p. 46).

The findings also revealed a lack of awareness and understanding among teachers. Prior to the introduction of the bilingual program, there was a general climate of unpreparedness and unwillingness to take on board the changes and to accommodate the new innovations in curriculum and material design for teaching. The data suggests that some teachers still do not fully grasp the nature of transitional bilingual education. This is indicated by their questioning the purpose of teaching a child’s mother tongue rather than seeing it as a medium for learning and literacy development.
Curriculum officers fully recognise the importance of awareness. They maintained that unless there is cooperation and awareness among all stakeholders and the general public in PNG, people will not appreciate the true meaning of bilingual education which uses Tok Pisin and vernacular languages.

7.1.3.4. The Influence of Training on Attitudes

A fourth factor which influenced the attitudes of teachers in this study is the type of qualification or endorsement they hold. The curriculum officers noted the importance of teachers’ qualifications, training and in-service sessions for teachers throughout PNG at the primary level. Officers wanted to upgrade their own qualifications to assist them to arrange continuous workshops and in-service training for teachers in schools throughout the country.

The influence of training and experience on teachers’ attitudes to bilingual education is shown by the fact that bilingual certified teachers were more supportive of the usage of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the classroom than traditional ESL teachers. Teachers who had not experienced learning through the medium of their mother tongue themselves, who had not observed other competent teachers using mother tongue successfully, and had no, or very little, specific training in bilingual education experienced difficulties and confusion. This partly conforms to Shin and Krashen’s (1996) study on teachers’ perceptions on bilingual education, who found that teachers with supplementary training such as ESL and bilingual training were more inclined to accepting bilingual education.

The crux of this problem in all participating schools in this study is the shortage of bilingual certified teachers. It was found that many teachers (who had been teaching for more than twenty years) had no formal training in bilingual education and therefore had great difficulties in bridging students from Tok Pisin or Tolai to English. At the same time, they experienced problems in planning in two or more languages. While some teachers said that lack of funding prevented them from enrolling in bilingual in-service training programs, others were totally against bilingual education. The bilingual certified teachers who had been teaching for one to ten years and embraced the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages as mediums of instruction in
the classroom, were being adversely affected by such attitudes. As one vocal male teacher said in an interview:

‘… it took me two years to get this training in theory and for me to implement it on the field, it will take a while to adjust myself since most of these teachers on the field are still not familiar with the new bilingual education system. Most of them are still in the old system so some of us after graduating from the college in this new reform we just fall in line with what they have in place. I am finding it hard to adjust myself to put into practice what I learnt and just going along with what everyone is doing here’.

(IV12/teach/William/21.05.09)

Thus new graduates (bilingual certified teachers) deployed to schools which still have strong traces of the English-only culture are not able to fully put theory into practice. This problem seems greater in village schools, possibly due to the high proportion of Tolai teachers (who are traditional ESL practitioners) in village schools who are still not ready to accommodate the new changes. In contrast, the urban schools have a lot of teachers from different provinces of PNG who are better prepared to accept changes. Teachers in two urban schools in this study were found to have a good rapport with the new bilingual certified graduates, encouraging the latter to utilise new practices learned in college meaningfully in their lessons. This shows that teachers’ educational training and knowledge of a second or third language affects teachers’ personal beliefs, behaviour, and practices, which confirms Shin and Krashen (1996). Teacher attitudes thus have a great influence on the successful outcomes of bilingual education in PNG.

7.1.3.5. Lack of Resources and Resource Funding

Another factor which contributed to the attitudes of participants was the perceived lack of teaching and learning resources in all schools. Litteral (2004, p. 7) first highlighted the lack of vernacular materials when the education reform was newly introduced by reporting what the NDOE and SIL had done in terms of sets of printed pictures and Shell Books to supplement teaching resources that were produced locally. It is now eighteen years into this education reform and teachers are still highlighting the lack of resources.
Two teachers who had previously taught in remote schools in the country where the language of instruction was a minority language claimed that they had difficulties teaching as the language lacked a written alphabet. This confirms yet another issue which Litteral (2004) pointed out, namely that many smaller languages in PNG had yet to have their alphabets developed. With SIL’s assistance, alphabets for another 135 smaller languages were developed in alphabet design workshops (Wroge and Hoel, 2003). As already mentioned, over 400 languages now have orthographies and are being used in elementary schools throughout the country. However, the remaining 400 plus languages, representing the smaller language communities, are most in need of support.

Although it may have started off as a brilliant idea in the Matane Report (1986) for the inclusion of all PNG vernacular languages in the current school system due to the loss of relevance of education for the majority of students, and the lack of early childhood education opportunities as stated by Kale (2005, p. 2), critics like Honan (2003) have pointed out that “It is obviously impossible for the NDOE to provide classroom materials in 850 languages” (p. 4). Litteral (2004, p. 9) mentioned that AusAID did provide grants for training and materials. However, these grants were given only from the period 1997 to 2002, leaving the PNG government to step in and take control of the situation then.

As noted in Chapter 6, the shortage of teaching materials provided by the NDOE has forced teachers to: a) use the class sets of resources from the previous English-only curriculum, b) illegally purchase at their own costs pirated copies of text books which are not approved by the NDOE and/or c) spend a lot of time and energy producing locally made materials. Teachers are very creative and can produce appropriate learning materials if supported financially by the school administration.

Teachers suggested that both the NDOE and the BOM adequately fund the production of teaching resources to minimize the current difficulties faced by teachers. Unless this issue is dealt with by the NDOE and BOMs, the lack of teaching resources will continue to affect teachers’ views of the current bilingual education system and prevent it from achieving the successful outcomes that schools and families expect.
7.2. Key Findings of Research Question Two

Research Question Two:

Based on participants’ views, is the current policy on bilingual education being implemented in schools? In answer to this question, the main findings are divided into a number of key areas below:

**In-service training and workshops**

Findings revealed that the curriculum officers, who are also policy planners, are providing in-service training and workshops on bilingual teaching and material design at the PNGEI to teachers who lack bilingual teaching skills. This is in line with the terms and conditions of the bilingual policy, which is to train teachers who do not have the knowledge and skills in bilingual teaching.

However, as discussed in 7.1.3.4, the study found that the majority of the older teachers are not fully implementing the bilingual policy because they lack awareness, knowledge and skills in bilingual teaching (e.g. they lack the skills in planning in two languages). Therefore, head teachers with assistance from the Provincial and National Education divisions need to work together to encourage and support these teachers financially to undergo training to help bridge the current gap between policy and practice.

**The use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages**

From their visits to schools, the curriculum officers happily reported that the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages in the classroom situates well with the multilingual situation in PNG. They assume that teachers are using the students’ L1 as the medium of instruction in the classroom.

However, data collected in this current study clearly showed that a lot of Tok Pisin is being used in transitional programs regardless of what language was used in elementary schools. This may be because the teacher is more fluent in Tok Pisin than the vernacular designated as the L1 for that class, or some of the students use Tok Pisin more than the vernacular. Whatever the reasons, responses from this study indicate that current teacher practices do not conform to the NDOE Lower Primary Language Teachers’ Guide which advises teachers that students attending Tolai...
elementary schools should be taught entirely in Tolai when they move onto Grade 3 while
students attending Tok Pisin elementary schools should be taught in Tok Pisin to prevent
confusion among students.

Deployment of teachers to schools
Teachers are being posted to schools where the language of instruction is unknown to them. In
such a situation it is clearly not possible for the teacher concerned to use the vernacular as the
medium of instruction. This is a worrying issue and confirms Morgan (2005), who also found in
his study similar concerns raised by curriculum officers as shown below:

“twenty-two per cent of Grade 3 students said that their teacher does not speak their vernacular, which
rose to 64 per cent of Grade 4 students surveyed. It seems that schools are not adhering to the bridging
policy of gradual transition from vernacular to English” (p.1)

Teaching Resources from the English-only System.
Lack of teaching resources has been one of the major issues highlighted throughout this study.
As a result, teachers are still using teaching resources from the English-only days as described by
a curriculum officer below:

Line 6: we have teachers who come for in-service training and we take them and you know some of them
from the remote areas, they don’t know anything about the reform and also they are saying they’re still
using the Minenda and Pacific series from the old system’.
Line 8. ‘The reform should also be in line with resources. There’re no resources and also the teacher
student ratio should be right. You go down to Ward Strip Demonstration School, there’s sixty to seventy
students there, so overcrowded with very limited resources, and with this reform system how are you going
to get the students to, you know, achieve their objectives at the end of their lessons’?
(IV6/Curricoff/Jessie/6.05.09)

Teachers in this study also reported that the lack of teaching and learning resources in most
schools is severely impeding the full implementation of the bilingual policy. The fact that
English-only materials are reportedly still being used, also suggests that the bilingual policy is
not being fully implemented.
**Monitoring and Evaluation**

According to the curriculum officers in this study, monitoring and evaluation units were initially set up in each province to cater for teachers in each specific district. Elementary officers, trainers, and inspectors (now standard officers) in these units in provincial education headquarters are responsible for measuring the performance of all teachers in the current education reform. However, there is a major lack of funds nationwide to carry out the necessary monitoring and evaluation of teachers’ performance and progress in PNG. This therefore affects the full implementation of the bilingual policy.

In terms of school assessment policies, teachers reported that the assessment of students’ progress was also problematic. As Litteral (2004) pointed out, with so many languages involved in the current system, trying to develop equivalent means for monitoring national standards is difficult compared to the English system, which emphasized standardized testing and assessment. It was also found that the assessment procedures in the current bilingual education guidelines were not being followed in all schools. Certain teachers who had taught in the English-only system still do not fully accept nor use the new ‘on-going assessment’ approach.

**Transition/Bridging period from the students’ L1 to English**

Data from teacher responses indicates that the transition/bridging period from the students’ L1 to English is not being successfully implemented within the required time frame. Bridging from Tok Pisin and vernacular languages should begin in Grade 3 and continue up to Grade 5 (in lower primary), enabling students to master basic skills in English ready for Grades 6-8 in upper primary. However, in reality, this is not working as evidenced in the many participants’ responses like the one below:

… at the upper primary now there is no more bilingual no more planning in two languages it’s pure English but we still encounter a lot of problems especially with grammar skills therefore we are still using Tok Pisin and Tolai to assist us in our teaching. Still students find it hard to write in English (IV48/teach/Tammy/05.12.09).
Parents’ responses also indicated a gap between bilingual policy and practice. The view of many of the parents that children are leaving school without adequate proficiency in English indicates that the transition from Tok Pisin and/or vernacular to English is not in line with the policy goals.

The above discussion therefore shows that there is a need for the NDOE to carry out an assessment and evaluation in schools to measure how practices at the school level match the bilingual education policy. It is clear from the findings in this study that although the bilingual policy is being implemented to some extent, there are a number of mismatches between policy and practice also known as the “policy gap” (Sayed, 2002, p. 29), which is a common trait in countries that practice bilingual education.

7.3. Unexpected Findings
A number of findings which were not expected by the researcher in the initial phase of this study are discussed in this section.

a) It was found that some teachers in schools that were categorised by the NDOE as Tolai bilingual schools (see section 4.3.1) were not actually teaching through the medium of Tolai. Thus, unexpectedly, a number of teachers in these schools asked to complete the Tok Pisin questionnaires and distributed the Tok Pisin questionnaire to their students instead of the Tolai questionnaire.

b) In addition, students in Tolai dominated classes who were initially assumed by the researcher to be using mainly Tolai in the classrooms and in the school grounds, a common assumption by education officials and curriculum officers in this study, actually reported that they used Tok Pisin in contrast to Tolai. This indicates that a ‘language shift’ from vernacular to Tok Pisin is permeating the schools that participated in this study. Language shift from vernacular or indigenous languages to Tok Pisin was also reported by Sumbuk (2006) on the basis of observations he made on speakers of Sare and Kaningara in the Sepik area, and by Kulick (1997) on Taiap. This has a bearing on the question of whether pidgins can be used in school programs. As the CRIP Report (2004) showed, Grade 4 students who had an English and Tok Pisin experience in Grade 3 performed, on average, better in both mathematics and language.
assessments than those with an English and vernacular experience, confirming the strength of Tok Pisin usage in the classrooms. The rapid increase in children shifting from their vernacular to Tok Pisin enables the latter to become the language of dominance (see also Mühlhausler, 2003).

c) Teachers in all participating schools reported that they used Tok Pisin more with their colleagues and students either monolingually or bilingually with English. This shows that Tok Pisin is fast replacing all other languages at the workplace but less at home, thus confirming yet again the observations of Mühlhausler (2003) and reaffirming Nekitel (1998).

d) An important finding in this study was clear evidence of the increase in the trilingual mode of teaching (Tok Pisin, Tolai and English) by teachers compared to bilingual teaching in either Tok Pisin and English or Tolai and English. Some teachers reported on the advantages of this approach during the bridging to English period while others thought it caused confusion.

e) Finally the study revealed that while parents complained bitterly about their children’s lack of proficiency in English, unlike themselves (who were educated in the English-only curriculum), their responses and those of their children indicated that they failed to assist their children at home with their English skills. Only one Tolai parent in this study spoke English with her child, one used it in a bilingual mode with Tolai, and three used it in a bilingual mode with Tok Pisin. No Tok Pisin parent was found to speak English only with their children, but twelve used it trilingually with Tolai and Tok Pisin. This could contribute to the poor English outcomes in schools since the literature emphasizes that parents are key elements in children’s educational upbringing and successful bilingual education programs (Baker, 1992; Gardner, 1985; Sung and Padilla, 1998).

7.4. Conclusion
This chapter has discussed the key findings of the study in relation to the two research questions of this study. The first section (Section 7.1) discussed question one, which investigated the attitudinal similarities and differences that existed among curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the languages (Tok Pisin, Tolai and English) used in the current bilingual education program in PNG. Findings indicated five factors that influenced the way the four
groups of cohorts perceived the current bilingual education program. The second section (7.2) discussed the findings of research question two. The study found several mismatches in policy and practice which indicates the need for head teachers, Provincial Education Authorities and the NDOE in PNG to more closely assess and monitor how the bilingual program is being implemented in schools. The third section (7.3) discussed five unexpected findings which also contribute to a critical assessment of the current bilingual program. The major findings discussed in this chapter indicate the need for a major evaluation of the language policy in the current education reform if the country wishes to provide a successful bi/multilingual education for Papua New Guinean children.
CHAPTER EIGHT

Conclusions and Recommendations

8. Introduction

This final chapter presents a synthesis of the findings of this study, suggests conclusions, outlines its limitations, and offers recommendations for further research. The organization of the chapter is as follows: Section 8.1: Revisiting the purpose of this study, Section 8.2: Key findings of the study, Section 8.3: Limitations of the study, Section 8.4: Contribution to theory, Section 8.5: Implications and recommendations of research findings, Section 8.6: Epilogue.

8.1. Revisiting the Purpose of this Study

The research was undertaken to investigate the attitudes and similarities and differences that curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students have towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages with a focus on Tolai for instruction at the lower primary level and how these languages are impacting on PNG children’s learning. It also sought to investigate if the current policy on bilingual education is being implemented in schools based on the views of the participants. The major reason why this study was carried out was because of the curriculum change from English-only to a bilingual education (in Tok Pisin and local vernaculars) in PNG’s education system in the mid 1990’s which resulted in an on-going national debate. The study focused on six primary schools in the Kokopo District in East New Britain Province on an initial assumption that all schools were adhering to the reformed bilingual language policy. That is, the two urban schools were assumed to be using the bilingual mode of Tok Pisin - English whilst the village schools were using Tolai - English. Interestingly, this was not the case.

A mixed-method methodology was used which collected data through questionnaires and interviews to answer the following questions:

1. What are the attitudes of curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classroom?
*Sub-Question One:* What are the similarities between the curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classroom?

*Sub-Question Two:* What are the differences between the curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages for instruction in the lower primary classroom?

2. Is the current policy on bilingual education being implemented in schools based on the participants’ views?

### 8.2. Key Findings of the Study

A discussed in detail in Chapter 7, the data gathered from participants indicates that there are many deficiencies in the current transitional bilingual program in PNG. The vast majority of participants, regardless of their stated level of support for the current system, mentioned the lack of support in terms of funding, resources, and training.

Responses from the teachers, parents and students also indicate that policy makers and officers at the national and provincial level do not know enough about what is actually happening in classrooms, particularly in schools outside major towns and cities. Such information is vital to ensure the policies being followed are the most suitable and are being implemented as fully as possible.

The findings demonstrate the importance of taking into account the attitudes of all stakeholders since these have a powerful effect on how bilingual programs are viewed and implemented in practice. The value of including the views of children was also shown. It was interesting to see how they said they valued the use of their mother tongues in the classroom and how this helped them learn, echoing the views of supporters of the bilingual policy among curriculum officers and some teachers and parents. The attitudes of children themselves to bilingual education are seldom heard in debates about its success and failures.
Participant responses indicate that one of the major reasons for the lack of acceptance of the appropriateness of the use of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages in education is the perceived failures of the current educational system. Participants cite increased school dropouts, poor academic findings, and low levels of English language proficiency as evidence of these failures. Many teachers and parents attribute this situation to the whole idea of bilingual education and indicate support for a return to an English-only system. Others, including curriculum officers, teachers who have been bilingually trained and children learning under the bilingual system, see such problems as the result of the deficiencies in the system noted above.

The findings have also highlighted the increasing role of Tok Pisin in PNG’s social life in the realm of work and education in PNG. Participants’ responses showed that they acknowledged this, though there were differing views about if this was a threat to vernacular languages or not. It was clear from the questionnaire responses that participants saw Tok Pisin as a more useful language for education than a vernacular language like Tolai. As regards Tok Pisin being a bridge to English, some respondents considered its similarity to English as an advantage, others as a disadvantage. Such findings add to the literature on the use of pidgins and creoles in education and need further investigation.

Finally, the study found that both teachers and students reported that more than two languages were used in what are officially classified bilingual programs. Responses indicate that this might be due to the mismatch between the linguistic abilities of the teachers, or sometimes the students, and the nominated medium of instruction in that class or school. It might also be a natural result of the increasing use of Tok Pisin as a lingua franca and as a mother tongue. Such findings indicate that the role of Tok Pisin in vernacular bilingual programs in PNG needs further investigation.

### 8.3. Limitations of the Study

A number of limitations were observed in this study and are discussed below:

Firstly, the data in this study were collected from six schools in only one part of PNG, namely the Kokopo District, East New Britain Province. This limits the generalizability of this study. A much larger data base drawn from all four regions MOMASE, Highlands, Southern and New
Guinea Islands, is needed for future research to inform the practicalities of bilingual education programs nationwide.

Secondly, even though the individual research instruments were piloted, a larger pilot study could have guided the present study in a more realistic situation regarding the practices in bilingual classrooms, thus paving the way for data collection and methodology not based on the assumption of a clear distinction of Tok Pisin versus vernacular bilingual programs in schools. Such a pilot study could have also guided the modification of questions used in the interviews and questionnaires.

Thirdly, since teachers’ and children’s attitudes were explored with self-reported data (from interviews and questionnaires), rather than actual observations in the classroom by the researcher, any conclusions drawn regarding actual practices in the classroom can only be tentative. In order to validate such findings, future research should include direct observation of practices.

Fourthly, the present study had more females than males (curriculum officers: 8 females, no males; teachers: 14 females and 4 males; parents: 13 females and 2 males; and students: 4 females and 2 males) engaged in the interviews due to cultural norms in the researcher’s society which prevented her from approaching male participants more often. This in turn can be viewed as a limitation of the findings confined only to a feministic view. Therefore, to validate the findings, future research should focus on equal participation of both male and female participants to avoid such prejudice.

Fifthly, the parents and students who chose to complete the questionnaires were self selected. Their views and attitudes cannot therefore be assumed to be representative of those of all parents and students in PNG. A methodology that used random sampling would give more reliable findings.
A further limitation of this study involves the small number of students (6) who took part in the interviews compared to the questionnaires (242 students). Due to the limited number of students (as a result of time constraints associated with students’ availability during the researchers’ visits to schools), not enough data was obtained in the in-depth interviews to draw firm conclusions; therefore many of the conclusions for students were drawn from the survey questionnaire findings. Future research needs to focus on a much bigger data set of interviews with student participants.

8.4. Contribution to Theory
This study is the first research of its kind conducted in six schools in the Kokopo District in East New Britain Province. Its mixed methods approach collected data not only from curriculum officers, teachers and parents but also from children who had never before been surveyed and interviewed on the concept of bilingual education in PNG. The study contributes to theory by providing a theoretical framework to critique the current changes in a bilingual education program that utilizes all 850+ vernacular languages including Tok Pisin alongside English. It is expected that the findings of this study will contribute to the improvement of the bilingual education programs in PNG and would also be beneficial to governments elsewhere that are yet to introduce bilingual education programs in their countries. Moreover, this study contributes to the existing literature on pidgins and creoles in education, specifically on people’s attitudes towards pidgins and/or creoles as the medium of instruction in the classroom using PNG as an example.

8.5. Implications and Recommendations of Research Findings
The findings of this study provide implications for both practical application (Section 8.5.1), policy (Section 8.5.2), and further research (Section 8.5.3).

8.5.1. Recommendations for Practice
The findings from this study are offered to inform the relationship between policy and practice of the current bilingual education program in PNG. This study has provided evidence of the gap between the language policy and the current practices in the classroom. Teachers in this study are not always adhering to the bilingual language policy which requires teachers to continue
teaching children in the bridging classes with the language they used in elementary school to further develop children’s cognitive abilities and to fully prepare them for the transition to English. Instead it was found that teachers were often using Tok Pisin together with Tolai to transition to English, thus creating confusion in children’s learning. Therefore, this study recommends that:

❖ Professional and high quality monitoring and assessment on teachers’ teaching practices during the bridging period need to be revised or established by provincial education authorities to examine the mismatch in policy and practice.

The study found that some teachers in this study had difficulties teaching the bridging classes they were allocated to teach due to their lack of knowledge on students’ L1 thus resulting in teachers resorting to using Tok Pisin instead to overcome this barrier. Therefore, the study recommends that:

❖ The NDOE or provincial education authorities should carefully consider the deployment of teachers to schools so that teachers’ L1 matches students’ L1.

The study found that there was a shortfall of bilingual certified teachers in the six schools that participated in this study. Teacher training should adopt programs aimed at promoting the understanding and implementation of bilingual teaching pedagogies. Therefore, the study recommends that:

❖ The NDOE review its training and re-training courses targeted at practising teachers (traditional ESL teachers) from the previous English-only curriculum in literacy and language development as well as in effective L1 and L2 teaching methods. This is the only way to ensure that these teachers are proficient in the language of instruction and are familiar with bilingual teaching methods.
This study demonstrated that lack of awareness about bilingual education in PNG prior to its inception was one of the major contributors to the attitudinal differences that all stakeholders now hold. Therefore, the study recommends the following options:

- The NDOE and provincial education authorities should take heed of creating publicity and public awareness in support of Siegel (1999, p. 525) to promote the value of bilingual education in Tok Pisin and the vernaculars. This should in turn enable teachers and parents to understand the necessity for children to continue to develop proficiency in their L1, and be reassured that, despite some possible initial delay in developing proficiency in English, their children/students are more likely to succeed in acquiring both L1 and additional languages (including English) if they are given the opportunity to participate in mother tongue based bi/multilingual pre-primary and bilingual primary education (Ball, 2010, p. 46).

- Another recommendation is for more funding, commitment and better organisation by the NDOE.

### 8.5.2. Recommendations for Policy

Findings suggest that the bilingual language policy in the current reformed education in PNG which uses Ball’s (2010) approach No. 5 (see Section 1.2) needs to be reviewed. According to Skutnabb-Kangas (1999), it is one of the weak models of bilingual education and seems to be encouraging bilingual education only as a bridge to learning English which does not help the development of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages and their cultures. Therefore the study recommends that:

- The current bilingual education model is replaced with Ball’s (2010) Approach No. 6, Maintenance bi/multilingual education (or the ‘additive approach’) which is a stronger model of bilingual education as discussed in section 3.2.2. In the PNG case, the role of Tok Pisin in vernacular bilingual program needs to be taken into account. In this approach, although one or two more languages are added, they do not displace the mother tongue whether this is a vernacular or Tok Pisin.
OR

- The current bilingual language policy based on Ball’s (2010) Bilingual Approach No. 5 is maintained with major improvements on the areas discussed in this study.

### 8.5.3. Implications for Further Research and Future Direction

This study sets a platform for future research in the successes and failures of bilingual education programs. The PNG experience demonstrates that more commitment on the part of the NDOE to implement the bilingual education policy in schools is needed and is of paramount importance to uphold the Matane (1986) doctrine to provide Papua New Guineans with an education relevant to their needs and participation in society. The NDOE has a duty to develop and implement bilingual schooling systems nationwide that will serve the entire school-aged population and guarantee them relevant basic education thus taking into consideration the language and culture of all students. Therefore, this study recommends that:

- Future research within the same context but with a larger randomised sample from more regions (MOMASE, Highlands, Southern and New Guinea Islands) is needed to confirm or extend the findings of this study for the benefit of Papua New Guinean children (see section 8.3).

- The inclusion of children’s views in this study is of vital importance as it sets a precedent in PNG’s bilingual education history which calls for further research.

To conclude, it is imperative that more research work is done to add to what is known about using Tok Pisin and vernacular languages in bilingual education programs in the current education system in PNG. Knowledge gained from further investigations in different settings and different population samples will provide a more comprehensive view of the bilingual education program using Tok Pisin and vernacular languages in PNG with specific focus on children who are the products of the current bilingual education program, an issue of national debate since the program started in 1995.
8.6. Epilogue

The genesis of this thesis would not have become a reality if it was not for the wishes of my people in a contemporary changing community in Kokopo, East New Britain Province. Although I knew that it would be a huge commitment to be engulfed in a long, winding and desolate journey, I felt inclined to bear the laments and wishes of my people who, for over a decade, had longed for an education system that would equip their children with sound knowledge and skills with a promising future in their community and not a future that would derail their expectations. Being one of them, and a relative to many children who had dropped out of the current bilingual education system due to very low proficiency levels in English which deprived them of their chances of seeking future job prospects with happy returns for their families, I was then compelled to set out on this journey to explore this much talked about concept of bilingual education, which had become an issue of national debate.

The findings of the study reflect my own educational journey. As I travelled back and forth from each school listening to the accounts of each participant, telling me their own versions of the experiences they faced as teachers, parents and students, I was reminded of my own educational journey and how I had been resilient in enduring the educational, socio-economic and political challenges to arrive at this point in my own journey.

The challenges faced by all groups of participants (curriculum officers, teachers, parents and students) and the ambivalence that they were confronted with, indicated that there are deficiencies in the current bilingual program which need to be addressed immediately. I sympathize with the concerns and struggles of both teachers and parents in trying to overcome the problems and barriers highlighted in this thesis, and I am particularly concerned about the increasing number of children who are the products of the current bilingual education curriculum and do not make it into high schools. I am disturbed by the fact that a wonderfully elaborated language policy which seemed perfect during its initial stages has lacked support from the NDOE in terms of commitment, infrastructure, monitoring and evaluation to ensure they were following the right model and to minimise the mismatch in policy and practice. Despite that, I have been happy to celebrate the success stories of teachers who struggled to respond appropriately to the changes with limited teaching resources and re-training on bilingual
pedagogies. Similarly, I have celebrated with parents who showed initiative in assisting and supporting their schools in terms of providing cultural concepts and materials to foster cultural heritage and providing support in language skills to their children at home. Although this chapter marks the conclusion of this thesis, it also provides a new beginning for further investigations.
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# APPENDICES

## Appendix 1: Interview Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Institution/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lani</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Manager Elementary Unit</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary T/T Lecturer</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tanita</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Elementary T/T Lecturer</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mavis Willie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer in Primary Unit</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Delilah</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Coordinator Primary Unit OBE</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jessie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Head Professional Studies Dept</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Curriculum Officer -PE Primary</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Doreen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Coordinator PNG School Journals</td>
<td>CDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher (ESL)</td>
<td>Kabagap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Deputy Head Teacher (ESL)</td>
<td>Kabagap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Teacher (ESL)</td>
<td>Kabagap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Teacher (Bilingual Certified)</td>
<td>Kabagap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher (Bilingual Certified)</td>
<td>Kokopo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher Grade 4 (ESL)</td>
<td>Kokopo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dorah</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher (Bilingual Certified)</td>
<td>Kokopo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher (Bilingual Certified)</td>
<td>Kokopo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Deputy Head Teacher (ESL)</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mathew</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Teacher (ESL)</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Simaima</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior Teacher (ESL)</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Leah</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Elvina</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher (ESL)</td>
<td>Kabaleo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Lynna</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Kabaleo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher (ESL)</td>
<td>Kabaleo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Alanna</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Kokopo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Arabella</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Kokopo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bradley</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Kokopo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher (Bilingual Certified)</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Damarish</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher (ESL)</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Osila</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – House wife</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Elda</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – Executive Secretary</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – Office Manageress</td>
<td>Kokopo Open Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Parent - IT Specialist</td>
<td>Kokopo Open Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Jackyne</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent - Canteen Manageress</td>
<td>Kokopo Open Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Blaise</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Parent - National High School teacher</td>
<td>Keravat National High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Theckla</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – Office secretary</td>
<td>Kokopo Open Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Ida</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – Self Employed</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Emil</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Teacher (Bilingual Certified)</td>
<td>Special Educ. Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nellie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – Self Employed</td>
<td>Kalamanaguana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nemika</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – Shop owner</td>
<td>Vunamami Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – Mission worker</td>
<td>Vunamami Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Konio</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – Self Employed</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – Self Employed</td>
<td>Kalamanagunan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – Shop owner</td>
<td>Vunamami Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Parent – Mission worker</td>
<td>Vunamami Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher (ESL)</td>
<td>Vunadidir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Tammy</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Teacher (ESL)</td>
<td>Vunadidir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Curriculum Officers n = 8  
Teachers n = 18  
Parents n = 15  
Students n = 6  

TOTAL n = 47
Appendix 2: Tok Pisin Teachers’ Questionnaire

Teachers’ Questionnaire

Part 1. Background Information

1. Gender:  Male (   )   Female (   )
2. Age: ______
3. Position in School: __________________________
4. Home Province: _____________________________
5. Number of years teaching in the Education Reform era: ______
6. Total number of years teaching in both English only era and Vernacular education reform era and previous education system: _____
7. Highest Qualification (level of education): _______________________________________
8. What language(s) were you educated in when you were in school? Tick your answer.
   English (  )   Tok Pisin (  )   Local vernacular (  )   Other (  )
   If it’s ‘Other’, please specify.__________________________________________________
9. What is your mother tongue? ______________________________________________
10. What other languages do you speak? List in order of confidence.____________________________________________________________________

Part 2. Language Use

Please tick the language(s) that you use for the situations given in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation: The language you use to communicate with;</th>
<th>Tok Pisin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mother Tongue</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. your spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. your children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. family members at dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. a vendor at the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. a shop assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. a teller at the bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. your colleagues at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. your colleagues after office hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. your students during lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. your students after school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. a parent of a student at the school open day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. a public servant at another government department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. members of your community or village in a meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. an old classmate who comes from the same village as you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. a stranger you meet at the bus stop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. a pastor/priest in church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 3. Language Attitudes  TOK PISIN TEACHERS

Please answer the following questions as they relate to your personal experiences regarding language usage in the current bilingual program. Please tick (‘) the appropriate number from 1-5 depending on how much you agree/disagree with the statement.

Strongly agree = 1   Agree = 2 Disagree = 3 Strongly Disagree = 4 Undecided = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General language attitudes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Teaching Tok Pisin in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Using Tok Pisin and English in the classroom will result in students losing their local vernaculars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. English is an international language therefore children should acquire English at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language for Schooling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Students are keen to learn English during the bridging stage (Grade 3).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Heavy use of Tok Pisin in the classroom contributes to students’ lacking proficiency in English.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. The use of Tok Pisin alongside English in the classroom helps students acquire English easily.

Teacher’s competency in language skills

33. I speak Tok Pisin very fluently but I am less fluent in reading and writing Tok Pisin.

34. I find it difficult to plan for the integration of learning in two languages (Tok Pisin and English) across the curriculum.

35. I only have little knowledge of how to plan for two languages in use in one classroom, to assist in ‘bridging’ students from the home language to the language of the wider communication.

36. Teachers training colleges should introduce a unit on literacy in Tok Pisin for teachers in the bilingual education program (Grade 3-5).

37. Bridging teachers need specialized training in teaching English as a second language.

Teaching Material

38. I spend a lot of time preparing and designing my own teaching materials in Tok Pisin because the education department does not provide us with enough teaching materials.

39. There is an abundance supply of teaching materials in Tok Pisin in primary schools.

Part 4. Open – ended questions

In this final section, I would like you to respond to these additional questions in your own words.

40. How would you describe the impact the teaching of Tok Pisin has had on the educational achievements of your students?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

41. Which do you prefer? Vernacular/Tok Pisin Education or the English-Only policy? Please explain why.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

42. Any further comments? Please feel free to do so.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

Kilala Devette-Chee
PhD candidate
Faculty of Arts and Design
University of Canberra
Appendix 3: Tolai Teachers’ Questionnaire

Part 1. Background Information

1. Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )
2. Age: ______
3. Position in School: __________________________
4. Home Province: _____________________________
5. Number of years teaching in the Education Reform era: ______
6. Total number of years teaching in both English only era and Vernacular education reform era and previous education system: _____
7. Highest Qualification (level of education): _______________________________________
8. What language(s) were you educated in when you were in school? Tick your answer.
   - English ( )
   - Tok Pisin ( )
   - Local vernacular ( )
   - Other ( )
   If it’s ‘Other’, please specify.__________________________________________________
9. What is your mother tongue? __________________________________________________
10. What other languages do you speak? List in order of confidence.
    __________________________________________________________________

Part 2. Language Use

Please tick the language(s) that you use for the situations given in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation: The language that you use to communicate with;</th>
<th>Tok Pisin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mother Tongue</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. your spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. your children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. family members at dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. a vendor at the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. a shop assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. a teller at the bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. your colleagues at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. your colleagues after office hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. your students during lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. your students after school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. a parent of a student at the school open day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. a public servant in another government department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. members of your community or village meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. a friend from (another province) in a personal letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. a friend (from the same province as yours) via an sms text message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. a pastor/priest in church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 3. Language Attitudes  TOLAI TEACHERS

Please answer the following questions as they relate to your personal experiences regarding language usage in the current bilingual program. Please tick (√) the appropriate number from 1-5 depending on how much you agree/disagree with the statement.

Strongly agree =1  Agree = 2  Disagree = 3  Strongly Disagree = 4  Undecided = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General language attitudes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Teaching Tolai in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Using Tolai and English in the classroom will result in students maintaining their local vernaculars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. English is an international language therefore children should acquire it at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language for Schooling

30. Students are keen to learn English during the bridging stage (Grade 3).
31. Heavy use of Tolai in the classroom contributes to students’ lacking proficiency in English.
32. The use of Tolai alongside English in the bridging program helps students acquire English easily.
Teacher’s competency in language skills

33. I speak Tolai very fluently but I am less fluent in reading and writing Tolai.

34. I find it difficult to plan for the integration of learning in two languages (Tolai and English) across the curriculum.

35. I only have little knowledge of how to plan for two languages in use in one classroom, to assist in ‘bridging’ students from the home language to the language of the wider communication.

36. Teachers training colleges should introduce a unit on literacy in Tolai for teachers in the bilingual education program (Grade 3-5).

37. Bridging teachers need specialized training in teaching English as a second language.

Teaching Material

38. I spend a lot of time preparing and designing my own teaching materials in Tolai because the education department does not provide us with enough teaching materials.

39. There is an abundance supply of teaching materials in Tolai in primary schools.

Part 4. Open – ended questions

In this final section, I would like you to respond to these additional questions in your own words.

40. How would you describe the impact the teaching of Tolai has had on the educational achievements of your students?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

41. Which do you prefer? Vernacular/Tok Pisin Education or the English-Only policy? Please explain why.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

42. Any further comments? Please feel free to do so.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

Kilala Devette-Chee
PhD candidate
Faculty of Arts and Design
University of Canberra
Appendix 4: Tok Pisin Parents’ Questionnaire

Part 1. Background Information
1. Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )
2. Age: _____
3. Home Province: ______________________
4. Highest Qualification (level of education): ____________________________
5. Name of Institution: ____________________________
6. Occupation: ____________________________
7. Number of years working: _____
8. What languages were you educated in when you were at school? Tick your answers
   English ( ), Tok Pisin ( ), Local Vernacular ( ) Other ( ). If it’s other, please specify
9. What is your mother tongue? __________________________________________________
10. What other languages do you speak? List in order of confidence.
   ____________________________________________________________________

Part 2. Language Use

Please tick the language(s) that you use for the situations given in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation: The language you use to communicate with:</th>
<th>Tok Pisin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mother Tongue</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. your spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. your children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. family members at dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. friends at a rugby league game in town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. a friend (from the same province as yours) via an sms text message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. a friend (from another province ) in a personal letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. a neighbour whose mother tongue is different from yours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. a neighbour whose mother tongue is the same as yours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. members of your community in a meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. sellers in the markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. a shop assistant in a shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. a loans officer in a bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. your workmates at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. your workmates after office hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. other children (not your own) in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. another public servant in a government office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3. Language Attitudes TOK PISIN PARENTS

Please answer the following questions as they relate to your personal experiences regarding language usage in the current bilingual program. Please tick (‘) the appropriate number from 1-5 depending on how much you agree/disagree with the statement.

**Strongly agree = 1  Agree = 2  Disagree = 3  Strongly Disagree = 4  Undecided = 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General language attitudes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Teaching Tok Pisin in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Using Tok Pisin and English in the classroom will result in students losing their local vernaculars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Tok Pisin hinders the learning process of a child when attempting to learn English in the bridging program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language for schooling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. English is an international language therefore children should acquire English at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The use of Tok Pisin in schools elevates the child’s pride in his/her culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Tok Pisin helps my child excel in his/her schoolwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. My child finds school work in Tok Pisin easy to understand.

34. The use of Tok Pisin should cease at the end of Lower Primary (Grade 5) as stipulated in the curriculum guidelines and only English should be used in the upper primary level (6-8).

**Teacher’s Competency in language skills**

35. Teachers must be literate in Tok Pisin in order to assist my child well in bridging into English.

36. Grade 3 bridging teachers must be fully bilingual in English and Tok Pisin.

37. Lower primary teachers must attend regular in-service training on the planning and integration of two languages in one classroom (i.e. Tok Pisin and English).

   Lower Primary teachers must attend regular in-service training on planning Tok Pisin and English

**Teaching Material**

38. The NDOE must provide bilingual teaching materials to all schools

39. Teachers must be multi-skilled in both Tok Pisin and English produce a variety of teaching materials.

---

**PART 4. Open – ended Questions**

In this final section, I would like you to respond to these additional questions in your own words.

40. How would you describe the impact the teaching of Tok Pisin has had on the educational achievements of your child?

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

41. Which do you prefer? Vernacular/Tok Pisin Education or the English-Only policy? Please explain why.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

42. Any further comments? Please feel free to do so.

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

---

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

Kilala Devette-Chee  
PhD candidate  
Faculty of Arts and Design  
University of Canberra
Appendix 5: Tolai Parents’ Questionnaire

Part 1. Background Information
1. Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )
2. Age: ______
3. Home Province: ____________________
4. Highest Qualification (level of education): ___________________
5. Name of Institution: _______________________________
6. Occupation: ____________________
7. Number of years working ______
8. What languages were you educated in when you were at school? Tick your answers: English ( ), Tok Pisin ( ), Local Vernacular ( ) Other ( ). If it’s other, please specify ________________
9. What is your mother tongue? __________________________________________________
10. What other languages do you speak? List in order of confidence. __________________________

Part 2. Language Use

Please tick the language(s) that you use for the situations given in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation: The language you use to communicate with;</th>
<th>Tok Pisin</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Mother Tongue</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. your spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. your children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. family members at dinner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. friends at a rugby league game in town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. a friend (from the same province as yours) via an sms text message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. a friend (from another province ) in a personal letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. a neighbour whose mother tongue is different from yours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. a neighbour whose mother tongue is the same as yours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. members of your community in a meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. sellers in the markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. a shop assistant in a shop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. a loans officer in a bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. your workmates at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. your workmates after office hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. other children (not your own) in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. another public servant in a government office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3. Language Attitudes  TOLAI PARENTS

Please answer the following questions as they relate to your personal experiences regarding language usage in the current bilingual program. Please tick (v) the appropriate number from 1-5 depending on how much you agree/disagree with the statement.

Strongly agree = 1  Agree = 2 Disagree = 3  Strongly Disagree = 4  Undecided = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General language attitudes</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Teaching Tolai in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Using Tolai and English in the classroom will result in students losing their local vernaculars.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Tolai hinders the learning process of a child when attempting to learn English in the bridging program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language for schooling</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. English is an international language therefore children should acquire English at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The use of Tolai in schools elevates the child’s pride in his/her culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Tolai helps my child excel in his/her schoolwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. My child finds school work in Tolai easy to understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. The use of Tolai should cease at the end of Lower Primary (Grade 5) as stipulated in the curriculum guidelines and only English should be used in the upper primary level (6-8).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teacher’s Competency in Language Skills

35. Teachers must be literate in Tolai in order to assist my child well in bridging into English.

36. A Grade 3 bridging teacher should be fully bilingual in English and Tolai.

37. Teachers in the Lower Primary (bilingual education program) must attend regular in-service training on the planning and integration of two languages in one classroom (i.e. Tolai and English).

### Teaching Material

38. The NDOE must provide bilingual teaching materials to all schools.

39. Teachers must be multi-skilled in both languages (Tolai and English) in order to produce a variety of teaching resources.

### PART 4. Open-ended Questions

In this final section, I would like you to respond to these additional questions in your own words.

40. How would you describe the impact the teaching of Tolai has had on the educational achievements of your child?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

41. Which do you prefer? Vernacular/Tok Pisin Education or the English-Only policy? Please explain why.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

42. Any further comments? Please feel free to do so.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.

Kilala Devette-Chee  
PhD candidate  
Faculty of Arts and Design  
University of Canberra
Appendix 6: Tok Pisin Students’ Questionnaire

Topic: The Use of Tok Pisin and English

Hello Student!

Instructions:

Please write your answers neatly in space provided in the tables.

Part 1. Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Write your answers here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you a boy or a girl?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How old are you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is your Home Province?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is your first language?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What other languages do you speak?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2. Language Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Write your answers here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“What language do you use to speak to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. your mother?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. your father?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. your brother(s)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. your sister(s)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. the whole family at dinner?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. your friends whose first language is different from yours?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. your friends whose first language is the same as yours?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What language do you use:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. to talk to a person selling food at the school market?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. to speak to your teacher during class time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. to speak with your friends during recess and lunch outside the classroom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. to speak with friends in Sunday School?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. to speak with your Sunday School teacher in church?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 3 Attitudes toward Tok Pisin and English  TOK Pisin Students

In this part, read each sentence and put a tick (√) under Yes if you agree and a (×) under No if you do not agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Using Tok Pisin in the classroom helps me understand English better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I speak Tok Pisin most of the time in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I find it easier talking to my teacher in Tok Pisin than in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Tok Pisin is more important to learn than English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is important to learn English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Writing a sentence in English is harder than writing in Tok Pisin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. If I don’t speak English well, I will not get a good job in future.

25. Most children in my class like learning English.

26. I only speak English during class time and nowhere else.

PART 4. Open-ended Questions

In this final section, I would like you to write an answer in your own words on the blanks provided.

27. Which of these two languages, Tok Pisin or English do you think is important to you?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

28. Explain why this language is important.

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

29. Which language is not important to you? Tok Pisin or English?

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

30. Explain why this language is not important.

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you very much for your help.

Kilala Devette-Chee
PhD candidate
University of Canberra
Appendix 7: Tolai Students’ Questionnaire

Topic: The Use of Tolai and English

© Hello Student!

Instructions:

Please write your answers neatly on the blank spaces provided in the tables.

### Part 1. Background Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Write you answers here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you a boy or a girl?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How old are you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is your Home Province?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What is your first language?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What other languages do you speak?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part 2. Language Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Write your answers here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“What language do you use to speak to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. your mother?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. your father?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. your brother(s)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. your sister(s)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. the whole family at dinner?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. your friends whose first language is different from yours?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. your friends whose first language is the same as yours?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| What language do you use:                                                 |                         |
| 13. to talk to a person selling food at the school market?                |                         |
| 14. to speak to your teacher during class time?                          |                         |
| 15. to speak with your friends during recess and lunch outside the classroom? |                     |
| 16. to speak with friends in Sunday School?                              |                         |
| 17. to speak with your Sunday School teacher in church?                  |                         |

### Part 3. Attitudes towards Tolai and English

In this part, read each sentence and put a tick (✓) under Yes if you agree and a (×) under No if you do not agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Using Tolai in the classroom helps me understand English better</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I speak Tolai most of the time in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I find it easier talking to my teacher in Tolai than in English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Tolai is more important to learn than English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. It is important to learn English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Writing a sentence in English is harder than writing in Tolai

24. If I don’t speak English well, I will not get a good job in future

25. Most children in my class like learning English

26. I only speak English during class time and nowhere else

Part 4. Open – ended Questions

In this final section, I would like you to write an answer in your own words on the blanks provided.

27. Which of these two languages, Tolai or English do you think is important to you?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

28. Explain why this language is important.

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

29. Which language is not important to you? Tolai or English?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

30. Explain why this language is not important.

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

Thank you so much for your help.

Kilala Devette-Chee PhD candidate (University of Canberra)
Appendix 8: Interview Guide for Curriculum Officers

Background Information

1. Present Position/Status at the CDD
2. Number of years in this profession

The “Bridging Concept” (From Tok Pisin/Vernaculars to English)

3. Do you believe that providing background knowledge in Tok Pisin/Tolai facilitates English instruction? OR Do you think the previous English-only education system was better than the current one?
4. What then are your views on the concept of initial education in a child’s first language? Is it becoming a success? What are the issues that have come about?
5. According to research, Tok Pisin has now become the mother tongue of thousands of Papua New Guinean children (especially in urban centres), and most teachers are now moving away from using vernacular languages to using Tok Pisin instead in the classrooms. Now, what is your view on the use of Tok Pisin in PNG classrooms? Do you think Tok Pisin should be standardized? What is your view?

Perceptions on teaching resources

Let us now talk about the issues related to teaching resources.

6. First of all, do you produce teaching materials for schools here at the curriculum unit or do you only provide training without teaching materials for teachers?
7. What languages are used to write teaching materials for students here at the curriculum unit?
8. Do you think teachers are innovative enough to produce their own teaching materials?
9. Are teachers monitored on whether they are producing enough and appropriate teaching resources in schools? Are they being monitored also in their teaching performances?
10. Do you have any further comments in general on the current bilingual education program?

Thank you for your time.
Appendix 9: Interview Guide for Teachers

Background Information

1. Present Position/Status in school

2. Number of years in this profession

1. Institution where employed

Experience on the “Bridging Concept”

2. You’ve been in the teaching field for ___ years. Do you believe that providing background knowledge in Tok Pisin/Tolai facilitates English instruction?

3. Have you encountered any problems at all in this bilingual education program using the local vernacular/Tok Pisin and English?

4. Can you describe your experiences of having to plan and teach in two different languages compared to the previous curriculum where you had to teach only in English?

5. Speculate on why more and more teachers are choosing to teach in Tok Pisin rather than the local vernaculars they supposed to use.

Perceptions on teaching resources

Let us now talk about the issues that have come about as a result of lack of teaching resources.

8. How well do you think teachers understand the need to create a wider variety of text types for the production of ‘Big Books’ and closely related.

9. In your opinion, how can school boards be encouraged to allocate sufficient funds each term/year to enable teachers to continue to produce resources essential to their teaching?

Tok Pisin Issue

10. Finally, I’d like us to talk about the promotion of Tok Pisin nationwide. In your opinion, what will the promotion of Tok Pisin mean in terms of language transfer and shift? (Already many communities are choosing Tok Pisin as the language of instruction in elementary grades. This is both an advantage and a disadvantage; an advantage because a corpus of print material already exists and is likely to continue to be produced; a disadvantage because the more Tok Pisin blossoms, the fewer vernacular may be used).

Thank you for your time.
Appendix 10: Interview Guide for Parents

Background Information

1. Present profession

2. Number of years in this profession

3. Place where you work/where employed

Perceptions of language use

As far as I am aware, you are a parent of a child who is attending ___ primary school. I am particularly interested in asking you a few questions related to the issue of Tok Pisin and vernacular languages use in the Lower Primary schools.

4. First of all, I’d like you to speculate on whether or not the use of Tok Pisin or a local vernacular is appropriate for Papua New Guinean children.

5. Please explain why.

6. Would you prefer abolishing the current education reform and be happy re-introducing the ‘English-only curriculum’ in PNG?

7. Please explain why or why not?

8. What is your view on the Outcome Based Education (OBE) that has recently been woven into the existing vernacular education reform?

9. What suggestions would you like to make in order for Papua New Guinean children to have quality education?

10. Do you have any further comments or questions to ask?

Thank you for your time.
Appendix 11: Interview Guide for Grade 3 Students

Background Information

1. Class: _______
2. Teacher’s name: _______
3. Place where you live: _______
4. Name of Local Community Government: _______

Perceptions on language use

I understand you were taught in Tok Pisin/Tolai in Elementary 1 and 2.

5. Did you enjoy your lessons? And did you understand all instructions that your teacher gave you? Tell me a little bit about that.

6. Are you happy that you are now learning English in Grade 3? Tell me, is there anything that you find difficult learning English?

7. Do you think, it would have helped if you had started learning English in Elementary 1 and 2? Explain why or why not.

8. Do you find that the use of Tok Pisin/Tolai helps to understand concepts in English when your teacher is explaining something?

Students’ Suggestions

Now let’s talk about what you would like to see in future regarding language use.

9. In order for you to understand English and speak it well, suggest what you would like your teacher to do.

10. Apart from your teacher helping you, how would you help yourself to become proficient in English. Would you like you teacher to give you more work in Tok Pisin/Tolai or in English and why or why not.

Thank you for your time
Appendix 12: Letter to the Provincial Education Advisor in East New Britain Province

UNIVERSITY OF CANBERRA
TESOL and Foreign Language Teaching Program
Faculty of Arts and Design
5th December 2008

The Provincial Education Advisor
Division of Education
P.O.Box 922
Kokopo
East New Britain Province, PNG

Attention: Mr Pais Gawi

Dear Mr Gawi,

Subject: Seeking Approval on an Education Research Study to be carried out at Kokopo and Kalamangunan Primary Schools, East New Britain Province in March - May 2009.

I am Kilala Devette-Chee, a former high school teacher and Teachers’ College lecturer in East New Britain Province in the late 1990s. After completing my Graduate Diploma in TESOL and Masters in English Language Teaching (MA ELT) at the University of Canberra in 2000 and 2001 respectively, I was employed by the University of PNG as a linguistics lecturer and have been with the Linguistics Department ever since.

I am now enrolled as a PhD student in the TESOL/Foreign Language Teaching Program in the Faculty of Communication and International Studies at the University of Canberra where I also work as an IELTS Examiner. My reason for writing to you is to seek approval to carry out my research project in Kokopo, Kabaleo, Kalamantunang, Takabur, Kabagap and Raluana Primary Schools in East New Britain Province in March - May 2009.

I am investigating the effectiveness of the use of pidgins and creoles in education. I intend to specifically explore two main research interests: a) an investigation of the impact of Tok Pisin on primary school children's academic achievement compared to the use of local vernaculars in the current education reform.

b) a thorough examination of teachers’, parents’ and children’s attitudes towards Tok Pisin usage in schools compared to Tolai (Kuanua). I will be using survey questionnaires and in-depth interviews with selected individuals.

My reasons for choosing this topic is because of the on-going debate in PNG on whether or not the use of Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars in the current education reform is appropriate for Papua New Guinean children.

I have already had meetings with the headmasters and deputy headmasters of the two focused schools in July 2008, where they all verbally agreed to let me use their schools for the research study.

I look forward to receiving your response to this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Kilala Devette-Chee (PhD Candidate)
Appendix 13: Standard letter to School Principals

UNIVERSITY OF CANBERRA
TESOL and Foreign Language Teaching Program
Faculty of Arts and Design

5th December 2008

……………. Primary School
P.O. Box …………
Kokopo , East New Britain Province
PNG

Dear ……………

Subject: Follow-up of our July 2008 Meeting

I am writing to you as a follow-up of our meeting which we had in July this year regarding my Research Project. Firstly, I’d like to take this opportunity to thank you for the hospitality and advice you gave when I visited your school.

My main reason for writing to you now, is to ask if you could send me a formal reply stating that you support my research and that you have agreed that I can conduct my research in your school in March - May, 2009.

Although you have given me verbal approval, I need a written approval from you as the head of the institution I will be carrying out my research in, as proof to show the Human Ethics Committee here at the University of Canberra who will in turn approve my fieldwork.

If you are able to fax me your response, my fax number is:
+61 (2) 6201 2649

If you choose to send it by mail, please send it to my personal home address:

    Kilala Devette- Chee
    7 Levey Place
    Melba, ACT 2615, Australia

Your early response to this matter will be highly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Kilala Devette-Chee (PhD Candidate)
Appendix 14: Letter from the Head Teacher of Kokopo Primary School

DIVISION OF EDUCATION
KOKOPO PRIMARY SCHOOL

Telephone: 982 9588
Facsimile: 982 9553
B Mobile: 671 4497
Digicel: 728 62416

FEAR GOD - UNITED WE SHALL STAND.

6th January 2009

Dear Mrs. Kilala Devette-Chee,

SUBJECT: APPROVAL GRANTED FOR YOUR EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY.

I have received your letter on the 4th /01/09. Thank you for showing interest in my school to conduct your Education Research Project towards your PhD qualification.

On behalf of the school administration your request is acknowledged and accepted. Thus, official approval is granted to you to carry out your research tasks in the school whenever you will be available. Please do not be hesitant to consult us for any assistance which you may require especially with the organization and scheduling of your research procedures in our school. It would be convenient if you see the administration of the school prior to conducting the study regarding the organization.

Furthermore, as this is an educational research, I believe the findings and recommendations that you will have in your report would be beneficial to the education system of Papua New Guinea schools. Most specifically to Kokopo Primary School. I believe your study will help us to improve the language used as the medium of instruction in the implementation of the current curriculum reform.

I suggest also to you, if it would be possible for you to send us a copy of your thesis or report after completion, endorsement and recognition procedures are done by the institution you are studying at. This will be kept in the schools library archives for future reference and usage, and also as a schools souvenir.

With this, wish you all the best in your research preparation and looking forward to having you here in our school.

God bless and have a belated happy new year 2009.

Yours Sincerely,

MR. GEORGE CHOI
Outgoing Deputy Head Teacher

MR. OSCAR KARREK
Head Teacher
04\textsuperscript{th} March, 2009

Dear Madam,

\textbf{Subject: \textit{APPROVAL TO CARRY OUT YOUR RESEARCH PROJECT HERE}}

I acknowledge receipt of your letter via Mr. Michael Chee requesting approval to use our school to carry out your research. I personally feel that your research topics is not only for your capacity building but can be use by the Reviewers and Implementors of the current Reform System to come up with more appropriate and relevant measures.

For this reason, I have no objection to your request but do accept it and look forward to your coming.

Thank you

[Signature]

K. Tabulo
HEAD TEACHER
Appendix 16: Letter from the Head Teacher of Kalamaganunan Primary School

Division of Education

KALAMANAGUNAN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Telephone: (675) 982 8236
Fax:

P. O. Box 70, KOKOPO
East New Britain Province
Papua New Guinea

Date: 29/01/09

Ms Kilala Devete Chee,
7 Levey Place
Melba Act 2615
AUSTRALIA

Dear Madam,

RE: PERMISSION GRANTED TO DO RESEARCH

Your request to conduct your research at Kalamaganunan Primary School from March to May 2009 is hereby granted.

The school will do all it can to help you in your research work.

Thank you for choosing Kala for your research.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

MARK PETELO
Head Teacher
Appendix 17: Letter from the Head Teacher of Takabur Primary School

EAST NEW BRITAIN PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION
DIVISION OF EDUCATION

P O BOX 922
VUNADIDIR
EAST NEW BRITAIN PROVINCE
PNG

05th March, 2009

University of Canberra
ACT 2601
Australia

Dear Madam,

Subject: Approval on an Education Research Study to be carried out at our school from April to June 2009

I have read through your letter and very much interested on your research topic.

I, therefore, wish to assure you that, the school has approved you to carry out the research at our school.

We are looking forward in meeting you soon.

Please advice us in advance of the actual date you’ll be coming to the school to carry out the research.

Should we know of anything, you can contact these following people:

Mrs. Vincensia Waninara on Digicel # 727 45920 – Head Teacher
Sister Albertina Kal on Digicel # 729 35735 – Deputy Head Teacher

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

Vincensia Waninara (Mrs.)
School Head Teacher
Appendix 18: Letter from the Head Teacher of Kabagap Primary School

KABAGAP PRIMARY SCHOOL
Post Office Box 217, Kokopo, East New Britain Province, PNG
"GNGCR"
STRIVE FOR SUCCESS
EPH 3:16
"...be strong in the Lord and in the power of his might...."

4th March 2009

Kilala Davette-Chee
Faculty of Communication and International Studies
University of Canberra
Australia

Dear Madam

SUBJECT: EDUCATION RESEARCH STUDY – APRIL-JUNE/2009

We acknowledged your letter dated 26th February, 2009. The School Administration met on the same date and gave approval for the study to be carried out.

We understand your reasons for the study. Therefore our teachers have been informed of your visit around April/2009. Teachers and students look forward for your visit. We hope to help where possible in regard to your study.

The School Administration in-advance acknowledged your interest in choosing to use our school for a worthy study. We believe the results of the study will help our school and the country (PNG) in planning purposes.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]
NATHANIEL MESULAM
(Head Teacher)

Cc: DEO Kokopo District
Cc: SDO – Camilus Kanau
Cc: BOM Chairman – Sakius Wakaina
Cc: BOM Vice Chairman – Dickson Ngaina
Appendix 19: Letter from the Head Teacher of Raluana Primary School

Division of Education
RALUANA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Phone: (675) 982 8048
Fax:
Email:
P.O.Box 1503,
RABAUL,
East New Britain Province,
Papua New Guinea.

Date 05/03/09

Mrs. Kilala Devette Chee
University of Canberra
Faculty of Communication & International Studies
ACT 2601, AUSTRALIA

RE: ACCEPTANCE OF YOUR REQUEST TO CONDUCT YOUR RESEARCH STUDY AT OUR SCHOOL THIS YEAR, 2009.

Dear Mrs. Chee,

We the administration of Raluana Primary School solemnly accepts your request to conduct your research in our school starting from April to June 2009.

Thank you very much.

Yours Faithfully,

MR. HUBERT WANGUN
HEAD TEACHER.
Participant Information for Teachers and Parents

Project Title: The Use of Tok Pisin in Primary Schools in PNG: A Case Study

Researcher:
Kilala Devette-Chee
PhD Candidate (Education)
TESOL/Foreign Language Teaching
Faculty of Arts and Design

Chair of Supervisory Panel:
Dr. Elke Stracke
TESOL/Foreign Language Teaching
Faculty of Arts and Design
Appendix 21: Participant Information for Teachers and Parents

Title of Project: The Use of Tok Pisin in Primary Schools in PNG: A Case Study

Participant Information for Teachers and Parents

Thank you for showing an interest in my research project. Please read the information in this document carefully first before choosing whether to participate or not. If you decide to take part, I thank you. If you choose not to take part, you will not be disadvantaged in any way and I thank you for considering my request.

Project Aim
The main aims of this project are:
1) What impact does Tok Pisin have on primary school children’s academic achievement compared to the use of the local vernaculars?
2) What are the attitudes of teachers, parents and students towards Tok Pisin usage in primary schools in PNG?

Benefits of the Project
1. Reports about the use of pidgins and creoles in formal education are still rare therefore, this formal comparative study on the use of Tok Pisin in PNG Primary Schools will provide answers to the on-going debate on whether or not Tok Pisin helps children become proficient in English.
2. This study will provide a point of reference for comparison with similar projects on bilingual education using pidgins and creoles as the medium of instruction as well as the daily language of the routine tasks of the classroom.

General Outline of the project
This research project seeks to investigate the effectiveness of the use of pidgins and creoles in education. The study focuses on Tok Pisin, which is an English-lexifier pidgin widely spoken in PNG as a lingua franca and now as a creole by thousands of Papua New Guinean children. Although Tok Pisin has been marginalized for many years by previous governments in PNG, it is now strongly encouraged by the current NDOE (NDOE) to be used as the medium of instruction in elementary and Lower Primary schools along-side vernacular languages in bilingual education programs and as a bridge to English at a later stage. The study also examines the attitudes of teachers, parents and students towards the use of Tok Pisin in primary schools. However, at this point in time, there has been strong opposition to the use of Tok Pisin by some teachers and parents who have spoken out publically in the country’s two daily national newspapers that Tok Pisin is a language that has contributed to the under achievements of their children.

This research project is a case study which uses the ‘mixed methodology design’ and employs ‘data triangulation' which involves the following sources of data: Grade 8 end-of-year tests, Questionnaires, In-depth interviews, Classroom observations, Documents (including archival material from newspaper), Research Journal.

The fieldwork will be carried out in six schools in East New Britain Province in PNG namely: 1) Kokopo Primary School 2) Kalamanagunan Primary School 3) Kabaleo Demonstration School, 4) Raluana Primary School 5) Takabur Primary School and 6) Kabagap Primary School.

The participants of this study will be 240 primary school children (40 students from each school). In addition, there will be 120 teachers; 20 from each school and similarly 120 parents (20 from each school). All in all, there will be a total of 480 participants.
After completing all tasks involved in this research project, all work will be collated in a thesis which will then have to go to the assessors for assessing. A summary of the research report can be forwarded to you once it gets published. If you wish to have a copy sent to you please fill up the necessary information in the ‘Informed Consent Form’

**Participant Involvement**

As a participant in this research project, you are kindly asked to complete a language attitude questionnaire which will take about 20-30 minutes. In this questionnaire, you will be asked to answer questions about your domains of language use and your attitudes towards Tok Pisin and Tolai as languages of instruction in the current bilingual education programs in East New Britain Province.

You are also invited to take part in a follow-up interview on the use of Tok Pisin in education in PNG Primary Schools. The interview will take place after the questionnaires have been collected back from all participants. Interview participants will be randomly selected and all interviews should last 20-30 minutes in an empty classroom in school. The interviews will be taped into a digital voice recorder and downloaded to my computer (which is password protected) and later transcribed.

Please note that your participation in this project is voluntary and you may without any penalty, decline to take part or withdraw at any time without providing an explanation, or refuse to answer a question.

**Confidentiality and anonymity**

Your participation in this study will be very much appreciated. There are no unforeseeable risks associated with this project. Your identity and responses will be strictly confidential and will not be disclosed to anyone. At a later date, your data may be used for other purposes but because it is anonymous data, you will not be named and will not be identified in any way.

**Data Storage**

Storage of the data collected will adhere to the University regulations and kept on University premises in a locked cupboard/filing cabinet for 5 years. A report of the study will be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

**Ethics Committee Clearance**

This project has been approved by or on behalf of the University of Canberra’s Human Research Ethics Committee (UCHREC) in line with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research.

**Queries and Concerns**

If you are in doubt about any sections of this participant information form or about the research project in general, please feel free to contact me. All enquiries can be directed to either the principal researcher (me) or my Supervisor.

Our contact details are:

Principal Researcher: Kilala Devette-Chee (PhD Candidate)
email: kilala.chee@canberra.edu.au
phone: 0061 2 26201 2271  Fax: 0061 2 6201 2649

Primary Supervisor: Dr Elke Stracke
email: Elke.Stracke@canberra.edu.au
phone: 0061 2 6201 2492  Fax: 0061 2 6201 2649
Informed Consent Form for Teachers and Parents

Project Title
The Use of Tok Pisin in Primary Schools in PNG: A Case Study

Consent Statement
I have read and understood the information about the research. I am not aware of any condition that would prevent my participation, and I agree to participate in this project. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about my participation in the research. All questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction.

Name: ................................. Signature: ..................................................

Date: ..............................................

A summary of the research report can be forwarded to you when published. If you would like to receive a copy of the report, please include your mailing address below.

Name: .................................

Address: ........................................................

...........................................................

...........................................................

...........................................................

...........................................................

Tel. +61 (2) 6201 2271
Fax +61 (2) 6201 2649
Email kilala.chee@canberra.edu.au

UNIVERSITY OF CANBERRA
Faculty of Arts and Design
TESOL/Foreign Language Teaching

Postal Address:
University of Canberra
ACT 2601   Australia
Location: University Drive, Bruce ACT
Australian Government Higher Education (CRICOS):
Registered Provider : University of Canberra #00212
Appendix 23: Parent Information Letter Re-Children

Parent Information Letter Re-children

Dear Parent,

Introduction and Purpose
I am Kilala Devette-Chee, a research student at the University of Canberra, Australia. I am conducting a study on “The use of Tok Pisin in Primary schools in PNG compared to the use of local vernaculars” and would like to involve your child in my study.

Selection of Participants
I would like to talk to as many Grade 3 students as possible about their experiences in the transition from Elementary 2 (which is taught in Tok Pisin or a local vernacular) to Grade 3 (which is taught in Tok Pisin/local vernacular and English). I would like to ask your son/daughter to participate because she is in Grade 3 and is currently under-going this transition experience.

Voluntary Participation
You do not have to agree that your son/daughter can take part in my study. You can choose to say no if you wish to do so. I know that the decision can be difficult when it involves your children.

Procedures
Questionnaire
Your son/daughter will be invited to fill out a questionnaire in class together with his/her classmates at the presence of the researcher who will then collect the completed questionnaires from the students. The types of questions your son/daughter will be answering will involve mainly his/her views on the languages that he/she uses both in and out of the classroom. If your son/daughter does not wish to answer any of the questions included in the questionnaire, he/she may skip them and move on to the next question. The information recorded is confidential, and no one else except the researcher (Kilala Devette-Chee) with access to the information, will have access to his/her questionnaire. The questionnaire will be destroyed after five years.

Interview
Your son/daughter is also invited to take part in an interview with the researcher. Questions that he/she will be answering will be on his/her perceptions on the medium of instruction used in elementary school and his/her current bilingual education class, Your son/daughter will also be given an opportunity in the interview to suggest what he/she would like to see in future regarding language use. This interview which will last 20 minutes in your child’s classroom will be recorded by the researcher on her digital voice recorder. This recorded interview is also confidential and no one except the researcher will have access to the recording.

There will also be an observation of your child’s level of engagement in learning activities in the classroom. This observation will last 40 minutes (a whole lesson) in your child’s classroom.
Risks/Discomforts
All information will remain completely confidential. No child will be identified by name. Confidentiality: Participation in research may involve loss of privacy; however, my records will be handled as confidentially as possible. Only Kilala Devette-Chee will have access to the completed questionnaires, recorded interviews and lesson observation notes. These records will remain locked in a secured cabinet in Mrs Chee’s home in Kokopo. When the research project is complete, the records will remain locked for 5 years at the University of Canberra and then destroyed. No individual identities will be used in any reports or publications that may result from this study.

Benefits
There will be no direct benefit to your child from participating in this study. However, the information gained from this research may help education planners and policy makers in PNG better understand how Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars contribute to children’s education in general.

Costs
There will be no costs to you or your child as a result of taking part in this study.

Payment
There will be no payment to you or your child as a result of taking part in this study.

Questions
If you have any questions or concerns about participating in this study, please feel free to contact me. All enquiries can be directed to either the principal researcher (me) or my Supervisor. Our contact details are:

Principal Researcher: Kilala Devette-Chee (PhD Candidate)
email: kilala.chee@canberra.edu.au
phone: 0061 2 26201 2271  Fax: 0061 2 6201 2649

Primary Supervisor: Dr Elke Stracke
email: Elke.Stracke@canberra.edu.au
phone: 0061 2 6201 2492  Fax: 0061 2 6201 2649
Appendix 24: Parent Consent Form

I understand that I can choose not to have my child participate in this study, or to withdraw my child from participating at any time. Declining participation will not interfere with my child’s care or learning experiences in their classroom. I understand that by not participating in this study, my child will continue to be provided with developmentally appropriate activities and experiences. I also understand that at any time I can participate in parent activities and educational opportunities. I will discuss this research study with my child and explain the procedures that will take place.

I will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

I give my consent to allow my child to participate:

............................................
Print Name

............................................
Signature of Parent/Guardian Date: .....................
Appendix 25: Participant Information for Students

Participant Information for Students

1. My name is Kilala Devette-Chee.
   I am a research student at the University of Canberra in, Australia.

2. Your parents have agreed that you take part in my study project.

3. I would like to find out about how well Tok Pisin/Tolai helps you to learn English.

4. I will ask you to do a few things over the next few weeks:
   I will ask you questions about what you have learned here.
   I will also ask your other classmates whose parents also agree to take part in this study.
   I will ask you questions about what you do in the Tok Pisin/Tolai and English bilingual program.
   I will ask you questions about how you feel about being in the program.
   After you go home, I may contact you later to ask you some more questions. If I do, you will have the chance then to decide whether you want to answer my questions.

5. I do not believe that you will be hurt or upset by being in this study.
   If you take part in the study and believe that you have been hurt or upset in any way, you may stop being in the study.
   I will not tell anyone else the things you tell me about the Tok Pisin/Tolai and English bilingual program or anything you tell me about yourself or any other person.
   But if you tell me that someone here is hurting you, I must report it to the proper authorities.

6. Your answers to my questions will teach me important ways to help other children like you in the future.

7. If you don’t want to be in this study, you don’t have to participate. Remember, being in this study is up to you and no one will be upset if you don’t want to participate or even if you change your mind later and want to stop.

8. You can ask any questions that you have about the study. If you have a question later that you didn’t think of now, you can ask me next time.

Thank you for taking part in this study.
8 April 2009

COMMITTEE FOR ETHICS IN HUMAN RESEARCH

Project number 09-12

Mrs Kilala Chee
7 Levey Place
Melba ACT 2615

APPROVED

Dear Mrs Chee

The Committee for Ethics in Human Research has considered your application to conduct research with human subjects for the project entitled: The use of Tok Pisin in Primary Schools in Papua New Guinea: a case study

Approval is granted until 30/12/10 the anticipated completion date stated in the application.

The following general conditions apply to your approval. These requirements are determined by University policy and the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans (National Health and Medical Research Council, 1999):

1) **You must immediately report to the Committee anything which might warrant review of ethical approval of your project, including:**
   (a) serious or unexpected adverse effects on participants;
   (b) proposed changes in the protocol; and
   (c) unforeseen events that might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project.

2) **Monitoring:** You must assist the Committee to monitor the conduct of approved research by completing and promptly returning project review forms, which will be sent to you at the end of your project and, in the case of extended research, at least annually during the approval period.

3) **Discontinuation of research:** You (in conjunction with your supervisor) must inform the Committee, giving reasons, if the research is not conducted or is discontinued before the expected date of completion.

4) **Extension of approval:** If your project will not be complete by the expiry date stated above, you must apply in writing for extension of approval. Application should be made
before current approval expires; should specify a new completion date; should include reasons for your request; and should be endorsed by your supervisor (if applicable).

5) **Retention and storage of data:** University policy states that all research data must be stored securely, on University premises, for a minimum of five years. You and your supervisor (if applicable) must ensure that all records are transferred to the University when the project is complete.

6) **Changes in contact details:** You should advise the Committee of any change of address during or soon after the approval period including, if appropriate, email address(es).

Please add the Contact Complaints form (attached) for distribution with your project.

Yours sincerely

Bronwyn Low  
Secretary

Cc Dr Elke Stracke  
Faculty of Arts and Design
Appendix 27: A Curriculum Officer’s Sample Interview Transcript

“Identifying Chunks’

IV1/Curricoff/Lani/5.05.09 14.22 mins

Z = Informant  R = Interviewer

1  R  hello I’m Kessie a research student at the University of Canberra I’m currently doing a research project on the use of pidgins and creoles in education with specific focus on Tok Pisin in PNG primary schools compared to the local vernaculars I am very much interested to find out about your perspectives on the current education reform especially your views on the use of Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars in elementary and primary schools I am also interested in your views on the planning production and dissemination of teaching materials to schools throughout PNG furthermore I would like to hear about your personal views on the bridging and bilingual concepts in primary schools but before that . please tell me a little bit about who you are and what you do in your current job

2  Z  OK my name is Lani I am the manager for the elementary unit. one of the programs at PNGEI I manage the elementary teacher training program in the country and that consist of two three academic programs two are offered by PNGEI the third one is offered by University of Queensland the first one is for the training of our elementary teachers for the system school the second program the certificate of elementary teacher training program is to train the elementary trainers that facilitate our program. the CET program for the teachers at the different um district and provincial levels and the third one is a degree program in next year. that program as I said earlier is offered by QUT

3  R  alright thank you now first of all. let us talk about the bilingual bridging concepts now do you believe that provide providing background knowledge in Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars facilitate the English instructions? Or do you believe or do you have anything to say about the previous education system which you were you and I were educated in. the English only education um whether it better enabled students to be proficient in English compared to the current bilingual education program. I mean that is just comparing the old system with the new system so what are your views on that?

4  Z  I strongly believe in multilingual education in PNG because of the current multilingual communities in PNG. not bilingual but multilingual education and that will take in the the issue of bridging. compared to the previous. I think the edu reformed system of education I believe is in the right direction for PNG to provide the relevant education that um we are hoping to achieve for the children of this country

5  R  alright thank you now let’s move on to the issue of Tok Pisin OK now according to research Tok Pisin has now become the first language of thousands I mean it has become the first language or mother tongue of thousands of Papua New Guinean children today now most teachers in primary schools are also moving away from using vernacular languages and are using Tok Pisin in some of the schools. now what then do you think is the future of Tok Pisin? Do you think that the use of vernacular languages should be abolished and replaced solely
by this, by this by this um, Tok Pisin that there should there be some form of standardized Tok Pisin in all primary schools? I mean what’s your view?

6 Z my view is that Tok Pidgin I agree that it is becoming a language of most of our multilingual children and at the moment it should be standardized in a way for use for teaching and learning. I think don’t think it has come to that level yet so with Tok Pidgin. in the in the context of elementary education as the form of identity for PNG Tok Pidgin, if you look at it whom do we identify with? If you are Tolai and I am a Buin I can identify with the vernaculars of those um communities so in that context I believe that Tok Pidgin because of the nature of a developing language. it will be used as a short term purpose for the urban areas and in district areas where there are multilingual children because that is the first that teachers will rely on but in terms of fully implementing the reasons for the reform in terms of vernacular education. we are trying to maintain and promote and the cultural values and identity, the use of our languages or vernaculars must be used in education and support must come in that area in terms of training our teachers and also preparing materials and whatever in-services to cater for our teachers and trainees in the our system schools

7 R alright thank you and finally I’d like us to go onto what you just um raised. the issue of teaching resources OK Now um, first all what languages are the teaching and learning materials for both the teachers and students written in? Is it just in English?

8 Z at the moment um. it’s a big area in elementary education. the curriculum materials that are developed by the department. the teacher elementary education. we use for our training are done in English so in our trainings we teach the students to use the English written materials from curriculum materials and to use their tok ples to develop the teaching and learning materials inside the classroom and looking across the teachers themselves. are not very confident in their mother tongue, we’ve got a problem and also the the issue of bridging comes in. of teachers not being really understanding what bridging is all about. The elementary sector is being blamed at the moment for teach children not being literate in Grade 3, but in in the elementary teacher education we do bridging for only terms 3 and 4 in oral English, it’s not much but the current the current we are reviewing the policy and the department has to endorse or the government of the day has to it has to the policy has to be reviewed light, we are reviewing it in the light of children’s age in learning, the critical period

9 R learning the critical period

10 Z matching. so we are trying to move the bridging issue to earlier grades in elementary instead of a later grade. a later grade so that tapping on the critical age when children learn we will now teach teachers. train teachers to use two languages so I strongly believe. the longer we have the bridging program, the better for them the teachers to be competent in their mother tongue and that will further support their learning academic learning in English so that’s the current development we are doing in elementary education so most of our teachers struggle to develop their own vernacular materials

11 R that that is the issue that is why I asked that question
and because of the lack of funding, the in supporting the materials production for for the classrooms, you will not see much of you know. much of materials production inside the classroom environment but it depends on the teacher, it depends on the teacher. we train them to use improvised materials develop the curriculum materials for teaching. learning and assessment purposes inside the classroom.

yes. so that leads me on to a a another question about teachers being innovative. the question I was going to ask you is that do you think teachers should be more innovative in producing their own teaching materials instead of relying on materials from you people here?

yes we, we do not provide materials for classroom teaching and learning. we only train them how to improvise at the school level the main teaching strategy we use is teach them how to use the big books for participants including literacy in in an integrated manner so that they have a theme in all the other participants and language is part of the theme and they develop the literacy skills.

so that means you’ve just answered one of my questions that is whether you think your dispatch and supply um unit um I mean supply all the schools in the country with enough teaching resources and now you just told me that no you don’t do that. So they just come for training and they go back and do their own materials.

for the training we offer. for offer for the teachers. our training materials are in English and we’ve got four components of our program that is offered. the program for the teachers is three. three years. it takes three years so each year is um composed of four components one is the face-to-face six weeks that is the admission to their next academic year and then they have the self instructional units which is eight books. second year is eight books. third year is seven books their they do their own study and then um from there we offer also courses courses during the face-to-face six weeks and the in there we train them the academic knowledge that they need to know for the learning of the different participants that is content teaching and also the content teaching is contained in those self instructional units that’s the distant mode and they have, they have forty weeks on the job training. so the trainers go and supervise them any any any problems they encounter in their teaching and learning. administration and curriculum teaching and learning. they we have a what we call the curriculum cluster workshop. the trainers will use the curriculum cluster workshop to run an in-service for them for the identified need of teachers yea so we got that plus the commitment to teaching is the assessment of teachers attitudes. suitability to be a teacher so we have those four components. people do not understand the program we offer and they criticise.

well exactly. because a lot of people say they come only for a short period of time but all in all it’s about three years?

three years, year twos and years threes. Assessments are linked to their training allowances. In their first years, they get um twenty five percent. second year they get fifty percent and in their third year they get seventy five percent and when they graduate they get one hundred percent training.
19 R well, it’s just a misconception

20 Z yes

21 R people don’t know this. that’s why they complain a lot

22 Z no, but from verbal reports taken for elementary teachers to better in-services where the primary section combines the elementary section or into developing their own materials, and teaching and learning programs while the primary section. the curriculum materials were done in a a that the content is there, where as teachers. our teachers’ contents. contents which is which is um, um linked to the outcomes for the curriculum syllabus. the outcomes for elementary one. so using the outcomes. teachers plan their programs. plan their programs, teach their programs assess the programs. literacy and other subject

23 R alright. thank you very much that is the end of the interview
Appendix 28: A Curriculum Officer’s Sample, Stage One: Open Coding

IV1/Curricoff/Lani/5.05.09

Numbers refer to transcript lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literal Chunks from the Interview Transcript</th>
<th>Initial Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. I strongly believe in multilingual education in PNG because of the current multilingual communities in PNG.</td>
<td>Multilingual education for PNG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. not bilingual but multilingual education and that will take in the the the issue of bridging.</td>
<td>Disregard bilingual and focus on multilingual education including bridging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I think the edu reformed system of education I believe is in the right direction for PNG to provide the relevant education that um we are hoping to achieve for the children of this country</td>
<td>The education reform in PNG is heading the right direction as its providing relevant education for its children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tok Pidgin I agree that it is becoming a language of most of our multilingual children and at the moment it should be standardized in a way for use for teaching and learning.</td>
<td>There’s a need for Tok Pisin to be standardized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. in the context of elementary education as the form of identity for PNG Tok Pidgin, if you look at it whom do we identify with?</td>
<td>In a PNG context Tok Pisin does not give a person an identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If you are Tolai and I am a Buin I can identify with the vernaculars of those um communities so in that context I believe that Tok Pidgin because of the nature of a developing language, it will be used as a short term purpose only for the urban areas and in district areas where there are multilingual children</td>
<td>The use of local vernaculars gives a person a sense of identity not pidgin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. because that is the first that teachers will rely on but in terms of fully implementing the reasons for the reform in terms of vernacular education, we are trying to maintain and promote and the cultural values and identity, the use of our languages or vernaculars must be used in education</td>
<td>Although teachers will still rely on Pidgin in urban areas, the use of local vernaculars must be used in education in order to maintain and promote cultural values and identities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. and support must come in that area in terms of training our teachers and also preparing materials and whatever in-services to cater for our teachers and trainees in the our system schools</td>
<td>Support is needed in the area of teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. our trainings are done in English so in our trainings we teach the students to use the English written materials from curriculum materials and to use their tokples (local vernacular) to develop the teaching and learning materials inside the classroom</td>
<td>Trainings are in English and students use local vernaculars to develop their own teaching and learning materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. looking across the teachers themselves. are not very confident in their mother tongue, we’ve got a problem</td>
<td>Teachers are not very confident in their mother tongue which is a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. also the the issue of bridging comes in. of teachers not being really understanding what bridging is all about.</td>
<td>The concept of bridging is not well understood by teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The elementary sector is being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. The elementary sector is being blamed at the moment for teaching children not being literate in Grade 3,

8. but in the elementary teacher education we do bridging for only terms 3 and 4 in oral English, it’s not much

8. but the current we are reviewing the policy and the department has to endorse or the government of the day has to it has to the policy has to be reviewed light, we are reviewing it in the light of because of in the light of um. in the light of children’s age in learning, the critical period

10. so we are trying to move the bridging issue to earlier grades in elementary instead of a later grade.

10. we will now teach teachers. train teachers to use two languages so I strongly believe. the longer we have the bridging program, the better for them the teachers to be competent in their mother tongue and that will further support their learning academic learning in English so that’s the current development we are doing in elementary education

10. most of our teachers struggle to develop their own vernacular materials

12. because of the lack of funding. in supporting the materials production for the classrooms, you will not see much of you know, much of materials production inside the classroom environment but it depends on the teacher, we train them to use improvised materials develop the curriculum materials for teaching. learning and assessment purposes inside the classroom

14. we do not provide materials for classroom teaching and learning. we only train them how to improvise at the school level

blamed for children not being literate in Grade 3

Not much is being put into the bridging concept, its only in terms 3 and 4

The current policy is being reviewed to cater for children’s age in learning “the critical period.

Bridging to be moved to earlier grades in elementary rather than a later grade

Teachers to be trained using two languages

Most teachers struggle to develop their own teaching Materials

As a result of lack of funding, there is less evidence of material production in the classrooms. However it all depends on the teacher

The curriculum division does not provide materials for classroom teaching and learning. They only train students/teachers how to improvise at the school level
Appendix 29: A Curriculum Officer’s Sample, Stage Two: Focused Coding

IV1/Curricoff/Lani/5.05.09  Purple = Focused Coding  Green = Emerging Themes

→ Multilingual education a must in PNG – multilingual education in PNG

→ Focus on multilingual education and bridging, not bilingual education – multilingual education in PNG

→ The current education reform in PNG is suitable for its children – education reform is suitable

→ Tok Pisin must be standardized – standardize Tok Pisin

→ Tok Pisin does not give a person an identity in PNG – Tok Pisin; no identity

→ Tok Pisin does not give a person a sense of identity but local vernaculars do – local vernaculars give identity

→ Tok Pisin is the most common language in urban areas but local vernaculars must be emphasized to maintain cultural values and identities – Tok Pisin common language in urban areas, local vernaculars give identity and cultural values

→ Teacher training must be supported – teacher training lack support

→ Teacher training is done in English but students use their own vernaculars to develop teaching resources – training in English

→ Teaching resources done in vernaculars

→ Teachers not being confident in their mother tongue is an issue in the current education reform – teachers lack confidence in teaching own mother tongue

→ Teachers do not understand the bridging concept well – bridging concept not understood

→ The elementary sector is being blamed for children not being literate in Grade 3 – elementary blamed for children’s illiteracy

→ Less work has been put into the bridging concept – the bridging concept needs more work

→ There is now a review on children’s age in learning “the Critical Period’ review children’s age in learning

→ Bridging will be moved to earlier grades in elementary schools rather than a later grade – bridging to English in earlier grades

→ If all goes well teachers will be trained using two languages in elementary - teachers to be trained in two languages

→ The bulk of the teachers face difficulties trying to develop their own teaching materials – difficulties in creating teaching resources

→ Because of lack of funding, material production is less evidenced in the classrooms. But it depends on individual teachers – lack of funds result in lack of teaching resources
Appendix 30: A Teacher’s Sample Interview Transcript

Initial Coding: Indentifying Chunks

IV9/teach/Tanya/21.05.09 9.51 Minutes

Z = Interviewee R = Interviewer

1 R good morning I’m Kessie a research student at the University of Canberra but currently doing a research project on the use of pidgins and creoles in education compared to the use of it about vernaculars in our primary and elementary schools in PNG now to start off our interview I’d like you to tell me a little bit about yourself

2 Z thank you Kessie I’m Tanya, firstly I graduated as a certificate teacher but in 2005 I um decided to upgrade my qualification so I went up to Kabaleo Teachers’ College and did primary diploma in-service and gained my uh diploma then in teaching and yeah

3 R OK thank you now um how long have you been teaching? How long have you been a teacher?

4 Z uh this is my seventeenth year

5 R your seventeenth year?

6 Z yeah

7 R OK if this is your seventeenth year then how long have you been teaching in the current reform?

8 Z um from 2000 um 2003 to 2009

9. R so it’s roughly about six years in this current reform?

10 Z yeah

11 R alright now do you believe that providing background knowledge in Tok Pisin and Tolai facilitate English instruction like do you think it is good that we’re using these two languages in order for the children to gain a better understanding of English in the classroom? What is your opinion?

12 Z I believe that what that was recommended should be emphasized has been brought forwarded according to the needs which have been encountered and you could say there is a fact that learning into a more than two languages

13. R OK then have you encountered any problems in this current bilingual program when using either Tok Pisin and Kuanua the Tolai language?

14 Z the only problem that I have encountered is that I am not from this Province not a Kuanua speaker but I am teaching in this society and most of the schools um the local should be the ones sorry but my aim and motive is that um a foreigner not a foreigner but I’m from a

15 R someone from outside

16 Z yea someone outside

17 R not a native speaker of the language

18 Z of the language OK the only problem that I encounter is that how I could how I could link or bridge students children from what they already know so that I can help them bring them up to the next level of learning

19 R using their mother tongue?

20 Z yes

21 R so what do you normally use then since you are not a Kuanua or a Tolai speaker?
I use pidgin OK I have to admit here when I use pidgin and the kids that I am teaching may be Grade 3 who already went through elementary in their own vernacular Kuanua OK the problem that I have encountered is they were taught using Kuanua and then when they come in here to primary level I teach with pidgin that’s the problem then I make them confuse when I teach them there are two different things.

two different languages

so you must be a native speaker to bridge them

to bridge that gap

from Tolai in elementary to like English language um some of them might not even understand.

so there is a breakdown there adding on to that. I believe that those um pidgin speakers should be allocated a special class in elementary coming to there should be a Grade 3 teacher allocated for the pidgin alone

pidgin speakers to a pidgin class and Kuanua teacher Tolai teacher to Tolai speakers to bridge to English? OK thank you now can you describe your experiences of having to plan and teach in two different languages compared to the previous curriculum when you were teaching only in English? Can you describe your experiences have you like you know to describe your experiences to plan and teach in two different languages? I’m not sure whether you have experiences in the past where English only was taught

OK I could say that planning and programming in two languages makes it easier for me as a teacher to bring across the concepts and for the students to see clearly how they can link the concepts or their understanding that there is a sort of something like from the known to the unknown situation from what they do know just going in deeper trying to connect so programming in two languages two things side by side talking about the same thing is OK

OK lets go onto the issue of teaching resources now do you think there is enough teaching resources in your school?

that’s the failure in the school now Kabagap primary school consists of more than nine hundred students and uh as a I am a teacher from here for more than 9 years um our classrooms are not that equipped

with resources

OK

now in your opinion how can uh school boards be encouraged to allocate sufficient funds like each year or term to enable students sorry teachers to continue to produce resources? do you think that the school board or the P and C or whoever can step in? from you experiences what can you say?

the school board this is from my experience they are more interested in the physical development not to do with academic

nothing much to do with the teaching resources so they leave that to you teachers?

expecting the department

expecting the department and the teachers to find means to it

alright my final question is what do you think is the future of Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars I mean what I’m asking for is . do you have anything else to say about the current reform you can air your views now

mhm OK the thing is that the two languages should be enforced

OK can you explain why
because but in terms of they are not mixed what I mean here is that some elementary and 
pre schools started elementary classes with pidgin and back at home Kuanua so when they come into a 
primary school the two different schools try to combine so I believe that those attending um elementary or 
prep in Tok Pisin shall continue in Tok Pisin and bridging by a Tok Pisin teacher and kuanua the same
OK thank you very much that is the end of our interview.
Appendix 31: A Teacher’s Sample Stage One: Open Coding

IV9/teach/Tanya/21.05.09

Numbers refer to transcript lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literal Chunks from the Interview Transcript</th>
<th>Initial Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. I believe that what that was recommended should be emphasized has been brought forwarded according to the needs which have been encountered and you could say there is a fact that learning into a more than two languages</td>
<td>providing background knowledge in Tok Pisin and Tolai facilitate English instruction which meets the needs that have been encountered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. the only problem that I have encountered is that I am not from this Province not a Kuanua speaker but I am teaching in this society and most of the schools um the local should be be the ones sorry but my aim and motive is that um a foreigner not a foreigner but I’m from a</td>
<td>Teachers do find difficulties when they are teaching in a school which uses a local vernacular that is different from theirs and therefore find it hard to bridge children into English in Grade 3 after leaving elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. of the language OK the only problem that I encounter is that how I could how I could link or bridge students children from what they they already know so that I can help them bring them up to the next level of learning</td>
<td>Due to teachers not knowing the local vernacular of the children they resort to using Tok Pisin in Grade 3 instead and teachers have admitted that they do make students confuse. Therefore teachers point out that when children in an elementary school learn Tolai they must have a Tolai teacher to bridge them onto English. The same with pidgin elementary students, they must be taught in pidgin to bridge to English in Grade 3 in order to avoid confusing children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I use pidgin OK I have to admit here when I use pidgin and the kids that I am teaching may be Grade 3 who already went through elementary in their own vernacular Kuanua OK the problem that I have encountered is they were taught using Kuanua and then when they come in here to primary level I teach with pidgin that’s the problem then I make them confuse when I teach them there are two different things</td>
<td>Planning programs into languages makes it easy for the teacher to impart content to the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. two different languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. to bridge that gap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. OK I could say that planning and programming in two languages makes it easier for me as a teacher to bring across the concepts and for the students to see clearly how they can link the concepts or their understanding that there is a sort of something like from the known to the unknown situation from what they do know just going in deeper trying to connect so programming in two languages two things side by side talking about the same thing is OK the failure in the school now Kabagap primary school consists of more 32. than nine hundred students and uh as a I am a teacher from here for more than 9 years um our classrooms are not that equipped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. the school board this is from my experience they are more interested in the physical development not to do with academic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. expecting the department and the teachers to find means to it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. the thing is that the two languages should be enforced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. because but in terms of they are not mixed what I mean here is that some elementary and pre schools started elementary classes with pidgin and back at home Kuanua so when they come into a primary school the two different schools try to combine so I believe that those attending um elementary or prep in Tok Pisin shall continue in Tok Pisin and bridging by a Tok Pisin teacher and Kuanua the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School boards are mostly interested
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>in funding the physical development of the school only and not funding students and teachers resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars should be unforced in schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be strong emphasis put on children leaving Tolai elementary school to be taught by a Grade 3 teachers who speaks Tolai and the same with Tok Pisin elementary students to be taught in Tok Pisin in Grade 3 so there’s a smooth transition into English to avoid confusing children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 32: A Teacher’s Sample Stage Two: Focused Coding

IV9/teach/Tanya/21.05.09

→ Providing background knowledge in Tok Pisin and Tolai facilitate English instruction which meets the needs that have been encountered – Tok Pisin and Tolai - helpful.

→ Teachers do find difficulties when they are teaching in a school which uses a local vernacular that is different from theirs and therefore find it hard to bridge children into English in Grade 3 after leaving elementary - Lack of students L1 causes difficulties for teachers.

→ Due to teachers not knowing the local vernacular of the children they resort to using Tok Pisin in Grade 3 instead and teachers have admitted that they do make students confused. Teachers choice of Tok Pisin confuses students.

→ Therefore teachers point out that when children in an elementary school learn Tolai they must have a Tolai teacher to bridge them onto English. The same with pidgin elementary students, they must be taught in pidgin to bridge to English in Grade 3 in order to avoid confusing children- students from Tolai elementary with Tolai teacher, students from Tok Pisin elementary schools with Tok Pisin teacher.

→ Planning programs in two languages makes it easy for the teacher to impart content to the students Programming in two languages - helpful.

→ There’s an ever increasing number of students each year and the schools are lacking teaching resources in school - Lack of resources.

→ School boards are mostly interested in funding the physical development of the school only and not funding students and teachers resources - School boards must fund teaching resources.

→ Enforce Tok Pisin and the local vernaculars in schools.
Appendix 33: A Parent’s Sample Interview Transcript

Initial Coding: Identifying Chunks

(In Tok Pisin with English translations in blue. The identified chunks are italicized in bold blue)

IV45/par/Annette/04.12.09
7.15 Minutes

Z = Interviewee  R = Interviewer

1  R hello nem blo mi Kessie mi kam mi wanpla research student lo University of Canberra mi kam lo PNG lo wokim wanpla research lo the use of pidgin or Tok Pision na ol tokples blo yumi long ol schools blo yumi so but bifo yumi go lo interview mi laik bai yu tokim mi lo nem blo yu wonem ples yuk am long en na na wonem kain wok yu sa mekim lo hia lo ples

hello my name is Kessie and I am a research student from the University of Canberra in Australia I am here in PNG to do a research on the use of Tok Pisin and our local language in our schools but before we go on with the interview I’d like you to tell me your name where you from and what you do in the village

2  Z OK nem blo mi Annette bifo mi sa wok lo TNT as a manageress lo disla company ol i kolim lo TNT Air Cargo nau mi no mo wok mi stap nating lo ples mi self-employed lo uh ples olsem mi wokim ol liklik housework kain olsem ol liklik uh liklik ol liklik wok we em inap halivim mipla ol papa lo sindaun lo laif blo mipla lo ples

OK my name is Annette before I used to work with TNT Air Cargo as the company’s manageress but now I am no longer working. I am now self-employed in the village doing house work and odd little things for selling in order to supplement my family’s life in the village

3  R na wonem ples yuk am long en?

and where do you come from?

4  Z mi kam lo Vunamami village lo Kokopo district

I come from Vunamami village in the Kokopo district

5  R OK OK tenkyu lo disla OK igat olsem faivpla question olsem tasol uh the first one that mi laik askim yu long en em i refer back i go lo displa ol tokples ol tokples ol i save usim lo ol classroom lo ol schools blo yumi first of all mi laik bai yu tokim mi lo ol opinion blo yu whether you think the use of pidgin na ol local vernaculars ol tokples em i appropriate o em i suitim ol uh o emi gutpla lo ol pikini blo yumi lo PNG? yu ting em gutpla samting bai oli ken lanim tok ples na Tok Pisin lo elementary bihain kam lo English lo primary? wonem kain tingting?
OK thank you for this OK I have about five questions here and the first one involves the languages that are used in the classrooms in schools first of all I’d like you to give me your opinion on whether you think the use of Tok Pisin and our local vernaculars are appropriate for use in our schools? do you think it’s good for these languages to be taught to children first in elementary then learn English when they move on to primary?

6 Z lo lukluk blo mi taim mi lukluk bek lo ol pikinini blo mi i skul long elementary school ol i lanim tokples na oli no save lo Tok pisin na tok English na bihain ol i kam lo community school em ol i lanim English nau tasol i hard long ol long catch up wantem English because ah disla English ol i mas statim yet lo taim ol i stap lo elementary na disla sapos ol i startim lo elementary em bai halivim ol enabalim ol lo uh tok tok English lo taim ol i go lo community school

from my observation and reflecting back on the time my children went to school they did not learn Tok Pisin and English only Tokples (Tolai) It was hard for them to catch up with English I think English should have been introduced at the time they started elementary in order to enable them speak good English when they moved onto community school

7 R OK tenkyu tru lo disla OK lo taim ol pikinini blo yu I bin go lo school na ol i kam bek wanem ol homework blong ol yu bin lukim olsem ol pikinini blo yu i bin sa findim isi lo taim ol i wokim homework o ol i sa askim yu ken lo explainim i go long ol? yu sa halpim ol tu mi laik save

OK thanks for this OK when your children went to school and came back with their homework did you observe that your children were finding it a bit difficult to do the work? and did they ever ask you to explain things again to them?

8 yes disala taim oli sa kam bek wanem ol homework blong ol em i save hard long ol lo wokim aut ol homework blong ol bikos disala ol languages ya i sa confusim ol bikos ol i no save lo English ol i no save long Tok Pisin ol i save tasol long tokples na sapos ol i sa lo lukluk blo mi mi lukim olsem taim ol i stap lo elementary ol i mas skulim ol long English na pidgin na tokples wanem bai gutpla lo halivim ol long taim ol i go antap lo community skul bikos lo taim ol i stap lo community school na ol i sa kam wantaim ol homework blong ol em i sa hat long ol lo uh tingim ol wonem kain meaning blo ol disala wok we bai ol i karim i kam lo ples lo mipla lo ol papa mama lo uh wokim out

yes I observed that they found it very difficult to do their homework because all these languages confused them they did not know English and Tok Pisin they only knew tokples (Tolai) in my view I think that if they were taught English and Tok Pisin together with Tolai in elementary it would have been very helpful to the children and therefore being taught in English and Tok Pisin in primary school wouldn’t have been a problem

9 R OK so i bin luk olsem ol papa mama ken ol i gat traipla wok ken long halivim ol pikinini olsem ol i kamap ol teacher ken em steret?

yes so it looked like parents played the role of the teachers again is that correct?
yes that’s correct it looked like parents will have to become the children’s first teachers in helping out with homework

OK tenkyu narapla question em lo level of English blo ol pikinini nau OK nau yu stap lo ples yu wok lo lukim olsem ol pikinini ol grade eight o oli lusim skul na kam na yu sa harim ol tu at least oli sa speak English na sapos ol i sa speak English level of English blong ol em i olsem wonem? O yu ken toktok liklik long disla o nogat turu? o olsem wonem?

OK thank you another question is on the level of English of those children who finished grade eith and are back in the village what can you say about their spoken English?

yes I can say something on that now that I’ve finished work and am at home in the village these children don’t even have a good command of spoken English so I believe it is better to start them off with English as early as possible in elementary school even most of the high school students I hear do not speak good English at all

so you would say it’s their grammar that is not good

yes their grammar is not really good unless they start them off in elementary

OK another thing is on these two systems the way you talking is like the views of some other parents I’ve spoken to so do you think we should abolish this current education system and re-introduce the English only curriculum?
my view goes like this I’d like to see this present system abolished and re-introduce the old system but to introduce also both Tok Pisin and English in the elementary school

OK thanks a lot for this the last thing I’d like to ask is whether you have anything else to say in general about the language system or any other things

OK I can tell you that when I see our children move up to primary school they find it very hard to speak or catch up with English or even understand English I feel sorry for them because at least they should be introduced to English at the elementary so by the time they come to primary school it will be easy for them to speak English when we go to the school market to sell food we feel sorry for the students when we hear them speaking broken English but what can we do it’s all part of this new system

this OBE is not really good and some of us parents are against it and would like to see the old system come back

OK tenkyu tru long disla interview blo yumi tupla Annette tenkyu
Ok thanks a lot for our interview Annette

OK mi ken tok olsem taim mi save lukim ol pikinini blo yumi i sa kam antap lo community school na i sa hat long ol lo speakim or catch up wantem English or understandim English mi sa sore long ol bikos at least bai ol i startim yet long elementary na taim ol i kam lo community school em bai easy long ol lo speakim English na taim mpla ol mama mpla sa go long market lo school mpla i sa sori long ol lo taim mpla sa harim ol broken English we ol i save usim lo taim ol i toktok lo school ah sampla taim mpla i sa lap but mpla bai mekim wonem?disala niupla system

em disala OBE emi no gutpala tumas olsem na mpla sampla i strongly againsim na mpla laikim oldpla system bai mas kam bek yeah

OK I can tell you that when I see our children move up to primary school they find it very hard to speak or catch up with English or even understand English I feel sorry for them because at least they should be introduced to English at the elementary so by the time they come to primary school it will be easy for them to speak English when we go to the school market to sell food we feel sorry for the students when we hear them speaking broken English but what can we do it’s all part of this new system

OK tenkyu tru long disla interview blo yumi tupla Annette tenkyu
Ok thanks a lot for our interview Annette

OK tenkyu Kessie
Appendix 34: A Parent’s Sample Stage One: Open Coding

IV45/par/Annette/04.12.09

Numbers refer to transcript lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literal Chunks from the Interview Transcript</th>
<th>Initial Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. from my observation and reflecting back on the time my children went to school they did not learn Tok Pisin and English only Tokples (Tolai) It was hard for them to catch up with English I think English should have been introduced at the time they started elementary in order to enable them speak goo English when they moved onto community school</td>
<td>This parent recalls that when her children went to elementary school they were only taught in the local vernacular and not Tok Pisin and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. yes I observed that they found it very difficult to do their homework because all these languages confused them they did not know English and Tok Pisin they only knew tokples (Tolai) in my view I think that if they were taught English and Tok Pisin together with Tolai in elementary it would have been very helpful to the children and therefore being taught in English and Tok Pisin in primary school wouldn’t have been a problem</td>
<td>Her children found it very difficult to do their homework at home and so had to step in to assist them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. yes that’s correct it looked like parents became the children’s first teachers again in doing homework</td>
<td>She thinks it would have been helpful if they had learnt English and Tok Pisin also at elementary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. yes I can say something on that now that I’ve finished work and am at home in the village these children don’t even have a good command of spoken English so I believe it is better to start them off with English as early as possible in elementary school even most of the high school students I hear do not speak good English at all</td>
<td>This put a lot of pressure on parents who have to help out their children again at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. yes their grammar is not really good unless they start them off in elementary</td>
<td>English must be introduced in elementary school to children so they have a good command of the language as they progress onto later levels of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. my view goes like this I’d like to see this present system abolished and re-introduce the old system but to introduce also both Tok Pisin and English in the elementary school</td>
<td>At the moment children cannot speak good and correct English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. OK I can tell you that when I see our children move up to primary school they find it very hard to speak or catch up with English or even understand English I feel sorry for them because at least they should be introduced to English at the elementary so by the time they come to primary school it will be easy for them to speak English when we go to the school market to sell food we feel sorry for the students when we hear them speaking broken English but what can we do its all part of this new system</td>
<td>Most sentences they produce are grammatically incorrect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. this OBE is not really good and some of us parents are against it and would like to see the old system come back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This parent recalls that when her children went to elementary school they were only taught in the local vernacular and not Tok Pisin and English. Her children found it very difficult to do their homework at home and so had to step in to assist them. She thinks it would have been helpful if they had learnt English and Tok Pisin also at elementary. This put a lot of pressure on parents who have to help out their children again at home. English must be introduced in elementary school to children so they have a good command of the language as they progress onto later levels of learning. At the moment children cannot speak good and correct English. Most sentences they produce are grammatically incorrect.
This parent recalls that when her children went to elementary school they were only taught in the local vernacular and not Tok Pisin and English.

Her children found it very difficult to do their homework at home and so had to step in and assist them. Difficulty in doing homework.

She thinks it would have been helpful if they had learnt English and Tok Pisin also at elementary. Both Tolai and Tok Pisin at elementary.

This put a lot of pressure on parents who have to help out their children again at home. Parents are pressured.

At the moment children cannot speak good and correct English. Students lacking proper English skills.

Grammatically incorrect sentences.
Appendix 36: A Student’s Sample Interview Transcript

Initial Coding: Identifying Chunks

(In Tok Pisin with English translations in blue. The identified chunks are italicized in **bold blue**)

IV26/stu/Arabella/18.06.09 3.37 Minutes

Z = Interviewee R = Interviewer

1  R  OK hello name blo mi Kessie OK na wonem name blo yu?
   OK hello my name is Kessie OK and what is your name?
2  Z  Arabella
3  R  Arabella OK na how old are you?
   Arabella OK and how old are you?
4  Z  mi
   me
5  R  uh no no wonem wonem krismas blo yu?
   uhm no no how old are you?
6  Z  ten
7  R  ten yu years old? OK orait what grade are you in now?
   ten years old OK what grade are you in now?
8  Z  three
9  R  you are in Grade 3? OK orait mi sa yu mas attendim elementary school before ah
   before yuk am lo Kokopo OK tokim mi wonem elementary school yu attendim?
   you are in Grade 3? OK alright I know you must have attended elementary school
   before you came to Kokopo OK tell me what elementary school did you attend?
10 Z  Vunapope elementary
11 R  Vunapope elementary school? OK lo taim yu stap lo Vunapope elementary school
   teacher blo my i save toktok lo wonem tokples or wonem language? uhm English uhm Tok Pisin
   or Kuanua Tolai?
12 Z  Pidgin
13 R  Pidgin ah so yu lanim Pidgin lo elementary OK na lo taim teacher blo yu i teach
   lo Pidgin yu save enjoym class blo yu?
   Pidgin so you learned Pidgin in elementary school OK and when your teacher
   taught you in pidgin did you enjoy the lesson?
14 Z  yes
15 R  OK so nau yu kam lo Grade 3 lo Kokopo primary yu hamamas that ol i teachim
   yu English nau?
   OK so now that you are in Grade 3 are you happy that you are being taught

   English?
16 Z  yes
17 R  OK na yu ting English i important lo yu why? why bai yu mas lanim English?
OK and why do you think English is important to you? Why do you have to learn English?

18  Z  English mi sa laikim
    *I like English*

19  R  mhm yu save long English bai yu wokim wonem samting?
    *mhm if you know English what do you intend to do?*

20  Z  sapos ol i speak English lo mi bai mi save
    *If they speak English to me I will know*

21  R  OK na tu sapos yu kisim wok bai yu wok lo tok Pisin long ofis or English
    OK and if you do get a job would you use Tok Pisin or English in the office?

22  Z  English

23  R  so yu ting English em i important lo yu ah? OK orait na sapos lo classroom na teacher i explainim ol samting bai yupla wokim lo classroom yu save painim isi lo taim i sa speak English? na sampal taim?
    *so you think English is important hey? OK alright and if your teacher explains something in English in class do you find it easy? and sometimes?*

24  Z  sampla taim i hard
    *sometimes its hard*

25  R  sampla taim i hard na sapos i hard yu findim hard yu yet yu sa mekim wonem?
    *sometimes its’ hard and when you find it hard what do you do?*

26  Z  askim em
    *I ask him*

27  R  yu askim em bai mekim wonem?
    *why do you ask him?*

28  Z  explainim lo pidgin
    to explain it in Pidgin

29  R  explainim lo pidgin OK gutpla OK nau because yu no sa speak English olgeta taim yu ting bai yu mekim wonem or teacher mekim wonem lo halpim yu bai yu save gut long English so that bihain taim yu ken save gut long English?
    *explain it in pidgin OK good OK now because you don’t speak English all the time what would you or your teacher do to help you know English better?*

30  Z  bai mi pray long God long helpim mi long English
    *I will pray to God to help me with my English*

30  R  OK bai yu pray long God bai helpim yu long English OK  apart from askim God long helpim yu long English wonem samting tu yu tingim bai teacher i ken wokim?
    *OK you will pray to God to help you with your English OK apart from asking God to help you with your English what do you think your teacher should do to help?*

31  Z  bai teacher givim mi sampla homework
    *the teacher should give me some homework*

32  R  OK bai wokim sampla homework bai yu karim i go lo haus na bai yu go lanim
    OK na yu yet lo hia long school yu sa speak English tu arasait or nogat?
    *OK he should give you some homework to do at home OK and when you are here in school do you ever speak English outside the classroom?*

33  Z  no

34  R  na yu sa speak English anywhere at all or nogat?
    *and do you speak anywhere at all*
35  Z  nogat
    no
36  R  nogat olgeta na lo haus blo yu? yu speak English or nogat?
    not at all and what about at home do yhou speak English or no?
37  Z  mi sa speak sampla taim tasol
    I only speak it at times
38  R  sampla taim tasol?
    only sometimes?
39  Z  mipla sa speakim
    we do speak it
40  R  so sampla taim wantaim family blo yu yupla sa speak wonem?
    so at times with your family what else do you speak
41  Z  pidgin
42  R  pidgin only OK OK gutpla so yu gat sampla samting ken lo tok long en olsem bai
    yu improve lo wok blo yu lo school?
    pidgin only OK OK good so do you have anything else to say in order to improve
    in school?
43  Z  yes
44  R  OK so yu ting bai yu ken tokim mi long wonem samting teacher i ken wokim or
    yupla wantem ol friends blo yu bai save gut long English
    OK so what else can you tell me about what your teacher or your friends can do in
    order to help you know English better?
43  Z  teacher i save tok lo wonem yu mas harim tok na wokim
    the teacher tells us to listen and do as he says
44  R  wantaim ol friends blo yu tu? OK tenkyu turu em tasol OK
    is this together with your friends? OK thanks a lot that’s all OK
Appendix 37: A Student’s Sample Stage One: Open Coding

IV26/stu/Arabella/18.06.09

Numbers refer to transcript lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literal Chunks from the Interview Transcript</th>
<th>Initial Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Vunapope elementary school? OK when you were at Vunapope elementary school what language did your teacher use? Uhm English Tok Pisin or Tolai?</td>
<td>This student attended a Tok Pisin elementary school where she was taught in Tok Pisin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Pidgin</td>
<td>Because she was taught in a language she knows she enjoyed her lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pidgin so you learned Pidgin in elementary school OK and when your teacher taught you in pidgin did you enjoy the lesson?</td>
<td>The student is now happy that she is being taught in English and she likes learning English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. OK so now that you are in Grade 3 are you happy that you are being taught English?</td>
<td>So when she come face-to-face with people who speak English to her in her future job she will know what to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I like English</td>
<td>At the moment the student still finds difficulty understanding her teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. If they speak English I will know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. OK and if you do get a job would you use Tok Pisin or English in the office?</td>
<td>When there’s misunderstanding, the student asks the teacher to explain in Tok Pisin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. English</td>
<td>The student hardly speaks English outside the classroom but does speak it at times in class when the teacher asks him to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. if your teacher explains something in English in class do you find it easy? and sometimes?</td>
<td>The language she speaks at home with her family is Tok Pisin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. sometimes its hard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. sometimes its’ hard and when you find it hard what do you do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I ask him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. why do you ask him?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. to explain it in Pidgin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. the teacher should give me some homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. when you are here in school do you ever speak English outside the classroom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I only speak it at times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. so at times with your family what else do you speak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Z pidgin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. the teacher tells us to listen and do as he says</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This student attended a Tok Pisin elementary school where she was taught in Tok Pisin. Because she was taught in a language she knows she enjoyed her lessons. Initial education in L1 helps. The student is now happy that she is being taught in English and she likes learning English. Students enjoys learning English. So when she come face-to-face with people who speak English to her in her future job she will know what to do. English for student’s future. At the moment the student still finds difficulty understanding her teacher. Misunderstandings between teacher and student. When there’s misunderstanding, the student ask the teacher to explain in Tok Pisin. Tok Pisin for clarify misunderstandings. The student hardly speaks English outside the classroom but does speak it at times in class when the teacher asks him to. No English outside classroom. The language she speaks at home with her family is Tok Pisin. Tok Pisin -home language.
## Appendix 39: Hypothesis test Summaries for Teachers, Parents and Students

### a) Hypothesis Test Summary for Teachers (Tok Pisin and Tolai)

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q31. The distribution of ‘the heavy use of Tok Pisin/Tolai in the classroom contributes to students lacking proficiency in English’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U Test</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32. The distribution of ‘the use of Tok Pisin/Tolai alongside English in the classroom helps students acquire English easily’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Test Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39. The distribution of ‘There is an abundant supply of teaching materials in Tok Pisin/Tolai’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b) Hypothesis Test Summary for Parents (Tok Pisin and Tolai)

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27. The distribution of ‘Teaching Tok Pisin/Tolai in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in the PNG society’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U Test</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29. The distribution of ‘Tok Pisin/Tolai hinders the learning process of a child when attempting to learn English in the bridging program’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Test Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32. The distribution of ‘Tok Pisin/Tolai helps my child to excel in his/her school work’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33. The distribution of ‘My child finds work in Tok Pisin/Tolai easy to understand’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q34. The distribution of ‘The use of Tok Pisin/Tolai should cease at the end of Lower Primary’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q35. The distribution of ‘Teachers must be literate in Tok Pisin/Tolai in order to assist my child well in bridging to English’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q36. The distribution of ‘Grade 3 bridging teachers must be fully bilingual in English and Tok Pisin/Tolai’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q37. The distribution of ‘Lower Primary teachers must attend regular in-service training on planning in Tok Pisin/Tolai is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q38. The distribution of ‘The NDOE must provide bilingual teaching materials to all schools is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q39. The distribution of ‘Teachers must be multi-skilled in both Tok Pisin/Tolai and English to produce a variety of teaching materials’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) **Hypothesis Test Summary for Tok Pisin Parents vs Tok Pisin Teachers**
Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27. The distribution of ‘Teaching Tok Pisin in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in PNG society’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U Test</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>Retain the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) **Hypothesis Test Summary for Tolai Parents vs Tolai Teachers**
Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27. The distribution of ‘Teaching Tolai in elementary schools is important for a child’s survival in PNG society’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U Test</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) **Hypothesis Test Summary for All Parents vs All Tolai Teachers**
Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q29 in the teachers’ questionnaire and Q30 in the parents’ questionnaire The distribution of ‘English is an international language therefore children should acquire it at an early age (in elementary 1 and 2) to be successful in life’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U Test</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) **Hypothesis Test Summary for Students (Tok Pisin and Tolai)**
Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q18. The distribution of ‘Using Tok Pisin/Tolai in the classroom helps me understand English better’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U Test</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. The distribution of ‘I speak Tok Pisin/Tolai most of the time in school’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Test Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20. The distribution of ‘I find it easier talking to my teacher in Tok Pisin/Tolai than in English’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. The distribution of ‘Tok Pisin/Tolai is more important to learn than English’ is the same across all categories of Groups.</td>
<td>Independent Samples Mann-Whitney U test</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>Reject the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>